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ABSTRACT

The academy and community: seeking authentic voices inside higher education

The research explores ‘community’ as perceived and experienced by academics associated with one higher education institution. Focusing on the meaning and experience of community, the research reveals living academic identities wrought by the concrete reality of experiencing community in its various forms. ‘Authentic voices’ in this context means voices that are firmly rooted in day-to-day lived experience and not abstract or institutionalised. The imperative for the research lies in the quest to break free from the constraints of the calculative thinking that pervades higher education. The dominant tone of the literature on academic community is disconsolate but not despairing. The dominant language is that of professional practice and values. The empirical dimensions of the research comprises a series of extended conversations and focus groups with twelve academics and a heuristic analysis, channelled through five themes, seeking the individual’s idea and experience of community and its orientation to their status, their academic practice and their institution and environment. The original contribution to knowledge is the revelation of the significance of value and values in the meaning and experience of community and how these may be applied in a theoretical and practical context when constructing and understanding community both as a concept, and as lived experience. Value and values are brought together in a suggested new model (called the ‘infinity model’), a relational construct that signifies the formation and experience of community through a continual or infinite dynamic between ‘value and validity’ (centred on status and institution), and ‘values and virtue’ (centred on practice and elements of community), realised through the nexus of individual or collective agency. The new model has research and agentic potential as a framework for both investigating and realising the social relations of the intellectual field.
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PREFACE

In 2005 I joined higher education from a charity chief executive role and worked as a middle manager at the University of Greystone until 2014 when, according to a colleague, I ‘moved over to the other side’, by securing a research fellowship at the same institution. The impetus for the doctoral research emerged from my management role in community-university engagement although the research ended up focusing more on community than engagement. My experiential knowledge of community inside academia is not insubstantial and I am fascinated by all aspects of community in a variety of settings, not just universities. Problematising my experience of academia enabled me to be reflexive in my approach to the research, in a way that enhances the theoretical understanding and conclusions presented in this thesis. From the outset I explored interrelatedness and reflexivity, constructing the subjective reality of the research, not by denying my worldview but by using it to deepen my understanding of the phenomena I was researching – community inside a higher education institution. This is perhaps why, at times, doing the research has felt like a bit like an out of body experience, or rather what I imagined such an experience to feel like. Whilst I remained physically a part of the community at Greystone, my consciousness became detached, helping me to see it from a different angle. This was however, no psychic excursion but simply an exchange about something that affects us all and something that I care about deeply: community.
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Chapter 1
COMMUNITY, CONCEPTS AND SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the focus of the research, explains the conceptual framework, locates the research within the existing body of knowledge on this topic by defining and constructing the research object with reference to selected literature in the field, and introduces the analytical framework. The voices of the research participants (the participants) are heard from the outset, not only as research data but also via three fictional vignettes at the end of Chapters Fours to Six. This is in keeping with Sparkes’ less ‘traditional’ approach, by writing a story based on informal interviews in an amalgam of,

Partial happenings, fragmented memories, echoes of conversations, whispers in corridors, fleeting glimpses of myriad reflections seen through broken glass, and multiple layers of fiction and narrative imaginings. (Sparkes 2007)

The aim of the vignettes is to reveal elements of the participants’ lives within a fictional setting that helps to describe something about their scenarios and stories. Zipin and Brennan constructed a fictionalized story, a ‘morality tale’ from sites and incidents in their own working lives at universities, and stories that academics tell one another. They suggest that ‘tales of our fields – intimately personal yet illustrative of current conditions of our professional practice…’ should be treated as a ‘telling kind of ‘data’ in the tradition of Bourdieus reflexive sociology (Zipin and Brennan 2004).

1.1 THE FOCUS AND THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The research explores ‘community’ as perceived and experienced by the participants, twelve academics associated with one higher education institution, the University of Greystone. The research does not set out to define or explain community per se. It sets out to explore the meaning and experience of community from the perspective of the participants – that meaning and experience is the research object. The overarching research question is therefore,

‘How do academics conceive of and relate to the idea of ‘community’?’
Community is understood, realised and lived in different ways. The research involved pilot data gathering via a life-writing workshop followed by the main data gathering, a series of extended conversations and two focus groups. None of the twelve were involved in the pilot study.

1.1.1 Exploring perspectives on community

My initial intention was to conduct research on community-university engagement in the context of my professional role, and not on the experience of community itself. Whilst I was interested in the perspective of individuals, the questions tended to focus on organisational issues. The pilot data then opened a more in depth exploration of the topic from the perspective of individuals. The following descriptions of ‘community’ were given by the workshop participants (all staff at Greystone) –

Network, school, public, healthcare, responsibility, village, care in the, unity, belonging, exclusion; you can feel quite excluded. (terms identified by the participants in a facilitated discussion)

Community, its virtues trip so easily off the tongue...any one person has multiple identities...community is a set of complex inter-connected networks, it’s not concentric circles. (workshop participant)

From the beginning, I looked at the topic from the inside out; that is, always seeking what it means from the perspective of those who were inside the institution. When invited to talk about their idea and experience of community, all the participants decided to focus on Greystone rather than anywhere else, although they did occasionally refer to experiences of community outside the institution. More often, they referred to others who are not members of Greystone but whom they considered to be a part of their research or teaching community. This was indicated by aspects of their academic practice, which may be categorised as community-university engagement such as involving patients in research and involving service users in undergraduate teaching. Of the twelve participants, all had been involved in community-university engagement in some form or other as defined by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE). And the participants do talk about their ideas and views on university-community engagement as they relate to their perceptions of community.
Being connected to or being a part of the university community, the status and strength of those connections and indeed the durability of the community itself proved to be an important dimension for all who participated in this research. In examining morale in university life through a review of existing literature and his own surveys of university communities, Watson, who views universities as ‘membership organisations’, acknowledges the complex and contradictory nature of higher education,

The culture of higher education and the mesh of psychological contracts, or ‘deals’ that it involves make much of the current discourse about happiness and unhappiness in contemporary life look simplistic and banal. (Watson 2009 p3)

He says that working in higher education is at the same time hugely frustrating and immensely satisfying and asks whether there is a ‘quantum of happiness’ without which universities cannot survive as successful communities. He cites the sense of efficacy, of purposive engagement, of satisfaction and of feeling valued, a member of the HE community; it is about groups and connections (Watson 2009 p136, Watson 2014).

In the first chapter of his edited collection on, ‘Academic Community: Discourse or Discord?’ Barnett describes the notion as a ‘quaint idea of the past’ and offers three different interpretations of the forms of academic community and its loss, saying that they are conceptually and empirically separate from each other; we can imagine any one being present independently of the others. They are, Community as a discourse or language (a loss of community being felt in a new kind of inability to communicate within the academic world); Community as institutional interaction (a loss of community being evident in academic institutions) and Community as a function of the student experience (a loss of community being apparent in the student body). Barnett asserts that talk of loss of academic community is not new and that it,

Breaks out when there is a marked distinction between the interests of the academic world on the one hand and the perceptions of the academics of the demands of the wider world upon them. It marks a sense of threat or diminished authority on the part of the academics. It is an indication that the academics feel the need to re-identify what it is they have in common and to reassert their distinctive identity in and contribution to society. Concerns over academic community turn out, then, to be a symptom of that community’s weakened position in society. A community or group does not worry over its inner connections and identities when it is flourishing and when its constituent parts are confident. (Barnett 1994 p10)
The research explores the idea and experience of community at a time when autonomy in the field of higher education is weak. It utilises Bourdieu’s conceptual approach (see ‘The Conceptual Framework’ below), in an attempt to link, ‘lived experience’ to broader managerial shifts in governance... evaluating the impacts on staff identities and relations.’ (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p32) It identifies different perspectives on community and the relationship between those perspectives. It examines how individuals describe their idea and experience of community and how that description compares with the institutional narrative (or doxa) on community. For example, why talk of ‘values’ may be important and how the notion of values may be ultimately exploited in the interest of sustaining a particular interpretation or view of community, which may or may not be dominant.

1.1.2. Exploring authentic voices

Henkel cautions against a tradition in higher education literature, strongly informed by idealism and essentialism which leads to the neglect of reality of academic working lives in favour of overemphasized abstract epistemologies (Henkel 2000 p22). This research aims to reveal living academic identities wrought by the concrete reality of experiencing community in its various forms. I was drawn towards the need to find the ‘authentic’ voices of academics in higher education; a need prompted by the sense that in my professional role at Greystone, I was not altogether hearing them because I was too close to the official or institutional narrative on community. ‘Authentic’ in this context means voices that are not abstract or institutionalised but honest, sincere and firmly rooted in the day-to-day lived experience. To find these authentic voices, I needed to converse with academics at a more individual level. In his Epilogue for Walker and Nixon’s collection entitled, ‘Reclaiming Universities from a Runaway World’, Barnett reflects on the possibility of the authentic university. He concludes that authenticity becomes possible precisely where authenticity is threatened; it is won in a milieu of inauthenticity, and that, ‘authenticity has to be fashioned, chiselled out and crafted. It is not there willing to be taken.’ (Barnett in Walker and Nixon 2004 p206)

A crucial question for Cribb and Gewirtz in their critical analysis of the ‘hollowed out’ university, is whether there is still the possibility of realising some ‘authentic’ conception of what the university as a distinctive organisation can and should be... and what it can and should mean, to be an academic in a contemporary UK university,
Unless such alternative routes are explored, it seems possible that universities without an ethical centre and telos could degenerate not only into sites of superficiality or emptiness but also into sites of corruption. (Cribb and Gewirtz 2012 italics in original)

Citing Nixon’s defence of the virtues of university life and the role of the university as a civic space devoted to independent and rigorous critique, they assert that in order to avoid such theorisations as being, ‘no more than internal academic conversation’, we need to foster organisational change that is designed to embody, model and encourage the realisation of such social and civic ends. Nixon himself, on the ‘virtuous university’, argues for the possibility of an authentic dialogue that is predicated upon shared values. That is, in the daily discourse of university life, those who hold in common some notion of the thoughtful, examined life talk to one another on the assumption that trust is, ‘at least a possibility’, ‘Trust can exist in spite of radical disagreement, given a shared assumption that the thoughtful, examined life is a life worth living.’ (Nixon 2008 p37)

This research investigates aspects of that examined life.

1.1.3 The heuristic value of an insider perspective

From the outset I was an insider researcher in a position closely related to the research topic. This enabled me to use my practical knowledge and experience of the subject to inform the research including the creation of the analytical framework (see below) and the coding structure described in Chapter Two, which I used to conduct the final data analysis. Bourdieu considers the implications for those who choose to research their own field,

In choosing to study the social world in which we are involved, we are obliged to confront, in dramatized form as it were, a certain number of fundamental epistemological problems, all related to the question of the difference between practical knowledge and scholarly knowledge, and particularly to the special difficulties involved first in breaking with inside experience and then reconstituting knowledge that has been obtained by the means of this break. (Bourdieu 1988 p1)

My involvement at Greystone gave me a specific and practical orientation to the research object. For example, I contributed to Greystone’s official narrative and policy on community-university engagement and in doing so, may have influenced the environment within which the participants experienced aspects of community inside the university by contributing to the doxic experience of the social world (see the section on ‘Habitus’ below for an explanation of doxa and the doxic experience). The break that Bourdieu is advocating may be achieved by
the exercise of epistemic reflexivity, a notion discussed below. It is in the reconstitution, or coming together, where the heuristic value of my insider perspective is realised. That is, the exercise of bringing together my existing practical knowledge of the research object and my newly formed scholarly knowledge gained in doing this research whilst at the same time acknowledging my proximity to what is being researched. According to May and Perry,

The link between knowledge produced by social scientific work and practice occurs in terms of rendering intelligible the constitution of our actions and those conditions that appear to be impediments to our understandings and aspirations. (May and Perry 2011 p106)

Wenger uses the term ‘knowledge brokers’ to describe people who can introduce elements of one practice into another. Brokers are able to make new connections across communities of practice and can open new possibilities for meaning. He describes the activity of brokering as complex. It involves processes of translation, coordination and alignment between perspectives (Wenger 1998 p109).

1.2 THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section introduces and explains the chosen conceptual framework. An introduction to the underlying principles is followed by a discussion of Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology and an examination of its key theoretical instruments.

Notions of interrelatedness, reflexivity and authenticity informed a methodological approach which draws upon Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology and relevant concepts of identity such as those utilised by Taylor and Henkel (Taylor 1999, Henkel 2000). Taylor sees identity as a social and cultural achievement and in exploring the concept of academic identity, he defines what he calls a ‘cosmopolitan’ identity which embraces ‘indexes of the self’ and a version of ‘self-shaping’ whereby academics have to learn to work with two ‘publics’, the general community and the disciplinary community. They live by two sets of rules, the public set of which provides a more universal ‘cosmopolitan’ image or identity. He says this is not a unitary construct and can be thought of in terms of levels of layers or symbols which reflect the diversity in the meanings attached to the term ‘academic’ and the relative uniformity at the cosmopolitan level (Taylor 1999). Henkel, who takes an ‘actor-structure’ approach within a ‘communitarian perspective’ (a philosophy which embraces paradoxical and mutually reinforcing ideas enabling identity to be represented as a social as well as an individual construct) describes
individual academics as ‘engaging in dialogues and argument with the ideas and theories of their communities…’ (Henkel 2000 p22)

These perspectives provide an ‘analytic lens’ through which it may be seen how to embed individual academic perspectives in their careers, day-to-day lives and in the broader structures of the field; that is, their own institution and the sector (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p19). Gee explores identity more broadly (not just academic identity) through a series of analytical lenses that are rooted in sources of power derived from nature, within institutions, through interaction with ‘rational’ individuals and through affinity groups. He emphasises the role of interpretative systems (e.g. people’s different views of nature, norms, traditions and rules of institutions) that are used to recognise identity and discusses the modern need for recognition whereby individuals ‘must win recognition for them through exchange with others.’ (Gee 2000 p113) Identity is clearly a social as well as an individual construct; it incorporates the dynamic between, as Henkel describes, ‘individuality and the collective, past and present’ (Henkel 2000 p17). The analytical framework introduced towards the end of this chapter, is informed by the distinctions that these perspectives offer between the individual, the collective and the institutional.

This section turns to the key instruments of Bourdieu’s sociology that this research aims to employ (field, habitus and capital). Whilst they are considered in turn, in order to be understood, field, habitus and capital need to be interpreted methodologically as relational concepts. That is, they are not utilised or understood in isolation. Agency, social relations and reproduction, and epistemic reflexivity are also discussed, as they all are brought together in the analytical framework.

1.2.1 Field

Under the heading of ‘Invisible structures and their effects’ in ‘On Television’, Bourdieu defines field as,

A structured social space, a field of forces, a force field. It contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which the various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field. (Bourdieu 1998 p40-41)
The social cosmos is described by Bourdieu as being made up of a number of relatively autonomous social microcosms, ‘spaces of objective relations that are the site of a logic and a necessity that are specific and irreducible to those that regulate other fields.’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p97) A given field for example, artistic, religious or economic, will have its own specific logics and may be compared to a game. In analytical terms, Bourdieu describes a field as,

A network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific points that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.). (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p97)

This is illustrated by Bourdieu’s ‘analysis of correspondences’, a way of representing the phenomena he is researching which he uses in several publications. For example, in ‘Homo Academicus’, Bourdieu’s study of the field of French higher education, attributes held by academics (e.g. social origin, cultural capital – membership of administrative committees) are plotted graphically in order to illustrate clusters, oppositions and variations (Bourdieu 1988). Maton points to the limitations of this approach, describing it as a form of sociological reductionism, which reduces position-taking to epiphenomena of the play of positions within a field. The danger is that the study itself obscures structuring influences (Maton 2005). This research attempts to avoid this. It does not, in a ‘Homo Academicus’ sense, describe in great detail the structure of the field or indeed, Greystone (the institution) but observations are made about structural influences and positions are explored, analysed and presented with the intent of rendering individual trajectories. Whilst structural relations are important therefore, this research applies the notion of field in a way that enables the interpretation of what Crossley calls, ‘concrete interactions and bonds’. (Crossley 2011)

For at least two generations the field of higher education sector has been pounded by resurgent tides of intricate and complex forces that have resulted in, ‘substantial shifts in the norms of the field’ (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p22); a profusion of governmental initiatives driven by the national economic and skills agenda; the utilisation of research by government in policy-making; the commodification of knowledge, the dawn of the ‘knowledge economy’ and the marketisation of the sector; the decline of cognitive authority in the context of the ‘scientification’ of society; expansion and massification of higher education; and the
ascendancy of a ‘new management’ with a business and social reform discourse and an audit culture that is focused on delivering a corporate organisational mission that meets both governmental and societal expectations. An exploration of the many forces is beyond the limits of this research though some are relevant to the experience of academic community such as the ascendancy of a ‘new management’ and an audit culture focused on delivering a corporate organisational mission.

Whilst it is Bourdieu who described the scientific field as a, ‘separate world, apart, where a most specific logic is at work.’ (a field of forces, of struggles, a space of competition (Bourdieu 1991 p6)), the lack of autonomy is generally accepted today. The higher education sector (in the UK and elsewhere) is different from the time that Bourdieu was writing. In 1991, Bourdieu wrote about the notion of a,

```
Relatively autonomous field, endowed with a history and, if you will, a memory of its own... the order of symbolic representations... the totality of objectified cultural resources, produced by history as it accumulates in the form of books, articles, documents, instruments and institutions... presents itself as an autonomous world. (Bourdieu 1991 p12)
```

Watson says it is foolhardy to try and capture a holistic view of the modern university though his own attempt at providing what may be described as the long view, via a geological analysis, is informative. He sees the history of the sector as ‘strata’ and outlines the main layers as six distinct phrases; specialist communities; national and regional institutions serving post-industrial society; public ‘systems of HE’; curriculum and institutional innovation; blurred boundaries and the ‘dual sector’; the ‘for profit’ sector (Watson 2014 ). Taking Watson’s layer of ‘specialist communities’ as perhaps the most relevant to the topic of this research, he describes the early foundations of universities in late medieval times such as Oxford, Cambridge and Paris, and emphasises Stephen Lay’s observation that their distinguishing feature was the presumption of independence from state authority, creating conditions of ‘autonomy.’ (Watson 2014 p2)

It is stated above that autonomy does not come without the social conditions of autonomy; and these conditions cannot be obtained on an individual basis. It is the autonomy of the field of higher education which Maton contends will be determined by the way in which actors in higher education negotiate forces such as marketization which he says, ‘increasingly forces academics to pay ritual obeisance to both the two rival gods of culture and economy.’
According to Maton, autonomy is central to understanding the value of Bourdieu’s conceptualization of fields (Maton 2005 p701 & 702). Kerr, in updating his publication on the uses of the university, states that further integration into society spells further disintegration within the campus, ‘External societal pressures sharpen the challenge for academic leaders to maintain their own sense of direction and their own sense of values.’ (Kerr 2001 p222) Whilst Becher investigated ‘academic tribes and territories’ from an ‘internalist’ perspective, he provides an insightful analysis of ‘The Wider Context’ and refers to the sense of isolation, of the ivory tower, as more illusory than real, citing Barnett who has maintained that higher education in the modern world is, ‘inescapably bound into its host society.’ (Becher 1989) Tight also claimed that the academic community, ever since its medieval origins, has been, ‘intimately connected with its host society.’ (Tight 1988 p102)

According to Watson, there have been some, ‘rapid and probably irreversible developments in university autonomy’ since the 2008 crash. Watson, who has written extensively about the role of universities in society, claims that universities are ‘more comfortable fulfilling a major role within civil society than as instruments of state policy’. Those that align themselves too closely with state leadership have come to undermine their cores values (Watson 2014).

What is also undermined is the capacity for universities to act as a ‘civic space’, a ‘unique civic space within which to address questions of moral purpose’ (Nixon 2008). In setting out to reclaim a ‘viable and workable’ notion of a good society (‘the goodness of which lies in part in the virtues of our academic institutions and the academic practice they sustain’), Nixon describes universities as becoming increasingly dominated by a language of ‘cost-efficiency, value for money, productivity, effectiveness, outcome-delivery, target-setting, and auditing.’ He says, it is not just a different way of talking about the same thing (that is, learning) but that it radically alters what is being talked about (Nixon 2008 p11).

Bourdieu concludes that in established fields of high autonomy, “revolutions” are generated within the fields themselves; ‘the field becomes the site of a permanent revolution’ (Bourdieu 1991 p3). As autonomy in the field of higher education is currently weak (especially compared with the higher education field observed by Bourdieu), it is unlikely that the field will become a site of permanent revolution in the way that Bourdieu describes. As the field of higher education yields to other fields (in particular, the economic field), university autonomy is damaged. The question is, therefore, how can the university once again become, ‘the one
place where we can, indeed must, ask awkward questions about why we do what we do.’ (Nixon 2008 p6)

One possible answer is through research such as this that not only salvages spaces for a deliberative discourse but also has the potential for bringing about change through a critical discourse that asserts reflexive engagement. The intention is not to over-claim the significance of the project but to recognise it as an opportunity to raise a ‘discursive consciousness’ (May and Perry 2011 p43) through which the actors may reflect upon their idea and experience of community. The research explores the phenomena primarily at an individual level and the comment on authentic voices above is, therefore couched accordingly. However, the research does also consider sectoral issues for the field of higher education but only as they relate to the environment (or ‘professional sector’ - (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p21)) within which the participants experience community. It is the relationship between the individual and the environment to which the discussion now turns as the instrument of ‘habitus’ is examined.

1.2.2 Habitus

According to Bourdieu,

The, ‘structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (e.g. the material conditions of existence characteristic of a class condition) produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p72 italics in original)

Habitus is derived, therefore, from the synchronicity of the conscious (agency) in the form of dispositions and actions and the unconscious (environment) in the form of the putative material conditions that make up the everyday world. The process of synchronicity is not mechanistic or knowingly deterministic. Rather, the formation of habitus as a structure is, ‘orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p72)

This, as Reay says, ‘fits in well with the complex messiness of the real world’. Reay perceives habitus as first and foremost a conceptual tool, to be used in empirical research rather than an idea to be debated in texts – it has to be apprehended interpretively. While it is important to view individuals as ‘activity engaged’ in creating their social worlds, Bourdieu’s method
emphasises the way in which the structure of those worlds is already predefined; habitus is therefore a means of viewing structure as occurring within small-scale interactions and activity within large-scale settings and itself, has a duality as both collective and individual which creates conceptual difficulties (Reay 2004).

This research does indeed engage with the notion of habitus interpretively, as the nature and meaning of the participants’ idea and experience of community is explored through a heuristic analysis. It is observed above that when invited to talk about their idea and experience of community, all the participants decided to focus on Greystone rather than anywhere else. For this reason, and because all the participants are academics, habitus as it relates to the features and characteristics of interactions and activity within academia (and specifically, the University of Greystone), is the conceptual core of this research.

In the context of ‘Homo Academicus’, habitus governs the response of academics under specific historical and social conditions determined by the field,

> Everything leads us to believe that an initial or subsequent orientation towards positions of temporal power depends on the dispositions of the habitus and on opportunities – to which these dispositions themselves contribute through anticipation and the effect of the ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ – of attaining the only officially recognised objectives in the field, that is, scientific success and specifically intellectual prestige. (Bourdieu 1988 p99)

Bourdieu describes the relationship between habitus and disposition,

> A habitus, understood as a system of lasting, transposable disposition which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks. (Bourdieu 1972 p82-83 italics in original)

Disposition is intrinsic, it takes the form of feelings and emotions and can be fragile, strong or indifferent. It is the ‘cultivated disposition inscribed in the body schema and in schemes of thought which enables the agent to engender all practices.’ Recently, Reay explores the potential of habitus to, ‘provide a window on the psychosocial’ and to include ‘affective dispositions’ (Reay 2015). The acknowledgement of disposition does not necessarily mean that practices can be predicted or that practices are controlled or determined by habitus. As Bourdieu states, the agents, ‘remain in command’. They have an, ‘infinity of practices adapted to endlessly changing situations.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p80)
This raises the question of the extent to which the idea and experience of community for the participants in the form of dispositions and practises, manifests itself as a material construct of community inside academia that is normalised. Bourdieu refers to the production of a ‘commonsense world’, to the homogeneity of habitus which causes practices and works to be immediately intelligible and foreseeable, and hence taken for granted; the ‘harmonization of agents’ experiences and the continuous reinforcement that each of them receives from the expression, individual or collective (in festivals, for example), improvised or programmed (commonplaces, sayings), of similar or identical experiences (Bourdieu 1972). That reinforcement is assisted by a ‘sense of limits’ or ‘sense of reality’ explained by Bourdieu as ‘doxic’ experience whereby the instruments of knowledge of the social world,

Contribute to the reproduction of the social world by producing immediate adherence to the world, seen as self-evident and undisputed, of which they are the product and of which they reproduce the structures in a transformed form. (Bourdieu 1972 p164)

The concept of doxa, as utilised by Bourdieu, denotes,

The relationship of immediate adherence that is established in practice between habitus and the field to which it is attuned, the pre-verbal taken-for-granted of the world that flows from practical sense.’ (Bourdieu 1990 p68)

It is the belief in the game and its stakes (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p98). For example, Mann in her study of alienation in the learning community, describes a ‘dynamic of compliance’ which pulls teachers and learners towards a ‘surface form of harmony.’ (Mann 2005) The notion of the reproduction and normalisation of community is discussed below under, ‘Social relations and reproduction’. The notion of complicity in relation to doxic experience is explored in Chapter Seven.

1.2.3 Capital

According to Bourdieu, capital makes the ‘games of society... something other than simple games of chance offering at every moment the possibility of a miracle.’ The structure of the distribution and possession of different types of capital therefore, determines the inherent social structure of the social world. The possession of capital and its mobilisation determines the agents’ social position, influences practices and affects the reproduction of capital itself. Whilst contending that economic capital is at the root of all other forms of capital, Bourdieu takes the concept beyond the confines of economic theory,
It is in fact impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognised by economic theory. (Bourdieu 1986)

By ‘all its forms’, Bourdieu is referring to symbolic capital that is socially produced in the field – social and cultural capital as well as economic. Social capital essentially refers to social networks or relations and economic capital to material possessions or monetary wealth. Cultural capital is a notion that, according to Bourdieu, initially presented itself to him in the course of research as a theoretical hypothesis which made it possible to explain the unequal scholastic achievement of children originating from the different social classes (Bourdieu 1986). His research on taste in French society (published in ‘Distinction’), explored the relationship between cultural practices, educational capital and social origin (Bourdieu 1984). In 1986 Bourdieu explained ‘The Forms of Capital’ including cultural capital which,

Can exist in three forms: in the embodied state, i.e., in the form of long-lasing dispositions of the mind and body; in the objectified state, in the form of cultural goods (pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.), which are the trace or realization of theories or critiques of these theories, problematic, etc.; and in the institutionalized state, a form of objectification which must be set apart because as will be seen in the case of educational qualifications, it confers entirely original properties on the cultural capital which it is presumed to guarantee. (Bourdieu 1986)

These expressions of cultural capital, defined by Bourdieu are incorporated cultural capital, objectified cultural capital and institutionalised cultural capital.

In ‘Homo Academicus’, Bourdieu distinguished between two forms of cultural capital, or power. Academic power is, ‘founded principally on control of the instruments of reproduction of the professional body’ and scientific power is ‘scientific prestige measured through the recognition accorded by the scientific field.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p78-79) For example, he collected information on a random sample (N=405) of university professors for a series of ‘indicators’ that included specific capitals; the capital of academic power; the capital of scientific power; the capital of scientific prestige; the capital of intellectual renown and the capital of political or economic power (Bourdieu 1988 p40). It is acknowledged above that Bourdieu viewed the scientific field as a space of competition. He described the scientific field as a field whose structure is defined by, ‘the continuous distribution of the specific capital possessed, at the given moment, by various agents or institutions operative in the field.’ Agents or institutions
work at ‘valorising their own capital.’ (Bourdieu 1991 p6-7) In academia, capital is commodity and it is power.

The focus of this research is on community in the context of academia. The definitions of cultural capital as applied in ‘Homo Academicus’ are not, however, sufficient for exploring attributes that relate to the idea and experience of community, even in academia. This is because the notion of community for this research has broader connotations in that it relates strongly to what Nixon describes as, ‘intrinsic goods’, or a ‘particular value-orientation’ (Nixon 2008 p28-29). This is not to ignore the relevance of scientific prestige but to employ an extended conception of capital that reflects ethical values and possibly has a greater relevance to the motivation of the individual. Bourdieu himself states that the holders of cultural capital are, ‘defending not only their assets but also something like their mental integrity.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p6)

And so what might this form of cultural capital look like in the context of this research? How might it take a symbolic form that applies in the specific setting of a university? As the main data gathering for this research progressed, changes and conditions that the participants were experiencing which affected their idea and experience of community were increasingly revealed; for example, changes to their roles at the university and in one case, leaving the university altogether. Reflection on these changes and the different situations that the participants had faced during the research encounter and in previous years during their time at the university, raised the question as to whether ‘community’ itself could possibly be construed as a form of cultural capital, maybe in a diffuse or symbolic form, depending on its manifestation and how it is mobilised.

In order to explore cultural capital as ‘community’ in this context, it was necessary to engage with the data at a deeper level. The aim was to operationalise the concept of habitus, treat it as both method and theory and ascertain in particular its relationship with capital (Reay 2004 p439). The participants, at different times before and during the research encounter, were in different situations and positions, with variable dispositions expressed and embodied in their discourse and actions. It is these that were explored through the coding and analysis of the data, moving from the second analysis where the voices of the participants were anonymised, back to the specific voices in the final analysis, getting to know them again as individuals rather than as a group (the coding structure is explained in Chapter Two).
The aim of the analysis in this research therefore, was to identify expressions and dimensions of cultural capital and examine what it is that gives its value or worth to the individual (the participant or agent), particularly as they relate to other members of the academic community, to the community itself and to their institution (Chapters Four to Seven focus on the data and analysis). The aim was not to explore the transmission of cultural capital as in ‘Distinction’ whereby Bourdieu ascertains the combined effects of cultural transmission by the family and cultural transmission by the school; it is not about the ‘entitlement effect’. It is however, about the balance sheet – what is valued, acquired and mobilised – how ‘community’ is realised, or converted, in the positions, actions and dispositions of the participants. Signifiers of ‘community’ as cultural capital are identified in relation to these definitions:

As incorporated cultural capital in academia, community may exist as, for example, a sense of belonging. The presence or absence of a sense of belonging may be determined by the agent’s habitus, which is to some extent formed of their disposition generated by the interplay between their idea and elements of community, their status (particularly in relation to the university), their academic practice and their institution and environment. Reay utilised the concept of ‘emotional capital’ to encompass the emotional dimensions of lived experience and as stated above, is now focusing on the utility of habitus as a conceptual tool for exploring the psychosocial (Reay 2000, Reay 2015).

As objectified cultural capital in academia, community may exist as, for example, access to or ownership of laboratory facilities, and even a laboratory team (people as artefacts of objectified cultural capital) and membership of networks or access to communities that contribute to research and teaching (the latter could perhaps be construed as a form of social capital but in this context it is treated as an entity). The presence or absence of objectified cultural capital such as access to laboratory facilities may be determined by the agent’s success or failure in securing research awards, which are used to fund research projects. There is no guarantee it will continue as research awards expire and new awards must be secured.

As institutionalised cultural capital in academia, community may exist as, for example, academic status and length of time at the institution. The presence or absence of particular forms of status are determined by the institution which not only provides employment but also bestows titles and awards on the individual which in turn affects their position the community. Temporary status or no formal status at all may affect not only the agent’s
disposition but also their place in the community and how other members of the community behave towards them.

1.2.4 Agency

The introduction to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus above asserts that social conditions are internalised by individuals who are actively engaged in creating their social world. Habitus reconciles the individual as agent and their environment without restricting the possibility of agency itself,

The concept of habitus – long outmoded despite a number of occasional usages – was the best one to signify that desire to escape from the philosophy of consciousness without annulling the agent in its true role of practical operator of constructions of the real. (Bourdieu 1996 p180)

Agents are ‘independent, yet objectively orchestrated, cognitive machines’ (Bourdieu 1989 p1), and agency, being idiosyncratic, is the thinking and action of individual agents. But whilst agency is distinctive or unique, it is still a social construct. With intricate and complex properties, agency is diffuse and influenced by conditions of the social world such as the agent’s own position in the field and by the social conditions of habitus derived from interactions with other agents (significant or otherwise), by homogenised systems, spatial structures and events. In ‘Homo Academicus’, Bourdieu explains what he means by ‘socialized agents’ and stipulates that

We need to escape the mechanist vision which would reduce agents to simple particles swept up in a magnetic field, by reintroducing not rational subjects working to fulfil their preferences as far as circumstances permit, but socialized agents who, although biologically individuated, are endowed with transindividual dispositions, and therefore tend to generate practices which are objectively orchestrated and more or less adapted to objective requirements, that is irreducible either to the structural forces of the field, or to individual dispositions. (Bourdieu 1988 p149-150)

Whilst agency is devised and enacted in specific social milieus, which determine the conditions for action, it also involves reflexivity. In ‘The Rules of Art’, Bourdieu explains that the strategies of agents,

Depend on the position these agents occupy in the structure of the field (that is to say, in the structure of the distribution of specific capital) or the recognition, institutionalized or not, which is granted to them by their competitor-peers and by the
public as a whole, and which influences their perception of the possibles of the field and their ‘choice’ of those they will try to make into reality or produce.’ (Bourdieu 1996 p206)

Realising reflexivity through agency involves making choices about actions that are influenced by position in the field, habitus and the possession of capital and also by engaging with perceptions and self-awareness. As Bourdieu states, agents (people) do not operate in a vacuum,

Agents are not pure creators, who invest in a vacuum, ex nihilo, but rather that they are, so to speak, actualizers who translate into action socially instituted possibilities; these potentialities in fact exist as such only for agents endowed with the socially constituted dispositions that predispose them to perceive those potentialities as such and to realize them. (Bourdieu 1991 p10-11 italics in original)

Nixon, who says there is no escape from the deepening reflexivity of late modern society, coins the term, ‘moral agency’ to describe a way of engaging with the world, informed by Arendt’s notions of representative thinking and right action and an understanding of the historic mission of the university to, ‘uphold the values of the thoughtful, examined life.’ (Nixon 2008 p36) He sees universities as a space within which, ‘people from widely different backgrounds and beliefs are able to insist upon thoughtfulness as a necessary condition of their own and others’ moral agency.’ (Nixon 2008 p37) Nixon also addresses the issue of autonomy which he categorises as a virtue, asserting that it is not synonymous with self-interest nor can it be collapsed into ‘collective’ autonomy without risking its own integrity; it is, ‘poised between two opposing forces: that of self-interest and of collective interest.’ He describes autonomy as the ‘virtuous mean’ between these competing polarities (Nixon 2008 p101). This tension between the individual and the collective is pertinent to the consideration of community in this research and it is ever present.

The potential for the realisation of agency may also be present in other ways. For example, Rolfe, in echoing Bourdieu’s ‘community of unconsciousness’ (Bourdieu 1972, Bourdieu 2004), offers freedom (and possibly happiness) to the agent via a parallel existence in his ‘paraversity’ with its ‘organic, fluid, rhizomatic, evolving community of Thought’ in which the ‘values-based’ researcher and lecturer have the ‘freedom to be good.’ (Rolfe 2013) Freedom is exercised by a ‘community of critical friends committed to the process of thinking together’. Rolfe focuses on the practice of scholarship (specifically the essay and the seminar) as a vehicle for enjoying this freedom and indeed, the participants in this research appear to be attempting (with some
success) to realise their sense of community through their academic practice (see Chapter Six on ‘Academic Practice’).

1.2.5 Social relations and reproduction

As explained above, the research does not set out to define or explain community per se. It is about the meaning and experience of community from the perspective of the participants. It is helpful, however, to briefly consider the notion of community itself as relational entity, using what Bourdieu terms as the ‘relational mode of thinking.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p16) For the purpose of this research, community is taken to be a relational phenomenon created and reproduced through the propinquity and interplay of actions, dispositions and structure. Wacquant, in setting out the major features of Bourdieu’s sociology of class, describes his approach as ‘relational, agnostic, and synthetic. For Bourdieu, the stuff of social reality, and thus the basis for heterogeneity and inequality, consists of relations.’ (Wacquant 2013)

The intention is not to objectify the research object here (the concept of the idea and experience of academic community as an object of study is used below as the device for reviewing selected literature) but to explain the significance of relations in the reproduction of social conditions, through employing Bourdieu’s epistemological tools described above. Relations are critical to the interpretation and understanding of the object (which, as a reminder, is academics’ idea and experience of community) – its creation and its reproduction. Bourdieu states, for example that habitus is, ‘the basis of strategies of reproduction that tend to maintain separations, distances, and relations of order(ing), hence concurring in practice (although not consciously or deliberately) in reproducing the entire system of differences constitutive of the social order.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p3) Bourdieu sets out the formula as ‘[(habitus) (capital)] + field = practice.’ (Bourdieu 1984 p95)

Phenomenalogically, the relative position of, and linkages between, features of the object as defined using the instruments of field, habitus, capital and agency, serve to create an understanding of it as a relational whole, as a social and structural entity. Chapters Four to Seven set out a reading and analysis of the research data, identifying signifiers of the idea and experience of community as expressions and dimensions of cultural capital. The analysis provided in these chapters aims to ascertain what it is that gives the cultural capital its value, how it affects the agent’s habitus, disposition and position in the field and what the relationship between these mean for the construction and reproduction of the (relational)
whole; the relational whole being the idea and experience of community, and possibly the academic community itself. Included is the influence of the research encounter itself, for as a participant observed the research is actually helping to create communities,

This research project I would say is doing that by getting people to reflect on it, to talk about it, to think about what you mean by community. It’s creating communities, it’s creating a sense of what that is, it’s creating bonds. (Ben, a contract researcher who became a lecturer C2p37)

Bourdieu states,

What is at stake in the social world is no inert and interchangeable particles of matter, but agents who, being both discernable and endowed with the ability to discern, perform the innumerable operations of ordination through which the social order is continuously reproduced and transformed. (Bourdieu 1989 p2)

The research also attempts to move beyond the constraints of phenomenological knowledge and of objectivism, to countenance the presuppositions inherent in the position of the observer and their relation to the object of study. This is another relationship to consider. By exercising epistemic reflexivity in this research and exploring the researcher’s relationship with the research object, the underlying implications of the position of the researcher are revealed and accounted for in the ultimate knowledge claim.

1.2.6 Social relations, structure and agency

Bourdieu also states that the structure of the university field, ‘reflects the structure of the field of power, whilst its own activity of selection and indoctrination contributes to the reproduction of that structure.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p40) The relationship between structure and social reproduction is relevant here, though often contested. In the case of the relationship between structure and agency, for example, Crossley is of the opinion that there is actually nothing to resolve, ‘agency and structure are effectively co-existing aspects of the social world which assume greater or lesser salience in different contexts.’ (Crossley 2011 p5) This is helpful in that one does not discount the other. And according to Nixon,

Human flourishing and well-being are always a matter of both structure and agency: structure without the notion of human agency topples over into determinism; agency without a notion of institutional structure teeters towards romantic voluntarism. (Nixon 2008 p114)
Perhaps it is more a question of what is dominant, when and in what context. According to Taylor, a developed understanding of the underlife of higher education can

Highlight more clearly the ways in which action is implicit in structure, how structures are perceived, socially reconstructed and responded to in variegated ways. The ideologies, beliefs, assumptions, values, principles, tastes and the taken-for-granted recurrent behaviours stemming from them, which comprise culture, are not easily disposable. In fact they are remarkably durable, and this durability stems from their social rather than individual character. (Taylor 1999 p152)

Barnett, in acknowledging the existence of structure, or structures in the contemporary university, concludes that the space for an academic community to be an academic community is shrinking and that structure as such may tend to obtrude into the human relationships of a community. There is too much structure. (Barnett 2004 p204)

Agency, in the context of this research, is focused on the idea and experience of community from an individual perspective. As explained above, agents (individuals) employ strategies that are influenced by position and disposition and by their relationship with structural factors. McNamara, who has researched nursing academic identities, states that agents will act both to increase their volume of capital and to ensure that the species of capital on which their position depends remains or becomes the pre-eminent marker of status in their field. Their ability to do this depends on the structure of the field, their specific location within this structure, and on the personal, social and career trajectories by which they have arrived in the field (McNamara 2009 p1573). Bourdieu stated that the strategies of agents in the scientific field depend upon their, ‘leaning’, which may be,

Toward (scientific and social) subversion, or toward conservation, by the specific interests associated with possession of a more or less important volume of various kinds of specific capital, which are both engaged in and engendered by the game. (Bourdieu 1991 p7)

The conservation and reproduction of community is at the heart of this research. For Bourdieu, the ‘struggles’,

Remain determined by the structure to the extent that scientific strategies – which are always socially overdetermined, at least in their effects – depend on the volume of capital possessed and therefore on the differential position within this structure and on the representation of the present and future of the field associated with this position. (Bourdieu 1991 p7)
And in his view, they make little difference,

I have never overlooked the contradictions and the conflicts of which the academic field is the site and which are at the very root of the ongoing changes through which it perpetuates itself – and remains more unchanged than may appear at first sight’ Bourdieu on ‘Homo Academicus. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p89)

1.2.7 Epistemic reflexivity through reflexive sociology

For the purpose of this research, epistemic reflexivity is the transcendence of the partial perspective with the aim of legitimising a knowledge claim made as a result of academic inquiry. Academic research attempts to transcend partiality as a way of asserting authority. As Bourdieu states, ‘All objectivist knowledge contains a claim to legitimate domination’. Bourdieu acknowledges the ‘theoretician’s claim to an ‘absolute viewpoint’ and declares,

The unanalysed element in every theoretical analysis (whether subjectivist or objectivist) is the theorist’s subjective relation to the social world and the objective (social) relation presupposed by this subjective relation. (Bourdieu 1992 pp28 & 29)

The transcendence through reflexive sociology does not however, involve denying the position of the researcher. Rather, it involves embracing it but in a way that recognises and allows for the researcher’s subjective reality and does not compromise the legitimacy of the knowledge claim (Maton 2003, Maton 2005).

You cannot ignore the fact that, as May and Perry stress, knowledge production is a social activity (May and Perry 2011 p36). The way to achieving epistemic reflexivity lies in attending to the subjective relation between the research, the researcher and the social world; that social world includes the academy itself (in this instance the University of Greystone, the site of the research and a part of the higher education sector). A ‘genuine epistemology’ is relational and for Bourdieu is built on a knowledge of the social conditions within which research functions. He says, ‘a superb questionnaire, a splendid body of hypotheses, a magnificent protocol of observation that do not include the practical conditions of their realisation are void and worthless’, and employs the term, ‘scientific realism’ to denote an approach to research through which the ‘instruments of reflexivity’ may be ‘collectively mastered and collectively realised.’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 pp178 & 183)
Archer acknowledges what she perceives as Bourdieu’s concession to the ‘possibility of reflexivity, as an option open to certain agents’; in particular, in the context of sociology and his study of members of a scientific field. In stating that this concession left his theorising ‘far short of recognising the necessity of reflexivity’ for social life and life in society, Archer concludes that Bourdieu’s realisation of reflexivity in academia is presented as necessarily being a collective enterprise which can develop amongst those whose job it is to critique one another’s ideas. She says it follows that this necessary condition for consciously correcting one’s dispositions will be lacking for the vast majority of people – academia being ‘a world apart.’ (Archer 2007 Loc 590 of 5133 italics in original)

This research examines what it is that possibly makes academia a ‘world apart’, if indeed it is, a community as perceived and experienced by those who occupy positions within the academia itself. The aim is to avoid what May and Perry call the ‘fallacy of internalism that plagues reflexivity’ whereby ways of seeing and modes of constructing objects as if they were bounded within particular communities, as opposed to being bound up with what is viewed and the conditions under which they are viewed. (May and Perry 2011 p55) This underpins the selection of Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as the conceptual framework for this research. As May and Perry state, Bourdieu was, ‘at his best, most consistent and most provocative’ on the topic of endogenous reflexivity within the social scientific community. (May and Perry 2011 p109)

Field is a useful theoretical tool for examining the reflexive tension between individual and structural issues in the context of acquiring a knowledge claim that is not undermined by normative assumptions about the significance of the field. Bourdieu addresses this through what he terms as a ‘third-order knowledge’ moving through a ‘second break’, beyond the constraints of phenomenological knowledge (‘the unquestioning apprehension of the social world which, by definition, does not reflect on itself and excludes the question of the conditions of its own possibility’) and beyond the constraints of objectivism (analysis that ‘merely defines the limits of its validity by establishing the particular conditions within which it is possible’). (Bourdieu 1972) He states that,

Social science must not only, as objectivism would have it, break with native experience and the native representation of that experience, but also, by a second break, call into question the presuppositions inherent in the position of the ‘objective’ observer who, seeking to interpret practices, tends to bring into the object the principles of his relation to the object. (Bourdieu 1992 p27)
Bourdieu’s ‘scientific reflexivity’ includes the epistemic and existential benefits of what he terms as ‘participant objectivation’; that is, ‘the objectivation of the subject of objectivation, of the analysing subject – in short, of the researcher herself,’ and describes the practice as, ‘idiosyncratic personal experiences methodically subjected to sociological control constitute irreplaceable analytic resources... mobilising one’s social past through self-socio-analysis...’ (Bourdieu 2003). It seems unthinkable to Bourdieu that a sociologist could not be aware of how their own discipline works, how it is positioned in the field and what this means for their knowledge claim,

How could the sociologist possibly not know that the field of sociology itself functions according to the laws that govern the functioning of every scientific field? (Bourdieu 1991 p24-25)

Bourdieu appears to view sociology as a discipline that is better placed than any other to achieve true epistemic reflexivity,

A social science, armed with a scientific knowledge of its social determinations constitutes the strongest weapon against ‘normal science’ and against positivist self-confidence, which represents the most formidable social obstacle to the progress of science. (Bourdieu 1988 p31 italics in original)

Clegg, in exploring what we mean by field in relation to research in higher education, suggests that in analysing the field of higher education, and in understanding it as a field (or fields), we are also striving to become certain sorts of ‘corporate agents’ (as defined by Archer) in that we think that researching into higher education matters,

Research into higher education should be critical and alert to its social purposes, but it can only do so if it recognises the structuring influences of the field of higher education. (Clegg 2012 p677)

Clegg encourages us to be less introspective, and more challenging in our research questions, in terms of what matters in higher education. The intention of this research, which could perhaps be classified as ‘internalist’, is to be ‘critical and alert’. It is for the reader to judge whether or not this was achieved.

My position in relation to the field is assessed through the integrated sub-theme of, ‘The researcher and the return gaze’ (see below). Like Barnett’s declaration of his belief in ‘the university’ (Barnett 2012), my stance is that the idea and experience of community matters in
higher education. This does not mean that the structural influences of the field of higher education are ignored and that challenging questions are avoided; it does mean, however, that from the outset, my position is acknowledged. If epistemic reflexivity is indeed achieved, it can lead to ‘a comprehensive and reflexive objectivism that opens up a liberating collective self-analysis.’ (Bourdieu 1991 p4) Such a self-analysis may be the very sort of collective action that Archer describes as occurring in the ‘world apart’ of academia though it is difficult to see the extent to which such reflexivity may be achieved in a field currently lacks autonomy in relation to other fields.

1.3 THE SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

This section locates the research within the scholarly context by defining and constructing the object of study (the object), and helps to explain the contribution of the research to the existing body of knowledge. It is informed by a literature review that assesses aspects of the academic profession and identity and the historical and policy context of relations between the individual academic, the university and the wider policy landscape. The literature on the topic of identity is prolific and wide-ranging. In seeking relevant publications, bibliographic searches focused not only the topic of identity but also the role of the academic in society and issues around values and working conditions in academia. In addition to the electronic databases and physical collections, the Research into Higher Education Abstracts published by the Society for Research into higher Education, provided invaluable information on papers from the latest periodicals in the field.

There is a strong tradition of UK authors who have occupied management positions in the field and this is reflected in their writing, which tends to be philosophical and reflective in its approach; these authors include Barnett, Nixon, Scott and Watson. Others are more empirically grounded such as Henkel and Clegg although, like Macfarlane who has written extensively about integrity, they are also reflective. Few singularly address the question of the idea and experience of academic community. The research, therefore, draws upon a range of empirical and interpretive texts that cover relevant aspects of the academic habitus such as academic identity, academic practice, and the management of universities. The research methods utilised in the empirically based texts that were read included interviews (unstructured, semi-structured and structured), questionnaires and surveys, desk analyses, observation (participant and non-participant), narrative inquiry, and ethno and auto-ethnographic inquiry.
The research is joining a broad conversation about academic community, a conversation that, despite Watson’s accusation of a lack of scholarly self-knowledge, has quietly persisted in response to increasing pressures on and within the field over the past twenty or more years. Certain texts have already been brought into the discussion above, as they relate to the justification of the research focus and the conceptual framework of Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology. The aim in this section is to synthesise and combine aspects of the literature as they relate to defining and building the idea and experience of academic community – the object.

1.3.1 Defining the object

Harking back?

As declared above, the research does not set out to explain academic community per se. It is useful, however, to consider how academic community as a notion and an experience is portrayed in the current literature. Doing so helps to reveal specific characteristics of the object and to expand on the scholarly context. Contributors to Barnett’s 1994 publication on ‘Academic community: Discourse or Discord?’ for example, reflect on aspects of its meaning. Scott refers to an assumption that there was once a ‘golden time’ in which there was a common culture, a shared discourse and refutes the claim that there once existed an organic academic community which has now splintered into ‘uncomprehending fragments’, saying there is very little evidence, empirical or anecdotal, to support it (Scott 1994 p26). Finnegan reflects on what we mean by recovering ‘academic community’ and refers to a more open concept of community ‘without walls’ that moves away from the earlier model of academic community defined by, ‘physical contiguity, long-term commitment over years, and exclusive full-time membership.’ (Finnegan 1994 p187) (Extending perhaps, the Mertonian norm of ‘communalism’ whereby the substantive findings of science, ‘are a product of social collaboration and are assigned to the community.’ (Merton 1973 p273))

Barnett himself, ten years on (in a publication on ‘reclaiming universities from a runaway world’), reflects on a sense of loss over the idea of the university and the changing relationships between the university and wider society which in turn brings alterations in the practices found within the university, stating, ‘the very idea of ‘within the university’, of there being a kind of enclosed space that is the university’s, is now suspect as the boundaries between universities and the wider society are breached.’ (Barnett 2004 p195) Watson, an advocate of university-community engagement, in referring to the ‘rich legacy’ of community
interest in university foundation, questions where the university sits in relation to civil society, ‘is it a microcosm; an entirely autonomous agent; a service agency; or a social sorting device?’ (Watson 2007 p115) As Watson acknowledges, the story is more fine-grained and complex than it first appears and members of universities have to live in a number of, ‘interesting and overlapping worlds which provide locations, contracts, and trade, and a wider community of knowledge exchange and use.’ (Watson 2014 xxix & p63)

Tribes and territories

Becher, writing about interdisciplinarity and community, describes a ‘subterranean sense of community which is there to be unearthed.’ (Becher 1994 p70) This follows his earlier assertion elsewhere that the ‘tribes of academe’ define their own identities and defend their own ‘patches of intellectual ground’ to exclude what he calls ‘illegal immigrants’. The mechanisms of doing so include both structural features (membership and constitution) and cultural elements such as morals and rules of conduct, and linguistic and symbolic forms of communication (Becher 1989). Becher (and Trowler) later makes the distinction between the social aspects of knowledge communities and the epistemological properties of knowledge forms – the social and the cognitive – academic tribes and the territories they inhabit (Becher and Trowler 2001 p28). Trowler, in 2009, notes the cognitive or epistemological characteristic of disciplinary cultures and then moves beyond the ‘epistemological essentialism’ of Becher as a vehicle for conceptualizing the territories of academic practice, stating that ‘The fractures within them become very apparent when the analyst steps out of the helicopter, as do the similarities between them.’ (Trowler 2009 p183) Mann cites Derrida’s understanding of community as something that has ‘an inside and an outside.’ (Caputo 1997 p108) The word ‘community’ can presuppose the idea of exclusion and as Mann says, ‘belonging and sharing in common imply not belonging and sharing in common.’ (Mann 2005 my italics) What it is like to be to feel excluded from the tribe? The depiction of the academic tribe is further questioned by Trowler, as he acknowledges a tendency to see academic practices as operating in a bubble, stating, ‘In reality, universities and individual departments are open, natural systems, not the ivory towers of legend.’ (Trowler 2012 p29)

Corporatisation

Peters, who takes Readings as his lead (Readings writes about the university in ruins - see below under ‘Constructing the object’) declares the institutional transformation of the modern
university, which now functions, ‘as one more bureaucratic system among others harnessed in the service of national competitiveness in the global economy (the ‘post-historical university’) (Peters 2004 p80). Globalization and corporatization in education go hand in hand according to Blum and Ullman who say that the emphasis is now, ‘less of community and equity, and rather more on individual advancement.’ (Blum and Ullman 2012 p368) The movement away from ‘structural collegiality and self-regulatory academic communities’ towards corporate, bureaucratic and explicit management approaches is also noted by Dowling-Hetherington in her case study of decision-making process and faculty participation in Ireland (Dowling-Hetherington 2013). Kligyte and Barrie reflect on the dominant fantasy of collegiality, an unattainable collegiality ideal in binary opposition to management that ultimately disguises the contingent nature of the relationship between academics and management and serves to solidify and reproduce the status quo. (Kligyte and Barrie 2014 p166) Lucas also cites the dominance of the corporate model for describing managerial relations, stating that there is very little supporting evidence for the collegial ideal in relation to research planning and management, ‘The experiences of many academics within these institutions points more to a hard-edged corporate model.’ (Lucas 2006 p169)

Citizenship

Focusing on the notion of academic citizenship, Macfarlane concludes that the collegiality of faculty life has been replaced by, ‘a less communal and more isolated existence.’ (Macfarlane 2007 p26) This is supported by Bolden, Gosling et al who explored the preoccupations of academics as citizens rather than employees, managers or individuals and found there was not a strong sense of citizenship and community across the sector as a whole (Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014 p762). Morgan and Havergal ask if academic citizenship is ‘under strain’ as they observe rising individualism and a role, the performance of which is pressured by ‘invisible’ duties and activities such as external examining, evaluating for funding bodies, peer review, participation in committee meetings and appointment panels, public engagement and others. Macfarlane is quoted as describing academic citizenship as the ‘glue that keeps academics working’. (Morgan and Havergal 2015 p34) Much earlier, Tight had signalled a ‘cultural shift’ undergone by the academic community, caused by what he terms as the ‘facts of life’; firstly, that the academic community is content to contribute to UK Inc. and secondly, the fragmentation of the academic community into discrete disciplinary sub-cultures which had, ‘precisely the effect of reducing the internal sense of community across academic fields.’ (Tight 1988 p102)
Identity and identities

Peters goes on to contemplate the potential of, ‘knowledge cultures’, based on shared epistemic practices, embodying culturally preferred ways of doing things, often developed over many generations. He poses, as a ‘single governing idea’ the Wittgensteinian notion of a, ‘constellation based on family resemblances.’ (Peters 2004 p80) Barnett and Di Napoli describe not to a constellation but a ‘patchwork of communities of identity’ that are not fixed but continually in the process of construction and reconstruction as the nature of academic identity is both contested and subject to a, ‘dynamic, if complex process.’ (Barnett and Di Napoli 2008 p6) Ylijoki and Ursin, in compiling ‘identity constructions embedded in nine narratives’ of academic roles in Finnish higher education (resistance, loss, overload, job insecurity, success, mobility, change-agency, work-life balance and bystander) acknowledge that academic identity has never formed a unified and monolithic entity and say it has been differentiated foremost by disciplinary communities and also by institutional settings, that differentiation having multiplied under managerial and structural transformations in the university environment (Ylijoki and Ursin 2013 p1147).

Kerr emphasised the idea of a pluralistic institution, an institution with several purposes,

It constituted no single, unified community... The multiversity has a ‘strung-along type of unity, with its lack of devotion to any single faith and its lack of concentration on any single function, with a condition of cohesion at best or coexistence at next best or contingency at least. (Kerr 2001 p104-105)

Winter describes ‘a collection of communities’ rather than a homogenous group united by corporate values and goals in the context of universities characterised by multiple or hybrid identities and stresses the importance of generative conversation as a, ‘necessary first step towards promoting a multi-vocal institutional identity.’ (Winter 2009) Conversation, or ‘talking’, is suggested by Heinrich as contributing to a sense of belonging amongst academics, helping them to, ‘find their home for teaching, among others with related teaching responsibilities.’ (Heinrich 2013 p468)

Writing about the decline of the university in South Africa, Waghid poses the notion of an academic ‘community of thinking’, stating that if the staff can justify their association with a particular action, it does the work of a community of thinking by rendering and evaluating a reason for action. Waghid aims to avoid an instrumentalist definition of the community of
thinking by coupling the notion with an ‘epistemological journey’ that is more attentive to, ‘unimagined possibilities, unexpected encounters, and perhaps the lucky find.’ (Waghid 2012 p77) This is similar to Rolfe’s ‘paraversity’ with its ‘organic, fluid, rhizomatic, evolving community of Thought.’ (Rolfe 2013) (See section on ‘Agency’ above) Whitchurch uses the concept of third space to denote communities in higher education that are characterised by integrated, semi-autonomous and independent spaces in which individuals inhabit different roles and identities. This space, unlike Rolfe’s paraversity, accommodates ‘less boundaried’ forms of professional identity beyond the traditional academic/non-academic division. (Whitchurch 2013)

The portrayal of academic community in the current literature as described above suggests a complex and weathered terrain. There is clearly no one ‘academic community’ but multiple assemblages that come together, mainly as epistemic communities, individuals connected by cognitive affiliations and practice. The organic nature of these communities appears to be diminishing in the face of structural forces such as managerialism and corporatisation although a potential restoration of a community culture or sense of belonging through a generative discourse, is observed.

From bad to good

Academic community may be experienced in different ways and an aim of this research is to explore what that experience is for the participants. It may, for example, be experienced as an ideology, and not always a positive one according to Barnett, whose three different interpretations of the forms of academic community are described above under ‘Exploring perspectives on community’. Barnett labelled academic community as a ‘pernicious ideology’, along with entrepreneurialism, competition and quality, saying it is in its interests to convey the impression that it is a community when its actual dispositions, and indeed, behaviours are quite to the contrary; it can take a pernicious or a virtuous form. Bourdieu also uses the term, ‘pernicious’ when referring to his first-hand knowledge of the Ecole Normale Superieure (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p231). Barnett concludes however, that academic community (unlike the other pernicious ideologies) could be turned into a virtuous ideology if effort is put into bringing it about, and later refers to the potential of community and individualization working hand in hand, as ‘parallel tracks.’ (Barnett 2003 p112)
Barnett also contends that concerns about the loss of academic community and lack of, for example, academic freedom are not just a matter of perceptions or expressions of self-interest on the part of some academics and that to discount them as such would be to fail to take seriously their collective significance. Seeking to recover what he terms as the general principles of community, he describes these sensitivities as being indicative of a disjunction in culture between the academic world and the wider society (Barnett 1994 p11).

This research, focusing on the idea and experience of the academic community (enclosed or otherwise), discloses a disjuncture not between universities and society but between individuals and their institution, although the separation does appear to be affected in part by the lack of autonomy of the field of higher education (see discussion under ‘Field’ above). The institution itself is weaker in relation to the field as it, in turn, is shaped by the dominant forces of the field such as the marketization of the sector. It is however, stronger in relation to the individuals who strive to retain their sense of agency. The relationship between individuals and their institution clearly affects how individuals experience community(s). Individuals who work in higher education institutions are affected in different ways; the homogenisation of universities leads to the fragmentation of individual identities (Taylor 1999); discourses of managerialism transmuted into the instrumentalisation of work, or ‘performativity’ (the need for individuals to organise themselves in response to targets, indicators and evaluations) provoke a range of individual responses including ‘fabrication’ and inauthentic practice (Ball 2003); a divergence between individual and institutional stories of academic work that leads to ‘hidden’ or ‘secret’ stories of academic identity, subversion (Henkel 2000) and even disembodiment (Sparkes 2007, Churchman and King 2008). Taylor concluded that academics are experiencing a form of Toffler’s ‘future shock’; that institutional structures are ‘being poured’ into academics’ work settings and, using Trowler’s analogy, he says that some academics will learn to swim and others will drown (Trowler 1998, Taylor 1999). In this environment, they cannot ignore their institution’s strategy as the level of interactions between each academic and his/her own university is simultaneously higher and more constraining (Musselin 2013 p28). Reflecting on Ball’s notion of performativity, Walker and Nixon describe a need for individuals to ‘constantly remake and reinvent our biographies in response to institutional requirements...’ (Walker and Nixon 2004 p2) The individualisation, detraditionalisation and globalisation of higher education, the rapid acceleration in the pace of individualisation and this accelerating process highlights the importance of institutions whilst posing a severe threat to their continuity and integrity. This in turn threatens the sense of
institutional membership and belongingness, structured around notions of commonality and sameness. (Walker and Nixon 2004 p3)

However, it is not all pessimistic. Harris, on rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times, believes the partnership culture, deregulation, and the blurring of the private/public sector, are creating more fluidity and permeability of professional and institutional boundaries, at the same time that performativity is encouraging fragmentation (Harris 2005 p428) Clegg challenges Ball’s notion of performativity and, without claiming to generalize, concludes that rather than being under threat, it appears that identities in academia are expanding and proliferating (Clegg 2008). It has also been claimed that the objectification of accountability, the erosion of the public ethic and its replacement by a business discourse, has seemingly liberated individuals from the need to rely on personal motivation or professional ethics (Nowotny, Scott et al. 2001).

The dominant tone of the literature on academic community is disconsolate but not despairing. Bolden, Gosling et al identify six themes about the nature of academic life including ‘citizenship and community’, and conclude that despite a rather pessimistic view of the sector, ‘an undercurrent of genuine passion and commitment to the values and purposes of HE’ is revealed (Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014 p763). The dominant language is that of professional practice and values. Kleijnen, Dolmans et al, in comparing staff conceptions of quality management and organisational values, find that ‘flexible human relations’ values (e.g. collaboration and togetherness) are preferred by senior academics but university departments are failing to realise these (Kleijnen, Dolmans et al. 2014). Nixon observes that values saturate practice, ‘without values practice becomes meaningless, devoid of agency and direction; and without practice, values lack legitimacy and moral grounding.’ (Nixon 2008 p42) Barnett states, ‘Values that are characteristic of the university are, we may judge, deep in its academic activities, embedded in its research and teaching. Yet, the university is changing.’ (Barnett 2003 p123)

1.3.2 Constructing the object

Krejsler, who describes a research group as having its own secluded environment, states that gaining an understanding of the specific features of lived university life requires painstaking attention to the specificities of particular university landscapes and their genesis. (Krejsler
The approach to constructing the object of this research also requires painstaking attention and reflects the following interpretation by Bourdieu & Wacquant,

> The construction of an object... is not something that is effected once and for all, with one stroke, through some sort of inaugural theoretical act. The program of observation and analysis through which it is effected is not a blue-print that you draw up in advance, in the manner of an engineer. It is, rather, a protracted and exacting task that is accomplished little by little, through a whole series of small rectifications and amendments inspired by what is called le métier, the ‘know-how’, that is, by the set of practical principles that orients choices at once minute and decisive. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p227)

The pilot data gathering in this research (described in Chapter Two) led towards a clearer construction of the object. Indeed, the process of construction itself became increasingly conspicuous as the early data was used to formulate the analytical framework (see below), a device used for objectifying the object. Bourdieu states that there is no escaping the work of constructing the object, and the responsibility that this entails. His logic of research is,

> An intermeshing of major or minor problems which force us to ask ourselves at every moment what we are doing and permit us gradually to understand more fully what we are seeking. (Bourdieu 1988 p7)

This is also the logic of my own professional practice wherever I have worked, in higher education, in the voluntary & community sector and in local government. I constantly try to understand more fully what I am doing and why and, according to Nixon who believes that ‘what distinguishes the university is its focus on the question of why we do what we do’, there is no better place to do so than the context, and the subject of, this doctoral research. In my practice I attempt to make new connections and to, as Wenger says brokers do, open new possibilities for meaning (Wenger 1998 p109).

**A dialogistic approach and symbolic interpretations**

In a presentation at an SRHE (Society for Research into Higher Education) symposium on, ‘Structuring Knowledge: new visions of higher education’, Barnett made an entreaty for the play of the imagination and for others to enter a dialogic community and to see their world as he sees it; as a relational entity (Barnett presentation, ‘Head in the Clouds and Feet on the Ground: Structuring Knowledge in an Age of Non-Structure’) (Education 2012). Biesta, at the same symposium, reflected on a need for a more accurate account of what is going on in
higher education. He called for a ‘non-epistemological’ approach that allows for the telling of different stories other than the story of knowledge; stories about what it means to be an academic or a researcher (Biesta presentation, ‘Knowledge? Look again! Asymmetry, democracy and Higher Education’), and whilst Michael Young in his presentation called for a differentiated epistemology rather than none at all (because then, ‘all we are left with is meaning making’), he did acknowledge a need for ‘community’ and for people to feel a part of something; a point that many of those present endorsed (Young presentation, ‘Why educators must differentiate knowledge from experience’). As Gareth Williams (Institute of Education) observed, we want it both ways; knowing how to be a member of the community and extending community. How do we get the balance between structure and openness? (Education 2012)

This debate is cognisant of the search for a structural definition of community and is reminiscent of Hamilton’s Foreword to Cohen’s publication on community, where he describes Cohen’s contribution as a way out of the impasse,

*The issue to be faced in the study of community is not whether its structural limits have withstood the onslaught of social change, but whether its members are able to infuse its culture with vitality, and to construct a symbolic community which provides meaning and identity.’ (Hamilton in Cohen 1985 p10)*

The participants in this research were invited to draw upon their own repository and reflect on the meaning of community, to describe their idea and experience of community and to picture it in some symbolic form. Some began by approaching the exercise as an intellectual exploration of what is meant by community, at least in part. However, as the exchange went on, particularly during the second meetings, and as the questions probed what community means in relation to for example, their values and their sense of belonging, more idiosyncratic reflections and stories emerged.

Henkel, on academic identity, adopts a ‘communitarian’ perspective in which individual choices are to some extent shaped and structured by institutions and communities, and in which individuals are understood as engaging in dialogue and argument with the ideas and theories of their communities. The participants in this research reflected on such dissimilarities. As Cohen concludes in ‘Symbolic construction of community’, people construct community symbolically, ‘making it a resource and repository of meaning, and a referent of their identity.’ (Cohen 1985 p118)
Mann suggests that we resist the idea of certainty contained in a consensus-based (or more structured) view of community, ‘in order to maintain openness to the possibility that the future might bring something which is as yet unimagined or unknown.’ (Mann 2005) She concludes that belonging or having a shared purpose is not at issue. Rather, what seems to be at issue is the opening up of possibilities for expression (e.g. seeking understanding; making explicit norms and assumptions in order to question and configure them more appropriately; and voicing different experiences, histories and positions, and having these accounts heard). Facilitating dialogue is more critical than establishing a sense of belonging, in the quest for reducing alienation (Mann 2005). This research facilitates a dialogue about the meaning and experience of the university community and provides therefore, the possibility for expression about aspects of community. The empirical dimension, in which the dialogue between the researcher and the participants occurs, is set out in the thesis under four key themes; idea and elements of community, status, academic practice and institution and environment, and one sub-theme, the researcher and the return gaze. An introduction to these is provided under ‘The Analytical Framework’ below and they are fully explained in Chapter Three.

This dialogistic approach to constructing the object is in keeping with Readings’ question about the claim for an ideal community in the University where he argues that it is possible to think the notion of community without recourse to notions of unity, consensus and communication. The University becomes, ‘one site among others where the question of being together is raised... the University is where thought takes place beside thought, where thinking is a shared process without identity or unity. Thought beside itself perhaps.’ (Readings 1997 pp 20 & 192 italics in original)

Taking responsibility

According to May and Perry, the process of constituting objects of social science discourse results in a demarcation between ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ knowledge. However, to consider endogenous reflexivity alone would not allow us to see the implications of this separation and how it is that the social sciences are constitutive of social relations (see above for a discussion of reflexivity through reflexive sociology). In order, therefore, to avoid the ‘one-way hermeneutic’ whereby social research is separated from social life, it is necessary to breach what May and Perry describe as an ‘epistemic impermeability’ and ‘attend not only to the endogenous but also to the referential dimensions of reflexivity if we are to unleash the
potential in their meeting to inform practical actions within the lifeworld.’ (May and Perry 2011 p92) What difference will this research make in the world, if any? The intention of the research is to inform practical actions and not to conceive of the social world as ‘totality intended for cognition alone, in which all interactions are reduced to symbolic exchanges’ but to see the construction of the object as a, ‘practical activity oriented towards practical functions.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p96)

Constructing the object, as Bourdieu states, entails responsibility. This research is conducted in the spirit of that responsibility and of Watson’s notion of ‘soft’ citizenship which entails ‘a sense of loyalty; a balance of scepticism and trust; a commitment to progressive engagement with wicked or intractable problems; and a presumption that knowledge can inform responsible action.’ (Watson 2014 p59) Watson believes that universities are distinctive in that they, ‘deal in a non-dogmatic, open and experimental way with both ‘social memory’ and ‘social hope’.’ (Watson 2014 p88) Nixon states that in the reflexivity lies the hope. ‘The hope lies in the associative and civil structures that render academic practice durable and sustainable and that define it historically and in terms of its moral ends and purposes.’ (Nixon 2008 p143)

Focusing on values

Barnett calls for ‘responsible and yet poetic anarchy’ no less, ‘the imagination needs... to be conditioned by appropriate values and principles. The imagination itself needs also to be responsible.’ (Barnett 2012 p203) As observed above, the dominant language of academics on academic community is that of values. This research aims to break what Barnett calls the ‘conspiracy of silence’ about values that persists in universities; the ‘not-in-front-of-the-children’ silence whereby any mention of values brings on sheer embarrassment.’ He is referring to academic values, which he names as tolerance, discursive freedom, respect for persons and critical dialogue. In qualifying this assertion, he states that the silence is ‘over-determined.’ That is, there is collusion among many parties within and without the university – academics and managers collude to ‘air brush’ values from their images of academic life because adding value talk, ‘would simply add a level of complexity that promises no resolution’. Barnett acknowledges the paradox of the university’s value positioning as the university rarely stops to try to spell out the reasons that attest to its own values, ‘even though the university declares itself on the side of reason’. Greystone’s Corporate Plan 2008-2012, for example, declared, ‘the cohesion of our own community depends on parity of esteem and a
sense of collegiality and mutual obligation.’ (Plan 2, p4) Barnett declares that the university has not carried through its own value framework to its logical conclusion: ‘it has truncated its reason in relation to itself.’ Under these circumstances, a discourse of values cannot gain a hearing (Barnett 2003 p121-123 italics in original).

As acknowledged under ‘Field’ above, the field of higher education lacks autonomy and is weak. Values of a different kind, of the economic field for example, appear to be thriving. Barnett himself said that the silence is supported by the corporate sector’s interest in the sector,

\[It\] values, in favour of profit, growth and market share, are not so much assumed as imposed as a \textit{fait accompli}. Interests in promoting knowledge and understanding are being replaced by interests in generating income, personal advancement and sheer survival. The new value structure is one of calculation and of profit and loss understood generally... an ethics of the balance sheet. (Barnett 2003 p122&125 italics in original)

This is supported by Roscoe’s assertion that we are shut into the panopticon of economics. All economics is normative. It is inescapably bound up in the construction of the world that it seeks to describe. Economic thinking, embedded in language and devices, constitutes us as economic subjects; the assumptions upon which economic analysis are based are normalized. (Roscoe 2014 p199) Bourdieu refers to the ‘scholastic illusion’ of economics, which remains unchallenged, ‘because of the failure to consider the economic conditions of compliance with the laws of the economic world, which the theory thus constitutes as the universal norm of practices.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p60) Harris wants to change the focus away from what she describes as the disempowering elements of neo-liberal modes of governance and says, ‘We need to find ways of exchanging ideas and ways of working within and across disciplines and institutions which are underpinned by shared values and understandings about the moral purpose of working in academia.’ (Harris 2005 p428) This topic is revisited in Chapter Eight in a discussion on the value and values of academic community.

1.4 THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This section introduces and explains the analytical framework. Constructing a scientific object requires breaking with empiricist passivity and building a model, tackling, ‘a very concrete empirical case’, and yielding, ‘a coherent system of relations which can be put to the test.’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p233) The purpose of the analytical framework in this
research, therefore, is to help with that construction and with objectifying the object. It provides both an illustration of the object and a schema for the final data analysis with which to test the relations between the different characteristics and component parts of the object. It presents the object as a diagram that is,

An abstract representation, deliberately constructed, like a map, to give a bird’s-eye view, a point of view on the whole set of points from which ordinary agents (including the sociologist and his reader, in their ordinary behaviour) see the social world. (Bourdieu 1984 p163)

In considering the generative formula, Bourdieu states that the most rigorous analysis, ‘cannot manifest all the possible coherence of the products of practical sense without at the same time bringing to light the limits of this coherence.’ (Bourdieu 1990 p210) And yet he extolls the utility of generative models or diagrams by saying, ‘Probably the only way to give an account of the practical coherence of practices and works is to construct generative models which reproduce in their own terms the logic from which that coherence is generated...’ (Bourdieu 1990 p92) Bourdieu used diagrams throughout his work. For example, the diagram of the field of power according to Sentimental Education and the literary field at the end of the nineteenth century in ‘The Rules of Art’ (Bourdieu 1996); a diagram to describe the space of social positions in ‘Distinction’ (Bourdieu 1984) and a diagram to describe the space of the faculties in ‘Homo Academicus’ (Bourdieu 1988).

In explaining his diagram of the space of social positions, Bourdieu does not claim that it aims to be, ‘the crystal ball in which the alchemists claimed to see at a glance everything happening in the world’. He also points to the disadvantages of diagrams; firstly, that they may encourage readings which will, ‘reduce the homologies between systems of differences’ to, ‘direct, mechanical relationships between groups and properties’ and secondly, that they may encourage the form of ‘voyeurism which is inherent in the objectivist intervention, putting the sociologist in the role of the lame devil who takes off the roofs and reveals the secrets of domestic life to his fascinated readers.’ Despite these limitations, however, he sees diagrams as ‘synoptic schema’, bringing together information from areas, which the usual classificatory systems separate – ‘so much so that they make mere juxtaposition appear unthinkable or scandalous’. Diagrams enable the reader to see potential relations, ‘making manifest the relationships among all the properties and practices characteristic of a group.’ (Bourdieu 1984 p124)
Using Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as the conceptual approach, the analytical framework set out below is derived from the first and second analysis of the early data (the research design and analytical process is fully explained in Chapter Two). In particular, the first conversations, the aide memoires, documents and the literature review (the findings of the literature review as described above are interpreted as ‘data’). The aim is to give the object, ‘a finite set of pertinent properties, whose variations are associated with the variations of the phenomenon observed’ (Bourdieu 1988 p9). The framework is set out below –

**Illustration 1: the analytical framework**

The presence of field in the framework allows for a description and analysis of the object’s social setting primarily at the institutional level (the University of Greystone) and also at a sectoral level (higher education) as it affects the institutional perspective on community. Note the proximity of the theme, ‘institution & environment’, firmly in field, as the conditions of the field affects relations between the individual and their institution. It relates to the sector and policy but also crosses into habitus as it can in turn affect the academic profession and conditions for ‘small scale interactions’ (Reay 2004) within the academic community. ‘The
university & community’ and ‘Documents & doxa’ include the formal institutional narrative, or doxa on academic community as presented in official publications such as Greystone’s Corporate Plan; these relate to institutional and collective actions as well as individual doxic experience. They represent systemic or organizational representations of academic community. Also included here are documents selected by the participants for discussion e.g. research centre annual report and a small selection of historical papers (listed in Chapters Two).

The presence of habitus in the framework allows for a way of connecting the individual (including their disposition), the institution and their environment, of moving from the idea and experience of academic community from an individual perspective as an idiosyncratic notion through to the idea and experience of academic community in the context of professional practice (‘academic practice’) and career (‘status’). Note that the themes, ‘academic practice’ and ‘status’ both traverse the permeable boundary between agency and habitus as they involve institutional, collective and individual actions.

The presence of Agency in the framework allows for an interpretation of the object from an individual perspective in both symbolic (as notions) and material forms (as compositions, feelings and actions). Note the proximity of the theme, ‘idea & elements of community’, situated firmly in the idiosyncratic, the unique perspective of individuals.

The presence of Epistemic Reflexivity in the framework allows for an acknowledgement of the perspective that is my subjective reality as the researcher, as a member of the same institution as the participants, and as someone who has occupied a professional role that relates to the object. This includes the participants’ views of the researcher and is represented by the sub-theme, ‘the researcher and the return gaze’.

The presence of social relations and the reproduction of community allows for the relationship between the object’s distinctive components, which leads to the reproduction of academic community as experienced by the members of that community. Note that all lines in the framework are permeable. Social relations are key to the interpretation and understanding of the object; aspects of ‘community’ are considered throughout. The analysis and interpretation of all the framework components reveals positions that affect social relations and the reproduction of community in this context.
All components and their interpretation are fully discussed in Chapters Four to Seven which focus on the four major themes that emerged from the first and second thematic analysis – ‘idea and elements of community’, ‘status’, ‘academic practice’, ‘institution and environment’. The fifth, sub-theme, ‘the researcher & the return gaze’ is referenced as it relates to the other themes. It does not contribute to the creation and conversion of community cultural capital to the same extent as the others. The emergence and adoption of all the themes is explained in Chapter Three where they are fully explained. The analytical framework as presented above is converted into a final conceptual model, fully informed by the data analysis and the research as a whole. That model is presented and explained in Chapter Eight.

1.5 SKETCH OF THE THESIS

Through eight chapters and eight appendices, the thesis shapes and builds a meticulous narrative about the idea and experience of community inside one higher education institution. Chapter One declares the research focus, introduces and explains the conceptual framework, delivers an extended discussion of the literature as it relates to defining and constructing the research object, and outlines the analytical framework, which forms the scaffolding for the data analysis and the foundation of the final model. Chapter Two focuses on methodology and the empirical dimension, describing the different phases of the project, explaining how and why the research was carried out in the way that it was. Chapter Three provides more detail about the research site and all the players, and introduces the key topics that emerged from the final analysis in preparation for the more fine-grained examination presented in Chapters Four to Seven. Those chapters focus on each key theme in turn; idea and elements of community, status, academic practice and environment and institution. Chapter Eight lays out the distinct characteristics of ‘community’ value and values (as derived from the overall analysis) which form the basis of a conceptual model called the ‘Infinity Model’ that may, as explained, have both research and agentic potential. Apart from the standard research documentation and the headings from the second analysis, the appendices include an open letter written by a group of unnamed scholars to the Vice-Chancellor, and extracts from a research poster presented at the Society for Research into Higher Education Annual Conference, 2012.
1.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter introduced the focus of the research, explained the conceptual framework, located the research within the existing body of knowledge on this topic by defining and constructing the research object with reference to selected literature in the field, and introduced the analytical framework. The answer to the question about the imperative for the research at this particular time lies in the responsibility that is so readily accepted in the process of construction of the object, as explained above. It is determined by the emphasis in the current literature upon values and Barnett’s call for ‘responsible and yet poetic anarchy’, and is approached with what Zipin and Brennan describe as ‘critical mindfulness’,

We seek to arouse a sense of the ethical necessity of raising our consciousness to take more reflexively articulate looks at the usually subconscious layers or dispositional tendency within our field. (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p32-33)

The limitations of the research are primarily twofold. Firstly, on generalisation: as with Clegg, who in 2008 conducted open interviews with just thirteen academics, there is a need to resist over-simple derivations from what might be seen as global trends e.g. that academic identities are under threat. As Clegg states, studies of the academic habitus tend to be local and contextual. She concludes that questions of identity are unlikely to be capable of being read as macro-sociological analyses. Clegg’s own aim was not to generalise, even at the micro level of the department or institution, but to, ‘theorise some of the possible ways in which the life-world of academics is being experienced.’ (Clegg 2008)

Secondly, on the potential for stimulating collective action: whilst Archer appears to be giving great credence to the prevalence of collective action when she concludes that reflexivity is possible in academia as a collective enterprise, it has to be recognised that the situation is complicated. The lack of reflexivity in higher education at an institutional level appears to suggest that a collective enterprise of this sort is actually more unlikely than likely, even as the findings of research such as this are shared. Barnett states that universities are faced with ‘supercomplexicity’ (Barnett 2000) and according to Henkel, agency is affected by the ‘paradoxes of academia and its organisation’; the policy changes that expose higher education to influences which may be disturbing to the values and structures within which academic identities have hitherto been sustained (Henkel 2000 p21).
This does not, however stop us from caring. To care about our field not only as researchers, but also as pro-active agents who value the ‘social good of the field’, is to remember that we have agency to shift even the most seemingly intractable ‘necessities’. (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p32)

Being aware of the implications for the knowledge claim of my position as an insider researcher (an issue further explored in Chapter Two) but not wanting to fall short of being ‘critical and alert’, it is perhaps important that the agential potential of this research is acknowledged, limited though it may be. The opportunity to discover and to challenge is one not to be missed.
Chapter 2
THE EMPIRICAL DIMENSION

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One introduced the focus of the research, explained the conceptual framework, located the research within the existing body of knowledge on this topic by defining and constructing the research object with reference to selected literature in the field, and introduced the analytical framework. This chapter revisits the research question and extends the narrative to ways in which the empirical dimension has been framed and conducted. It explains how the pilot data gathering led to the research question, the research design itself and the rationale for the data analysis. It also identifies, describes and explores the methodological challenges in relation to the research design and its execution, aiming to ‘make visible’ the hand behind the text (Watson 1994 S78).

The overarching research question is,

‘How do academics conceive of and relate to the idea of ‘community’?’

2.1 THE DATA COLLECTION

This section describes the pilot study purpose, origins and format, explains the sample selection process for the main data gathering and describes the approach to the main data gathering itself. The pilot data confirmed how subjective and diverse perspectives and experiences of community and university-community engagement can be amongst individual academics; and, how important life stories are to defining community and defining identity and culture, even within a professional setting.

2.1.1 The pilot study: purpose, origin and format

The purpose of the pilot study was to help determine the focus of the research question, not to pilot any particular method, although the format, nature and subject area of the setting in which the pilot study took place fitted in with the overall approach of this research in that it involved participation and reflection.
In 2005, a local author, working in collaboration with the BBC, approached the university to see if anyone would be interested in delivering a workshop that explored people’s life stories. Later, in my professional role, I commissioned a workshop exploring the meaning of research and its role in society, involving five postgraduate researchers and five members of the public,

I would say that I wouldn’t put myself more in a university identity than I would in a community identity. (postgraduate researcher) (McDaid 2009)

Following the success of that workshop, it was decided to offer it to all university staff as a part of the staff training and development programme under the heading of community engagement. The 2010 Workshop took place over a period of four weeks at a ‘neutral’ venue close to Greystone. The activities included writing about first memories, about people who had inspired or influenced the participants and about community-university engagement. The exploration of shared experiences was deeply personal. In advance of the workshop, the facilitators had expressed a desire for the participants to not know the ‘rank’ of their fellow participants’ posts at the university. They said that they did not want anyone to feel inhibited in any way. At the sessions name badges were not used, for the facilitators and the participants. During the initial exercises described above, no-one mentioned which university school or department they were from and only one person referred to their job in the context of describing their motivation for attending the workshop in order to do something creative, as they felt their job was not so. At the end of the first session still no-one knew each other’s job roles. The only person who actually described their role was me. I introduced myself as a researcher and told the group that I would be working as hard as everyone else, if not harder. I thanked everyone for consenting to my presence. I participated fully in all the workshops and wrote field notes at the end of each session.

2.1.2 Sample selection for main data collection: people

The main data collection comprised of a series of extended conversations with twelve academics in one university (none of whom were involved in the pilot study), exploring their idea of community. The twelfth participant was recruited late in the process for one conversation, someone who was no longer at the institution but who had worked at a senior level, as pro-vice chancellor a number of years ago. Not all the participants defined themselves as ‘academics’, ‘...partly because I’m not a lecturer, I don’t regard myself as an academic in some respects...’ (Susan 1 C1p2) Although for the purpose of the research I would
describe them all as such. There were also times when participants felt excluded from the university community, particularly when faced with the end of their research contract and in one case in particular, having had no formal status at all after completing a doctorate they left the institution to take up a research fellowship elsewhere.

Conversing with just twelve participants from the same institution enabled a more contextualized and deeper understanding of their individual perspectives and actions. It was also realistic in terms of capacity as for most of the research (except for the last eighteen months) I was employed full-time in my professional role, albeit in the field which gave me constant access to the phenomena. Early on it seemed that I was constantly on the alert for data gathering possibilities and at times it seemed that too much of what I saw was relevant. I was at risk of being overwhelmed. Potts, in his experience as an insider researcher found that being continuously ‘on site’ did pose difficulties, such as never being able to completely withdraw from the research setting (Potts 2008 p164). Mercer, an ‘insider’ researcher who conducted a study of appraisal systems in two higher education institutions where she worked as a lecturer, found it harder to tell where the research stops and the rest of life begins (Mercer 2007 p6). At least the pilot data-gathering workshop provided a discrete setting as it had a beginning and an end. Using the workshop for the pilot data collection could be described as ‘an opportunistic research strategy’ as it did form a part of the project that I was managing in my professional role. Such a strategy is advantageous, even beneficial (Riemer 1977).

This is the principle behind the recruitment of the research participants. Of the twelve recruited, I had known seven directly in my professional role and all were involved with community-university engagement in some form or other as broadly defined (see Chapter One). (Skelton, who undertook a study of teacher identities in a ‘research-led’ university, knew all his participants and referred to them as a ‘convenience’ or ‘opportunistic’ sample (Skelton 2012)). This association did not appear to present any particular difficulties according to the participants although assurance about anonymity needed to be reaffirmed for the participant who had no formal status.

An ‘invitation’ to participate in the research, accompanied by a research information and consent form (see Appendix A), was emailed to a number of selected individuals. Three invitations did not result in recruitment; one was sent to a professor, a former head of school, with whom I had had a very difficult meeting in my professional role two years earlier. The
meeting was difficult, not because he rejected the notion that community-university engagement was an activity that could potentially benefit the members of his school but because of the way in which he had conducted the meeting. He was arrogant in his demeanour and aggressive in his actions, throwing the materials that I had brought to the meeting across the table towards me, as I got ready to depart the room at the end of our time together. He did not respond to my invitation. Another professor, also a former head of school, declined my invitation via a very polite response, stating that time did not permit her to engage with the research. The third was to a lecturer who did not respond at all.

Clegg ‘chose’ people with different academic roles and at different levels in the formal hierarchy; her choice was informed by a desire to talk to diverse individuals, not by any concern with representativeness (Clegg 2008). Similarly, I was not concerned with representativeness as such but I did aim to account for certain variables such discipline (both Henkel and Becher stress the importance of discipline in academic working lives and stage of career (Becher 1989, Henkel 2000). The sample was as follows; all names are fictitious and their positions are as they were at the beginning of the research encounter –

Susan - contract researcher, post-doctoral – social scientist, faculty of health
Ben - contract researcher, post-doctoral – social scientist, faculty of science
Nicola - associate tutor, post-doctoral – social scientist, faculty of social science
Bryan - professor – emeritus, formerly head of research centre & formerly head of school – social scientist, faculty of social science
Edward - professor, formerly head of school – social scientist, faculty of arts & humanities
Tessa - professor, head of research group – scientist, faculty of health
Michael - professor, emeritus, formerly head of school & formerly pro-vice chancellor – social scientist, faculty of social science
Jonathon - senior lecturer, academic director – social scientist, faculty of social science
Fiona - senior lecturer, centre director – social scientist, faculty of health
Tim - senior lecturer – scientist, faculty of science
Sandra - senior lecturer –scientist, faculty of science
Rosa - no contractual status, post-doctoral – social scientist, formerly faculty of arts & humanities
The process of ‘snowballing’ was not used as the sample was relatively small, unlike Gunasekara who started with senior university executives and regional leaders (Gunasekara 2007). Churchman & King held a World Café with 21 participants at a European regional conference on practice-based learning and set out to explore the ways that academic staff made sense of changes to their work practices. The data was used to compose two stories; Secret Story 1 – Academic Joy and Secret Story 2 – Academic Loss and Fear (Churchman and King 2008). Robertson & Bond’s study of how academics experience teaching and research and their interrelation was prompted by the publication of a New Zealand university newsletter. Nine academics responded to the publication, all of whom were invited to participate in interviews (Robertson and Bond 2001). Becher chose to interview academics in elite institutions that were already viewed as ‘reasonably prestigious’ within their disciplinary communities, stating that these members embodied the central value of the discipline, the ‘pacemakers’. In referring to the lessons learned in his research, Becher states that he took into consideration in his research design of the need for respondents to span the full range of age and experience which is not borne out by his clearly stated intention in his ‘points of departure’ to focus on the more established members of the academic community. He concludes that the expressed need for the full range of age and experience proved ‘relatively insignificant’ when subjected to more detailed analysis, which did not uncover discrepancies in perception or response across the category. He does, however, under the heading, ‘getting to know the ropes’ state that his research indirectly confirms the efficiency of the ‘initiation’ process into academic life which takes place at the doctoral student stage though the research students that he interviewed were nearly all in their final year and were already imbued with the cultures of their chosen academic communities (Becher 1989).

2.1.3 Sample selection for main data collection: documents and institutional context

A number of selected institutional documents were interpreted in order to gain an understanding of Greystone’s formal narrative identity and how in particular, the institution officially portrays the notion of a university community. These contributed to the institutional context of the phenomena and an interpretation is provided in Chapter Seven. It was not my intention to assess the material goods or record keeping systems that are integral to the organisation of everyday social life as suggested by Hammersley & Atkinson who warn that the ethnographer ignores these at his or her peril (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p133). But then, it was not so much a ‘documentary reality’ that I am aimed to construct but an
impression of the institutional narrative on community, including specific examples that the participants could respond to. The documents selected for interpretation are,

Consultation Draft Greystone Corporate Plan 2007-8 to 2011-12 (Plan 1)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2008-2012 (Plan 2)
Draft Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (Plan 3)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (Plan 4)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (designed version) (Plan 5)

Vice-Chancellor’s Inaugural Address, 1963
Vice-Chancellor’s letters to staff, September 2009 – December 2013

In addition to these documents, four of the participants selected a number to include in our conversations. The latter aided the conversations and were not interpreted as the institutional narrative. Edward, who was clearing through his office in preparation for retirement, provided 25 documents ranging from memorandums to minutes and including an open letter to the Vice-Chancellor from ‘Humanist scholars’ (see Appendix B). Bryan chose to discuss the annual report of the research centre that he had co-founded. Susan had brought along a newspaper cutting of an article written by me that had been published in the regional press and Ben had an academic publication which the researcher read in advance of the second conversation (Rose, N The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government Economy and Society 25 3 August 1996: 327-356).

2.1.4 The main data collection

Twenty-three one-to-one conversations were conducted with individual participants and two focus groups. The plan was for three conversations with each participant. The purpose of the first was to inform an aide memoire which was used in the place of an interview schedule to frame the second. The third conversation was to serve as an opportunity to confirm key themes and potential conclusions. Documents chose by the participants were brought into the discussion. The order of the data collection process was set out in the information and consent form as follows -

**Beginning**: first conversations timed at 20 mins each
Write up transcripts
Draft aide memoires & check with research participants, gather documents selected by participants

*Middle:* second conversations not time limited
Write up transcripts, identify themes from second conversation & send to participants with any other documents selected

*End:* third conversations timed at 45 mins each
Write up transcripts, complete final analysis

The invitation to participate in the research was framed as broadly as possible to allow for this relatively unstructured approach, introducing the subject area, and at the same time providing a clear statement of expectation for all involved; that is, what I expected the participants to do (e.g. how much time they may need to invest in the process) and what I committed to doing myself.

The intention was to share the individual transcripts from the second conversation, in advance of the third conversation. However, as explained below, I decided to conduct focus groups in response to questions from the participants about what the others were saying and only one participant, Rosa, ended up having a third conversation and that was because she was unable to attend a focus group. I did share the transcripts from the first conversation along with a draft aide memoire (see below). Table 1 below sets out how the participants were involved in the data gathering –
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Conversations</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan contract researcher, post-doctoral</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben contract researcher, post-doctoral</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola associate tutor, post-doctoral</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan professor – emeritus, formerly head of research centre &amp; formerly head of school</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward professor, formerly head of school</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa professor, head of research group</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael professor, emeritus, formerly head of school &amp; formerly pro-vice chancellor</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon senior lecturer, academic director</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona senior lecturer, centre director</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim senior lecturer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra senior lecturer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa no contractual status, post-doctoral</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: the participants and the data gathering

Drake and Heath used loosely structured interviews (as a means of potentially keeping their roles as unobtrusive as possible), allowing the direction of the interview to be driven by the participants’ agenda, within the overall framework of the inquiry (Drake and Heath 2008). Hammersley & Atkinson described the process as ‘reflexive listening’, allowing discussion to flow in a way that seems natural where at different points in the same interview the approach may be non-directive or directive, depending on the function that the questioning is intended to serve which is usually decided as the interview (or conversation) progresses (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). This process is reminiscent of grounded theory, though I would say my approach is not strictly within that tradition; it was more deductive. Whilst my own stance was less unobtrusive than theirs, my approach was more akin to that of Drake and Heath who describe theirs as a ‘trail of discovery’ in the spirit of grounded theory, only I aimed to make it a ‘shared’ trail of discovery in that certain parts of the research data were to some extent co-constructed between myself and the research participants.
The aide memoire

Platt describes her interviews as ‘exceedingly unstructured’ saying that they could resemble participant observation rather than the traditional survey interview, and concludes that the conventional distinctions between modes of data collection are not always useful. This approach was adopted in the main data collection. The ‘aide memoire’ was, to some extent, co-constructed with the research participants though essentially, I produced a draft for feedback covered by the following text,

You’ll see that I’ve constructed the AM in a way that reflects our first conversation and also sets out a range of questions for our second conversation that enable us to further explore your perceptions of community. Please would you see if the AM is acceptable to you? You might want to make some changes? (covering email to participants)

In constructing the aide memoire, I transcribed the first conversation, devised questions with selected quotations and sent them as a draft aide memoire to the research participant along with a transcription. I also asked each participant if there were any institutional documents that they would like to use and made suggestions if asked. Each aide memoire was therefore, unique to the particular exchange although some questions were replicated and every one contained the following introduction,

Extract from aide memoire –

**Reminder of the research method: extended conversations as a shared trail of discovery**
The method includes an element of co-construction. Julie Worrall (my former name) will converse with individual academics. That is, participate in a series of ‘extended conversations’ with academics in one university, with a view to exploring their idea of community, in such a way that will ‘make room’ for her own subjective reality in the field. An ‘aide memoire’, jointly constructed by Julie Worrall and the research participant, will be used to frame the second conversation instead of an interview schedule or questionnaire. In addition, each participant will be asked to select any institutional documents that they would like to use or refer to in the conversation. Each aide memoire is, therefore, unique to the particular exchange.

**Definition of an aide memoire –**
[A thing, especially a book or document that helps you to remember something] Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary

The **second conversation** is framed by the Aide Memoire
The third conversation will provide an opportunity to interpret the data and reach conclusions.

Phrases above such as, ‘co-construction’ and ‘subjective reality in the field’ are most likely to be understood by the participants in this study who are academic researchers. These are not phrases that I would have used if the research involved participants that were not familiar with the language of research. Platt, on interviewing one’s peers, refers to equality and status which implies reciprocity and symmetry in the relationship between an insider researcher and their research participants and the challenges of providing a full account of the rationale and purpose of the study to respondents without being intellectually condescending but not inviting discussion of the study, rather than getting on with the interview (Platt 1981 p80). Chapter One notes how a number of the participants initially approached the research topic as an intellectual exercise. I also referred, in the original invitation, to the upgrade paper (January 2011) for a fuller explanation and rationale of the research question, methodology and methods, offering to send a copy on request. One participant responded by email saying,

I am in a data collection phase myself so can appreciate that you are trying to pin down some participants!’ (email from Susan to researcher 16th May 2011), and,

I would be interested to read your upgrade paper so that I can get a better idea of how you are approaching this. Can you send a copy? (email from Susan to researcher 17th May 2011)

Taking into account the context of the research and the invitation to include documents of the participant’s choosing in the conversations (see above), this is not altogether surprising. Ben responded to the draft aide memoire by saying,

This all looks fine to me - and I think you’ve done a good job of cutting across my rather rambling responses. If I were to add anything to the AM it might be to try and think a bit more about the ideas around communities of practice/interest that I was talking about, and also about the idea of performativity. (email from Ben to researcher 11th July 2011)

Many of the questions in the aide memoires were accompanied by supporting quotes selected from the first conversation transcript. These acted as a reminder of what was said in the first conversation and enabled the dialogue to move on rather than dwell excessively on what had been previously discussed. It was particularly useful in enabling the conversation to move on to a deeper and more personal reflection. See Appendix C for a full list of the aide memoire questions.
The conversations

The research is of an ethnographic nature. Hammersley & Atkinson describe ethnographic research as a set of methods not far removed from the means that we all use in everyday life to make sense of our surroundings, of other people’s and even our own actions (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p4). A conversation, for example, can be described as an exchange, a two-way process, though as we are reminded, in research it can never be simply a conversation because the ethnographer has a research agenda and must retain some control over the proceedings (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p17); the ‘extended conversations’ that I had were not, for example, entirely naturalistic. When interviewing her peers at an educational institution, Platt used an ‘aide memoire’ to structure her interviews, explaining that one’s peers are one’s equals in role-specific senses,

They share the same background knowledge and sub-cultural understandings, and they are members of the same groups or communities. (Platt 1981 p76)

In assessing the social construction of interview data, Gunasekara refers to researcher identities as ‘fluid and changing’. He took the individual academic as the focal point and, similar to Clegg, utilised an interpretative perspective, placing emphasis on the meanings and interpretations of the interviewees (Clegg asked her respondents to reflect on what is important for their self-definintions; to dwell on the nature of the university ‘...through the lens of their own meaning making.’ (Clegg 2008 p324))

The conversations or one-to-one research encounters, took place between April 2011 and October 2012 and all except two were conducted at Greystone. Rosa’s third conversation took place at her new institution and Michael’s single conversation took place at his. Seven of the twelve participants chose to have the conversations in their own office. There were 23 in total, the shortest of which was 19.11 minutes and the longest, 103 minutes.

The focus groups

A number of participants asked (after the recording device had been switched off) what the other participants were saying in the other conversations. I had not originally intended to have focus groups and had not included these in the original research design. I considered how they may possibly enhance the data gathering and decided that they would enable the
participants to not only hear the perspectives of others and receive feedback on their own ideas and thoughts but also to build upon the previous conversations with myself. The focus groups took the place of the third conversation for all the participants though not all were able to attend and Rosa had a third conversation as an alternative.

By introducing the focus groups, the intention was to build upon and enrich the insights gained during the first and second conversations. The group was able to explore as a collective, the individual perspectives. An initial analysis of the data from the individual conversations was shared with the participants as a part of the preparation for the groups. A proposal to conduct a focus group was emailed to the participants with an explanation saying,

I would like to propose that I invite all my participants to join a focus group after I have transcribed their ‘second’ conversation. The focus group agenda will be informed by all the conversations that I have had with those participants so far. Clearly, individual anonymity will not be possible in this context though I would expect my participants to agree to non-disclosure of each other’s identity before, during and after the process. I can provide a consent form to that effect. In addition, I will anonymise any data that I will use in the focus group scenario. (email to participants, February 2012)

Two focus groups were held in a venue off campus in a hired room at a voluntary organisation. The first had four participants and the second had three. Names were not disclosed in advance of the sessions.

Audio recording and transcription

The total recorded time for the conversations was 1,066.84 recorded minutes, or 17.78 hours. The recorded time for the focus groups was 1.56.22 for focus group one and 1.11.26 for focus group two. I transcribed the first conversations myself and I had the second conversations professionally transcribed. I chose to do the first conversations in order to assist with the drafting of the aide memoires. This task was manageable in that most (but not all) of the first conversations were time limited (I had intended to limit them all to twenty minutes each but this proved to be difficult in some cases). Using a transcriptionist for the second conversations saved time – I was working full-time and my capacity was limited. The decision was, therefore, purely pragmatic. When I received the draft transcripts, I listened again to the conversations and made corrections. I had not intended to transcribe the focus groups and indeed, told the participants that I would not be doing so. However, whilst listening to the audio recording was useful, transcribing the individual voices of the participants was actually the best way to gain a
better understanding of their contribution to the discussion. I therefore, recorded and transcribed the individual voices in both focus groups. Throughout the analysis I invoked Archer’s idea of the ‘inner-conversation’ and like Clegg, treated each transcript as unique; the themes that emerged were not common categories but, ‘...areas of concern and the spaces in which individual projects appeared to be being framed.’ (Clegg 2008 p133)

The total word count for the transcripts of the 23 conversations is 145,200 words.
The total word count for the focus group transcripts (the voices of the participants only) is 23,887.

2.2 ETHICAL MATTERS

This section explains the approach to seeking the formal ethical approval for the research, explores the ethical issues associated with converting a professional activity into research material and discusses the implications for confidentiality of the ‘political’ climate within which the research took place. My own insider status may be described as a ‘continuum’, as opposed to a ‘dichotomy’ (Mercer 2007), as I move between the professional activity and the research.

2.2.1 The juxtaposition of professional and research roles

Ethical matters, particularly as they relate to my position as an insider researcher, were never far away from my thoughts and are discussed briefly in Chapter One where the heuristic value of my insider perspective is explained. In Chapter Three under the heading of, ‘The researcher and the return gaze’, the participants’ views on this are outlined via their perspectives on methodology, on position and potential disclosure and on the researcher’s professional profile. It is stated above that the pilot data gathering in 2010 led to the research focus. The pilot study focused on a workshop, which had originated as a BBC supported course designed to help the participants’ use creative writing to tell their life stories (see above for a description of the workshop). It also became a ‘test bed’ for thinking about and rehearsing how to deal with ethical matters.

The application for the ethical approval of the pilot data gathering comprised a 6,400 word paper and included a proposed research participant consent form described as a ‘Contributor Contract’ along the lines of a standard BBC contract, agreed with the author (the main
facilitator for the workshop). In response to feedback from the School’s Ethics Committee, this contract was replaced with a more standard research information and consent form (see Appendix D). The ‘Contributor Contract’ had referred to the professional aspect of the workshop (the fact that it was being provided under the project I was managing) and combining this aspect with seeking permission for involvement in doctoral research (including my involvement in the course as a researcher), was not deemed appropriate by the Ethics Committee. Indeed, on reflection it detracted attention from the purpose and only served to confuse the prospective relationships that the workshop participants were to have with all those involved.

I circulated the approved information and consent form to the prospective workshop participants, all of whom consented to the research (it was stated that the observation would only go ahead with the consent of all the participants). I declared my intention to use participant observation and field notes and stated that I would not be recording the proceedings or producing transcripts. I invited the prospective participants to contact me, particularly if they had any concerns about my position as an, ‘insider researcher’. One prospective participant stated that they were ‘a little unsure’ of my presence on the course, that it would ‘become clearer on the course’ and that they will sign the consent form at the first session. I discussed this with them and they appeared to be reassured. At the end of the first session this participant further explained that the reason she was unsure about my attendance was that she thought I was going to sit at the side of the room observing and taking notes; she thought it was better that I was actually participating. She had understood the research but it was not clear to her as to how I would actually go about attending the workshop. Also, during a quiet moment at the first session, another participant asked how I was conducting the research. I explained that my observation was unstructured, compared to a more quantitative approach (this participant worked in the science faculty); that it was like ‘being there’ and observing what people said and did.

The participants could have been inhibited by my role in their organisation and like Potts, I did stress that the research is independent of the University’s administration (Potts 2008 p160). However, whether or not people have knowledge of social research, and whatever attitude they take towards it, they will often be more concerned with what kind of person the researcher is than with the research itself; they will want to know, for example, if the ethnographer can be trusted (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p65). I answered any concerns
that the workshop participants had about potential harm or exploitation though I must say, there were very few.

Hammersley and Atkinson advise that whilst pilot research should be conducted if possible, it is better to use a setting that will not be used for the main data collection (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p30). Using this Workshop provided an opportunity to explore potential settings for the main data collection and to further refine the approach to the key themes. I did as Elliot suggests, used my intuition to inform what should be observed and what is important (Elliot 2005). And I used the process to reflect on my own position in the research including any biographical experiences that may influence the methods and data analysis.

Of course, the pilot data gathering took place within an organisation that already has a culture of research and in this respect the participants were supportive. Drake and Heath certainly found that the professional student felt both supported and encouraged when there was a strong institutional culture of research-based practice (Drake and Heath 2008 p136). I still, however, needed to be aware of potential resistance. Hammersley & Atkinson, in describing ethnographic research in higher education, cite potential ‘acute’ problems of resistance where the people being studied are academics, where the participants may be, or consider themselves to be, very sophisticated in their knowledge of research methodology (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p64). I did not find this to be the case in the pilot data gathering.

In terms of the ethical matters, the pilot data gathering was relatively fleeting compared with the main data gathering. It took place over a period of four weeks, it comprised a group scenario throughout and I knew just one participant beforehand through my professional role. The main data gathering took place over a period of 19 months, from April 2011 to October 2012 and involved a series of one-to-one conversations and two focus groups. Outlined above is the approach to recruiting the twelve research participants, seven of whom were already known to me in my professional role. The duration and depth of the main research encounters resulted in greater exposure to the research for the participants, some of whom I continued to work with in my professional role to July 2014 when I resigned from the management post at Greystone in community-university engagement. There were times when I was conscious of that extra dimension to my working relationship with individuals, a dimension that needed to be accommodated and sometimes, hidden.
2.2.2 Confidentiality in a ‘political’ climate

The issue of confidentiality and in particular, the anonymity of the research participants, was challenging in this context from a participant’s perspective, for the pilot and to a greater extent, the main data gathering. The Workshop involved the sharing of experiences and personal memoires and was attended by academic staff, support staff and postgraduate researchers. The facilitators were used to dealing with these issues, one of whom is a trained counsellor. Confidentiality in relation to previous workshops was maintained through anonymity at the request of the participants and I offered anonymity in the research. However, as Potts had warned his respondents, while anonymity and confidentiality would be offered, this would not necessarily mean that others could not accurately guess their identities (Potts 2008 p162). This is a concern that I had for the participants involved in the main data gathering. Drake and Heath conducted a small study in two universities and looked at the challenges experienced by students taking Doctorates in Education who are attempting to develop a critical research-based perspective on the workplace. Their conclusion that people who work in education institutions operate in ‘intensely political climates’ concurs with my own professional experience. In researching an area that relates to my professional role, I am to a certain extent, positioned by what they describe as, ‘prevailing political ideologies’ and I have remained very conscious of this, attempting to manage the issue carefully (Drake and Heath 2008 p140). One participant from the main data gathering expressed concern about the implications of both his and the researcher’s position as ‘insiders. He acknowledged the prevailing climate at the institution, observing sensitivity at an institutional level about corporate image (partly as a result of a major incident in November 2009, the consequences of which exposed the institution to criticism worldwide) and the potential implications for those pursuing research.

As Coupal concludes in her discussion on the regulation of practitioner research, the process of conducting research is political and it can change the discourse within an organisation (Coupal 2005). Drake and Heath, on their own research, say it is their world too and they must live with the consequences, as much their participants (Drake and Heath 2008 p131). And so whilst I do not claim to be fundamentally changing the discourse on community at Greystone through the research, it is important to acknowledge three key points. Firstly, that some of the participants had a desire to change the culture of Greystone in relation to community.
As a community, I mean I love Greystone for lots of different reasons but also find Greystone quite frustrating at times and wish that there was a lot more community feeling across the different faculties... I wish and I hope that things will change at Greystone and that people like (vice-chancellor), and so on, will really make us feel together because that’s never really happened I don’t think in the years that I’ve been here and I have been here a long while. (Fiona C1p11)

Secondly, that the context of the Beacon for Public Engagement project and the higher education policy drive on university community-university engagement cannot be ignored as individuals and institutions are being strongly encouraged to think about ‘communities’ and to build engagement into their day-to-day academic practice.

And thirdly, I cannot deny my philosophy or world view but I can use it to enhance my understanding of the field in a way that is described by Elliot and Lukes in their examination of the truthfulness and warrant of case studies, where they state that the situation of the researcher cannot be discounted any more than that of the researched. They refer to the way in which social science has cultivated a distancing from experience and valuing in order to achieve objectivity, and conclude that the condition of our understanding is that we have prejudices and any inquiry undertaken by us needs to be approached in the spirit of a conversation with others (Elliot and Lukes 2008 p113). Bourdieu refers to the advantages inherent in the relation of belonging which enable us to combine information gathered by the objective techniques of scientific enquiry with the profound intuitions gained from personal familiarity (Bourdieu 1988 p3). The approach that I took in the research design provided for a more reflexive outlook.

2.2.3 An insider continuum: from ‘marginal native’ to research fellow

I needed to avoid the dangers of what has been described as ‘over-rapport that is, identifying too closely with the participants’ perspectives and failing to treat them as problematic. The term, ‘going native’ is often used to describe this scenario, though Sikes & Potts find the term distasteful, describing it as having connotations with colonial attitudes and of researcher superiority (Sikes and Potts 2008 p7). Potts described himself as ‘being native to begin with’, saying that he had empathy with them and their organisation, enabling him to use subjectivism and personal involvement to further his understanding of the academics and their institutional contexts (Potts 2008 p167). The term ‘marginal native’ may be more appropriate in my case as I am already constantly in the field (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007 p89). It also accords with Mercer’s understanding of ‘insiderness’ and ‘outsiderness’ as a ‘continuum’
(Mercer 2007 p3) and this is how I have chosen to present it in the thesis; my ‘insiderness’ is a strand which does not dominate but nevertheless runs throughout. One of the participants reflected on the term as,

An interesting juxtaposition of terms... it does hint at being on the borders of any particular community I suppose... possibly looking in or dipping in and out, so it’s a quite nice term. (Nicola C2p1-2)

I am a marginal native not only in the context of the research but also in the context of my professional role. My researcher identity was increasingly recognised from 2012 as a consequence of my contribution being costed into successful research council applications and projects (as a manager and a postgraduate researcher) that have utilised my growing understanding of university communities and community-university engagement. This understanding is predicated not only on professional experience but also on the research. On the professional side, my department was pleased to receive financial resources that have been secured via my ‘hybrid’ status (manager and researcher) that helped to sustain my management role, which was not supported with core university funding but by a subsidy from another department. On the research side, I started to build my profile and had my own ‘people page’ which set out my research, and my professional credentials. I became more comfortable with the term, ‘researcher practitioner’, used by a colleague at another university in relation to myself in 2013. I still had a sense of both belonging and not belonging to either a professional or academic peer group. This may be a distinct advantage. For example, Whitchurch cites individuals who thrive in their ‘third space’ roles, which enable them to operate utilise, ‘usefully loose’ organisational structures and relationships, creating a constructive dynamic between interest groups and also in representing the university with regional and national agencies. It also enables those to achieve a greater sense of authenticity than if they had been in a mainstream role in which they felt constrained (Whitchurch 2013 p91-92). In 2014, I resigned from the management role and I now work as a part-time ‘research fellow’ for an externally funded project, based at Greystone.

One of the participants in this research asked if I felt inhibited by the university’s concept of community,

I wondered whether... whether you feel inhibited by the university...whether you feel that the Greystone concept of community actually marries with yours or whether you feel that there are ways in which you can’t do or be as much as you would like... (Susan to researcher C2p1)
Susan was referring to community as portrayed in the university’s Corporate Plan. I had to think carefully about my response, asking myself how I may answer honestly and at the same time reduce the potential of influencing the research encounter. For example, I didn’t want my experience of working at Greystone on the culture change objective through the Beacon for Public Engagement Project brought into the frame. In the end, I chose to emphasise the benefits of the research itself, ‘if I do have any inhibitions or have had in my professional role, it’s through the research where those inhibitions are broken down a bit.’ (Researcher to Susan C2p1-2)

These issues highlight what may be construed as a tension for this research between the conceptualization of ‘community’ as an object of research and the function of ‘community’ as a policy instrument, which is employed by both Greystone and more broadly by those who fund and govern the higher education sector.

2.3 BUILDING AND USING THE CODING FRAMEWORK

This section explains the construction and the utilisation of the coding framework in the data analysis. Schostak described data analysis as a structuring process,

> Through which data gets to be shaped into quasi-units for all practical, political and ethical purposes. To imagine this ‘structurality’ is like trying to see the negative image of the photograph when looking at the positive image. Without the negative, there cannot be a positive. (Schostak 2006 p142)

The analysis was interpretive and reflexive. It was also characterized and influenced by the shared activity at different stages of the process, largely at the first and second stages in advance of the final analysis, which was conducted by the researcher alone. The three key stages of the analysis are set out below –

**First analysis:** an analysis of the first conversations, the aide memoires, documents & literature; this analysis informed the construction of the analytical framework

**Second analysis:** the open coding of all the transcribed data in preparation for the focus groups; this analysis was used to select quotations and scenarios from the transcripts which were shared with the participants in advance of the focus groups
**Third and final analysis:** an analysis using a coding framework; aspects of community as cultural capital in relation to the themes were explored and attributed for each participant.

The results of the second analysis (including anonymised quotations) were shared with the research participants a week before each focus group, along with an information & consent form and a briefing paper (see Appendices E and F). The second analysis in advance of the focus groups was anonymised not just for the purpose of confidentiality, although that of course was important. At this stage the purpose was to highlight themes and categories. It was not critical to establish who said what. In the final analysis, identification of the participants’ position and trajectory was necessary in order to provide greater meaning and context. I found that I could not do the coding and the thinking if I gave the participant a different name. For the purpose of the thesis, however, the participants have been given new names and they remained anonymised.

The same analysis was undertaken for each participant and identified themes and sub-themes, which occurred across all the research encounters. Only through this next layer of analysis, by scrutinizing in detail the encounters and themes was I in a position to fully explore the dimensions of the analytical framework and to explore in the final analysis the concept of cultural capital as applied to the research phenomena. For the purpose of the final analysis no names were changed.

### 2.3.1 Questions to bear in mind

In devising the coding framework set out below, it was evident from the first and second thematic analyses that there were several potential categories to which I may assign the data. These needed to be merged to leave a manageable number, say no more than eight or ten top level categories and a number of sub-categories; all of course in the context of the research questions and the story that I am aiming to tell with the research,

‘How do academics conceive of and relate to the idea of ‘community’?’

Does ‘community capital’ exist inside higher education and if so, what does it comprise of?

How might it be accumulated and utilised; by whom and to what ends?

What conditions are necessary in order to realise and reproduce community in a university environment?
And, as I have already acknowledged, in the final analysis I assigned the data to specific participants in order to give it greater context and meaning; individual history, as far as I am able to describe it without disclosing the identity of the participant. In seeking signs of agency for example, I identified those actions, emotions, attitudes, perceptions, disposition and practice that related to the research questions above. As I read through the data I considered the following,

*What individual and collective practices and physical characteristics could be labelled as ‘indigenous’ to the culture of higher education and the particular institution?*

*What might be described as individual and collective embodiments or manifestations of community in this context?*

*How are these accumulated, reflected upon and utilised?*

*What are the consequences of their absence?*

*Are there any examples of symbolic violence?*

The purpose of the coding framework was to facilitate the final analysis. It acted as a reading and thinking tool and was the result of the inductive process I have thus far outlined. The structure is based upon a series of lenses through which I read the data. Whilst it was not my intention to be overly prescriptive or sociologically reductive, using the framework as a reading tool enabled me to think about what I was seeing in the context of the research questions. I read the data through the eight lenses. What are the signs of the agent’s idea of community, of their experience of community? What experiences have they had of community? How relevant is their status? How is community represented in their academic practice? How do they see the institution and environment? How do they see me? The five refractions allowed me to recognise and interpret the signs in different ways; as vocabulary, disposition, action and cultural capital. They also enabled me to remain connected to the theory. This is where the theory and data, never far apart, began to move closer together for the final analysis.
2.3.2 The coding framework

Thinking through the medium of each lens; refracting the thoughts of the researcher as they interpret the symbolic & material worlds of the agents


Vocabulary | Disposition | Individual action | Temporal & Spatial frame | Capital
---|---|---|---|---

PRIMARY DATA – the aides memoire, transcripts & focus group recordings

CODED DATA

Illustration 2: the coding framework

Each lens is derived from the analytical framework:

**Idea:** the agent’s idea of community

**Elements:** what comprises the agent’s community(s)

**Experience:** the agent’s direct experience of community

**Practice:** community as it relates to the agent’s academic practice

**Status:** community as it relates to the agent’s status

**University:** community as represented in the institutional narrative

**Environment:** community & the Higher Education Sector

**Return gaze:** how the agent views the researcher

The refractions enable the researcher to interpret the data at different angles, each of which contributes to the analysis of the phenomena:
Vocabulary: examples of vernacular used by the agent
Disposition: signifiers of the agent’s state of mind
Individual action: examples of the agent taking action
Temporal & spatial frame: locating the agent’s thoughts and action in time and space
Capital – the presence or absence of capital in its incorporated, objectified and institutional forms

Disposition, in relation to habitus, is explained in Chapter One. The purpose of considering individual action in the analysis is to identify examples of situations when the participant has taken some sort of proactive or reactive action that relates to their idea and experience of community. In Chapter Seven, this is presented as the participants’ perspective on what the institution should do in order to create ‘community’ at Greystone. Temporal and spatial issues affect community. As Nespor states in his study of space, time and curriculum,

People fashion and refashion the temporal and spatial boundaries that define an activity, who belongs with whom engaging in it, and where and when it can happen... settings and boundaries are products and objects of social struggle. (Nespor 1994 p16)

The importance of time for the construction of community was identified by Bastian in her scoping study of the extent of research available on time and community. Time plays a complex and sometimes contradictory role in the construction of community. As an important variable, it affects the way in which community is conceptualized, how it might be understood, whether or not an individual is able to develop a sense of belonging to a community and how they make judgments about the status of others,

Time is not a passive background to community but is itself a source of conflict, with struggles over who can define dominant understandings of time being played out both implicitly and explicitly. (Bastian 2014 p156)

In exploring ‘marketing time’ in academia, Guzman-Valenzuela and Barnett conclude that a marketised higher education system is likely to spawn an internal market in the management of academic time. Focusing on higher education in Chile, with, ‘one of the most marketised systems of higher education in the world’, issues of ‘power, interest, negotiation, governmentality, academic identity, academic capital, academic space, academic rhythm and economic judgment’, are all aspects of how academics experience time (Guzmán-Valenzuela and Barnett 2013 p1133).
Time may also be related to space, as in the space for time to think and to do what you want. In rethinking space and academic identity construction in a higher education context, Madikizela-Madiya described the notion of space as a form of agency whereby academics exercise,

Their freedom and power to choose what and how to do things that develop their academic identities, the opportunities for them to grow academically, time to think and critically reflect, and be creative. Time therefore forms part of this metaphorical space. (Madikizela-Madiya 2014 p298)

The physical aspect of the spatial dimension is also relevant; physical space is a significant issue in relation to a sense of community. Nespor concludes that physical space has a social dimension, ‘What may be difficult is abandoning the ‘physicalist’ notion that space is merely a ‘natural’ container of activity, and instead accepting the idea that space is socially produced and contested.’ (Nespor 1994 p15)

2.3.3 Exploring the relational dimension

In the coding framework different aspects of the phenomena are placed in relation to each other. This is the basis upon which further relational dimensions were explored, particularly in the context of the thinking tools that were utilised (Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology), viewing the idea and experience of ‘community’ as a relational phenomenon. It allowed the interpretation of individual attributes and collective actions as they related to predetermined aspects of the structure that helped to create the conditions for the phenomena. Through the reading, thinking and coding, ‘units of meaning’ were identified that not only helped to illuminate possible answers to the research questions posed above but also point to those invisible relationships, particularly when those units collide and create new ways of seeing things. That is how the analysis and discussion in the subsequent chapters is set out; focusing on the distinctive and relational aspects of the phenomena and what these tell us.

Viewing the idea and experience of community as a relational phenomenon, the analysis is set out in a way that enabled an examination of community as cultural capital in line with the analytical framework and also identify invisible relationships and explore notions of structure and reproduction. The aim was not, however, to do what Crossley accuses Bourdieu of doing; fall foul of the, ‘errors of intellectualist abstraction’ and it was not my intention to give the analytical framework ontological priority over the reality it was supposed to be modelling
Individual positions were derived from actual relations; positions on ‘community’ that would otherwise have not been disclosed, or carried over, ‘from the private to the public sphere’ (Bourdieu, Accardo et al. 1993 p615) via the research encounter. All attributes have relational properties and the relations are multiple.

2.3.4 Rationale for the coding framework: thinking it through

As a child in the 1960s I had to undergo regular visits to the opticians in Cambridge. I didn’t mind that so much. It was a chance to skip school, sit in Dipple and Conway’s snug little waiting room and read Rupert the Bear annuals. I did mind, however, having to wear the plastic blue NHS spectacles and especially, having to spend the occasional week with a fabric plaster stuck over one of the lenses just to get my lazy eye to work that much harder. In thinking about the coding framework, what it was for and how I might use it to read the data, I was reminded of those visits to the opticians. Just like in the eye examination, my visual acuity was being tested – how could I clearly see the data?

In devising the codebook, or coding framework, I had to decide what is and isn’t important. My aim was to reflect the duality of the concept of community as both an ideal and a reality, and in the context of the research this meant the idea and experience of community from the perspective of the research participants – the agents.

Certainly, through the act of coding and analysis, I attempted to make influences less opaque by seeking to problematise structuring influences, which included my own inside experience and relationship with both the subject and the research participants. I was attempting to, ‘break through the screen of clichés behind which each of us lives’ (Bourdieu, Accardo et al. 1993 p614) and was once again reminded of those visits to the opticians; sitting in a big leather chair with my legs dangling, wearing heavy metal frames into which the nice optician slots different lenses as I attempt to read the letters off the Snellen chart hanging on the wall at the far end of the room. The danger, as always, was the temptation to recall the lines of letters from previous visits. I had to concentrate on seeing it all as though I had never seen it before and yet still be able to recognise what I was looking at. As with re-reading the data in the final, fine-grained analysis, whilst I needed some sort of informed framework with which consider the data, I needed to see it all afresh; not make assumptions or rush into any conclusions.
2.3.5 Doing it manually

Using the coding framework as a heuristic tool, informed by both an inductive and deductive approach enabled me to more systematically analyse the data. I used the literature review to inform the theoretical framework which I then used to conduct the first analysis. I also brought into the data some of the institutional documents such as the corporate plans and regular letters written by the Vice-Chancellor to all staff and students. Such documents are not only a part of the institutional manifestation of community but also form a part of my subjective reality that has helped to shape the research itself.

I should explain why I conducted a manual, in vivo analysis instead of using computer software. I attended a training course quite early on in the research (before the pilot data gathering) on the NVivo software programme and immediately became concerned about the possibility of the data being subservient in some way to the computer programme. It all seemed to be very process driven. Although I do acknowledge the plea, what is data analysis if not a process? I was also, however, concerned about the possibility of becoming too distant from the data and losing the voice of the participants in a noise of nodes. I did not want to become detached from meaning and context. I decided, therefore, to continue with a manual analysis. And I was not deterred by the prospect of creating a ‘visually informative schema’ to illustrate the findings without the aid of a computer programme (Kodish and Gittelsohn 2012). In applying this heuristic approach, I’m ultimately blending my existing practical knowledge of the research topic as an insider researcher, and my newly formed scholarly knowledge gained by doing the research itself. Also, sometimes a very practical, hands on approach, can be most productive.

Here is a case in point. I identified the categories or themes in the analytical framework introduced in Chapter One and set out below, by printing out and cutting up my upgrade paper and the aide memoires, and sorting key words and phrases into themes that fitted within a framework I had devised using Bourdieu’s concepts of agency, habitus, field and epistemic reflexivity, overlaid by the notions of capital, structure and social reproduction. I drew out the framework and then glued on the cut out words, creating my ‘Blue Peter’ model. The reliability and validity of this approach and of the theme identification and the codebook categories and interpretation, will ultimately, however, be tested by the research community, “In the end we are left to deal with the effects of our judgment, which is just as it should be.
Valid measurement makes valid data, but validity itself depends on the collective opinion of researchers.’ (Bernard cited by Ryan and Russell 2003 p104)

2.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has focussed on the research method and its rationale, and has explored the implications of doing insider research. The doctorate has not only contributed significantly to the development of my academic practice; it has also contributed to my professional development as a ‘hybrid’ member of academia; a Whitchurch ‘third space professional’ to July 2014 (Whitchurch 2013). Some of the challenges that I faced in designing and conducting this doctoral research have mirrored those that I faced as a middle manager, responsible for the contested area of community-university engagement at an institution where engagement was not a strategic priority. It is all a part of living and observing academia.

A number of colleagues at Greystone, in addition to the research participants themselves, were aware that I was conducting research about community inside higher education and were aware of my position as an insider researcher. The issue has not necessarily been a contentious one. Tuchman’s account of ‘Wannabe U: Inside the corporate university’ is based upon years of observation at a large state university in the United States. She ensured that people knew about her research, ‘so they could watch what they said to me and around me in order not to serve as informants.’ (Tuchman 2009 p211 italics in original)

In the next chapter more information is provided about the individual research participants and the site of the research. An initial explanation and reading of the overarching themes is also provided, the purpose of which is to foreground the description and discussion of the research findings. The four key themes are, ‘idea and elements of community’, ‘status’, ‘academic practice’, ‘institution and environment’ and the sub-theme is, ‘the researcher & the return gaze’, the latter of which does not have a dedicated chapter but is integrated into the others.
Chapter 3
INTRODUCING THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEMES

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One introduced the focus of the research and Chapter Two focused on methodology and the empirical dimension. This chapter describes the profiles of the actors in the research encounters, some whose voices have already been heard. It also explains the emergence of the five themes and provides an initial reading, supported by selected data, of what has been revealed about the object (the idea and experience of academic community) through the final analysis. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to set the scene, enabling the reader to get to know the participants and to ease into a more fine-grained and expanded presentation of the object and analysis of community as cultural capital, presented in Chapters Four to Six (Chapter Seven does not include an analysis of capital). The incorporation of the five themes into these chapters follows from the synergetic relationship between the first and second analysis and the final analysis, exercised through the knitting together of the analytical framework and the coding structure.

3.1 THE PARTICIPANTS

This section introduces the research participants and begins with an explanation of why status and position is relevant to gaining an understanding of the individual’s perspective on the object.

3.1.1 Where you stand is where you sit

Whilst the identity of the institution and the participants will remain undisclosed, the status of the participants and their career pathway, particularly in relation to the institution, is declared. This is in order to demonstrate the orientation from which the participants are speaking. Their position is important if we are to fully understand the views that they are expressing. As stated by a participant,

Where you stand is where you sit... your view on an issue depends on your seat at the table... there many examples of people changing their views as they change their role. (Edward FG1 50.15 – 53.44)
As explained in Chapters One and Two, the analytical framework was created for the purpose of describing the object and for informing the data analysis. The framework informed the (second) analysis carried out in preparation for the two focus groups by selecting quotations and scenarios from the transcripts, which served as an expression of the object. The analysis quoted extensively from the conversations leading up to the focus groups and it was shared with the focus group participants and also with participants who could not attend a focus group. All quotations were anonymised except for mine. At the final (third) stage of the analysis, identification of the agent’s position and trajectory was necessary in order to provide greater meaning and context to the data itself. It was clear, for example, that in considering their idea and experience of community, the participants’ position in relation to the institution, was very relevant.

In the context of having explored thus far, my own position as an insider researcher in the relation to the object, my status and trajectory is also described below. In the final stage analysis, the institution of Greystone itself is included as a player with an articulated position in relation to idea of community (see below and Chapter Seven on ‘institution and environment’). The institution is given a voice by the selection and presentation of the corporate documents, which cite the narrative on community.

Table 2 below describes the employment status of each participant in relation to the institution at the beginning and the end of the research encounter. One of the two contract researchers (Ben) and the associate tutor (Nicola) were appointed as lecturers during this period. The other contract researcher (Susan) was hoping to secure another research contract position. One of the professors (Edward) retired and was awarded emeritus status. One of the lecturers (Sandra) withdrew from the research after the first conversation due to pressure of work, having been appointed an associate dean. The participant with no contractual status (Rosa) left the institution to take up an early career fellowship at another higher education institution but continued to participate in the research. All names are fictional.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants &amp; their status in relation to the institution at commencement of research encounter</th>
<th>Length of association with the institution at the end of the research encounter</th>
<th>Participants’ status in relation to the institution at end of research encounter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan (contract researcher, post-doctoral)</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Contract researcher, post-doctoral (end of contract in six months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben (contract researcher, post-doctoral)</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola (associate tutor, post-doctoral)</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan (professor – emeritus, formerly head of research centre &amp; formerly head of school)</td>
<td>42 years</td>
<td>Professor emeritus, formerly head of research centre &amp; formerly head of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward (professor, formerly head of school)</td>
<td>37 years</td>
<td>Professor emeritus, formerly head of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa professor, head of research group</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Professor, head of research group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael professor, emeritus, formerly head of school &amp; formerly pro-vice chancellor, formerly regional director</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>Professor emeritus, formerly head of school &amp; formerly pro-vice chancellor, formerly regional director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon senior lecturer, academic director</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Senior lecturer, academic director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona senior lecturer, centre director</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Senior lecturer, centre director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim senior lecturer</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra senior lecturer</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Senior lecturer, associate dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa no contractual status, post-doctoral</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Left the institution, retained associate research fellow status, early career fellow at another institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: the employment status of the participants**

**Susan**

Well, it’s something that obviously occupies my mind greatly because my current research contract ends at the end of December. (Susan C1p8-9)

During the course of the research encounter (May 2011 to June 2012), Susan was aware that her current research contract was due to cease in late 2012. At the end of the research encounter she was preparing a research grant application, the outcome of which would determine whether or not she remained active in research or retired. She was almost sixty years of age and her husband had already retired. After a career in the civil service, Susan took up full time education and upon qualifying with a BSc in Mental Health Nursing and an MA in Medical Sociology, worked in two residential homes. Whilst working, Susan researched her doctorate. On completing her doctorate she took up a position as a full time contract
researcher on a fixed term contract at the same institution. Susan is a social scientist in the health faculty at Greystone.

Ben
In terms of my career stage at the moment I am very much seeking permanence. A contractual sense of permanence, at least. (Ben C2p34)

Throughout the research encounter (June 2011 to June 2012), Ben was seeking a permanent position. In September 2012, he was appointed to the position of lecturer at Greystone. He originally arrived as a postgraduate researcher six years earlier, having begun his doctorate at another institution, and from 2009 he worked as a post-doctoral research fellow and a senior research associate. Ben is a social scientist in the science faculty at Greystone.

Nicola
I love this sort of work, yes. Either research or teaching or both actually. So, the aim is to get a lecturer post in the long term. But I’ve got to get the publications up. (Nicola C1p8)

The research encounter with Nicola, who changed from Associate Tutor to lecturer, took place between April 2011 and September 2012. Nicola started her working life in local government. She left local government to do a second degree full time, and then worked for a short period at the same institution in an administrative role before commencing further study. Whilst researching her doctorate she undertook various research associate and temporary contracts, including a spell as a sessional lecturer at a neighbouring institution, which she continued as a post-doc until she was appointed to a lectureship in September 2011. Nicola is a social scientist in the social sciences faculty at Greystone.

Bryan
I’ve fulfilled a number of different roles and positions within the management structure but I’ve always gone back to the discipline, to the academic discourse. (Bryan FG2 12.06 – 13.30)

Throughout the research encounter (September 2011 – September 2012), Bryan was an emeritus professor. He was first appointed to Greystone in 1970, is a founding member of a research centre and is currently chief editor of an international journal in his field, a journal which he founded and administers from this institution. During his time at the institution he has been the head of his school and a research centre director. He was re-instated on a
temporary contract as a professor for the purpose of the Research Excellence Framework in order that his research may be cited in an impact case study. Bryan is a social scientist in the social sciences faculty at Greystone.

Edward

I started here in nineteen seventy-five... the school is very much like a home to me. I’ve seen it as a community grow from literally nothing... I was the first person to arrive in (subject). (Edward C2p3-4)

During the research encounter (October 2011 – June 2012) Edward was contemplating his impending retirement at the end of the academic year 2011/12. He was appointed to a lectureship at Greystone in 1975, the first in his subject, and he was appointed alongside a professor. He had previously worked as a research assistant at two other universities. Before entering academia, he worked as a grammar school teacher and a trainee archivist. During his time at the institution he occupied the roles of lecturer, senior lecturer, professor and is now an emeritus professor. His numerous administrative roles have included Head of School, Member of Senate and Senate Working Parties, School Research Director, School Postgraduate Research Director, School Teaching Committee, Chair of the School’s Admissions Committee, Senior Advisor to the School, Chair of the Honours Course Grading Committee, Member of the School’s Planning & Estimates Committee, Member of the University Library Committee and the University Admissions Committee. He has served on selection committees for seventeen lectureships and his external roles include the University Representative on Diocesan Board of Social Responsibility. Edward is a social scientist in the arts and humanities faculty at Greystone.

Tessa

If you have good grants and good papers and do deliver some teaching and something that’s innovative, then there is that feeling of being protected and having a second skin... if you drop down a gear, there’s always that risk of the sharks attacking. (Tessa C2p6)

Throughout the research encounter (November 2011 – September 2012), Tessa occupied a role as a professor leading a research group with an international reputation in her field. Before arriving at Greystone she worked with an industrial research organisation and had spent some time as an independent science advisor in addition to research and lectureship roles at other higher education institutions. Tessa is a natural scientist in the health faculty at Greystone.
Michael

I went fairly quickly through different phases at Greystone. (Michael C1p1)

At the time of the research encounter, which in this case was just one conversation (October, 2012), Michael was an emeritus professor who was still active in research elsewhere. He had collaborated extensively with colleagues at Greystone before being appointed as a professor and he subsequently became head of school and pro-vice chancellor. He held a regional position in higher education and is the founder of national and international research networks in his field. Michael is a social scientist, no longer working at Greystone.

Jonathon

I suppose I’ve become, perhaps even without realising it, a corporate beast... someone who identifies very closely with their organisation. (Jonathon C2p9)

Throughout the research encounter (April 2011 – September 2012), Jonathon occupied a role as a senior lecturer and academic director. He has a long association with Greystone, which began with his masters, followed by a doctorate during which he was appointed as a lecturer. He has undertaken a variety of management roles in continuing education and currently occupies a director role in teaching and curriculum. Jonathon is an historian working in the social sciences faculty who also has a whole-university role at Greystone.

Fiona

I have never really understood the reason why people who love doing research are not more able to do that and that people who love teaching cannot be more allowed to do that... I want to transfer to ATS but I’m not able to. (Fiona FG1p3)

Throughout the research encounter (November 2011 – June 2012), Fiona occupied a role as a senior lecturer and centre director. Although employed on a research (ATR - Academic, Teaching & Research) contract, Fiona’s work is primarily in teaching (ATS - Academic, Teaching & Scholarship) where she manages an extensive inter-professional learning programme. Fiona has a long association with Greystone, spending her first few years as a research associate before being appointed as a lecturer. Fiona is a former natural scientist who now works as a programme director in the health faculty at Greystone.
Tim

As well a running my research lab, I’m deputy head of theme... I’m the course director for the (subject) degree... I’m director of enterprise for the school and I organise a module... And I teach. (Tim C1p9)

Throughout the research encounter (October 2011 – July 2012), Tim occupied a role as a senior lecturer and in addition, a number of administrative positions including course director, deputy head of a theme, the school’s director of enterprise and member of the school’s executive. After gaining his doctorate, Tim held a series of research associate and fellowship posts in two other institutions before being appointed to a lectureship at Greystone. He runs a laboratory, which has a team including a manager, post-docs and three postgraduate researchers. Tim is a natural scientist working in the science faculty at Greystone.

Sandra

Sandra withdrew from the research after the first conversation and her transcript is not included in the final analysis although it did inform the development of the analytical framework. Sandra is not, therefore, cited in this section or in subsequent chapters.

Rosa

The problem I’ve got is I’m in a very exceptional position, because I have the email account but I’m not staff, I’m even not an associate researcher or associate position... I’m treated like a student or even worse. (Rosa C2p3)

By the time the research encounter had begun (it ran from June 2011 to August 2012) Rosa had already secured an early career fellowship with another higher education institution, which was to commence in 2012. She had completed her doctorate (which followed an MA) and was conducting some research funded by the Beacon for Public Engagement project hosted by Greystone. Since leaving the institution she has retained an associate research fellow status with a centre based there. Rosa, an historian and social scientist, was based in the humanities faculty and no longer works at Greystone.

The researcher

In some ways I’m in the position that any employee would be in a large organisation. (the researcher in conversation with Susan C2p2)

Throughout the research encounter with all the participants, and until July 2014, I was employed at the same institution on what was categorised as an academic-related contract
which had commenced in early 2005 when I moved to a new role at Greystone after nineteen years of working in the public and voluntary & community sectors. From August 2014, I remained in a research fellowship role attached to Greystone. As stated previously, my professional or management role was in community-university engagement. I had co-created and delivered a four-year national pilot on public engagement in higher education and then continued working at the same institution in a similar role for two more years. For this latter period, I had moved from the ‘semi-autonomous third space’ to the ‘integrated third space’ in the Whitchurch typology (Whitchurch 2013 p34).

The institution: the University of Greystone

A separate estate of the academic realm (Vice-Chancellor’s inaugural address on the founding of Greystone, 1963)

Greystone, the site of the research, is a comparatively small higher education institution in the UK, founded during a wave of sectoral expansion in the 1960s. It is one of Beloff’s ‘plate glass’ universities, all keen to establish their credentials as universities and subject to the tension between, ‘the pulls of a historic past and a beckoning future’ (Beloff 1968 p186). At 2011/12, Greystone had 17,610 students (including postgraduates), 3,930 staff of which 2,225 were academic and 1,705 were non-academic (HESA 2013). The university originally occupied a site of just under 300 acres on the edge of a regional medieval city, a site that has since expanded but is still relatively contained. Describing itself as research intensive, Greystone was a member of the 1994 Group, which disbanded in 2013.

3.2 THE THEMES

This section introduces the four key themes, the fifth sub-theme, and the issues that have emerged from the final analysis. The themes are, ‘idea and elements of community’, ‘status’, ‘academic practice’, ‘institution and environment’ and ‘the researcher & the return gaze’. They form a part of the object, which is defined in Chapter One through a discussion of selected texts and illustrated by the analytical framework, shown again below. These themes emerged from the analysis, of the first conversations, the aide memoires, documents and the literature, which informed the construction of the analytical framework. They were used as the basis for the constructing the lenses in the coding structure (the three stages of the analysis and the coding structure are explained in Chapter Two).
3.2.1 Idea and elements of community

The conversations, and indeed the research encounters, began with an open question of what community means to the participant. It has already been stated that all the participants decided to focus on the idea and experience of community as it related to the university and so the discussion is more focused on aspects of the university community, whatever that may mean. One participant did acknowledge that the conversation could well have focused on a different aspect of community had the research encounter taken place in a different context,

If you’d approached me from the local neighbourhood association though and the interview had been conducted in the village hall or a local pub, would I have said totally different things, I don’t know... for me, when I think about my communities it’s definitely the research community. (Ben C1p14-15)
It was noted in Chapter One, how the participants began by approaching the topic as an intellectual exploration of what is meant by community, at least in part. By extending the discourse via a second conversation and/or a focus group or third conversation, the research delved more deeply, probing perceptions, experiences and identity, thereby reaching a more individualized and arguably authentic account of the object.

The second analysis revealed different perspectives on community, listed in Appendix G. Some aspects may be construed as idiosyncratic (agency - the unique perspective of individuals) and some may affect and be affected by institutional, collective and individual actions (habitus). The final analysis revealed the extent to which the participants were prepared to invest in joining, creating, building, nurturing and sustaining their part of the university community and in some cases, protecting the very existence of the community itself against threats from both within and outside the university. In describing their existing communities, they declared a strong demarcation between those that were of significance to them and the rest of the university community,

Something like as set of pyramids or perhaps Russian dolls... the school or department has always been at the centre... and we grew quite rapidly from a fairly small unit to a fairly large one in the last ten years but I guess beyond that we all have bigger... faculty then various university things, that’s where it gets complicated beyond the university...it’s difficult to fit something as complicated as the community at Greystone into Russian dolls... (Edward FG1 19.15 – 21.05)

For some, their sense of community began with their research centre, laboratory or school. They demonstrated a clear sense of belonging, a sense of purpose and a responsibility towards their own, more immediate community in their actions. They also expressed concern at how their more immediate community was affected by ‘outside’ forces e.g. an imposed university-wide administrative reorganisation. This sense of responsibility was matched with well-defined strategies whereby they knew what they needed to do and demand (reciprocity was involved) in order to maintain what was significant to them and to those whom they considered to be a part of their more immediate community,

We have entrenched into a very small (subject) community... just to give ourselves a second skin and to focus very much on what we believe is important for our careers and for us as a group, which is the CV building in terms of papers and grants and if we are doing well in those two areas, the word isn’t ‘untouchable’, but we will feel more protected as a small community. (Tessa C2p12-13)
It was acknowledged that **communities change over time** and that they can die but that communities can also recover and regenerate, ‘it’s constantly changing and it takes on totally different forms, depending on what it’s trying to do at any particular moment in time.’ (Ben C1p3-4)

Concern was expressed over a **lack of a sense of community**, particularly at a school level. Concern was also expressed over a **perceived lack of understanding of what community is, on the part of the institution**. There was a strong disassociation between the individual’s idea of community and that expressed in the institutional narrative. The university is not one single community; it is,

> An amorphous assemblage of concepts... perhaps the spokes of a wheel might work with me at the centre and lots of little bubbles around the outside with a different community heading in each bubble... and I flip between each of them. (Jonathon C2p14)

Community is essentially about relationships... I think that’s the difficulty with some models of management, they’re very mechanistic and they don’t really take in the human element. It’s the human element that makes things work usually in my experience. (Nicola C2p12)

Being hidden or feeling marginalized and **not being or feeling part of a community, and in particular, the university community**, had a significant impact upon individuals which affected to a certain extent how they viewed their institution,

> I just think they’re myths... that there is this all embracing community here at Greystone... there are all kinds of divisions and people...there are people who are here temporarily and then gone... there are people who fight with other people in this community, although it’s not really been my experience, I know that it happens...I know there are people who won’t talk to other people in the school...that’s mirrored in the community that we live in...some people are excluded, some people are important, some people are valued and some people aren’t...that’s community in its widest sense...it’s not necessarily a positive experience for anyone. (Susan C2p22-23)

How the participants viewed the rest of the university community depended upon their own position within Greystone and their length of association with the institution. There was a **strong sense of hierarchy** and awareness of the individual’s place within that. Those who attained a higher level of ranking or whose role covered the whole institution e.g. dean or provost or chancellor, changed their perspective as they had more day-to-day contact with other
university departments and members. The higher rank appeared to widen their horizon in some respects,

When I was head of school one of the most interesting things about that was that it did mean that you had more experience of the university as a community. (Edward C2p15)

The impact of the physical environment on the sense of community was raised. The need for more communal physical spaces areas was expressed as participants recalled spaces that had existed previously but had then been removed or sequestered for different purposes, which had resulted in the lack of spaces for people to congregate. Whilst academics can be loners, electronic communications affected the way in which members of the community interacted to the extent that when the system failed, they took pleasure in the opportunity to communicate face-to-face,

It was said that when there was the big computer crash before last Christmas people were saying ‘Oh this is fun’... we’re actually going round and knocking on each other’s doors more. (Edward C2p20)

Different conditions engender a sense of community. For example, being part of an active network, particularly an international research network, contributed to a sense of being part of a community; a community that is not rooted in the institution. It was stated that there is a difference between a network and a community but being a member of a network did contribute to a sense of community, particularly when members of that network come together at academic conferences. It is at these conferences that a sense of belonging to a community is engendered. Participants relate strongly to their international networks,

Our sense of community is definitely related to the research science that we do, I think more than anything else... there is sense of community within the department and, to a smaller extent, within the school, in terms of teaching but the big bubble of community is definitely the research that we do and the collaborators that we have, internationally. (Tessa C2p16-17)

There was something different about the notion of community inside a university where members can grow into spaces that don’t exist by developing new areas of interest and practice. Community as an expression of academic practice, whether or not it was part of an established research or teaching project, was powerfully evidenced (see section on academic
practice below). The intention to bring about community through practice was clearly demonstrated,

My community is really related to my research and my research is based on my ambition, my whole lifetime ambition, to enhance services for older people... any sort of community I visualise, I see older people and their family carers and organisations who work for them and then they discuss and they help each other. So this kind of ideal community is kind of what I see when you talk about what community looks like. (Rosa C2p18)

The motivation to create something positive, to strive towards an ideal was strong. However, concern was expressed about the possibility of this cherished notion somehow being used against the individual, particularly by the institution, ‘The way I think about community and the way I am as a person I think I always want to think of something positive and alive.’ (Fiona FG1 22.57-24.17)

3.2.2 Status

The status of the participants and the length of their association with the institution affected how they viewed and experienced the university community. It also affected their relationship with their institution and with their research and teaching communities. Contractual or employment status was important but it did not always determine status in relation to the institution or to those outside the institution. The second analysis revealed different perspectives listed in G under the heading ‘Agency & habitus combined (status, career & contractual matters)’. Individuals appeared to have little or no control over what status they acquired though in fact a number of the participants did make deliberative choices regarding their status. It was clear from the final analysis, for example, that they had weighed the options and had decided not to seek an ATR (research-focused) role and instead stay with their ATS (teaching-focused) role, or vice versa, for distinct reasons,

It’s quite difficult on the ground when you’re trying to build a logical career... paradoxically I’m on an ATS contract but I’ve just got an ESRC grant but I’m not going to push to be on an ATR at the moment because it will give me all sorts of grief because of the REF. You have to make these sort of tactical decisions... it’s absolutely crazy... there are always constraints and you have to find your way through them. (Nicola who was appointed a lecturer FG2 46.02 – 47.53)
Susan, who described herself as a researcher and not an academic, at the beginning of the research encounter did not consider herself to be a part of the university community due to her status which she considered not to be academic,

I don’t see myself as part of that at all…that might be partly because I’m not a lecturer, I don’t regard myself as an academic in some respects…I’ve never taught, I’m not a lecturer and so that for me isn’t an option. (Susan C1p2 & C1p9)

Ben, who also would have preferred a research role, was prepared to teach on a voluntary basis as a part of his strategy to acquire a permanent contract of employment,

Contractually I’m not obliged to contribute to my teaching community. I feel that, you know, it’s good for my CV and that I need to do it but then my incentive is to do only the bits of teaching that I think will contribute to my CV and nothing more. So in terms of my career stage at the moment I am very much seeking permanence. (Ben C2p34)

The lack of permanent status, being employed on a fixed term or temporary contract of employment, contributed to a feeling of being under-valued and marginalized. Whilst the matter of needing to make a living was a factor, it was not all about paying the mortgage. It was about being a fully participating member of the university community and having your contribution acknowledged in some way,

I don’t get a sense that within the (school) community first, so my faculty as a whole or the university as a whole that there’s much sense of trying to keep me part of it. (Ben C1p12)

I’ve served my usefulness and I’ve got to the stage where I’m really no good any more… I’ve struggled with relating to being part of the community at Greystone, because I haven’t felt I’m here in the long term. (Susan C2p4)

Yet even when the status and recognition did exist, it did not always create a sense of worth. A professor whose work was publicly acclaimed by the institution when she carried out a public lecture for the alumni association, reflected on the purpose of the event,

Get some money out of the alumni. Here’s a girl and she’ll give a talk. So it wasn’t like there was a passion for your research because they wanted to hear it. There was a motive underneath it, it wasn’t so nice. (Tessa who gave a public lecture for Greystone’s alumni programme C1p11)
For the community outside the institution, for the public audience, the contractual status of the participant may not even be known or need to be known. Rosa always presented herself as a university researcher to her participants, ‘when I do any community engagement or research with the local people I present myself as a researcher and at the University...’ (Rosa C1p3)

Those participants who secured a high level status in academic management e.g. a head of school or directorship appeared to pay a price by becoming increasingly distanced from their discipline or subject area,

I am now increasingly finding that my only link with my discipline is through the (subject) group, which isn’t a university organisation, it’s completely outside the university. (Jonathon who became an academic director C2p11)

One participant (Bryan) decided to go back to his research after a spell as head of school.

A higher position or status for the individual and in some cases, a longer association with the institution, led to a wider vision of the institution and the university community. In some respects this appeared to lead to a very different perspective, and not always a positive one,

I was here for the RAE 2008.... I guess at this stage I’m involved in more higher level meetings, so I get more of a sense of the disarray that goes on. (Tessa C2p12)

A more senior status at the institution also created a greater sense of obligation, particularly to the local and regional communities outside the institution,

It was more a matter of noblesse oblige... that if you hold these positions of power and influence and privilege ... it’s not about the benefit, so much as the obligation that you have. (Michael C1p9)

Those with responsibilities for research teams and laboratories were keenly aware of what might happen if they fail to generate income and had clearly defined strategies aimed at maintaining the status quo,

My job... is to write the research grant proposals and make sure that we have funding to keep the lab going... and everything else. (Tim C2p3)

Tim was similarly conscious of the how fluctuations in Greystone’s status as a ‘research intensive’ institution could affect positions,
I think we’re very much placing ourselves in the top twenty... and then we’ve been told from up high that we have to be in the top twenty after the REF... even if we have to sack people to get a better REF return. (Tim C2p23)

Status was also acquired via **international research networks**. Networks that became increasingly vital to Bryan who had emeritus status and to those who expressed a loyalty to their research as opposed to their institution,

I’ve just come back from (city) at the European conference on (subject) research... No, I was not representing my university... I’ve become part of a very significant international network. (Bryan C1p4)

### 3.2.3 Academic practice

The second analysis identified thoughts, practices and scenarios listed in Appendix G under the heading of Agency & habitus combined (community & discipline, community & research and community & teaching). The practice lens used in the final analysis revealed the extent to which individual values in relation to community and community-university engagement were embedded in day-to-day academic practice. Six participants declared a **commitment in principle to some form of community participatory research and teaching** and all were involved in some form of **community-university engagement**,

Intuitively I like the idea of participatory action research models or approaches. (Nicola C2p3-4)

I’m quite keen in that project to get more reflexivity going on and say well we’re part of that community. (Ben C1p2)

It’s not just research, collecting voices or doing interviews automatically... I want to make them feel their voices are actually heard and understood and valued. (Rosa C2p6-7)

For the benefit of the community...for the benefit of the students that come, it’s great, and the professionals, it’s like a three way learning between the service users... the students and the professionals. (Fiona C1p5)

Susan viewed the patient and public involvement representative who is a member of her research team as the embodiment of what she saw as the university’s official idea of community-university engagement; an idea that she did not necessarily endorse herself. Her
engagement with this volunteer, however, someone she saw as a member of the team who is experienced in the field, **benefitted her own academic practice**, 

Engaging someone who’s got a label as a PPI representative and as a user and someone to represent patients... but it’s very different to engaging with people who are telling their stories...but the combination of those two in a research study has been really good, really rewarding. (Susan C2p19)

Establishing and maintaining **clear roles and boundaries** was clearly important in Fiona’s teaching whereby service users collaborated with university staff, enabling undergraduates to benefit from real world experiences,

Service users... if they have been involved a lot of the time, they get very confident. So they almost want to say, look we want to do it this way. Which is good but you also have to kind of say, well actually you have one role and we have another and you have to now trust us. (Fiona C1p13)

The participants also **invested in their communities inside the university through their academic practice**, some seeing it as a way of sustaining their own community or a community that they wanted to be a part of, some seeing it as a way of improving their own practice and some as a straightforward matter of survival,

If you make the teachers happy the students will be happy because they are this mirror of the place and the environment they are in so if their lecturers or researcher or whoever is giving them here what they are after... I mean that will just come. (Fiona C2p13 – 14)

Conversely, Jonathon sees the **potential for breaking down some of the barriers** between different practices and roles but feels that there is not currently a structure that can facilitate such a change,

Looking at the progression routes, the training opportunities, the development opportunities for staff across the institution, not just academic but administrative, clerical and trying to figure out what routes exist and how people can cross over from one career trajectory to another. Why shouldn’t it be possible for some administrators to cross over into an academic role and vice versa? Occasionally it does (happen). But it happens sometimes almost by accident. There is not a structure as such that facilitates it. (Jonathon FG2 56.22 – 57.30)
3.2.4 Institution and environment

The second analysis identified thoughts, practices and scenarios, listed in Appendix G under the headings ‘Habitus and Field combined (documents – perspectives on Greystone’s Corporate Plan, a research centre report, ‘the university and community’). The final analysis revealed awareness on the part of the participants of the various ways in which the institution portrayed the university community. For example, a Greystone Corporate Plan contained a description of community as, ‘A scholarly community within a wider community’. (Plan 2 p4)

Ben considered the institutional rhetoric to emphasise ‘institution’ over ‘community,

There isn’t a kind of single unitary Greystone community as the corporate plan would have it. OK there is an institutional identity. We have you know a corporate plan, things that happen across the university have implications for all of us, as employees of the same institution, but it is an institution rather than necessarily a community. (Ben C2p2)

Susan considered the sense of community as portrayed in the Corporate Plan to be ‘too big’, a sense that made her think about the community as not being a very safe or supportive place to be. For Fiona, who felt a sense of community at an institutional level was needed, the intention to create a sense of community in the Corporate Plan was authentic but the institution was not going about it in the right way, ‘you can force the notion of it but to make it happen you’ve got to help the people. You can’t force and force and force without putting something in place which supports it.’ (Fiona FG1p4-5)

Like Fiona, Susan recognised the intention of the Corporate Plan but she struggled to identify with certain aspects, particularly as they relate to the idea of community, ‘there were certain bits in there that I really liked, so… that was good but overall I still struggled with the concept of community that is put across in the corporate plan’ (Susan C1p2)

Ben could relate to ‘making a difference’, a notion that is promulgated in Greystone’s institutional literature,

(Ben quoting the Corporate Plan) With the active support of the university community as a whole, we believe these strategies will make a difference. How am I making a difference? Is a question that all of us should be able to answer on a daily basis. (Plan 2 p3)
You do research because you have a fundamental kind of belief or value that it’s making a difference, that it’s making a worthwhile contribution… it is that sense of being a researcher as an identity, very strongly I think. (Ben C2p5)

Communications with the staff by the senior management at Greystone was acknowledged as having some significance in helping to create a sense of community,

That attempt on their behalf in trying to build on community feeling; that we are Greystone; we are going to do this and all these things together also a really positive thing but I think that it’s really important for them on that layer if you like to really work on that. (Fiona C2p4)

The Vice-Chancellor circulated a ‘letter’ on a regular basis to all staff members and to students at Greystone. This communication, whilst not made in person, was particularly valued by Ben,

It’s a big thing for me… maybe a small thing in terms of my working day but in terms of my relationship with the Vice-Chancellor, it’s been massive, it’s the only time I’ve ever felt I’ve had any kind of contact and it’s been really good. (Ben FG1 1.17.05 – 1.17.20)

The question of visibility, of the senior management, was important to a number of the participants. Current levels of visibility in terms of nurturing a sense of community were deemed as being inadequate,

There has to be the network I think. You have to sometimes see the Vice Chancellor one way or another and you have to talk to the Deans… they work with a smaller population, they have to be visible. At the moment you get the emails from the Vice Chancellor and that is good but you see nobody. Communities need nurturing all the time… it’s the relationship. (Fiona FG1 1.18.57 – 1.19.37)

Michael, felt the physical environment actually engendered a sense of community, ‘the architecture made it a very joined up community.’ (Michael C1p3 – 4)

For others who are still working at Greystone (Michael is no longer there), however, the very spaces that could be deemed as creating the ‘social cement’ were being taken away, ‘we’ve lost an awful lot of those spaces… social cement.’ (Jonathon FG2 59.08 – 59.15)

Social spaces, or common rooms, were also viewed as having an impact on interdisciplinarity, one of Greystone’s founding principles,
It doesn’t happen at Greystone and it has never really happened at Greystone since about ten years after it was actually founded and it’s one of the things that continuously fascinates me as to why there was never any priority put into building social cement amongst the academic staff. (Bryan FG 2 57.29 – 50.41)

Nicola noted the negative impact of the physical environment on **individual working conditions**. She considered both individual academics and the institution were not doing what they should do including working together to resolve the issues,

They’re not very collaborative in changing things necessarily and I think that’s where the autonomy thing doesn’t work so well because everyone’s so individualised… a body of academics get moved from one building to another and we stop talking to each other just because we’re not bumping into each other in the corridor. (Nicola C2p17-18)

The impact of office moves were prominent in the conversations and focus groups in the light of an ongoing **re-organisation of administration** and the participants reflected on the implications of this in relation to their sense of community, ‘the latest integration project has isolated administrative staff away from academic staff.’ (Nicola FG2 30.29 – 30.54)

Bryan described the administration as a ‘parallel universe’ (C2p22) and Nicola noted the absence of what she described as ‘ground rules’,

If universities are wanting to create senses of community in whatever realm it is… there has to be a sense of what the ground rules are, how things are supposed to operate and that is difficult to do if everyone is separated off and it’s just relying on email. (Nicola FG2 27.22 – 29.19)

The distance between the administrative and academic staff was also noted in the context of the expansion of the institutional management and the resulting audit culture, although that was not generally cited by the participants as a factor that affects the sense of community,

Within the university community things have become far more bureaucratised and structured and impersonal. And that’s partly as result of the growth of size but also the result of far more extraneous pressures and hoops you have to jump through. (Edward C1p3)

One of those ‘hoops’ raised by the participants was the **Research Excellence Framework (REF)**. The REF of itself was not always seen as negative but observations were made about the institution’s response,
I do see Greystone as a very siloed place... things like REF... you sometimes get a sense of community, but I think it’s a panicked community, trying to pull together things... to get the best money and best score as opposed to having a sense of community. (Tessa C2p12)

3.2.5 The researcher and the return gaze

In Chapter Two I stated that my ‘insiderness’ is a strand; whilst I ‘belonged’ to the same organisation as the participants, in my position as an insider researcher I also occupied that liminal space as an, ‘insider in collaboration with other insiders’ (Burns 2012 p265). This strand does not dominate but nevertheless runs throughout. Hence it is included as a sub-theme in the final analysis but is presented as one that is not as significant for the participants as the others. All the participants were invited to talk about the position of the researcher. The questions included in the aide memoires for the second conversations are listed in Appendix C.

The second analysis identified thoughts, practices and scenarios listed in Appendix G under the heading of ‘Epistemic Reflexivity’ in line with the analytical framework. There was a clear distinction between the natural scientists and the social scientists in how they approached the issue of the researcher being a member of the same institution. The social scientists considered the methodological issues whereas the natural scientists did not. Overall, in the final analysis, the three main areas of consideration were methodology, position and potential disclosure, and perspectives on my professional role,

I think it’s important to be aware of it and for you to when you interpret the data to be objective or to recognize your potential bias perhaps. (Fiona C2p2)

The methodological implications of my position as an insider researcher are explored in Chapter Two. Here, the issue is outlined as seen by the participants, four of whom specifically referred to these implications and three how, in doing so, reflected on how they had approached a similar issue in their own qualitative research. In talking about her own doctoral research, Susan shared the fact that she had disclosed her identity as a care giver to her participants, not with a view to sharing her experience but to achieve a certain level of rapport between the researcher and the research subject,
I definitely wasn’t going to be talking about my experience and I made that clear as well that I was there to hear their story and not give mine because there have to be boundaries still obviously in that relationship. (Susan C1p4)

For Nicola, Fiona and Ben, the issue was also a normal one to be grappling with,

It’s just the degree to which you acknowledge it, and it sounds like you are acknowledging it. I mean as a researcher I believe that you can’t not have a position on the research you’re taking. It’s just the degree to which you are aware of that I think is the issue for me usually. (Nicola C2p2)

I think it’s important to be aware of it and for you to when you interpret the data to be objective or to recognize your potential bias perhaps. (Fiona C2p2)

I’m well aware of debates about going native... It is some of the best research that’s available I think, when you have a close understanding of it... I personally don’t see [researcher’s proximity] as a problem... it’s something to reflect on, something that’s interesting and part of creating and developing these communities. (Ben C2p3-4)

Ben refers to the researcher as being, ‘native to the research’,

Whether or not you’re native to Greystone I don’t think is necessarily what’s important. Perhaps more importantly is this idea of this kind of rather more amorphous research community and particularly the research you’re doing... This sort of thing I’m very supportive of, so we have more of a shared affinity there perhaps than we do in the fact that we work at Greystone, would be perhaps the way I’d look at it... in that respect, you’re native to the research. (Ben C2p3)

The issue of position and potential disclosure; that is, the potential disclosure of the participant’s identity, was a more difficult and challenging one for the participants in this context, particularly those whose status was not assured and those who were dealing with scenarios that affected their relationship with the institution. Two declared they were reassured by the professional rapport that had existed between them and myself prior to the research encounter,

For me as a participant in the study I feel quite safe being with you. Possibly because I, I know you a little bit as a person, a professional in university for quite a few years so for me as a participant I respect you and feel safe with you to open up. (Fiona C2p2)

This is an advantage... makes it easier for you to understand what I’m saying. (Rosa C2p2)
3.2 CONCLUSION

Whilst this research investigates the perspective of individuals, it is aimed at getting closer to a unified understanding of the object without claiming to over-generalise. The reader (especially if working in higher education) may be starting to recognise some of the characteristics that are emerging from the analysis which echo those cited from the existing literature on academic community as summarized in Chapter One. The description and analysis in the Chapters Four to Seven reflects an interpretation of the themes based on an in depth manual heuristic analysis of each participant’s orientation on the themes, using the coding structure that is explained in Chapter Two. Specific aspects of community as cultural capital are attributed to individual participants as they relate to each theme. These are summarized and discussed at the end of each chapter in the context of the analytical framework, which brings together all the components of the object.

The next chapter moves to the main thematic analysis and focuses on the theme of ‘idea and elements of community’.
Chapter 4

THEMATIC ANALYSIS: IDEA AND ELEMENTS OF COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of four chapters exploring each main theme in turn. Each is presented as a facet of the object (the idea and experience of academic community) and each focuses on a different aspect. The theme presented in this chapter is ‘idea and elements of community’. As illustrated in the analytical framework, this theme encompasses three key features. Firstly, the idea of community, what the notion of community means to the participants. Secondly, community make-up, what and who forms their community, and thirdly, experience of community, how they have experienced community in academia including in their own institution. As stated in Chapter One, community is taken to be a relational phenomenon created and reproduced through the propinquity and interplay of actions, dispositions and structure. Chapters Four to Seven build upon the individual profiles of the participants. Their position for example, including their status and career pathway, is critical to the interpretation of their orientation to the theme; any analysis without an acknowledgement of their position would be potentially flawed.

The introduction to the themes in Chapter Three outlined topics that emerged from the analysis. These are examined in more detail in Chapters Four to Seven. The topics are introduced and discussed, with quotations from the participants and a brief analysis. This includes a reading of the data as it relates to the three forms of cultural capital; incorporated, objectified and institutionalised. The presentation of cultural capital in this context includes vocabulary and phrases selected from the data and cited as potential expressions and signifiers of attributes that may reveal capital as internalised by the agent in the form of incorporated cultural capital (the term, ‘agent’ is used interchangeably with ‘participant’). The aim of the analysis is to identify from the data, signs of community as expressions and dimensions of cultural capital as defined by Bourdieu, to ascertain what it is that gives the capital it value and how it affects the agent’s habitus and position in the field as it applies to the object. A fuller explanation of Bourdieu’s notion of capital in this context is provided in Chapter One.

Three sections, immediately before the thematic conclusions of Chapters Four to Seven, discuss aspects of the participants’ disposition, individual action and the temporal and spatial frame (all featured in the coding structure, explained in Chapter Two). The thematic
conclusions in Chapters Four, Five and Six are followed by fictional vignettes, which provide a link to the theme of the following chapter.

4.1 TOPICS

4.1.1 Idea of community (Ben, Michael and Susan)

Chapter One refers to Cohen’s conclusion that people construct community symbolically, ‘making it a resource and repository of meaning, and a referent of their identity.’ (Cohen 1985 p118) The duality of the concept of community as both an ideal and a reality is reflected in the way in which the participants considered the notion of community, possibly as an ideal (it may or may not be their ideal) and the reality of community as they experience it day-to-day. According to Wenger, whilst the term, ‘community’ is usually a very positive one, interrelations arise out of engagement in practice, and not out of an ‘idealized view of what a community should be like’ (Wenger 1998 p76).

The participants envisaged their idea of community in different ways. For example, Ben (a contract researcher who, during the period of the research become a lecturer) described communities as being performative,

> Community is an amorphous, changeable dynamic thing and it comes into existence in particular forms when trying to achieve something, trying to respond to some kind of threat, and I deliberately don’t use the word external threat there… partly reactive, partly proactive…this community doesn’t just exist, it’s not some kind of latent, not like a reservoir of community that’s there all the time. You know, it’s constantly changing and it takes on totally different forms, depending on what it’s trying to do at any particular moment in time. So that in that respect community exists only through its performance. (Ben C1p3-4)

Michael (an emeritus professor who was head of his school and also pro-vice chancellor) visualised community as a conversation and described how he had once written a log over a period of eighteen months of conversations he had had in relation to the development of a conference paper which for him, reaffirmed the notion that the academic community represented the, ‘availability of these conversations and these ongoing conversations.’ (Michael - C1p17). He referred to Michael Oakeshott’s, ‘conversation of mankind’ and artistic traditions as conversations conducted over the ages,
That any of us join in at some point... and are probably rather bewildered at the opening stages of what’s going on... and gradually you make sense and you make some contributions and sometimes you get knocked down and then you gain more confidence and you make more substantial contributions, perhaps influence the direction of the conversation and, eventually, you leave but the conversation goes on. (Michael C1p17 – 18)

For Michael, his log reaffirmed the notion that what the community represented was the availability of conversations which are ongoing and which feed into each other,

It may be a conversation around the Cathedral Dean’s breakfast table... it may be at a seminar... maybe a conversation around the table... rather more it will be the conversation that takes place in the pub in the evening afterwards... I connect these conversations. (Michael C1p17)

The importance of providing opportunities for conversation and of conversation itself is echoed by Taylor, writing in 1999, who contrasted Australian campuses which lacked the physical space for conversation with his first taste of European universities in the early ‘90s where, ‘the ritual of morning coffee was sacred, and provided a welcome and well-used opportunity for rich scholarly conversation.’ (Taylor 1999 p101) In considering, ‘How May We Be?’ Taylor advocated for ‘dialogic conversation’ as a process of ‘collective sensemaking’ and ultimately, ‘collective action’ which involves, ‘a commitment to share all one knows, to uncover assumptions, and to enact collective decisions... being open to outcomes, and being reflective.’ (Taylor 1999 p134)

Susan (a contract researcher facing the end of her contract) saw community as a beehive, with connotations for her position as a contract researcher who works like a drone bee and is ‘flicked’ out of the hive when her work is done. For Susan, community is not always positive and in describing her experience of community (in contrast to the idea of community), she says, ‘for me it’s those hidden stories and hidden experiences that perhaps the idea of community even doesn’t engage with.’ (Susan C1p6)

Ben also sees community as nebulous, an energy or force that springs to life as a ‘performance’ in different circumstances; in response to a threat or focused on achieving a particular goal; it can be reactive or proactive; it can take different forms at different times. Having described community as amorphous, however, a ‘sense of solidarity’ is still important to Ben as he seeks to secure a sense of permanence in his role at Greystone. Whilst the aim was to, in some part, to explore how participants visualised their idea of community, like
Cohen, whilst defining ‘academic community’ as an object of study (see Chapter One), I did not set out to treat community as a morphology, a structure capable of objective definition and description but rather, to understand community by, ‘seeking to capture members’ experience of it’ (Cohen 1985 p19). Ben talks, for example, about the small research group in his school, which he has joined, about the group’s attempt to build its own sense of identity in response to ‘feeling marginalised within the community’ of the school. Michael’s idea of community as a conversation, or the availability of conversations, which are ongoing and feed into each other, is not dissimilar to Ben’s notion of community as something that is somehow unstructured. There is a difference, however, between Ben and Michael’s idea of community. Michael describes the conversation (or ‘community’) as something that ‘goes on’ all the while, something that anyone can join or leave at any time. For Ben, community is not there all the time; there isn’t a ‘reservoir’ of community. Susan’s fear of being ‘kicked out of the hive’ echoes the idea that someone may feel excluded from the community or conversation. The question of being in or out may not be a matter of choice.

Ben, Michael and Susan were in very different positions at the time of the research encounter. Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital are denoted by terms such as, ‘sense of satisfaction’, ‘my passion, my research’, ‘personal concept’ (Susan); ‘sense of solidarity’, ‘building things together’, ‘part of a formal community’ (Ben); ‘sense of obligation’, ‘values’ (Michael). No signifiers for objectified capital were found for Ben, Michael or Susan. In relation to institutionalised capital, Ben secured membership of a research project and for the first time became a part of the ‘formal community’. His length of association with Greystone at six years, however, was much shorter than that of Susan (fifteen years) and Michael (twenty-two years). Whilst all the participants reflected to a lesser or greater degree on their idea of community, Ben, Michael and Susan were selected to illustrate different perspectives on community for individuals in very different positions.

4.1.2 Investment in creating, nurturing and sustaining community (Tim and Tessa)

However the participants imagined their idea of community, in particular the academic community, it was evident that they desired to become and remain a part of it, and that they had determined what sort of investment was needed in order for them to do so. For Tessa, whose community was centred on her research group, she had to focus on the research income and publications,
We have an agenda, a clear plan at least for the next three to five years. So the silos around aren’t really impeding what I’m doing. They change the environment so that maybe it’s not as nice a place to work as it used to be but at least it means there’s a focus going on and success will happen because we’ve got the grants, post docs and the likes. (Tessa C1p8)

Tim, a senior lecturer in charge of a research laboratory and team, has a similar outlook to Tessa in that he sees himself as a provider who is responsible for ensuring the survival of the group, which he appears to view as his ‘community’; ‘I make sure the lab is well funded... people get lots of attention from me if they need it’ (Tim C2p3). Tim acknowledges, ‘it’s a tough business... you really have to look after yourself as well, because otherwise... you stop getting grants, you’re pretty much finished’ (Tim C2p19).

Tessa and Tim are both leaders in their respective research fields with high and successful profiles. The instinct to create and sustain some sort of fortification comprising research outputs such as research awards and publications, something that shields the research group from any threat to its existence, is strong. In considering the impact of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) on academic identities, Henkel concludes that individuals could feel, ‘acutely conscious of their individual responsibility towards their department’ (Henkel 2000 p136). Krejsler, in his study of Danish university reform, describes a research group as, ‘strongly integrated into a community’ with its ‘own secluded environment... coded in an almost homely way with, for instance, a kitchen for eating lunch together every day and discussing both professional and private matters.’ He observes, for example, that health and science research takes place in teams and laboratories, leading to a more coherent identity.

The research section leader is looked upon as someone who, ‘protects the individual, and involves staff in what she brings before the department management team’. The research group does not experience any sense of affiliation to the department (Krejsler 2013 p1163). Henkel also concludes that the RAE strengthened the stratification of universities.

Whilst Tessa talks of having a ‘second skin’ for her research group, she also complains about the fragmentation of research communities into silos, which happens as a response to the competition for research funds (Tessa C1p5). In this sense, Tessa, through her actions, is herself contributing to the division of the research community as she seeks to protect her own group from other parts of the university. In this respect, both Tessa and Tim are not simply aligned to a ‘community of practice’ in the way that Wenger may describe their ‘modes of belonging’ (Wenger 1998 p174). Their actions are more instrumental (or performative in the
way that Ben describes above) in that they are purposefully seeking to create and sustain their own ‘epistemic’ community that is not only geared towards knowledge creation but also to sustaining their own position in the field. The existence of the ‘joint enterprise’ (a dimension of a community of practice as defined by Wenger) that is research and teaching points to their membership of a broader community of practice that goes beyond the distinctly delineated epistemic communities that they have created via their research groups. That notion is considered in Chapter Six on the theme of ‘academic practice’.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Tim and Tessa are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘feeling of being protected’, ‘strong connection’, ‘keep our heads down’, ‘not as nice a place to work’ (Tessa) and ‘proud’, ‘loyalty in return’, ‘work together’ (Tim). Signifiers identified for objectified capital include good research grants, good publications (Tessa) and success at securing research grants (Tim). In relation to institutionalised capital, Tessa grew her research department from scratch. Her association with Greystone is eight years and Tim’s association with Greystone is fifteen years.

4.1.3 Responsibilities and well-defined strategies for building and sustaining community (Susan and Fiona)

It wasn’t only those with a responsibility for a research team who expressed a sense of obligation as they went about building and sustaining their community. Susan, a contract researcher who referred to herself as ‘trying to become’ a part of the university community and who had volunteered to act as the research associate’ representative in her school, considered that,

As individuals we have a responsibility for fostering a sense of community and becoming part of communities, you have to look out, setting up forums and reaching out all the time. Otherwise it doesn’t happen... it’s something very difficult to achieve. (Susan FG1p4)

She said,

You’ve got to build it, you’ve got to nurture it, to ensure that everyone feels a part of that community and not excluded for whatever reason. (Susan FG1p5 and FG1p1)
The need to nurture a community was emphasised by the participants in Focus Group 1 (FG1 – Fiona, Ben, Susan and Edward). Fiona, a senior lecturer and centre director with a long association with Greystone, was particularly captivated by the idea of nurturing,

You need to build a community but you need to nurture the community and you need to nurture the building… you need to nurture the relationship… you going to build that brick wall there… you have to build it but you have to nurture yourself and the workers… you need to know how tall it needs to be, is it safe from the wind. (Fiona FG1/2 1.14 – 1.47)

In seeking to gain an understanding of ‘academic citizenship’, MacFarlane surveyed over thirty university staff from the UK, North America, Australia, Canada and southern Europe. The respondents connected ‘academic citizenship’ with membership of a community; membership which also implies duties deriving from kinship in reciprocation of the benefits that membership brings. They described citizenship as being about ‘belonging to a group’, ‘belonging to a community with a set of values, rules and objectives with an idea of how it contributes to society at large’, ‘being part of the wider academic community, contributing via scholarly activity and/or research, to the development of one’s area of knowledge and being supportive of others in the same’, ‘a willingness to work with others.’ (Macfarlane 2007 p264)

Bolden et al, who explored the ‘preoccupations of academics as citizens, rather than as employees, managers or individuals’, identified the importance of a sense of shared identity and belonging to an identifiable community in terms of motivating academic staff to take an active role in, and responsibility for, leadership, management and governance activities. (Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014 p764)

The sense of responsibility is clearly evident as the participants attempt to cultivate both a sense of community and a sense of belonging, for themselves and for others. They consider it is something that has to be worked at, that without their efforts, it would not exist. The strategies described by Susan and Fiona, for example, may be characterised differently to those employed by Tessa and Tim’s but are no less instrumental in their intention. It is about protection. Susan is more acutely aware of how being excluded from community can affect someone and of the necessity of constantly reaching out to others and building connections.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Susan and Fiona are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘contribute to’, fostering’, ‘build it’ (Susan) and ‘nurture’, ‘safe from the wind’ (Fiona). Signifiers identified for objectified capital include holding the position as the centre director (Fiona); this is also institutionalised capital. Susan’s
key attribute for institutionalised capital is her position as the research associates’ representative for her school. Fiona has the longest association with Greystone compared with Susan and she appears to feel significant responsibility for building and nurturing community.

4.1.4 The motivation to create something positive (Rosa, Jonathon and Fiona)

The propensity to create community as something positive was palpable amongst the participants, including those who either felt excluded or not a part of the community at Greystone or who considered their community to be centred away from the institution. For many, it was personal. Rosa, who had no formal status at Greystone but who had already secured a fellowship at another institution, reflected on what community means to her wellbeing and also to her role as a researcher,

I value community... anything related to community, not only the researcher to collect voices, but as a volunteer or as a friend I always have personal connections, relationships. (Rosa C2p7)

I began to learn how to like or to get involved... really helps to my wellbeing and to feel more at home and then... I thought of my role as a researcher is to enhance community by using research or my knowledge. (Rosa C2p7)

The more I’m involved the more I feel attachment to the community. (Rosa C2p7)

Jonathon, a senior lecturer who calls himself a ‘university man’, recognises the intrinsic motivation of individuals that can act as a driving force for creating spaces and even communities,

I think sometimes people grow into spaces that don’t exist... there is no resource, there’s no time allocation, it’s just something that happens, because of who you are and what drives you and I think that’s probably the way it always has been. (Jonathon C2p13-14)

Fiona could connect positively with the idea of community in a personal way and expressed how she would like it to be in her team and at Greystone, acknowledging that at an institutional level it wasn’t happening,

Community – I think I would like to see it... what came to mind was how geese, for example, act when they go and eat together, in a piece of grass, hundreds of them and
then they suddenly fly off, in this creation where somebody leads them to a certain direction, and they, sometimes you can see an outsider, but it’s still coming in the community but then they swap and another goose takes the lead. I feel like in my team at work that’s how I would like it to be, and how would like it to be at Greystone, that we help each other but that it was also very much more focused if we’re talking about Greystone but that’s not happening. (Fiona FG1 22.57-24.17)

I suppose it has to be manageable but I feel in looking at that sort of community, I so wish there was a more sense of here we are doing this together and now we’re going to do great, doing different but doing great and this is how we’re going to do it. I feel part of a bigger family sort of thing. Maybe that’s impossible but I wish it was. (Fiona C1p11)

As with a sense of responsibility, the motivation to create something positive in the context of community appeared to be intense. It was something the participants recognised in themselves as well as in others. The idea expressed by Jonathon that people are not only motivated to grow into spaces that ‘don’t exist’ but can actually do so, may indicate that there is something unique about the conditions within a university which allow for this to happen. In contrast, however, Rosa’s experience suggests that it is not always possible. She is very motivated to create something positive which benefits her sense of wellbeing and her research; it is not necessarily associated with a need to create institutional status, which she clearly lacks as someone who has no formal status at Greystone. Fiona also desires a greater sense of community which she feels is lacking.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Rosa and Jonathon are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘value community’, ‘feel attachment’, ‘my wellbeing’ (Rosa), ‘common values’ (Jonathon) and ‘feel part of a bigger family’ (Fiona). Signifiers identified for objectified capital include the two project grants that Rosa had secured, which bridged her doctoral research and a prestigious fellowship at another institution that she was scheduled to take up with a few months. Jonathon had a strong network at Greystone through his role, which covered the whole institution. Having been associated with Greystone for twenty-five years, Jonathon had seen how people can be driven by a particular interest. He reflects upon the consequences of someone being given a management role overseeing the area of interest, which in the end actually takes them away from the opportunity to practice the very thing that enthused them in the first place. This had happened to Jonathon who had been promoted to the position of academic director. Having gained institutional cultural capital through the acquisition of status, he potentially loses a sense of attachment to his discipline, which in turn may reduce his incorporated cultural capital in this context.
4.1.5 A clear sense of belonging and purpose (Tessa, Bryan, Jonathon, Edward and Tim)

A sense of belonging for some participants was palpable, particularly in relation to their more immediate community. Immediate in this context didn’t necessarily mean physical immediacy; it could be in relation to discipline and research. In the context of the latter, connections to international research and professional networks are stronger than connections to Greystone itself. McAlpine & Turner refer to the ‘networking strand’ of ‘identity-trajectory’; that is, the range of local, national and international networks an individual has been and is connected with, wherever located (they used a lens of identity-trajectory through which to examine imagined and emerging career patterns amongst doctoral students and research staff) (McAlpine and Turner 2011).

Tessa’s sense of belonging relates to her discipline and subject group, which includes both her research group at Greystone and her international collaborators,

It is to the discipline and it’s to the small but well-formed (subject) grouping that we have here... there is a kind of a sense of loyalty to all those people that are helping out. (Tessa C2p14)

Bryan also has a sense of belonging centred on his international research community,

I do have a very strong sense of belonging to an academic community, but that academic community is not Greystone, is not rooted in Greystone.’ (Bryan C2p5-6).

For Jonathon, ‘Community begins here with the school’ (Jonathon C2p3). For Tim, his sense of belonging is focused on where he spends most of his time, his lab,

Some of the other science schools I obviously interact with but the university as a whole I couldn’t really say...I come to work, I tend to spend most of my time here, or in meetings, or in the lab talking to the guys actually doing the lab work. (Tim C1p8)

Edward, who is about to retire, reflects on how a sense of community in his school is boosted by pressures from other parts of the university,

There was a sense of there being a beleaguered unit, which was something which added to a community but beyond that there was an academic community in the sense of the research (Edward C2p8–9)
Having already identified Tessa’s need to protect her research group at Greystone, it is clear that her own sense of belonging extends to her international research community. Bryan, as an emeritus professor, similarly has an extensive international community, which provides him with a greater sense of belonging than his own school. Previously, when Bryan was dean or head of the school, he may have had a greater sense of belonging to his school. In contrast, Jonathon, a senior lecturer with a university-wide role whereby he works with colleagues across all faculties and disciplines, still sees his school as the ‘first level’ of community. Jonathon works from his office, which is located in his school and not in a central or corporate department in another part of the campus and this is likely to contribute to his sense of still belonging to the school. Nicola’s sense of belonging also starts with her school,

I have a strong sense of belonging very generally [to what?] … I don’t know really. It’s a very easy place to work and everyone is very friendly and nice. I suppose belonging to the school would be my first port of call… Because I’ve gone right through from degree to PhD to working here and it’s been a long association. And a lot of it has to do with people in the school. Because I sort of admire what they do... there are lots of role models I suppose. It’s a little bit like your second family, because you spend so much time there. So, work for me has created a strong community setting. (Nicola C1p3-4)

Tim’s school and his lab appear to provide a focus for his day-to-day interactions and so it may be unsurprising that his sense of belonging is focused upon those.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Tessa, Bryan, Jonathon, Edward, Tim and Nicola are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘strong connection’, ‘small community’ (Tessa); ‘locked into’ (Bryan); ‘begins here’ (Jonathon); ‘common interests’ (Edward); ‘loyalty’ (Tim) and ‘first sense of belonging’, ‘admire what they do (colleagues)’, ‘second family’ (Nicola). Signifiers identified for objectified capital include the strong international networks retained by Tessa and Bryan and Tim’s research lab and team; this is also institutionalised capital. Other key attributes for institutionalised capital are Bryan’s position as a chief editor of a major international journal which gives him a clear sense of purpose and Edward’s length of association with Greystone and his school; an association of thirty-seven years.
4.1.6 Being part of an active network (Tessa, Bryan, Michael, Fiona and Jonathon)

Networks, particularly international networks, feature extensively in the make-up of the participants’ communities and in how the participants perceive their sense of community and of belonging. Tessa, Bryan and Michael belong to international research networks, which they identify with more strongly than their own institution,

My academic community is very much (subject) research and Greystone is a small component of that but my community is partly based here, a very large part based in the US in (city) and collaborators across the EU. (Tessa C1p1)

Most of my research networks are now international networks. (Bryan C1p4)

There’s another part to my identity, which is the (discipline) identity and that community which is a very strong community, is an international community of scholars... it almost has to be because, we’re now so thin on the ground in the UK... all the way through all this I maintained my association... I’ve just recently come back from the International Network of (discipline) ... many of these are now close friends. (Michael C1p11)

Fiona, who is proud to represent Greystone at international conferences, feels part of a family when she is at an international forum and she actively nurtures her contacts,

I feel a part of a family because I know almost all of them even though I am not on the board anymore. I still have a very close contact with them. (Fiona C2p26)

Fiona’s networking enabled her to build a sense of community, ‘I always made sure that I talked to everybody and that was really trying to nurture the contact that we had with universities all over the UK or (continent).’ (Fiona C2p29). It also gave her a sense of security, ‘If you look at your pool of networking you’ve had over the years, you will feel safer than you do in your own team at Greystone.’ (Fiona FG1 38.50 – 39.24)

Jonathon, who, as seen above, declared himself to be a ‘university man’, feels there is something different about universities and that includes a global perspective,

One of the unique characteristics of working in universities... it is a global community of practitioners... the only boundaries as such are language boundaries and even those can be overcome so, I think for academics, the concept of the community is often rather different to perhaps Joe Blogs in the street. (Jonathon C2p10)
Tessa, Bryan, Michael, Fiona and Jonathon are building their own epistemic communities that reach well beyond the confines of those that lay within their own institution.

Delanty describes the scientific scholarly community as a ‘global network’ even if it is nationally organised in higher education systems (Delanty 2008 p132). The participants with strong networks tend to be well established in their field or discipline. Tessa, Bryan and Michael appear to value their networks more than their institution despite the differences in their career stages (Bryan and Michael are emeritus professors and Tessa is mid-career). Whilst Fiona (a senior lecturer and centre director with a long association with Greystone) is gratified to be representing her institution, there is the suggestion that in nurturing national or international networks, the participants are creating a stronger sense of community and belonging for themselves – to their networks and not necessarily to their institution. According to Hakkarainen et al, working with international networks was mostly experienced as a positive and productive collaboration for doctoral students, although when a student’s main collaborator was from outside of her own (institutional academic) community, relations with her own community could become weak. (P.K., Wires et al. 2014 p91) Participants have a strong affiliation to their networks and there will be instances where it may be in conflict with their institution, where the participants are in some way compromised. The fragility of research groups is acknowledged by Hoffman et al, regarding the relationship between information and communication technology based collaboration and research team dynamics. In ‘constantly changing environments, like higher education’, globally networked research teams and virtual communities are increasingly developing awareness, capacity and the purposeful management of research team dynamics, which positively contribute to the stability of the group and mitigate against anxiety and uncertainty. (Hoffman, Blasi et al. 2014 p478)

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Tessa, Bryan, Michael, Fiona and Jonathon are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘always proud’ (Fiona); ‘belonging to an academic community’, ‘bigger movement’ (Bryan); and ‘close friends’ (Michael). Membership of a network is included as a type of objectified cultural capital in this context and Michael considers himself to be a member of a ‘strong international community of scholars’, which is different to Humboldt’s ‘community of teachers and students’ (Lucas 2006 p25 citing Humboldt's four main conditions for the modern university). Key attributes for institutionalised capital are difficult to determine in relation to active networks although the participants’ institutional status will be relevant to their positions in whatever academic
networks they are engaged with. In certain scenarios job titles and positions bestowed upon the participants by the institution will affect their status as perceived by other members of certain networks and the ‘community of scholars’.

4.1.7 Exclusion leading to no sense of university community (Susan, Bryan, Rosa and Fiona)

Connectivity and a sense of belonging were most strongly felt in the context of the participants’ research and discipline whereas the community at Greystone as an institution, at times felt excluding, especially for three participants, all in very different circumstances. These are Susan who was approaching the end of her research contract, Rosa who had no formal status at Greystone and Bryan who was an emeritus professor. Susan felt like,

Some kind of drone bee, a worker bee who’s been out there for the last two years gathering all this honey… it’s just time to flick me out of the hive. (Susan C2p4)

Bryan, despite his long association with Greystone also did not feel a part of the Greystone community but for a different reason,

You could say that I am liberated now… in many ways the (school) is very generous to me. OK, I get kicked out of the room there which is quite substantial but nevertheless, I’m in here. I still have a place and I still have a space. Noises are still made about how valuable it is to have (me) around. So, you might say the institution is being very kind. (Bryan C1p10)

Rosa presented herself as a university researcher to those outside Greystone but actually felt that she does not belong, ‘Though I identify myself outside university as a university researcher… at the school I don’t feel I belong.’ (Rosa C2p3)

Susan found similarities between her own experience at Greystone and that of the group that she has researched (carers),

It’s a shame really that I have such a negative view of the word ‘community’, both in the way I experience being part or not a part of the community here [Greystone] and in the people that I’ve researched, their experience of being in a community that isn’t particularly supportive of them…it was only afterwards that I saw those parallels, so community for me has particular connotations. I always think of an excluding community which is the absolute opposite of what community is supposed to convey. So whenever I think of community, both in terms of my role here [Greystone] and in
terms of how people in the community experience the community...I don’t know why but I just turned it the other way around to see how community doesn’t serve people... it doesn’t support people...it can be very excluding of people. (Susan C2p22)

As Whitchurch states, much of what has been written about academic and professional identities in higher education has tended to focus on narratives of exclusion, resulting in binary perceptions that do not take account of the ways in which individuals interpret their own roles as defined (Whitchurch 2013 p4). Fiona reflects on the need for greater integration and how she may enable her administrative colleagues to feel a part of the team in a more positive way,

I have tried in the past anyway to encourage my admin staff to now and again read an academic paper and when we did have time which has been a while now we had a journal club and, and I have encouraged them to present a paper so that they felt a part of... they didn’t have to but they could if they would and they, they have taken on that as a part of being part of the team and... because being an admin person doesn’t mean that you don’t have the intelligence to be part of it. (Fiona, a senior lecturer C2p22)

Rosa, whilst being able to use an email account at Greystone and a shared space in her former doctoral supervisor’s office, did not receive any of the information that was distributed to researchers including news about school meetings and other formal notifications to staff. Also, whilst being identified as a university researcher by the communities with which she was researching outside Greystone, Rosa was not connected to all systems inside the institution. Consequently, she found it difficult to connect with or know what was going on. Bryan, as an emeritus professor, was no longer at the heart of the institution of Greystone and was instead locked into a ‘bigger movement’. His attention was elsewhere. Susan was actually giving attention to the university community that she was trying to join, despite feeling so negative about the idea of a community at Greystone. As noted earlier, Susan felt a responsibility towards the need to nurture the community and to ensure that everyone feels a part of it (Susan FG1p5).

As stated in Chapter One, Watson describes universities as ‘quintessentially membership organisations’ where participation is voluntary – by students, staff and other ‘partners.’ (Watson 2014 xxix) Expressions and signifiers of a possible absence of incorporated cultural capital for Susan and Rosa are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘being kicked out of the hive’ (Susan); ‘resentful’ (Susan) and ‘don’t feel I belong’ (Rosa). The idea that someone may be, or feel, barred from a community implies that there are certain terms or conditions of membership which must be applied in order for membership of that community to exist; some
sort of qualification. That qualification may include objectified and institutional cultural capital. For example, heading a department, being in charge of a lab team and having a title are assets that will very likely safeguard an individual from being or feeling excluded.

4.1.8 Communities change over time (Susan, Nicola, Tessa and Bryan)

Watson describes the story of higher education as one of ‘continuity and change’ (Watson 2009 p129). Changes to communities came about, according to the participants, for different reasons although it was generally considered that change or even the death or disbandment of a community was influenced by external factors that tended to be out of one’s control, ‘Unless you physically move, you withdraw from one community to another. But usually it happens to people.’ (Susan FG1p2). Nicola, who had by that time been appointed to the post of lecturer, considered community to be dependent upon shared interests, interests that come and go,

You talked about community as quite fluid. I think a lot of the reason for that fluidity is that if it’s about shared interests, that’s going to change over time because your own interests change apart from anything else and the constraints or structures within which you’re working change as well. (Nicola FG2 11.15 – 11.46)

Tessa, a professor and head of a research group, who moved to her school not long after it had been established, reflected on the increasing fragmentation, which took place over time,

There certainly are silos here. When I first moved here the (name) school was quite new, probably two, three years old. One of the big benefits here was the lack of silos. It was quite a small school. There was a lot of money around, a lot of enthusiasm about what direction are we going in and you could be a part of that framing of where things were going. But that has now changed, changed quite dramatically in the last year or so. Silos have emerged and it’s probably inevitable over time I guess because things have to kind of bed down and budgets aren’t what they were. And you get new characters coming in to kind of feed things. (Tessa C1p7)

Another factor affecting the university community, and one that pre-occupied a number of the participants, was a recent administrative re-organisation at Greystone, generally termed, ‘the integration project’. Nicola considered this project, ‘disastrous’,

The separation of the admin staff who are part of the community of the school, very integrated, you’re constantly talking to them every day and now you can’t get into their office, it’s all swipe card and they’ve got generic email addresses. We’ve managed to find out who is dealing with our bits so that we can manage to keep things going... you’ve been resourceful to keep things... it’s like they barrier themselves off.
So they’ve been separated out, in terms of fragmentation that’s certainly going to happen more. (Nicola C2p11)

Bryan described a scenario whereby an administrator had been advised that she no longer had to engage with academic staff,

One of our local support was told by one of her line managers that now she would no longer need to interact directly with academics and talk to them because she would now be part of an administrative structure. Said that to reassure her. Now she wasn’t at all reassured by that. She thought that was a horrific scenario. Oddly enough this decentralisation of the administration at Greystone into hub, which looks as though it ought to connect up the work of academic staff with administrative work has not. In fact it has created a greater distance between the two. (Bryan FG2 30.55 – 32.13)

There is an acknowledgement of the changeableness of communities, which can be influenced by different factors. It is generally accepted that communities and their environments are subject to constant change and that individuals can, albeit within certain constraints, choose to be a part of a community or not. Some of those constraints are explored above as Susan and Rosa contemplate being excluded from community. Those external factors that affected the participants’ immediate communities at Greystone did not always come from outside the institution. They were also from other parts of the institution including the administrative management and operations; an aspect of ‘managerialism’ described by Nixon as, ‘a mechanism for ensuring that human beings are not seen in their human aspect, but in their technical capacity to deliver on bureaucratically defined performance measures.’ (Nixon 2008 p74)

The response to the ‘integration project’, one such factor from inside the institution, demonstrates how closely the participants work with their administrative colleagues as they express concern about the possibility of barriers being created between them and colleagues that they have become used to working with on a day-to-day basis; although the barriers to some extent did exist before the reorganization as demonstrated by for example, the traditional binary division between ‘academic’ and ‘non-academic’ roles. In his epilogue to, ‘Reclaiming Universities from a Runaway World’, Barnett concludes that there is too much structure; that the space for the academic community to be an academic community is shrinking, ‘structure tends to obtrude into the human relationships of a community.’ (Barnett 2004 p204) Later, in exploring the tensions brought about by the emergence of management as a ‘surface feature’ of both the bureaucratic and corporate university, Barnett acknowledges that management comes to be identified with a, ‘closing off of spaces’. This does not mean,
however, that there is no space in the corporate university for, ‘individuals to be recognised as individual persons.’ (Barnett 2011 p55)

The participants in this research are all in a primarily academic role although some have and have had management responsibilities. The research did not include administrative staff, students or those outside the university although some of the participants do refer to other staff and students. It has been observed above how Tessa may be contributing to the fragmentation of the research community as she seeks to protect her own group by giving it a ‘second skin’. There is a sense of inevitability about Tessa’s approach to this issue, as though fragmentation is a natural consequence of organisational factors such as funding and management structures.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Nicola and Tessa are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘resourceful’ and ‘keep things going’ (Nicola); and ‘strong connection with each other’ and ‘keep our heads down’ (Tessa). The motivation to create something positive as explored above is also relevant in this context. There are indications here of what Watson describes as a ‘cosmological constant’ (a term coined by Einstein), whereby whilst each university has its distinctive but changing history, another part of the university enterprise has always remained the same; the independent and ‘deeply ethical’ part of academic work that is, ‘critical and concerned about enduring values’ (Watson 2007 p85). Signifiers identified for objectified capital are found in the strong networks that the participants have created within the community at Greystone. Key attributes for institutionalised capital could be signified by the length of association with the institution. The longer the association, the more knowledge an individual has of the cycles of change within organisations generally and within Greystone itself. Some participants have lived through previous administrative re-organisations. They have seen communities break-up and reform over time. In addition, some participants have seen Greystone from different perspectives over the years such as Nicola, whose ten-year association had seen her move from an undergraduate to a postgraduate and then on to an associate tutor and lecturer.

4.1.9 Perceptions and experience of the university community, institution and hierarchy (Edward, Tim and Michael)

Aspects of the participants’ views on the institution and the environment are explored in Chapter Seven where Greystone’s official narrative on community is also analysed. The focus
here is upon how the participants see community at universities and at Greystone. Edward, who is about to retire, reflects on the ‘old inherited’ notion of a ‘community of scholars’,

Obviously there’d be a master and all that but that collegiate model or parts of it were obviously transplanted or developed into the modern universities, I mean the universities of the nineteenth century onwards. Now clearly, I’ve certainly noticed a decline of that sense of democracy, collegiality/democracy which we could see at Greystone. (Edward C1p4)

Edward qualifies his reference to democracy by differentiating between ‘community’ and ‘democratic ethos’ by saying it, ‘...isn’t to say that there isn’t a community, just that there may be a less democratic ethos there.’ (Edward C1p5). The ethos may not feel democratic but there are structures that at least give the appearance of a democratic process whereby, for example, information is shared, as Tim outlines,

We have a school meeting every month... we have the Head of School and various Directors of different things stand up and tell everybody what’s going on, so if you want to find out what’s going on, you go to the school meeting... it kind of feels like (school) exec are in control, but actually I suspect, you know, if the Science faculty say you’ve got to take fifty more undergraduate students next year, we pretty much have to take fifty more undergraduate students next year... so it’s an illusion, I think, of democracy... (Tim C2p7-8)

Finnegan says the term, ‘community of scholars’ suggests a ‘close-knit personal group, probably sharing their knowledge together over a long period’. It is a powerful and influential model that needs to be examined critically (Finnegan 1994 p178-179). This is what the participants are doing as they consider their idea and elements of community and issues such as democracy. Democracy, be it meaningful or tokenistic, appeared to be an important element of community in an institutional context for some of the participants. Edward’s distinction between ‘community’ and ‘democratic ethos’, suggests a certain characteristic for the community at Greystone as it relates to the institution’s decision-making processes, which may not be as shared as they appear. The ‘illusion’ of democracy (as Tim’s describes it) and the participants’ willing involvement as players in the various structures may suggest a certain level of collusion whereby everyone is helping to maintain the appearance of a democratic organisation whilst knowing it not to be so. Dowling-Hetherington in her study of the changing shape of university decision-making processes and the consequences for faculty participation in Ireland, observes that faculty appeared to accept that that essentially the school meetings are, ‘pseudo-participative entities.’ (Dowling-Hetherington 2013 p227)
Edward describes the community at Greystone as a series of ‘overlapping layers’. His role as head of school enabled him to experience the whole university as a community, more so than from the position of the less elevated,

When I was head of school one of the most interesting things about that was it did mean that you had more experience of the university as a community, even if that meant sitting through some of the Vice Chancellor’s Monday sessions having some presentation from someone or other about employability or freedom of information or the latest thing it was thought we should know about. (Edward C2p14-15)

This was the same for Michael who was head of his school and also pro-vice chancellor which,

Brought me much more firmly into the university-level thinking on identity, because you had a committee of Dean’s and so on and I also found myself on some of the other university-wide committees so that gave you a sort of different perspective. (Michael C1p5)

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Edward, Tim and Michael are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘ethos’, ‘scholars and researchers together’ (Edward); ‘illusion’, ‘we work together’ (Tim); and ‘different perspective’ (Michael). Signifiers identified for objectified capital are not evident. However, institutionalised capital is signified by membership of executive teams (Tim is a member of the school executive team) and positions with management responsibilities such as Edward and Michael’s positions as heads of their school and Michael as pro-vice chancellor.

4.1.10 The impact of the physical environment (Nicola, Edward, Bryan, Michael and Jonathon)

Whilst the design of the physical environment is not the focus of this study, aspects of it are clearly significant in relation to the idea and elements of community for the participants. The physical environment is a key and complex element in the shaping of community; it cannot be ignored. According to Taylor, the nature of the physical environment is not only an outcome of management decisions but it should be given very careful consideration, ‘in terms of what it symbolizes and offers by way of amenity for both student and staff morale, and for academic work.’ (Taylor 1999 p101) Nicola, Edward, Bryan, Michael and Jonathon considered the impact of the physical environment on community and in particular, the availability and the management of spaces that provided for what Bryan had termed, ‘social cement’,

Structurally Greystone has always created silos because... in the early days... there was a common room but common rooms were undemocratically whipped... I’ve been quite shocked by it... having kicked around and examined in all sort of universities, you can go to the staff club in Birmingham and so forth, you get people from different disciplines sitting around having a drink, talking with one another... social spaces, what (former colleague) used to call ‘moral glue’... why has it never been seen to be important from the standpoint of the executive team within the university... I don’t understand it. (Bryan FG 2 57.29 – 50.41)

Jonathon also acknowledged that Greystone had lost, ‘an awful lot’ of those spaces (Jonathon FG2 59.08 – 59.15). The participants noted a lack of physical space for students to congregate as well as staff. Nicola, who was a student at Greystone before joining the staff, expressed what it was like to lack a meeting place as a student,

I think social spaces, particularly within schools... you identify with your school and yet you’re not given anywhere ‘to be’ effectively. It makes student organisation quite hard. The student (subject) society... where do you meet? (Nicola FG2 1.02.52 – 1.03.24)

Nicola, who’s school did have a space which was, ‘taken over’, felt that

If you’re trying to create a school community, it’s essential to have somewhere where the students can hang about in between lectures. As a student myself you feel a bit lost if you don’t have somewhere within the school. (Nicola FG2 59.59 – 1.02– 1.02.11)

Nathan, in her ethnographic account of a freshman year at a U.S. university, concluded in contrast that community spaces were often a retreat from social interaction, ‘a way to create more private options.’ (Nathan 2005 p53) The physical layout of a school, depending upon its location on the campus, may not always allow for an area to congregate, as with Edward’s school which is now served by a general area called a ‘Hub’,

There is not a common room of the school... we’re now on two floors... there’s no natural area (for congregation) at all... and then there’s that big area in the Hub, which I notice students are beginning to sit in but that’s for almost anyone. (Edward - C2p13-14)

According to Jonathon, you have to book a room every time you need a meeting,

Which is a pain. That’s of course one of the main drivers. It’s the lack of space at Greystone; it’s the competition for space that drives these changes, which have led to the removal of common rooms and staff common rooms. I can see why it happens but the result is very unfortunate. (Jonathon FG2 1.03.20 – 1.03.45)
Jonathon had attempted to create a space for a regular get together but the space available did not serve the purpose of the gathering,

When we were keen to promote a sense of ‘moral glue’ amongst our first year undergraduate cohort a few years ago, we wanted to hold a lunchtime get together and the only space we could find was the foyer of the (building). It’s a big space but it’s not particularly user friendly... very public as well. It’s a strange place in some ways because you feel like you’re in a goldfish bowl. At Greystone we don’t provide the social spaces that provide the cement. (Jonathon - FG2 1.00.31–1.01.20)

Focus Group 2 (Jonathon, Bryan and Nicola) considered other spaces that may be used by students, such as the student union building on campus, a ‘big space’ (Bryan FG2 1.01.48 – 1.01.59) but ‘not a terribly pleasant one’ (Jonathon FG2 1.01.52 – 1.02.11). Jonathon acknowledged that a lot of students go to the library to be sociable,

Which never used to happen because libraries were difficult to be sociable in because you were supposed to be quiet. Now of course you’ve got those really loud and noisy floors like floor zero and those do tend to be used increasingly as social spaces. (Jonathon FG2 1.02.28 – 1.02.45)

A perspective on the physical environment of Greystone as a whole was provided by Michael, who described the way in which the architecture enhances a sense of community, a ‘joined up’ community,

The architecture made it a very joined up community... it was single, built environment and the walkway was a place where you bumped into people all the time... more than any other university I know... the built environment actually holds a community together and gives you a sense of belonging to a place rather than a building on the periphery... the sheer physical environment kind of holds it together and that was no accident... student accommodation, libraries, lecture rooms, teaching rooms, laboratories are all within ten minutes’ walk one of another... that has quite an impact on a feeling of a university being actually held together. (Michael C1p3 – 4)

This view contrasts with the physical fragmentation experienced by other participants although Michael does go on to say that universities are not actually a single community, they are villages,

Universities probably do more than many institutions self-consciously create community or communities... you can’t often think of universities as a single community... they’re villages. (Michael C1p19)

Michael refers to ‘Little alcoves on corridors to encourage informal conversations’, saying, ‘the architecture is designed to get people meeting and talking together.’ (Michael C1p19)
The relatively compact campus located on a site of around 300 acres gives the impression of an integrated and cohesive environment occupied by inhabitants who constantly commune. The complex cluster of communities, or ‘villages’ as Michael calls them, the fragmented nature of the environment and the interactions within it, is not apparent to those outside. All the participants except for Michael were using the campus on a day-to-day basis and all agreed that the provision of a space for the purpose of congregation was an important element in helping to create social unity, or ‘glue’. Cox, Herrick et al in their vignettes about different spaces comment on how the references to imagery of the Oxbridge academic community, ‘disguise a collage, an assemblage of rather fragmented groups, each of which feels more engagement to specialist scholarly communities outside the institution and the city than to each other.’ They describe universities as ‘tenuous institutions, composed of multiple practices’. (Cox, Herrick et al. 2012 p705)

For the participants, the management of the available space at Greystone seemed to work against a sense of community for both staff and students. It is also likely that the impact of the recent administrative reorganisation, the ‘integration project’, heightened concerns amongst the participants about this particular issue as selected spaces were set aside to create a series of ‘hubs’. In 2014, Greystone opened a new teaching building, the design of which included a ‘collaboration zone’; effectively an open space with a variety of comfortable furniture outside the teaching rooms on every floor. Collaboration is also encouraged by the university library, which is now divided into zones for various group study-related activities.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital are difficult to determine in the context of the impact of the physical environment apart from the general recognition of a need for the provision of physical spaces that help to create some sort of social cohesion. None of the participants have control over the use of any physical spaces which may be construed as objectified capital. All of the participants (including Rosa) except for Michael who no longer works at Greystone, have institutionalised capital in the sense that they are members of staff and can, as such, book spaces via the university’s room booking system for various purposes.
4.2 DISPOSITION

The disposition of the participants varied depending upon their particular circumstances at different times during the research encounters. All appeared to be strongly motivated to build and sustain their university community, whatever shape or form that community took, be it laboratory (and team), centre, department, research group, school, international network or community partner. All the participants were positively disposed towards the idea of community, even those who had felt excluded from the university community in some way or other. To this extent, the participants’ dispositions, even in their varied states, reflect their internalization of the structures of their social world at Greystone,

As perceptive dispositions tend to be adjusted to position, agents, even the most disadvantaged ones, tend to perceive the world as natural and to accept it much more readily than one might imagine. (Bourdieu 1989 p18)

Whilst believing that no one could argue with ‘community’, Ben wondered if such a cherished notion could actually be used, ‘against us’,

Of course it’s a wonderful thing... everyone wants to be part of a community, whether that be a scholarly community or a local community or whatever... If you can appeal to someone’s community, appeal to strong emotional bonds, appeal to a sense of ‘motherhood and apple pie’ then you can get people to do things for you out of a sense of altruism to the community or whatever. That you wouldn’t necessarily be able to get them to do if you appealed to something else or if you didn’t appeal to anything, so there’s just flagging up the dark side of community discourses and there perhaps always is a dark side... the more strongly we cherish something the more easy it is to use it against us. (Ben C2p42-43)

4.3 INDIVIDUAL ACTION

Several participants felt it was encumbered upon them to build a sense of community, for themselves and for others, and they invested a great deal in doing so. Individual action was not always proactive; at times it was reactive. For example, Fiona, upon hearing a rumour that a profession was planning to withdraw from a teaching programme convened by her Centre, arranged a meeting for everyone involved to discuss the proposed change. When asked what this particular experience meant in relation to her sense of community, Fiona reflected on how it is when community doesn’t work,
I think when they felt that there was something they wanted to change, whoever they are, they shouldn’t have talked about it like that. They should have called a meeting with (Centre) and they should have said, ‘look how do we keep some of the experience and knowledge and you have and how can we meet to fulfil some of our needs that have come up new to the table, and how can we work together to make this work?’ But it wasn’t like that. It was completely showing no respect for the (Centre) team whatsoever. (Fiona C2p9 –10)

If you going to foster a good community spirit it can’t work like that. It’s not anything that is quick to solve I don’t think and maybe that doesn’t matter but it’s the journey of getting there together and I think if that could happen then it would be so much better than this. (Fiona C2p19-20)

This incident is explored further in Chapter Five.

4.4 TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL FRAMES

The temporal and spatial frames directly influenced the sense of community experienced by the participants. The impact depended, to a certain extent, upon the position of the individual participant. Susan was facing the end of her research contract,

I have nine full working weeks left, so I don’t feel part of the university in many ways because I’m not...I haven’t been taken on as someone who’s going to work here forever. (Susan C2p4)

During the all research encounters the university-wide administrative reorganisation (the ‘integration project’) affected the experience of community in a very tangible way. For example, the reorganisation created physical barriers to areas previously accessed by participants, dividing participants from colleagues with whom they had previously worked, ‘it’s like they barrier themselves off’ (Nicola C2p11).

It would be interesting to know actually, how the recent integration project has made people feel about their sense of community at Greystone because a lot of people have named it the disintegration project because it has fractured so many ways of working for so many people. (Susan FG1 32.25 – 32.44)

There was uncertainty about how the reorganisation project would affect the university community in the longer term. Edward, who had experienced an earlier reorganisation at Greystone, felt that location was very important,
The students, the sense of community for the student body and I know in our school some of the second year students are very worried about this... certainly one effect of the recent changes, the creation of these greats hubs which are effectively like call centres [the learning and teaching hubs]... instead of having a (school) secretary that the students used to go to see or a particular administrator that dealt with their marks and things like that, it’s all done very anonymously... geography can be very important. (Edward FG1 33.18 – 36.08)

The participants in the McAlpine, Hopwood et al research on ‘The Next Generation of Social Scientists’ (forty-one early career academics of whom thirty-two were doctoral students), ‘strongly valued’ the informal social/academic/thinking spaces that departments could create. These included weekly meetings, departmental away-days, community-building activities (parties and student conferences) and a ‘general culture of openness.’ McAlpine et al concluded that departments and research centres have a responsibility for both physical and intellectual spaces,

Spaces create belonging, community and status. They can also exclude and marginalise. Many highlighted the importance of a designated work/office space within departments as an important issue for students. It was seen as both a practical benefit and an acknowledgment of their existence. Several underscored the particular value of a dedicated and communal doctoral work-space, and the importance of 24-hour access. (McAlpine, Hopwood et al. 2009)

4.5 THEMATIC CONCLUSION FOR IDEA AND ELEMENTS OF COMMUNITY

What is it that gives ‘idea and elements of community’ its cultural capital and value in relation to the object, and how does it affect the participants’ habitus and position in the field? In the analytical framework, ‘idea and elements of community’ is strongly associated with ‘AGENCY: the idiosyncratic: the unique perspective of individuals’, incorporating ‘individual, perception, experience, identity and authenticity’. What factors help to determine their perspective?
Illustration 4: the analytical framework highlighting the theme, ‘idea and elements of community’

4.5.1 Incorporated cultural capital

As stated in Chapter One, incorporated cultural capital in academia in relation to community may exist for example, as a sense of belonging. The presence or absence of a sense of belonging may be determined by the agent’s habitus, which is to some extent formed of their disposition generated by the interplay between their idea and experience of community, their academic practice, their status (particularly in relation to the university) and their institution and environment. Indications of the disposition and habitus of the participants in this chapter are illustrated by the signifiers and expressions of cultural capital; they help to define and illustrate the meaning of ‘community’ as perceived by the participants, or agents. According to Bourdieu, ‘The habitus is necessity internalized and converted into a disposition that generates meaningful practices and meaning-giving perceptions.’ (Bourdieu 1984 p166)
The expressions and potential signifiers of incorporated cultural capital point to a strong individual motivation for building and sustaining community for a range of reasons and whatever the participants’ direct experience of community, good or bad. All the participants appear to desire, or need, a sense of community. Bourdieu states that legitimation of the social world is not,

> The product of deliberate and purposive action of propaganda or symbolic imposition; it results, rather, from the fact that agents apply to the objective structures of the social world structures of perception and appreciation which are issued out of the very structures and which tend to picture the world as evident. (Bourdieu 1989 p21)

The participants want to belong, to feel connected and attached. They want to be known, to feel at home and to be protected. They want to contribute, to nurture and collaborate. If they feel excluded, particularly from the community at Greystone, they feel resentful and they are puzzled when they perceive the institution as working against a sense of community. Their relationship with their institution in this context is complex; they appear to be fully aware of the institutional environment and of how it affects their experience of community which is not always positive. There are signs of struggle, particularly when the participants are facing change or the prospect of being excluded. They want certainty but would like to be less regulated and more supported in their aim to be more communal (this is explored further in Chapter Seven on ‘institution and environment’). At the same time they are acutely aware of a need to protect their immediate community e.g. their research group, from the effects of a competitive environment. They express a sense of responsibility towards their community and in turn expect loyalty from those they are protecting, that is, other members of their community. In ‘Distinction’, Bourdieu describes the organisation of the perception of the social world as the,

> Product of internalization of the division into social classes. Each class condition is defined, simultaneously, but its intrinsic properties and by the relational properties which it derives from its position in the system of class conditions, which is also a system of differences, differential positions, i.e., by everything which distinguishes it from what it is not and especially from everything it is opposed to; social identity is defined and asserted through difference. (Bourdieu 1984 p166-167)

These intrinsic and relational properties are, ‘inevitably inscribed within the dispositions of the habitus is the whole structure of the systems of conditions, as it presents itself in the experience of a life-condition occupying a particular position within that structure.’ (Bourdieu 1984 p167)
Intrinsic values associated with community as perceived by the participants are starting to emerge. Values about responsibility towards others, about nurturing and inclusion, about trust, about being valued and respected in turn, about protection and survival, and about getting voices heard and about cooperation. According to Watson, to be a full member of a university requires obligations, at the heart of which is the concept of membership. Watson, whose ‘Hippocratic Oath’ for higher education includes, ‘Sustain the community’, claims that there exist value domains which are special to higher education and that all the values he has observed in higher education are, ‘deeply communal.’ (Watson 2014p96 italics in original) Is this why some of the participants appeared to have some obligation towards their university or research community? Just how ‘collective’ is this phenomena and how is it surviving in the context of the corporatisation of the field? Position and disposition, and how they affect habitus, also appear to be important in relation to the idea and experience of community. Barnett asked, ‘Can we hope to realise a sense of community in academe today? If so, what form or forms might it take? And under what conditions might it be sustained?’ (Barnett 1994 p4) Wenger describes a ‘community of practice’ as, ‘neither a haven of togetherness nor an island of intimacy insulated from political and social relations’, meaning that conflict and tension or ‘disagreement, challenges and competition can all be forms of participation’ (Wenger 1998 p77). All the participants have, in some degree, been affected by events and tensions that affect their position and in turn, help to shape their idea and experience of community.

4.5.2 Objectified cultural capital

As stated in Chapter One, objectified cultural capital in academia in relation to community may exist as access to or ownership of laboratory facilities, and even a laboratory team (people as artefacts of objectified cultural capital) and membership of networks or access to communities that contribute to research and teaching. The presence or absence of objectified cultural capital such as access to laboratory facilities may be determined by the agent’s success or failure in securing research awards, which are used to fund research projects. There is no guarantee it will continue as research awards expire and new awards must be secured. Note that membership of a network is included as a type of objectified cultural capital in this context.

For some participants, their community is not necessarily centred on Greystone even when they acknowledge a desire to feel a part of the university community or at least to feel needed
by their institution. Those with active international research networks appear to view Greystone as essentially an operating base from which they service their network or their community. A strong international network may therefore be attributed as cultural capital in relation to community. It may work against any sense of institutional loyalty or it may not; a commitment to an international network does not necessarily mean a lesser commitment to the institution (differences between the participants’ experience of community and the notion of community as promulgated by the institution are explored in Chapter Seven). Those with good networks across Greystone itself may also have strong cultural capital in relation to community; it is just that their community is centred on, or at, the institution rather than on their networks beyond Greystone. Whilst community may be affected by physical proximity, it is not necessarily determined by it. It appears to be connections that help to reinforce the participant’s position and shape their sense of community. Proximity can however, be important for objectified cultural capital if it is in the form of, for example, a research laboratory and team for which the participant feels a responsible for, along with the grants required to sustain it. Or simply a desk for those who no longer have a position at the institution, which entitles them to an office. One participant, Rosa, did not have a desk but was able to extend her time at Greystone (albeit without any official status) because she had secured two successive grants (her former doctoral supervisor mentored her and permitted her to use a desk for one afternoon a week). Status is explored in Chapter Five.

Ben appeared not to possess any objectified cultural capital in this context. He described networks as more, ‘transient… fast moving and impersonal’ (Ben FG1 37.26 – 38.49) and did not appear to view his own networks as a significant elements of his community, although the community in which he feels, ‘most at home’ is at a conference where he feels a stronger affinity with people who share his theoretical approach (Ben C2p7-8) (see Chapter Six for an analysis of academic practice).

4.5.3 Institutionalised cultural capital

As stated in Chapter One, institutionalised cultural capital in academia in relation to community may exist as, for example, academic status and length of time at the institution. The presence or absence of particular forms of status are determined by the institution which not only provides employment but also bestows titles and awards on the individual which in turn affects their position the community. Length of association may be construed as cultural capital but it may not actually contribute to a sense of community, particularly if the individual
has had a long association but no security regarding their status e.g. they have been employed on fixed term contracts for several years. Length of association combined with position appears to create stronger cultural capital in this respect. Perspectives on community can be determined or helped by position in the hierarchy. For example, a senior position can help to create a sense of Greystone as a holistic university community, a community with which the individual can identify with. Such a position may also give the individual a greater understanding, or at least knowledge, of how the institutional perspective on community is created and managed, particularly if that individual is a member of university-wide committees and executives.

Having a ‘constituency’ by representing colleagues on certain groups, or to the school or department, can be a useful institutional mechanism that helps to give the individual a sense of being a part of the research and teaching community. Such a constituency, located inside the institution, may contribute greater institutionalised cultural capital than a constituency which, whilst seeing the individual as representing the institution, has no bearing on institutional position. Rosa, for example, has no institutional status but is viewed by her ‘constituency’ (communities outside Greystone) as representing the institution.

An historical association can also contribute to institutionalised cultural capital if an individual has, like Tessa, grown one’s department from scratch or, like Edward, was the first appointed lecturer in the school. It can create a greater sense of belonging, for example. However, such a long view is not necessarily an advantage at times of change and reorganisation. The founding charity chief executive, outgrown and no longer deemed useful by their organisation, is brought to mind. Institutions change over time as well as communities.

4.5.4 Idea and elements of community

Bourdieu describes the field of science as a field of ‘struggles’, and in doing so, he is breaking with the, ‘irenic image of the “scientific community” as described by scientific hagiography’ (Bourdieu 1991 p8). He is not denying the potential for unity but is recognizing that the scientific field is a field of forces, ‘whose structure is defined by the continuous distribution of specific capital possessed, at the given moment, by various agents or institutions operative in the field.’ (Bourdieu 1991 p6) Whilst the participants envisaged their idea of community in different ways, all their descriptions involved some sort of action on the part of individuals and the institution, which helped to bring community into being, or to enable individuals, and
indeed themselves, to feel a part of a community or some sort of grouping. These emerging features of the object (the idea and experience of community) in this first of four analytical chapters, indicates that the academic field is indeed characterised by efforts and travails that are complex and endemic, as discussed in Chapter One. Trowler emphasises the capability of the individual for autonomous reflection and decision-making and refers to people in universities, departments and work groups engaging in ‘clusters of practices in different locales where there are, ‘unique sets of recurrent behaviours and meanings about the world they are dealing with, ones that are particular to their location.’ (Trowler 2012 p32) He also states elsewhere that ‘teaching and learning regimes are, in effect, webs of meaning and of feeling, localized worlds created within a nexus of social structures by agents acting together in the world.’ (Trowler 2009 p194)

According to the participants, community is not always structured although there are structural elements involved, for example, contractual procedures that affect the formal status or membership of individuals and the physical environment controlled by the institution, which does or does not lend itself to communal behaviour. Community, according to the participants, is primarily performative and constantly changing, taking on different forms, an energy or force; it comes and goes. Community is not necessarily centred on the institution although for those who feel excluded, the institution is seen to be contributing to the process of exclusion, at an individual level and structurally. Community may be manifested as an international network or a particular group outside the institution or members of the public who are involved in research and teaching. According to Nespor, who conducted an ethnographic study of two university programmes in Physics and Management (and who is not over keen on the term ‘community’), a community is a network of power. People are, ‘defined, enrolled and mobilized along particular trajectories,’ as they move into these networks. A community is composed of, ‘extremely heterogeneous and dispersed elements linked together... fluid and contested definitions of identities and alliances that are simultaneously frameworks of power.’ (Nespor 1994 p9) The next chapter focuses on the theme of ‘status’.

**VIGNETTE: A SURPRISE MOVE FOR BRYAN**

Bryan needed the paper that he’d left in his office at Greystone. He took one more look through his briefcase, despite knowing full well that the paper was still on his desk. He could visualize exactly where he had left it, next to the bright yellow desk tidy his colleague, Wendy,
had given him for Christmas. Downloading the paper online was pointless – what Bryan really needed were the crucial, yet elusive, notes he had scribbled on a hard copy the day before his departure. He had been away for almost a month now, and was preparing for his third consecutive international keynote. It was no good. Barbara, his wife and veteran Greystone researcher, would just have to go in and retrieve it.

Following his call, Barbara made her way to the Social Science building. Standing in the corridor, she felt light headed and wheezy. She couldn’t decide what was making her feel sick. Perhaps it was the fumes from the emulsion. The breezeblock walls, it seemed, had been liberated from their bleak façade; a façade keenly unobserved by Barbara day in and day out for almost four decades, until now. How white they looked. How bright and clean. Equally, it could be the glue from the newly fitted plush blue carpet showered in tiny gold crest motifs. Soft underfoot and very unlike the brown rush matting that always so neatly soaked up the drips from spent umbrellas on rainy days.

Barbara planned to be quickly in and out but there seemed to be problem with the lock. As she stood there trying not to think about being sick, she tried the key again and then fumbled around in her bag, feeling flustered. She couldn’t believe it wasn’t the right key yet felt compelled to look for another. ‘Damn’, she said to herself, out loud. ‘He really has given me the wrong one’. She put her bag down and phoned Bryan. She’d no idea what time of day it might be at his end.

‘You do have the right key, don’t you?’ asked Bryan.

‘Yes,’ snapped Barbara

‘The one with the blue tab from my spare set’

‘Yes. It doesn’t work,’ said Barbara

‘Have you tried wriggling it?’

‘Yes, of course I’ve tried wriggling it.’

‘You need to push harder. It sticks sometimes.’
‘Bryan, I know how to open a door. The key doesn’t fit.’

‘Well, that’s ridiculous. How are we going to get the bloody paper? I can hardly come back from Brazil. Wait! Wendy will have a key. She’s always got spares.’

Hanging up, Barbara shuffled down the corridor, heading for Wendy’s office. She turned the corner and stopped. Her progress was halted by a clear glass wall painted with three towering white letters which she read out loud, ‘HUB.’

Inside there was a sign hanging from the ceiling, which read: ‘Learning & Teaching Hub: the key to your success.’

Walking through a roped off section which reminded her of the post office but without the queue – there was no-one else around – she reached a pristine counter, behind which sat a smart young girl who welcomed Barbara with a big smile,

‘Hi, how can I help you?’

‘I need to access Bryans’ office and he’s given me the wrong key. There’s a master key. Could I borrow it?’

The girl looked puzzled. ‘No office here. You can see we’re open plan… whose office?’

Barbara glanced back out into the corridor. ‘Out there… second door on the right?’

The girl shook her head.

‘Where’s Wendy? She’ll know what I’m talking about,’ said Barbara.

‘Sorry, there’s no one called Wendy working here.’

‘But I really need to get into Bryan’s office.’

Perplexed, the girl called a colleague over and asked her if she knew the whereabouts of a Wendy and also, an office belonging to someone called Bryan.

‘Ah yes,’ said the second woman. ‘Do you mean that rather quaint elderly gentleman who
used to pop in and chat with Wendy before she left? He did have an office here but that was cleared out a couple of weeks ago. It’s now the Hub storeroom. There were some old papers but I think they were put in one of the PGR cupboards.’

Barbara, feeling even more flustered and not quite knowing how to react, just wanted to get the paper and leave.

‘Is the PGR room still there?’ She was beginning to wonder.

‘Yes, of course.’

Barbara made her way out of the Hub, beyond what had been Bryan’s office, and stood outside the PGR room. To her frustration, she didn’t have the combination for the keypad.

Back at the Hub she was told that as she wasn’t a postgraduate researcher, she couldn’t have the number. Being the partner of an internationally renowned professor who supervises postgraduate researchers didn’t cut any ice.

No status. No access. No office. No paper.
INTRODUCTION

This Chapter explores the theme of status. As illustrated in the analytical framework, the theme encompasses three key features; position, career and contractual matters. The status of the participants and the length of their association with the institution affected how they viewed and experienced the university community. It also affected their relationship with their institution and with their research and teaching communities. Contractual or employment status was important but it did not always determine status in relation to the institution or to those outside the institution. The expressions and potential signifiers as described in this chapter illustrate how important it is for the participants to feel validated in their membership of the university or research community. Whatever form the validation takes, whether it is contractual (as a contract of employment at Greystone), hierarchical (as a senior university-wide position at Greystone) or a significant standing in international research networks, it does appear to affect the agent’s understanding of and relationship with their habitus (their institution) and the field. All the participants have had to, at some point, weigh options and make choices about their status at Greystone; choices that affect their sense of community. Bourdieu states that ‘the university field is, like any other field, the locus of a struggle to determine the conditions and the criteria of legitimate membership and legitimate hierarchy... to determine which properties are pertinent, effective and liable to function as capital so as to generate the specific profits guaranteed by the field.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p11)

Whilst the participants do not appear to be constantly calculating their next move, they do seem to be aware of this perpetual struggle that is a characteristic of the field. In this respect, they have internalised the structural conditions and at times have had to ‘fabricate’ themselves; that is, express themselves, ‘in relation to the performativity of the organisation.’ (Ball 2004 p151)

The topics are introduced and discussed, with quotations from the participants and a brief analysis. Three sections, immediately before the thematic conclusions, discuss aspects of the participants’ disposition, individual (re)action and the temporal and spatial frame.
5.1 TOPICS

5.1.1 Weighing the options (Jonathon, Edward, Fiona Nicola, Ben and Bryan)

The institutional narrative in recent years on the structure of academic staffing at Greystone, as set out in successive corporate plans, describes ‘two-strand’ (2007/8 – 2012) or ‘twin track’ (2012 – 2016) academic career pathways. These refer to the ATR (academic teaching research) and ATS (academic teaching scholarship) strands. A third strand, that of CRS (contract research staff), is also included (2007/8-2012). As at 2011-12, of the total 3,918 staff at Greystone, 603 were categorised as ATR and 340 as ATS (source: Greystone Human Resources). The activity of KT (knowledge transfer) and more latterly, public engagement and enterprise, is included in the ‘spectrum’ as something that is done by people in all three strands. The participants described a divisive culture centred on perceptions about the distinct types of employment contract, ATR and ATS,

It has resulted in some schools, more in some than others, the development of an unfortunate culture where the ATR staff tend to look upon the ATS staff as lesser colleagues because they’re not doing research. (Jonathon FG2 19.06 – 19.56)

Also hovering in these sort of employment conditions is ‘okay well you don’t do enough research we’ll put you on a ‘team S’ contract’ and it’s framed as a sort of punishment even though the terms and conditions are the same. So it gives you the message that teaching’s not as important, but of course in a brave new world it probably would become as important and with all the pressure on the research and the grant finding which is very difficult to do, I’m not surprised that some people think just well ‘sod that, this is fine. It’s an easier life, I know what I’m doing. It’s the way forward. (Nicola C2p9-10)

The most recent corporate plan cites the celebration and development of the ATS career pathway as a priority and the need for Greystone to publicise ATS achievements in, and accolades for, teaching, curriculum development, scholarship, synthesis and critique as well as enterprise and public engagement (2012 – 2016). Edward, who is about to retire, approved of this development and gave an example of a colleague whose teaching was thought to be, ‘absolutely brilliant’ but who had difficulty in securing promotion due to a deficiency in publications, ‘in the old days you could never get a promotion on teaching.’ (Edward C2p37 – 38)
Fiona, a senior lecturer and centre director with a long association with Greystone, is waiting to see what changes the pronouncement in the Corporate Plan will bring,

Is it just lip service? Is it just on paper or is it actually...or is it an aspiration but if it is a true aspiration where people will really feel that this is true but they don’t because at the moment they just chase everyone on...there are so many people on ATR that probably shouldn’t be on ATR, that is not going to be any good for REF now and that’s worrying people. (Fiona C2p18)

There were times when the participants needed to weigh the options when considering the type of contract they occupied at Greystone. Nicola, for example, who had by that time been appointed to the post of lecturer, decided to stick with her ATS contract despite having received an ESRC research grant. For Ben, (a contract researcher at the time) the need to choose between the option of building a research profile and the option of becoming a lecturer was also a matter of contractual permanence,

The permanence I seek is not necessarily habit or ritual... it is contractual and that’s to do with my life stage and those sorts of things, it’s not perhaps to do with research... I don’t think it’s a sense that I want to join a permanent community. It’s a sense that I just would like that personal sense of job stability, I guess reality bites, doesn’t it? (Ben C2p41-42)

According to McAlpine & Turner, ‘The interweaving of the personal and academic is a central characteristic of identity-trajectory... an important contribution to understanding career decision making.’ (McAlpine and Turner 2011 p546) In their longitudinal study they used a lens of identity-trajectory through which to examine imagined and emerging career patterns amongst doctoral students and research staff. They outlined the arenas, within which decisions and actions are imagined in relation to perceived possible futures – what the individual understands to be possible, interweaving agency and structure through,

a) opportunity structures – actual career possibilities (related to intra- and inter-organisational mobility extra-organisational support and happenstance); and b) horizons for action – options for ways forward conceived by the individual (related to subjective career). (McAlpine and Turner 2011 p538)

Overall, individuals moved from a rather naïve understanding of academic work (with their imagined futures representing a sort of wish fulfilment) to a grounded embodied experience of academic work... The intertwining of intention with increased work experience can be understood as exercising agency within an increasing awareness of structural constraints. (McAlpine and Turner 2011 p545)
There were also times when participants were faced with a choice about possible promotion. For example, Bryan, an emeritus professor who had occupied a number of senior roles at Greystone, chose not to take up the role of pro-vice chancellor when he had the opportunity to do so because he wanted to focus on his research, referred to some advice that he was given by a previous pro-vice chancellor,

(Pro-vice chancellor) gave me the piece of advice that really predicted my future, from about 1995 onwards. He said, ‘do your bit for the university,’ but he said ‘for God’s sake, give your main commitment to the development of your scholarship and your research, so... don’t not make a contribution to your organisation, but for God’s sake don’t get so bogged down into it that you get sucked into it and your scholarship and your research goes up the wall.’ And that was the single biggest bit of advice that influenced me, because when it then came to me being interviewed by (name), who was Deputy Vice Chancellor at the end of my term, and I’d made a decision, I was going on study leave. (Bryan C2p15)

Reflecting on this choice, Bryan acknowledged that despite being upset at being overlooked for the position at a later date, it was the right thing to do,

I was too arrogant to accept... well, I was very upset when I then subsequently got overlooked but I had made a decision to distance myself as a candidate for that kind of thing, ‘cause I knew that I’d never do any research or scholarship again, basically and although I enjoyed that side of it, particularly the politics and the micro-politics of it all. (Bryan C2p18)

Issues of contract and position affected the participants’ status, their place in the university community and their relationship with the institution. All the participants appeared to consciously reflect upon their status, the work they wanted to do (research and/or teaching) and all made choices at different times in their careers. Their experience mirrored Henkel’s findings whereby individuals, ‘depended heavily upon their own motivation, their appreciation of how systems worked and upon early and continued accumulation of social as well as intellectual capital’ (Henkel 2000 p180). Taylor says that an academic’s career path, the conditions of employment and opportunities for advancement, are derived from the relationship between academics and their institutions and in particular, academic and institutional values, priorities and practices. In referring to a ‘psychological contract’, he acknowledges the emotional investment in an, ‘expectation’ of what individuals may expect of their institution. (Taylor 1999)
Bourdieu describes the ‘homogenizing constraints of research administration’ and quotes senior faculty members who describe their ‘research’ as, ‘above all a work of direction, guiding people, finding funds, finding the right people... I don’t actually do the research myself, I help other people to do it.’ Bourdieu discusses the ‘contamination’ of scientific authority by statutory authority, which is ‘founded on the arbitration of the institution’. The work of accumulation and preservation of the social capital gained from senior positions (e.g. head of department) competes with the scientific work. (Bourdieu 1988 p54-55)

Bryan’s own story of his decision to focus on his research at the cost of being promoted to the position of pro-vice chancellor can be set against the narratives of many senior academics interviewed by Henkel; narratives, 

Informed by the myths of relatively free communities, in which individuals could follow the imperatives of intrinsic motivation, the logic of their own inquiry and the epistemological traditions, rules and practices of their disciplines. (Henkel 2000 p180-181)

According to Henkel, from the 1980s academics had to conform to a more rationalised, instrumental culture; everyone who wished to remain part of that culture had to conform. Bryan did remain part of Greystone but now, as an emeritus professor, he feels he is no longer at the heart of the institution.

Ben notes that it is now possible to be promoted for engagement,

Public engagement for example is now in at least one of the three things that you could be promoted on or are assessed against. I think those sorts of things are good. It gives a reason for it. I think it’s very important that I’d be committed to that. (Ben C2p27-28)

Burchell et al interviewed thirty biological scientists, most of who had considerable experience of ‘public dialogue’ and identified a ‘sea change’ in the professional scientific culture toward, ‘an endorsement of, and participation in, public engagement as a key component of scientific research and innovation.’ Public engagement skills were increasingly seen by scientists to be as important to a successful scientific career as scientific clinical and teaching skills. (Burchell, Franklin et al. 2009)
Nicola, Ben and Bryan all had to weigh the options at different times. Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital are denoted by terms such as, ‘aim is to get a lecturer post in the long term’ (Nicola); ‘very much seeking permanence’ ‘I want to join a permanent community’ (Ben); ‘decision to distance myself as a candidate for that kind of thing’ (position of pro-vice chancellor) (Bryan). No objectified cultural capital was identified in relation to weighing the options. In relation to institutionalised cultural capital, Nicola’s ten-year association with Greystone gave her a good understanding of the specific factors that affected her choice about her employment status. Ben also understood the implications of the decisions that he was taking; he knew the system. Bryan, who has a forty-two year association with Greystone, whilst appreciating the likely impact of his own decision not to pursue the position of pro-vice chancellor, was still upset at having been subsequently overlooked for promotion.

5.1.2 The relationship between contractual status and a sense of being under-valued and marginalised (Susan, Bryan, Rosa and Nicola)

The type of contract or role also affected how some of the participants viewed the university community. Susan, for example, as described in Chapter Three, in addition to feeling excluded because of her fixed term contractual status, also felt excluded because she did not consider herself to be an academic,

> It really challenged me, when you refer to the idea of the community that the university has because I don’t see myself as part of that at all. (Susan C1p2)

For 2011/12 at Greystone, 28.85 FTE ATR staff were on fixed term contracts (out of a total of 588.80 FTE ATR) and 49.99 FTE ATS staff were on fixed term contracts (out of a total of 281.37 FTE ATS). Of the Research & Analogous staff category (this would include research associates such as Susan), 236.67 FTE (out of a total of 298.82 FTE) were on a fixed term contract (source: Greystone Human Resources).

Being on a fixed term contract with its accompanying lack of permanence affected Susan’s experience of the university community, ‘It feels like a very transient existence’. (Susan FG1 16.21 – 17.50) As Susan contemplated the end of her contract she ‘struggled’ with relating to being a part of the Greystone community and was even resentful about the thought of the community carrying on without her,
I have nine full working weeks left, so I don’t feel part of the university in many ways because I haven’t been taken on as someone who’s going to work here forever ...it may well be that I find another research project to be engaged with and that would be fabulous but at the moment the chances of that look fairly slim. (Susan C2p4)

According to Reay, conditions are especially difficult for contract researchers,

Most women, and all contract researchers in the academy, inhabit a much more insubstantial academic habitus, one rooted in styles and distinctions that generate little cultural and symbolic capital – well at least for themselves. (Reay 2004)

This is echoed by Musselin who concludes that individuals recruited on a time-limited contract will less and less be considered as a not yet tenured academic but, ‘more as a labor force recruited to produce either research or teaching.’ (Musselin 2013 p30)

For staff not on fixed terms contracts, whatever their length of association, there is still the possibility of redundancy, as Bryan illustrates by citing a recent example of a course that Greystone had decided to close,

I think some of the people in that sector are absolutely stunned by the decision to abandon what they saw as a highly innovatory (course)... they were shocked and I was thinking to myself, yes but, I mean this is like young academic staff... well, they’re not young but most new academic staff see their job to be teaching courses. They’re preparing their teaching and then someone pulls the plug and their security and jobs are on the line. (Bryan C2p27)

Rosa had no formal status at Greystone and had already secured a fellowship at another institution. This did not lesson her feeling of being excluded at Greystone, which was due to her lack of formal status after completing her doctorate. For Rosa, it was important to have some form of official status,

It’s very crucial to have a kind of official status to do anything and then to know my work is contributing to the school, the body of knowledge... so I don’t know anything about what’s going on in the school or in the university, that’s why I just do it in my own way or just an encouragement by the (project), but if I can share or learn knowledge from the school or the university, I can do better, even though I don’t have any mentor but at least I know the strategy and I know what they are aiming. (Rosa C2p5)

After Rosa’s move to her research fellowship at the new institution she felt very different,
I feel I’m integrated and I’m fully recognised as staff... so whenever I attend conferences, I feel more comfortable and confident... and above all, I feel very proud... that’s the thing. I like to identify myself as a researcher at (institution). (Rosa C3p2)

Length of association, however, does not necessarily lead to a feeling of being included. Bryan, with the status of emeritus professor predicated upon his forty-two year association with Greystone, described the emeriti as feeling marginalised, ‘there is that feeling that from the standpoint of someone like me, and I think it’s a general feeling across the university, the emeriti feel very much marginalised, even though they’re very research active.’ (Bryan C2p26).

As noted in Chapter Three, Bryan was re-instated on a temporary contract as a professor for the purpose of the Research Excellence Framework in order that his research may be cited in an impact case study. Bryan’s diminished sense of belonging is actually heightened by this administrative act,

I don’t think it is the same as you want to belong. It’s about where you get your sense of value for your work from. Now, we’ve got a REF coming up, suddenly... ‘you’re entered for the REF... they’ll get you out of that cupboard they put you in.’ But the point is, that the academics are not the significant people, it’s the administrators and they’re under a line management system. (Bryan C2p21)

Bryan’s reflection on the importance of the status of the administrators as compared with the academics is in contrast with Henkel, who, in reflecting upon the ascendancy of administration in the university as a ‘corporate enterprise’ finds that administrators for the most part continued to see their role as supportive, rather than giving them direct power over the academics.’ (Henkel 1997 p140)

Both Susan and Nicola had worked in other professions before entering academia; in health and local authority settings respectively. Santoro and Snead, in their small study of academics who, ‘educate for the professions’ found that those who had previously worked in industry did not consider themselves to be academics, partly because their idea of a university that is bound up with a ‘Newman-like’ conception of what a university should be. Their participants did not see themselves as legitimate researchers and ‘real’ academics because they had narrowly conceptualized real research (Santoro and Snead 2012). Susan, whilst seeing herself as a researcher, did not consider herself to be an academic because she is not a lecturer. In terms of weighing the options, Nicola appears to have more successfully acquired an, ‘academic’ status’, perhaps because unlike Susan, she was involved in both teaching and research although, like Susan, she was not employed on a permanent contract.
satisfaction may be intrinsic to the job itself but job tenure and security can be a significant factor in whether or not the participant considers him/herself to be a member of the university community.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Susan, Bryan, Rosa and Nicola are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘regard myself as a researcher who is employed by the university’ (Susan); ‘now I’ve got more than enough interesting things to do’ (Bryan); ‘I feel integrated and I’m fully recognised as staff’, ‘feel more comfortable and confident’, ‘feel very proud’ (Rosa); and ‘great for creativeness’, ‘just do what I think might work and what seems to fit’ (Nicola). No objectified cultural capital was identified for contractual status. Institutionalised cultural capital may take the form of a permanent (as opposed to a fixed term) employment contract, or even a contract of any kind in Rosa’s situation. However, those participants who do have a permanent contract and certain status did not necessarily feel a sense of worth. Tessa, as described in Chapter Three, was aware of an underlying motive in Greystone’s invitation for her to give a talk to a group of alumni.

Length of association did not necessarily imply cultural capital of any form in terms of status. Bryan felt marginalised as an emeritus professor; feeling excluded like Susan but after a forty-two year association rather than, in Susan’s case, a short-term research contract.

5.1.3 Teaching on a voluntary basis to gain status (Ben and Nicola)

In Chapter Three it is noted that Ben, (a contract researcher who was later appointed as lecturer) was prepared to teach on a voluntary basis as a part of his strategy to acquire a permanent contract of employment, ‘it’s good for my CV’ (Ben C2p34). He had done this for two years as a doctoral student. Whilst acknowledging that the institution was putting into place mechanisms aimed at preventing the exploitation of doctoral students in this way, Ben also acknowledged that researchers needed to build up their teaching profile (Ben C2p33-34). Nicola, an associate tutor who was later appointed as a lecturer, did not teach on a voluntary basis and was comfortable with both teaching and research,

I love this sort of work, yes. Either research or teaching or both actually. So, the aim is to get a lecturer post in the long term. But I’ve got to get the publications up. (Nicola C1p8)

Through her ten year association with Greystone Nicola had moved from an undergraduate to a postgraduate, then on to an associate tutor and lecturer.
McAlpine and Turner, in their longitudinal narrative inquiry of social science doctoral students and research staff, concluded that overall, individuals moved from a rather naive understanding of academic work to a grounded embodied experience of academic work (McAlpine and Turner 2011). This is evident in both Ben and Nicola’s approach to their developing academic careers. They had the opportunity to get to know the culture of the institution, to observe the career pathways of colleagues. Both chose to apply for lecturer posts; Ben primarily because he wanted a sense of permanence (see Weighing the Options above) and Nicola partly because she wanted to avoid being caught up in research assessment (the Research Excellence Framework). Skelton, who explored how teacher identities are negotiated within a research-led institution in the UK, noted the ‘identity struggles’ of those who attempted to juggle their commitment to teaching with the realities of the research culture. Factors such as the Research Assessment Exercise (now the Research Excellence Framework) made an impact that reached, ‘far into the life of the individual and their emotions.’ (Skelton 2012)

Gale has found that teaching was overwhelmingly the primary role for early career academics in a post-1992 university (Gale 2012) but for different reasons. This is unlike Henkel, who concluded that young academics were primarily committed to their discipline (rather than specifically to their students) (Henkel 2000). Gale researched early career academics who had been appointed to the institution as ‘lecturers’; academics whose own previous experience of academia had been as a university students some time ago. Unlike Ben and Nicola, Gale’s participants had not reached their employment via a researcher role and did not have a PhD.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Ben and Nicola are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘feel that it’s good for my CV’, ‘I need to do it’ and ‘very much seeking permanence’ (Ben) and ‘I love this sort of work, either research or teaching or both’ (Nicola). No objectified cultural capital was identified in relation to teaching on a voluntary basis. Institutional cultural capital may be evident in the length of association that Ben, and in particular, Nicola, have with Greystone and with the higher education sector (Ben started his doctorate at another institution). Both Ben and Nicola were appointed as lecturers at Greystone by the end of the research encounter.
5.1.4 Status that brings responsibilities (Tessa and Tim)

For those participants with responsibilities for research teams and laboratories (especially Tessa, a professor and head of a research group and Tim, a senior lecturer), the most important factor that determines their status and consequently their career prospects, is research income,

Research will always be the carrot for promotion... it will always be the carrot for being head-hunted to another institution and it will always be the top institutions in the UK... those that are research led and research led teaching... if we wanted to become purely teaching then we could become a polytech... if research dies, Greystone dies with it. (Tessa C2p8)

It’s a tough business you know... you really have to look after yourself as well, because otherwise... you stop getting grants, you’re pretty much finished... ‘cause once you haven’t had a grant for a couple of years, you’re not going to get another one so if you don’t keep the research going... you have to be selfish in a way, just to prioritise your research, otherwise you won’t have a research career. (Tim C2p19)

Status that involves responsibilities brings rewards and risks. In assessing the individual-discipline-institution dynamic, Henkel refers to the increasing importance of subject-group reputation as a result of external pressures (e.g. the Research Assessment Exercise) and the department’s role in enhancing the institution’s reputation, including its research reputation. She concludes that even the most prestigious of disciplines could no longer take for granted their authority or even their security in the institution (Henkel 2000 p252). In the context of ‘research identities’ and status, Henkel describes a ‘fragile circle’ whereby public identity feeds into the sense of an individual professional identity and self-esteem; for ‘successful academics’ a fragile circle is created between reputation and self-esteem. For natural scientists in particular, their capacity to control their agendas was more dependent on funding possibilities (Henkel 2000 p188) as appears to be the case with Tessa and Tim who are clearly aware of the implications of their status as research leaders who generate income and oversee research facilities and teams. Whilst they may not see themselves as ‘dominants’ (a term used by Bourdieu), Tessa and Tim are rich in scientific capital. A manifestation of their power is that they are able to,

Consecrate certain objects by devoting their investment to them... through the very object of their investments, they tend to act upon the structure of the chances for profit and thereby upon the profits yielded by different investments. (Bourdieu 1991 p13)
Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Tessa and Tim are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘our research has to be top-notch’, ‘you need to be on top of your game’ (Tessa) and ‘probably the biggest responsibility’ (Tim). Objectified cultural capital may take the form of the teams, laboratories and research grants that Tessa and Tim are responsible for; their status is partly derived from objective capital. Institutionalised cultural capital may take the form of the formal institutional positions or titles that Tessa and Tim hold; Tessa is a head of department and Tim has four designated school roles including deputy head of theme, course director, director of enterprise. Tim is also a member of his school’s executive.

5.1.5 Status that brings a wider vision (Michael and Jonathon)

Michael, who rose relatively quickly to the position of pro-vice chancellor, gained a wider vision of the institution and of the community. Being a member of a university-wide group changed his perspective and brought him, ‘much more firmly into the university-level thinking on identity’ (Michael C1p5)

Jonathon, a senior lecturer, academic director, observes that promotion, which can sometimes be a ‘rapid transition’ in role and responsibility, that can take an academic away from the very activity and interest that helped to bring about their promotion,

Once you show a keen interest and once you show you’re good at something that’s not necessarily related to the teaching that you do, very rapidly you find yourself being given other roles that actually take you further from the teaching that you do to the point where sometimes the teaching disappears altogether. So the thing that actually sort of enthused you and made you a star in the organisation, in the school or whatever, you’re dragged from, sometimes willingly, sometimes hesitantly, sometimes kicking screaming, I’m sure, but colleagues suddenly find they have to make these transitions, because they’re often the only people in the organisation who can fulfil those roles. (Jonathon C2p14)

Status, defined as a hierarchical position, provides Michael and Jonathon with a different perspective on the institution and the academic community. Jonathon is possibly describing his own position at Greystone. Delanty states that the reality for most academics is that they have to perform many roles, ranging from teaching to research to administrative roles and entrepreneurialism. He says academic identities result from ‘creative engagement with institutional roles’. (Delanty 2008 p133) As the holder of a national award, Jonathon has been promoted to a directorship. A consequence is that he has less and less time for teaching
though he does not seem to be particularly troubled by this. Rolfe describes the ‘disintegration of academic practice’ whereby individuals are required to ‘unbundle’ their work into constituent parts. He says this ‘academic apartheid’ is facilitating and accelerating the, ‘demise of scholarship and the fully rounded academic’. (Rolfe 2013 p71) The theme of academic practice is explored further in Chapter Six. Jonathon may be described as one of Taylor’s ‘lone rangers’; as a ‘winner’ in the process of change, he has capabilities which were underutilized in earlier times and he is now a beneficiary of the changing institutional environment. (Taylor 1999 p48) Jonathon is actually benefitting from the march of what Krejsler terms as the ‘modernizing machine’; a university that, unlike the ‘democratic-Humboldtian machine’, is dominated by New Public Management, neo-liberal and Knowledge Economy discourses. For example, Krejsler describes the ‘Head of Department’ who ‘let his body and mind be partially territorialized’ by the modernizing machine, ‘not because he wanted to as such, but as a result of inner struggles that twisted him into the conviction that the coming of the modernizing machine was inevitable’. (Krejsler 2013 p1159)

Michael’s elevated position as pro-vice chancellor enabled him to have a more rounded view of Greystone and he perhaps experienced a different sort of transition to Jonathon although both appear to enjoy (or have enjoyed) their roles. In a small study involving participants from Russell Group universities, Schulz found that individuals were encouraged to contribute towards the objectives of the, ‘now visible and demanding’ university and that the relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity and satisfaction were dependent on the nature and level of the positions and the people’s perceptions of the situation. Professors, for example, have more experience and understanding of the university than other positions and are, therefore, more confident in their roles. (Schulz 2013) A respondent to Dowling-Hetherington’s study, a relatively junior faculty member, was quite ‘mindful’ of his place at faculty meetings and another noted that junior academic colleagues were inhibited from participating, having to build up the courage to ‘stand up’; participation was, ‘the privilege of those who had the status to contribute’. (Dowling-Hetherington 2013 p226 italics in original)

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Michael and Jonathon are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘on the margins of the faculty - not involved in the internal politics – nice position to be in’, ‘university-wide committees – gave you a different perspective’, ‘exciting and very positive’, ‘took on a much wider vision’ (Michael); ‘I’m seen as a safe pair of hands’, ‘I am good at managing colleagues, organising things, getting things done’, ‘all I am, just a coordinator’ (Jonathon). No objectified cultural capital was identified.
Institutionalised cultural capital is evident in the form of the hierarchical position achieved; dean (head of school) and then pro-vice chancellor, formerly regional director, member of committee of deans and university-wide committees (Michael); senior lecturer, academic director, acting in a university-wide role (Jonathon). Length of association with the institution may not be such a factor in terms of achieving a wider vision of the institution and the university community.

5.1.6 International research networks (Bryan and Tessa)

It is through his international research network that Bryan maintains status in his research community, ‘I am the Editor of the International Journal for (name)... I’ve become part of a very significant international network.’ (Bryan C1p4-5),

If you want to get international research, if you want to get into the sort of the big money, you need to collaborate with universities across international frontiers... things have changed here (Greystone) so that you don’t see that happening... exceptions... you’ve got a very vital research group there in (subject). Very strong, and part of the reason they’re strong is their international connections and international networking. (Bryan C1p13–14)

For Tessa, the international research network may be a route to promotion, ‘the carrot for being head-hunted.’ (Tessa C2p8) Membership or involvement with international research networks enhances status in terms of the participants’ research credentials, particularly outside the institution. It also appears to boost their sense of community.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Bryan are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘my community is international’, ‘I have a very strong sense of community and I travel the world in this community’, ‘locked into this bigger... movement which is very energizing’, ‘locked in to international discourses and networks’ (Bryan). Tessa and Bryan’s status within their international research network are identified as a signifier of objectified cultural capital. Bryan’s status as the chief editor of a major international journal is a signifier of institutionalised cultural capital.

5.2 DISPOSITION

Status and any changes to status or position, particularly in relation to their position at Greystone, appeared to significantly affect the participants’ disposition in some way. Their
circumstances led them to feel disqualified (Rosa, with no contractual status); dismissed (Susan, reaching the end of her contract); discarded (Bryan, by-passed for promotion and now emeritus); displaced (Fiona, by a change of management); and duty-bound (Tessa and Tim with responsibilities for grants, laboratories and teams, and Ben who taught voluntarily).

The most significant change to disposition during the research encounter was demonstrated after Rosa’s move from Greystone to another institution where she took up a prestigious early career research fellowship. She went from being, ‘treated like a student or even worse.’ (Rosa C2p3) to,

The most important change is now I’ve got a full status... I can identify myself... I belong to (institution)... when I work, or I go to conferences, the recognition that I’ve got is where I belong to... this is so crucial... I can identify myself... this is so important... stabilise and gives me security. (Rosa C3p17 – 18)

Having the project grants whilst at Greystone (Rosa won two grants which enabled her to deliver a two-staged project before taking up her fellowship at another institution) did not appear to improve Rosa’s disposition; having the resources and the recognition via the project grant and an individual award (with an individual citation read out at the graduation ceremony) was good for Rosa’s C.V. but did not appear to make her feel more positively disposed towards the Greystone community.

Fiona’s sense of resolve became more determined when faced with a change to her teaching programme. The situation referred to in Chapter Four (whereby Fiona had heard a rumour that a profession was planning to withdraw from a teaching programme convened by her Centre) affected Fiona’s team, and as the team leader, she put herself in their shoes,

We are very close team so I know how they feel, you see I walk this with them and I felt the same even though I’ve tried to help them to think differently, do you know what I felt the same as well so I can’t blame them ... I think what they felt was just the real explicit lack of respect from other people of what we do and because of that I think they thought, ‘you know fine we’ll change but you know we’ll never get the real pat on the back.’ I still think that probably we will. That’s why I am here and I will give it one more last go pretty much and I’m going to try hard and I’m going to try for a long time but I think that it can work. (Fiona C2p15)

In referring to ‘one more last go’ Fiona was alluding to the fact that she had considered resigning from Greystone during this incident,
That’s absolutely the first time. I’ve had my dips like everybody else but this was the only serious time where I thought I am going to leave this. I am not going to be here anymore because I do not believe in ethos of how people treat each other anymore. But then when I had written my resignation letter; kicked all my toys out of my pram, I, I picked them up again and decided that I am going to give it one more chance not necessarily for myself but for the team and for the students because I do think that we have spent and invested a lot of years into this. And changes always happen and that is good and I just felt like I am just going to try and see if we can you know turn it around to… maybe I just can’t see it. Maybe I over reacted inside myself and couldn’t see the world the way they saw it if you see what I mean. (Fiona C2p11)

5.3 INDIVIDUAL (RE)ACTION

In the context of the major administrative reorganisation at Greystone, it seemed that Fiona’s status as line manager had not been noted. Two members of her team received a telephone call from someone at the university that they had never met, telling them that he is their new line manager. Neither they nor Fiona (the centre director) had been previously notified of this change. Fiona viewed this as a, ‘typical example of not so good communication within a community’ (Fiona C2p21). On making enquiries (‘I said to the ladies ‘don’t worry about it. I will follow it up and ask the person who called.’ (Fiona C2p21)), Fiona discovered that the new line manager did not know who she (Fiona) was or that she had been line managing these staff members for many years. He asked if she would remain as line manager, including appraising them, with the proviso that the two staff members had links with the new line manager from an administrative perspective,

I had to fight a little bit to be line manager for these to two. Because they said that, ‘well an academic shouldn’t’... it was almost like ‘you shouldn’t have to work with admin staff. You should only need to line manage research.’ You think what is that all about? I’m line managing my team. (Fiona C2p23)

This incident informed Fiona’s reflection on the different roles at Greystone and the affect that perceptions and attitudes about status can have upon individuals,

They really feel a sense of them and us and they feel that they are just administrator which is really, really important part of the university. It’s different but it’s really important. It’s important for the students’ experience. It’s important for the academics. It’s a clockwork isn’t it and all the cogs needs to work but at the moment I think well not, not necessarily at the moment because I think that’s always been the case but, but I don’t think that goes with a PA who works closely with a professor. (Fiona C2p23)
As noted in Chapter Four, Fiona encouraged her administrative staff to participate as fully as possible in the team.

5.4 TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL FRAMES

The temporal frame as it relates to status influenced the sense of community experienced by the participants in two respects; firstly, transitions and secondly, length of association with the institution.

The transition from one type of employment contract or status to another, or from one research grant to the next, affected the experience of community but it was not always about joining a permanent community; it was about what role the individual would have in the community and how that role would be affected by other factors. Nicola and Ben were continuing their career pathways at Greystone and making choices about what type of role to apply for (ATR or ATS); choices that were made in the context of expectations about the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework and how it would affect the different roles. But status wasn’t always about joining a permanent community, as illustrated by Ben’s intention to simply get permanent employment, ‘It’s the longer term contractual permanence I want.’ (Ben C2p41-42)

Whilst Susan had successfully made the transition from being a doctoral student, (she had ‘struggled initially to feel a part of the academic community... make the mental shift from being a PhD student’ (Susan FG1p4)), she was constantly looking to the next research grant that would secure her future employment at Greystone as a contract researcher. Always being a researcher on a fixed term contract did affect Susan’s experience of the university community; ‘as a fixed term contract researcher at Greystone, I actually struggle to feel part of the community at Greystone. I don’t have a true sense of belonging...it feels like a very transient existence... I’m just there to do one piece of research and then move along.’ (Susan FG1p1)

Length of association appeared to provide all the participants, whatever their status, with an experiential knowledge of the different shifts, cycles and trends in university management and funding which gave them a certain perspective on the prospects of various roles they currently or planned to occupy. Any assumption about how the length of association may lead to a stronger sense of belonging is challenged by the experience of those participants who, despite
a long association with Greystone, nevertheless felt marginalised and undervalued. Bryan, with his forty-two year association and the achievement of a relatively high status (dean of his school) still felt undervalued. The question is, would Bryan have felt just as marginalised as a former pro-vice chancellor rather than as a former dean?

Bourdieu acknowledged the relationship between time and power, especially in academia,

In all the situations where power is hardly or not at all institutionalized, the establishment of durable relations of authority and dependency is based on waiting, that is, the self expectation of a future goal, which lastingly modifies – that is, for the whole period that the expectation lasts – the behaviour of the person who counts on the thing expected; and it is based also on the art of making someone wait, in the dual sense of stimulating, encouraging or maintaining, hope, through promises or skill in not disappointing, denying or discouraging expectations, at the same time as through an ability to inhibit and restrain impatience, to get people to put up with and accept the delay, the continuing frustration of hopes, of anticipated satisfactions intrinsically suggested behind the promises or encouraging words of the guarantor, but indefinitely postponed, deferred, suspended. Academic power thus consists in the capacity to influence on the one hand expectations – themselves based partly on a disposition to play the game and on investment in the game, and partly on the objective indeterminacy of the game – on the other hand objective probabilities – notably by limiting the world of possible competitors. (Bourdieu 1988 p89)

Waiting, according to Bourdieu, implies submission, ‘The all-powerful is he who does not wait but who makes others wait.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p228)

Edward (a participant with a long association with Greystone who was about to retire) was the only participant who appeared not to have been particularly affected by issues around status although he did acknowledge his own status as determined by the longevity of his association with the university. For example, during a focus group discussion in response to a statement about his role in building his school community, he reflected on his role in appointing many of his colleagues,

That certainly struck me once when I was looking around at some rather boring moment in the school a meeting when I would go around the table mentally and estimated from what I could remember that I’d been on the selection committee of probably over half the people there. (Edward FG1 27.27 – 29.29)
5.5 THEMATIC CONCLUSION FOR STATUS

What is it that gives cultural capital its value in relation to status, and how does it affect the participants’ habitus and position? In the analytical framework, ‘status’ traverses AGENCY and HABITUS, as it embraces institutional and individual actions. What is the relationship between ‘status’ and community? How does ‘status’ affect community?

Illustration 5: the analytical framework highlighting the theme, ‘status’

5.5.1 Incorporated cultural capital

A central ‘empirical thesis’ of Watson’s publication on morale in university life is that working in higher education is at the same time hugely frustrating and immensely satisfying. He says that it may be one of these things almost all of the time for some staff members and others may flip between the two states at alarming rates (Watson 2009 p50-51). Conditions of employment and status significantly affect the idea and experience of community for the participants. Like Watson, Taylor finds that whilst academics are relatively content with their
work, there are, ‘considerably lower levels of satisfaction with their relationship with their conditions of employment and the management practices associated with these conditions’ (Taylor 1999 p97). A narrative of ‘job insecurity’ amongst Finnish academics highlights an academic identity that is precarious and fragile, anxious about the future. (Ylijoki and Ursin 2013 p1142) And all Skelton’s participants when invited to talk about their professional lives were very positive about ‘why’ they wanted to work in academia. Skelton noted, ‘a clear sense of people working towards their values and finding spaces for their realisation in practice.’ (Skelton 2012)

Whilst the analysis of the theme, ‘idea and elements of community’, as set out in Chapter Four, revealed a number of issues for the participants as individuals, the incorporated cultural capital that was identified included responsibility towards others and a strong motivation for building and sustaining an inclusive community. The analysis of the ‘status’ theme revealed issues more strongly associated with the position of the participants as individuals, as agents who are dealing with conditions that significantly affect their sense of purpose and self-worth, depending on whether or not they considered themselves to be recognised as valid members of the university community. Bourdieu, in writing about, ‘Site Effects’, describes social agents as being constituted in, and in a relationship to, a social space or field,

As physical space is defined by the mutual exteriority of its parts, so social space is defined by the mutual exclusion (or distinction) of the positions that constitute it, that is, as a juxtapositional structure of social positions. (Bourdieu, Accardo et al. 1993 p124)

As suggested by the discussion under ‘Disposition’ above, and indeed, throughout this Chapter, the participants appear to have internalised the prominence attached to status in the university community, as assigned by the organisation. Perhaps, as Lucas states, it is not always a process of ‘cynical calculation’ to gain maximum social profit but more of an unconscious following of the ‘natural bent’ of the habitus. Lucas agrees with Bourdieu, that, ‘The struggle to augment one’s social being... is a struggle for symbolic life and death.’ (Lucas 2004 p38)

Membership of the university community, and how that membership may or may not be exercised, is affected by status. Whether or not one has a permanent employment contract, or any contract at all, has significant consequences for the individual’s position and disposition. Issues of status can generate strong emotions and also, a sense of disempowerment if status is
impeded in some way. Whilst the participants are strongly motivated to feel that they are an integral and recognised part of a community, whether that community is at Greystone or elsewhere, the need to be a recognised part of the community at Greystone is palpable. Bryan, for example, finds compensation for the lack of recognition at Greystone for his status, in his international networks and his role as chief editor of an international journal but that does not appear to lesson his sense of being marginalised.

Whilst not all the participants appear to be striving for status at Greystone, there may be emergent signs of what Bourdieu terms as symbolic violence in this context. The notion of symbolic violence relates to ways in which the conditions of habitus has been imbued by the agents (the participants in this research) to the extent that they may be viewed as complicit in their actions and disposition in the reproduction of those conditions;

The imperceptible incorporations of structures of the social order... takes place through the displacements and body movements organised by theses social structures turned into spatial structures and thereby naturalized. (Bourdieu, Accardo et al. 1993 p126)

For example, Ben was prepared to teach on a voluntary basis as a part of his strategy to acquire a permanent contract of employment. Issues of symbolic violence are further discussed in Chapter Seven.

5.5.2 Objectified cultural capital

Manifestations of objectified cultural capital in relation to status and community, described in this chapter as signifiers, include an acknowledged status within a strong international research network related to the participants’ academic discipline and status within Greystone as the leader of a research team or department. Bryan’s status as a recognised leader in his international research network is a signifier of objectified cultural capital in this respect.

Hughes and Bennett researched the experiences of research-intensive academics in relation to Australia’s Excellence in Research Framework and concluded that survival as an academic researcher in Australia might now necessitate, ‘a thick skin, an entrepreneurial mindset and the adoption of multiple selves.’ (Hughes and Bennett 2013) The enterprising strategies adopted by Tessa and Tim, for example, aimed at maintaining their position as leaders in the
research community is evidence of an entrepreneurial mindset, which they have developed in order to gain and maintain their objectified cultural capital.

5.5.3 Institutionalised cultural capital

The presence or absence of particular forms of status are determined by the institution which not only provides employment but also bestows titles and awards on the individual which in turn affects their position the community. According to Evans, promotions criteria for scientists in universities often favour those who can show that they have obtained large grants,

So scientists are increasingly likely to win promotion only if they can bring in the money, and the chances of doing that are likely to be increased by a willingness to do the kinds of work currently favoured by the research councils or to ‘make terms’ with prospective funders in industry. (Evans 2002)

Length of association is described in Chapter Four as possible cultural capital but it may not actually contribute to a sense of community, particularly if the individual has had a long association but no security regarding their status. In terms of status, length of association with Greystone could have positive or negative connotations. The transition from researcher to lecturer for both Nicola and Ben, for example, was eased by their familiarity with the environment. Whilst Nicola was from a different professional background (she started her working life in local government) she had had a long enough association with Greystone (ten years) which meant that she did not have to deal with the type of difficulties identified by Gourlay in her study of new academics in transition; Gourlay found that lecturers who entered academia from established careers were faced with a range of challenges including the potential loss of perceived status and confidence and a, ‘sense of invisibility within an unfamiliar and possibly isolating set of practices and emotional landscape’, proved too much for some (Gourlay 2011 p592). This is not to say that Nicola and Ben did not experience these things but that they knew what to expect. Their length of association with Greystone gave them experiential knowledge of cycles and trends that affect status including how the institution itself manages the different forms of status. There is then the question of to what extent the actions of those in a position such as Ben may be the result of symbolic violence, as identified above.
As noted above, however, length of association does not always provide cultural capital in relation to status and community. Bryan and Susan both felt marginalised despite a long association with Greystone; Bryan, despite his status within the international research community and as chief editor of an international journal. It is actually through his international research network that Bryan gains his strongest sense of community, and his sense of worth, not through his association with Greystone.

Also, a positive reputation within the institution or the research community brought about by status may contribute to institutionalised cultural capital but it does not appear to count towards a sense of community. Tessa may have a strong hierarchical status (she is a departmental leader) but she does not have a strong sense of community in relation to Greystone as an institution. A number of the participants occupied different formal positions within the Greystone hierarchy at different times. It was noted in Chapter Four that a higher hierarchical position helped to create a sense of Greystone as a holistic university community, a community with which the individual can identify with. This appears to be particularly significant for those who occupy positions with a university-wide remit. As described above, Michael and Jonathon in their university-wide roles have a stronger sense of the university as a community.

5.5.4 Status

Chapter One refers to Bourdieu’s description of struggles in the scientific field that are socially ‘overdetermined’ at least in their effects, dependent on the volume of capital possessed and the differential positions within the structure. Agents (individuals) employ strategies that are influenced by position and disposition and by their relationship with structural factors such as status. In presenting the theoretical principles behind Distinction (his study of taste in French Society) Bourdieu refers to ‘symbolic struggles’, meaning both the individual struggles of everyday life and the collective organised struggles of political life, which have a specific logic which, ‘endows them with a real autonomy from the structures in which they are rooted.’ He says that symbolic capital is,

Nothing other than economic or cultural capital when it is known and recognised, when it is known through the categories of perception that it imposes, symbolic relations of power tend to reproduce and to reinforce the power relations that constitute the structure of the social space. (Bourdieu 1989 p21)
Bourdieu acknowledges that the sacrifice of time implied by participation in institutional ‘rituals, ceremonies, meetings and displays’ is a necessary condition for the accumulation of symbolic capital known as a reputation for ‘academic worthiness’, and that the logic of the accumulation of power, ‘takes the form of a viciously circular mechanism of obligations which breed obligations, of a progressive accumulation of power which attract solicitations that generate more power.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p97) In this context the ‘Matthew principle’ may help to explain how those participants with a strong reputation and networks manage to reinforce their position and standing in relation to their institution and their scholarly community. (The Matthew principle has for many years informed the funding of research in higher education, based on the principle that more resources should be given to those who are already successful (Trowler 1998 p166)). The principle, invoked by Merton and cited by Becher and Trowler in their exploration of academic ‘tribes and territories’ (‘To those that have shall be given, and from those that have not shall be taken even that which they have’) (Becher and Trowler 2001 p81) creates an effect whereby the success breeds success. Merton himself states,

> Taken out of its spiritual context and placed in a wholly secular context, the Matthew doctrine would seem to hold that the posited process must result in a boundlessly growing inequality of wealth, however wealth is construed in any sphere of human activity. (Merton 1996 p321)

On the accumulation of advantage and disadvantage, Merton describes the benefits of being located at, ‘strategic nodes in the networks of scientific communication that provide ready access to information at the frontiers of research.’ (Merton 1996 p326)

As the participants struggle for the possession of cultural capital in terms of their status they are, at one level, helping to perpetuate the structural influences that shape their academic community. They are acting as Bourdieu’s ‘oblates’ who are always most inclined to think that,

> Without the church there is no salvation – especially when they become the high priests of an institution of cultural reproduction which, in consecrating them, consecrates their active and above all passive ignorance of any other cultural world. (Bourdieu 1988 p100)

In considering ‘aspects of community life’, Becher examines ways in which academics as individuals seek to earn their professional reputation not only through publications but also
through promoting themselves. As he says, one of the striking features of academic life is that nearly everything is graded in more or less subtle ways (Becher 1989). Prestige is attached to specific subjects, theorists are recognised more than experimentalists for their research. However, he found that the orders of priority were susceptible to conflicting criteria and subject to intellectual fashion. Becher explores the relationship between Institutional and personal prestige, describing it as reciprocal. He refers to the effect of the constant exercise of discriminative judgment, which creates elites and marks down those who are not the front-runners.

In considering the role of ‘prestige’ in the motivation of individual academics, Blackmore and Kandiko conclude that the academics themselves are constantly negotiating their roles and positions related to their intellectual work, their academic community and the structures of the department and university. They argue the case for incentives that allow for the possibility that academic motivations are about, ‘intellectual positioning rather than financial gain.’ (Blackmore and Kandiko 2011 p408) According to Musselin, status and discipline are no longer the only distinctive features organizing the academic profession; the processes of increased competition amongst academics is favoured by the introduction of individual assessment and the valorisation of individual performance within universities. (Musselin 2013 p32) Whatever the conditions, ‘objective relations of power tend to reproduce themselves in relations of symbolic power.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p21)

Nikunen, in her study of Finnish academics on short fixed-term contracts, concludes that managerialism seems to create new ways to govern oneself in the ‘entrepreneurial university’, whereby academics on fixed-term contracts see themselves as, ‘independent, autonomous entrepreneurs who make decisions about where and when they work’. Being like an entrepreneur is translated into the language of ‘academic freedom’. (Nikunen 2014 p131) How autonomous are they and how autonomous are the participants in this research? Howard Kirk, as Bradbury’s History Man, perceived the University of Watermouth as a place that he could ‘work against’ and yet was described by one of his students as a man who, ‘thinks he’s free. He talks about liberation, openness all the time. And what is he? An institutional man.’ (Bradbury 1975 p49 & p149) Fitzmaurice concludes that as early-career academics pursue their identity projects, they are critically influenced by the institution and their international peers in the discipline. However, values, virtues and beliefs are also important in identity construction and, ‘a professional life is not without its difficulties, and
there is a need for a dialogue about the academic role where the focus is on values and practice not regulations and output.’ (Fitzmaurice 2011 p621)

The next chapter focuses on the theme of ‘academic practice’ and helps to move the analysis on from considerations of position to considerations of values.

**VIGNETTE: JONATHON INTRODUCES RUTH TO COFFEE ‘AL FRESCO’**

It had been a trying few days for Ruth, a newly arrived lecturer at Greystone. She felt disconnected, almost cut off, despite having received a thorough induction from the administrators in the local support office and a five-page checklist of departmental directives, which seemed to cover every conceivable aspect of campus life. And that was only a part of it. After a campus orientation tour and yet more briefings on this, that and the other, Ruth was finally issued with a gleaming campus card. Now a fully signed-up member of the university, she had access to the hallowed ground that was the staff car park, just as long as she made it to work by nine every morning – before all the spaces had gone. Reeling after this most thorough initiation, Ruth still felt somehow lonely. She was dying to meet her teaching colleagues and wanted to get on with the teaching. She was also by now quite frankly desperate for a conversation about something more stimulating than first aid kits and fire drills.

The design of the arts building where Ruth had her office seemed to make things worse. When she first saw the rows of closed heavy oak doors along both sides of the narrow and dingy breeze block corridor, it crossed her mind that the place could easily be mistaken for a monastery, or a prison. She even asked herself,

‘Who occupies these cells, saints or sinners?’

For Ruth it felt like a more like prison. Confined to her cramped office behind one of those doors with barely enough room for a single desk, she found herself wondering where everyone was and how she could meet them.

Just that morning as Ruth was unlocking her office she heard a door open at the other end of the corridor. She turned quickly, ready to give a smile and at least wave good morning but to her disappointment, no one materialised and the door closed almost instantly.
Not to worry, she thought. This morning’s meeting will change all that. Ruth had received an invitation by email from her new academic director, Jonathon to a ‘scheduled conversation’ about the course she would be teaching. After locating his door, she knocked gingerly and heard a gentle voice,

‘Do enter’.

On the other side Ruth found Jonathon sitting in a comfortable room with a desk, a meeting table with four chairs and a large window, which overlooked the walkway, a long concrete pathway that zigzagged through the centre of the campus.

Across the room Jonathon was smiling.

‘Hi Ruth, welcome to Greystone. Glad you managed to locate my room. I know it isn’t easy for the uninitiated. I hope you’re settling in OK.’

Thinking but not dare saying, ‘I’d hardly describe myself as that’, Ruth enthusiastically greeted Jonathon and blurted out how keen she was to meet the team.

'It will be nice to finally meet everyone,' she repeated.

‘Ah yes’, he replied, and looking at this watch he added, ‘but it’s not quite time… coffee?’

Reaching up to a compact coffee maker tucked neatly on top of his filing cabinet, Jonathon asked,

‘What will it be, Cappuccino, Latte or Americano?’

Ruth imagined she might be in Costa, a brand seen on almost every campus. Not wanting to give the impression that having a barista for a boss was anything out of ordinary, she opted for her usual – an Americano. Jonathon happily obliged and poured it into a paper cup.

‘You’ll need a lid when we go out.’ He said. ‘I have some here.’

‘Go where?’

‘Onto the walkway... to meet the team. We’ve just a minute and then we’d better go down.’
‘On the walkway? I thought we might be meeting them in the staff room. You know, at coffee time.’

‘Oh we don’t have a staff room any more. And coffee time was stopped last year as part of the ‘Use or Lose’ Campaign. The school office did an audit. Something about the number of ideas for successful research grant applications and stuff like that, and then declared we didn’t need coffee time. In my opinion, use or lose doesn’t come into it. We were using it. I don’t think they realised just how much business is done over coffee. So we’ve had to find an alternative way to meet.’

‘What happens now then?’ asked Ruth.

‘We make our own coffee and meet on the walkway between 10 and 10.30 every day. It’s a bit random as you can often get what feels like the whole university wandering up and down. It gets really crowded out there. They must’ve shut down coffee time in all the schools. At least when we had it in 0.23 you knew who you’d be seeing.’ He paused. ‘Didn’t they cover this in your induction?’

‘I thought they covered pretty much everything. Seems not.’

Jonathon handed her a lid.

A moment later, he led Ruth down to the walkway. She wondered what exactly was going to happen. They stood in the walkway at the school entrance and waited. At first, there was hardly anyone around. Gradually people began to emerge from the various school entrances. Most were holding coffee cups, along with notebooks and IPads. Some were holding up sheets of paper with names written on them as if they were meeting someone at an airport.

After three for four minutes, people were milling around along the whole length of the walkway, in eager conversation. It gave Ruth the impression of exercise time in a prison yard.

With a shout of ‘Follow me!’ Jonathon started moving towards the top end of the walkway.

So, thought Ruth, this is how we meet the team.
Chapter 6

THEMATIC ANALYSIS: ACADEMIC PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

This Chapter explores the theme of academic practice. As illustrated in the analytical framework, the theme encompasses discipline, research and teaching as they relate to the idea and experience of community. The analysis and discussion in this chapter explores the idea and experience of community as translated through the practice of the participants. In conceptualising disciplines from a ‘social practice’ perspective, Trowler describes people as, ‘carriers of practice: they enact in specific ways a reservoir of ways of behaving, understanding and responding in ways which are to a certain extent particular to them in a social field.’ (Trowler 2012 p32) The participants carry, or conduct their practice in ways that strongly demonstrated their intrinsic values, mobilised through high levels of incorporated cultural capital. That capital helps to determine their position in the field, as Bourdieu states,

Each field imposes a tacit entrance fee: “Let no one enter here who is not a geometrician,” that is, no one should enter who is not ready to die for a theorem. (Bourdieu 2000 p78)

Practice is centred on a vocation and on practicing a profession. Bourdieu also says,

Agents well-adjusted to the game are possessed by the game and doubtless all the more so the better they master it. (Bourdieu 2000 p79)

In examining professional identity amongst academics and administrators, Kolsaker observes that ‘As a group, the academic community clearly displays the characteristics of a profession, though, naturally, many academics have concurrent external professional affiliations.’ (Kolsaker 2014 p132) Some of the participants are committed to, for example, co-creation, giving a voice to others and investing in building and sustaining their own academic community, sometimes through their networks beyond the university and sometimes in conflict with the university management. Nixon states that values, ‘saturate’ practice, ‘without values practice becomes meaningless, devoid of agency and direction; and without practice, values lack legitimacy and moral grounding.’ (Nixon 2008). Whilst the drive to create and sustain community is strong (as established in Chapter Four), the participants also
recognise and acknowledge the factors that serve to constrain their ability to practice as authentically as they would wish.

The chapter covers topics that connect community, values and practice, through research method, engagement with communities, teaching and investment in the existence of the academic community itself. Temporal and spatial dimensions are then considered, followed by individual action and dispositions. The conclusion reflects on aspects of community as cultural capital and on the notion of ‘community of practice’ in this context.

6.1 TOPICS

6.1.1 Community and participatory principles in research (Rosa, Ben, Nicola and Bryan)

A number of participants are committed to the idea of participation in their academic practice, although what they mean by ‘participation’ or ‘participatory’ can differ. Rosa, who considers her subject to be, ‘deeply connected to the community’ (Rosa C2p10), wants to ensure the voices of her research participants who are older people are, ‘heard and understood and valued’ (Rosa C2p6-7). Ben talks of ‘co-creation’ and of research where the academic is, ‘linking up and bridging and helping that pre-existing community of interest. Helping them reflect on things...less parasitical’ (Ben, C1p16). Both Ben and Rosa connect the concept and practice of participation with how they perceive the role of community and communities in research,

Community isn’t something that happens after the research. It’s not something that you do the research, and you’re invasive, and you take out what you need and then you go. (Ben C1p15)

Rosa and Ben also reflect on the role of researchers and the relationship between researchers and the communities that they research,

Whenever you do public engagement or work with the community, I think the status should be very equal, otherwise I think it might intimidate people in the community, especially people who are vulnerable... because, you just do the research for your own sake and just use them. I think they feel they are just used... I think equality and respect is very important. (Rosa C2p11)

We research the community. It happens, they have a community that does stuff and we look at what they do in their communities... we’re part of that community. Ok we
play a different role...we shouldn’t isolate ourselves from it and we should extend that and should see ourselves as a part of a kind of extended researcher practitioner, kind of community. (Ben C1p2)

Ben wants to be seen as a contributor by the wider research community and to have his contribution valued,

I’d like them to see us as is kind of critical friends/assistants, someone whose there that will give them the time and the space to think about what it is they’re doing, the challenges they’ve faced, how they might go forward as individuals and then by bringing together their different reflections hopefully at least allow them to reflect more broadly on what it is they’re doing, how they’re doing it etc. That would be the ideal. I think all too often it’s probably a sense of it’s a bit of a hassle. And I worry about, that’s what I worry about I guess...if they saw it as useful, then they wouldn’t see it as a waste of time and that wouldn’t be a problem. And with some people, they’re doing it as volunteers and so with a bit of luck they’ll be enthusiastic about it and happy to share it. So, hopefully they will see me in that sense as a kind of fellow enthusiast but who approaches it differently. (Ben C1p7-8 & 8-9)

Rosa acknowledges the personal benefit that she gleans from this aspect of her academic practice, which is heightened in the context of her lack of formal status at Greystone,

I was very conscious that I need belonging and I want to contribute and I want to get the most out of that good environment... I was also very aware about volunteering and to strengthen or rebuild the community because of my research... without research probably I never thought to think about what community meant... probably unconsciously, I was benefiting. (Rosa C3p10)

Rosa, Ben, Nicola and Bryan all appear to conclude that participation of some sort makes for better practice though the extent to which they are in a position to do participation as they would wish, also differs. Participation in this context is similar to the definition that Wenger employs in his treatise on communities of practice whereby participation is, ‘a more encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities.’ (Wenger 1998 p4 italics in original)

Nicola believes that the way in which research funding is structured works against participatory action research approaches, which require a, ‘degree of negotiation and compromise on the research question’,

You apply for funding with a very concrete proposal, that’s all laid out time wise and funding, you’ve got to cross the Ts and dot the Is and it’s really hard to do a proper action research model in that framework... I’m saying this in relation to community as I
would see, as a way of involving participants in whatever community you’re researching, in helping direct the research. (Nicola C2p3-4)

The opportunity to practice action research authentically presents a particular challenge for Ben,

I’ve always understood action research to be a much more about achieving particular aims, it’s about going into communities and saying ‘what is it…the issues you want to overcome now, and how can we work together to do that?’ So they become co-researchers not participants. And it’s like, ‘well actually our big problem at the moment is, you know, getting planning permission for a community playground or whatever,’ and so you then work with them as academics to... how would you do that and, you know, and in that process you learn about how they work and so that you... and at the same time you’ll help them fulfil their aims. (Ben C2p23)

The reality for Ben is somewhat different,

The two PIs already have an agenda and their agenda doesn’t involve action research, necessarily, or not so strongly or maybe you can bet your bottom dollar it’ll be badged as action research at some point but I don’t think its authentically... not in the way I would understand action research. (Ben C2p21)

Ben refers to the impact agenda and the Research Excellence Framework (REF), which he appears to view as working against the realisation of authentic action research or co-production,

I would very much hope the research we do comes out with findings that are useful in some way to that particular group. But if I’m brutally honest, I mean it comes back to this kind of thing, I don’t necessarily think that this research is as co-productive as it might be, I don’t necessarily think its action research for example... I think that the research agenda, the REF of getting four stars, comes ahead of the engagement agenda or the impact agenda ultimately. (Ben C2p19-20)

Bryan’s international research network is centred on his expertise in educational action research, which leads to assumptions on the part of others about the extent of action research that is actually going on at Greystone,

I get slightly embarrassed when people say they want to come and see all the work on action research that is going on in Greystone... it isn’t anything like the scene that we used to have. (Bryan C2p11)
Despite this, Bryan does continue to work at a local level,

I’m still developing the local agenda in education in schools... with a bit of luck I will have within a couple of years those people at (high school) writing joint papers with me and getting them published in international journals. (Bryan C1p5 – 6)

MacKenzie, McShane and Wilcox explore tensions between individual desires to enact the work of academic development practice in ways that foster authenticity, and the pressure to fabricate proper identities in the service of the performative university. They relate authenticity to an, ‘inner self that can recognise performative demands and act knowingly and mindfully in response to them.’ (MacKenzie, McShane et al. 2007) Whilst Rosa, Ben, Nicola and Bryan generally appear to value participation or co-production as a feature of their academic practice (as stated above, they are committed to the idea), they are aware of the environmental constraints that mitigate against participation as an authentic practice. These include the ways in which research is funded (structural conditions) and managed (at an institutional level). Also, it appears that reputations may be at stake. Bryan, for example, acknowledges the disjuncture between the image of Greystone as a hive of educational action research activity and the reality in which there is in fact very little going on. Ben alludes to the likelihood that a project he is working on will be ‘badged’ as action research at some point despite it not being action research as he recognises it. These may be signs of the authenticity at an individual level that MacKenzie, McShane et al. are referring to. The participants recognise, acknowledge and deal with the limitations, in whatever way they can.

In assessing how academic developers may usefully assist early career academics in developing their academic practice, Gough considers the impact of the work of institutional managers, disciplinary leaders and more junior staff who ‘can and do take their work off in new and challenging directions.’; it prevents academic developers from presenting a ‘universal and coherent’ impression of academic practice taken as a whole. Gough concludes that the fragmentary nature of the experience of developing their practice, the ‘obstacle of coherence to the project of forming a professional identity for the academic worker’, is the necessary price to pay for the assertion of academic autonomy (Gough 2014). The issues highlighted above by the participants are symptomatic of a similar fragmentation whereby only as individual practitioners, can they assert their commitment to participatory practice. That is, they seem to be relatively isolated in their commitment. The extent to which the participants can influence the management of research, making the practice as participatory as they would want it, varies according to their position. Also, depending upon their status, they may or may
not be in a position to develop funded research collaborations with community partners independently from their institution.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Rosa, Ben, Nicola and Bryan are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘deeply connected to the community’, ‘the status should be very equal’, ‘equality and respect is very important’, ‘I need belonging’, ‘I want to contribute’, I want to get the most out of that good environment’, ‘I’ve got the motivation’, ‘I benefit a lot’, ‘have a certain attachment (to people), ‘lifetime ambition, I want to contribute, always conscious of community and how I can do for the society’ (Rosa); ‘helping that pre-existing community of interest’, ‘less parasitical’, ‘should see ourselves as part of extended researcher practitioner, kind of community’, ‘(communities) as co-researchers, not participants’, ‘learn about how they work and at the same time help them fulfil their aims’, ‘hope the research is useful to that particular group’, ‘I don’t want to be seen as this kind of hassling academic’, ‘I’d like them (the community) to see us as is kind of critical friends/assistants’, ‘hopefully they will see me in that sense as kind of fellow enthusiast’, and, ‘a fundamental kind of belief or value that it’s making a difference’ (Ben); ‘involving participants, in helping direct the research’ (Nicola) and ‘writing joint papers, getting them published in international journals’ (Bryan). A possible signifier for objectified capital is the possession of a research grant that funds participatory research. However, Ben’s assessment of the way in which such grants are managed implies that the funding does not necessarily result in what could be described as authentic action research or co-production. A better signifier for objectified capital in this context is the participants’ strong local networks, for example, Rosa’s groups of older people and Bryan’s teacher networks. Key attributes for institutionalised capital are signified by the status of the participants and how it enables them to shape and direct their own research agenda in a way that is supported by the institution. The indications are that whilst the participants are committed to the notion and practice of participatory research, they do not possess the sort of institutionalised capital that would enable them to do so.

6.1.2 Community through community-university engagement (Jonathon, Michael, Ben, Tim, Rosa and Susan)

Chapter One explains how data from the pilot study moved the research question from a focus on community-university engagement to a focus on the idea and experience of community. Whilst the research is not, therefore, focussed upon community-university engagement per se,
in the context of their academic practice, it is relevant to how the participants view and operationalise community. A brief, but insightful international overview of the ‘public university’, by Michael Burawoy (President of the International Sociological Association 2010-2014), says the ivory tower has gone, that the academy, ‘has no option but to engage with the wider society’ (Burawoy 2010). Certain practices can clearly be categorised as ‘community-university engagement’ according to definitions of engagement such as that used by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement. Jonathon describes engagement as,

The university reaching out to a group of people and saying, ‘tell us what you need, we will do our best to try and provide it and we’ll help you to achieve your aims as an organisation by drawing on the expertise and the links that we have here at the University. (Jonathon C1p3)

This broad, organisational related definition is similar to Michael’s experience of community-university engagement from a more senior level, described in Chapter Four. Michael was, ‘was consciously going about community engagement, where fairly naturally, some of the leading elements of the community were brought together’ (Michael C1p7). This was a part of his academic practice. In a similar way, Jonathon sees himself as a ‘broker’ between the university and the community,

It is very much me acting as a kind of institutional broker, really, and finding out what people want from the university and then finding a way of making that happen by using the resources and colleagues that we have here who are able to help to give certain bits of what’s required... acting as the honest broker with the emphasis on can do rather than can’t do. (Jonathon C1p3-4)

Michael and Jonathon are ‘knowledge brokers’ with a keen sense of public service, making connections across different communities of practice (Wenger 1998 p109). ‘Public service’ was amongst the descriptors for ‘academic citizenship’ revealed by MacFarlane’s study of over thirty university staff across a number of nations, placed at the top of MacFarlane’s ‘service pyramid’, which also included ‘discipline-based or professional services.’ These commonly involved research-related work and collaboration e.g. organising an academic or professional conference, acting as a peer reviewer for journals and also giving public lectures, advising government, charitable and other public organisations, and developing educational links with community organisations. Many of MacFarlane’s respondents felt that their all service activities went unrecognised. (Macfarlane 2007) This context may have changed in the UK in the light of key policy drivers, which encouraged universities to recognise and reward engagement as a part of academic practice. For example, the RCUK Concordat on Engaging
the Public with Research was raised by me in conversation with Ben, who felt it was important to have aims and to give something back to the communities he has researched,

We would take this very seriously and that’s something we do try and build in, when your research is effectively talking to people. When it is effectively trying to understand very particular communities, if you want to use that term, you know, groups of people, audiences, they are fundamental to the research. They are your research and it is very strongly two-way. I could not have done my PhD, were there not a community out there that I could go and study… had they not allowed me to go and talk to them, there would have been no PhD, the same applies to research I’ve done on all projects since. Had they not allowed me to talk to them and opened their doors as it were, granted me access, talked to me about stuff, obviously felt some sense it was worth them talking to me, then it wouldn’t have happened. So then it’s only right that I try and then feed back into that or that you’re trying to make a difference to those communities through the process and through the outcomes. (Ben C2p27-28)

Looking beyond an ‘essentialist’ definition of academic practice, Gough considers the ‘service element’ or ‘Engagement Agenda’ whereby management, ‘dictates additional ways for its staff to link on behalf of their employer with wider societal interests.’ He suggests that some academic and even ‘non-academic’ staff might resent this new demand placed upon them, although he does acknowledge academics and universities have always ‘engaged’ anyway, ‘just not in such a forced manner.’ He suggests that, as with stepping up to the role of head of department, why should these other components of service not (continue to) be part of academic practice? (Gough 2014) Tim, who is actively involved in science communication, acknowledges that this gives him a licence to practice although it is also about accountability, ‘you probably shouldn’t be doing the research if you can’t explain it to the general public. Because they’re paying for it, basically.’ (Tim C1p6). Tim is perhaps demonstrating what Poliakoff terms as a ‘moral norm’ in his commitment to doing public engagement. (Poliakoff and Webb 2007 p247) He blogs regularly,

I have a blog now… kind of fun… it gets a lot of attention… we just pick interesting research papers… and then we write a little short summary in a language normal people can understand… we get rid of the jargon and try and turn it into English… you know, just cool stuff, basically. (Tim C2p25)

Mewburn and Thomson discuss the notion of academic blogging as a community of practice, stating that academics are most often writing for each other and, and very often about their work. They analysed one hundred blogs and concluded that the ‘academic’ identity represented was much more hybrid persona than that envisaged by advocates of communities
of practice. Blogs often combined personal and professional subjects, and ranged far wider than the blogger’s own specialised research area (Mewburn and Thomson 2013). They also recorded a ‘blog ethic’, which appears to combine Wenger’s categories of community and practice in a very particular way. Many of the blogs seemed to share information without seeking reward, ‘bloggers thus appeared to be altruistic, in the sense that they sought to provide information, advice and/or analysis without expectation of citation or personal benefit.’ Mewburn and Thomson describe this as a, ‘kind of scholarly ‘gift economy’ in which online mentoring, peer support and information sharing is the norm.’ (Mewburn and Thomson 2013)

Tim also contributes to outreach events, talking to schoolchildren,

GCSE students... So I gave a careers talk to them. Just on, you know, how I ended up where I am basically... where I went to school, what subjects I did, how badly I did in my exams. How I scraped through, went to university and ended up here... So that was quite fun. (Tim C1p4)

Rosa, who appears to be committed to a participatory approach in her research, is critical of the type of community-university engagement practiced by colleagues in her school,

They have public engagement... they show some films. But I still think this is a kind of one off thing... ticking the box... because they don’t actually engage... so, I don’t like this kind of approach to be honest. (Rosa C2p14)

Rosa sees the purpose of her role as a researcher as enhancing, ‘community by using research or my knowledge’ (Rosa C2p7). Many of Rosa’s immediate colleagues in her school at Greystone, however, are not conducting the same type of research and when Rosa changes institution, she moves to a department that is more social science based. Rosa also chooses to volunteer for community organisations that she knows will provide her with knowledge and experience that will be useful for future research,

I deliberately chose to do volunteering in my area, so whenever I construct interview questionnaires in the future or design my research, all these experiences gained from volunteering helps. (Rosa C2p9)

A major concern of those interviewed by Burchell et al (thirty biological scientists, most of who had considerable experience of ‘public dialogue’ (Burchell, Franklin et al. 2009)) was the contrast between the generally positive view within the scientific community of the benefits of
public engagement, and the difficulty of accommodating the activity within already overstretched job descriptions. The value of the voluntary nature of participation in public engagement was noted including the avoidance of turning engagement into a ‘box-ticking’ exercise; something more instrumental (Burchell, Franklin et al. 2009).

Susan’s collaboration with a patient and public (PPI) representative in her health research has benefitted her own academic practice and possibly enhanced her academic credentials. She used a research diary to communicate with the PPI representative,

It’s just been an amazing dimension to it all, because her passion for wanting to improve the education of this particular group of patients is quite extraordinary… so that’s really added value to the way that we’ve done this… it seems to have sort of travelled a bit, so several people have asked me know I do that… it’s a fantastic audit trail… for your funder or for ethics. (Susan C2p18 & 20)

In considering the ‘Foundations of a Science of Works or Art’, Bourdieu refers to communication between ‘professionals and lay people’ in the social sciences, stating that ignorance of the specific problematic which is historically constituted in the field, leads to scientific analyses being treated as ‘answers to questions of common sense, and result in practical interrogations, ethical or political, which are like opinions, and most often attacks.’ (Bourdieu 1996 Italics in original) Despite this, however, Bourdieu insists (elsewhere) on the ‘obligation’ of researchers and scholars to, ‘make the advances of research available to everyone’, as he considers what he would ask himself if invited to talk on television that reaches everybody,

Is what I have to say meant to reach everybody? Is it worth being understood by everybody?; Do I have something to say? Can I say it in these conditions? Is what I have to say worth saying here and now? In a word, what am I doing here? (Bourdieu 1998)

Of course, it is unlikely that that the participants ask themselves such questions on a day-to-day basis. What they do say about community-university engagement, however, indicates a certain level of awareness of what the activity and community may mean in the context of their own academic practice. Bond and Paterson surveyed and interviewed academics working in universities in Scotland and England (n=830 survey responses and n=80 interviews) about their ‘civic’ and ‘economic’ engagement with communities. They defined civic engagement as, ‘those activities which individual academics undertake which is some way involve interaction or engagement with the non-academic community and are related to
academic expertise.’ (Bond and Paterson 2005) This did not include instances where people are merely the ‘subjects’ of research. Many of their respondents demonstrated their engagement with their communities (be they local, national or international) through a wide range of activity, which they undertook over and above their more routine teaching and research roles. This activity often attracted little or no financial incentive and was frequently undertaken, ‘despite a number of professional and personal disincentives.’ (Bond and Paterson 2005 italics in original) In another paper based on the same research, Paterson states that there is widespread attachment to a civic role for higher education amongst the academics, ‘alongside strong attachment to traditional academic values.’ (Paterson 2003)

Michael, Jonathon, Ben, Tim, Rosa and Susan all appeared to be aware of, and understand, their own intrinsic as well as their more pragmatic motivations for including community-university engagement in their academic practice. Whilst there is at times an instrumental gain, which the participants do acknowledge, this is not a strong feature of their motivation. Lewis, Ross et al distinguishes between expressive and instrumental forms of collaboration and concludes that much collaborative work derives its value from not being overtly instrumental,

At its best, it happens organically, arising from disciplinary norms built around the sharing of ideas, and mutual interest in intellectual problems, where academics have sufficient time, space and resources to allow it to emerge. (Lewis, Ross et al. 2012)

Rosa, for example, was clear about the benefit that she gains herself from her volunteering whilst at the same time acknowledging that there is some sort of cost involved in terms of the commitment. Sometimes this cost has to be weighed against the possible affect the commitment may have on one’s career. In her study, focused on the perceived challenges and opportunities of public engagement for contract researchers, Davies concluded that there was a general awareness of public engagement and that most of those who responded to her survey (n=273) were well disposed towards it. For those that did carry out engagement there were ‘career-related’ costs. Davies states that whilst engagement is advocated – even demanded – by policy documents and government discourse, it remains difficult for contract research staff to put it into practice (Davies 2013).

Perhaps this depends upon the discipline, as Susan’s commitment to patient and public involvement in her research did not appear to be affected by her contractual status at Greystone. Some of Lindholm’s participants (she interviewed thirty-six professors at a public research university in the United States about the personal and environmental factors that led
them to pursue an academic career) – primarily women and minority faculty – cited ‘contributing to social change’ as a compelling reason for their ongoing commitment to institutional and community-based service activities (Lindholm 2004). Some of the participants, through their academic practice, are displaying traits similar to those outlined by Nixon who describes a professional orientation centred on care and affection which requires of its practitioners, ‘a willingness to reconceive and radically readjust the relation between their own ‘small world’ of professional interests and the wider public interests of the world ‘out there’. For example, the public intellectual as a ‘professional ideal' is realised through the practice of scholarship and teaching, research and writing,

Practices whereby the university remains open to difference: difference of opinion and outlook; difference of cultural background and expectation; difference of position and location. The university must reach out in order to survive and flourish in the world. (Nixon 2001)

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Michael, Jonathon, Ben, Tim, Rosa and Susan are denoted by terms and phrases such as, ‘consciously going about community engagement’ (Michael); ‘it’s much more me as an individual... practitioner, helping others to achieve what they want to achieve, pushing forward research at a local and regional level’ (Jonathon); ‘it’s only right that I try and then feed back’, (Ben); ‘shouldn’t be doing the research if you can’t explain it’, ‘kind of fun’, ‘that was quite fun’ (Tim); ‘I volunteer because I benefit. I’d like to help others, of course, but I think if I don’t benefit I don’t think I can continue’ (Rosa); ‘it’s just been an amazing dimension to it all’, ‘just generally being aware that you have to include someone’ (Susan). The participants appear to be acknowledging the different drivers that they may have as individuals when it comes to doing community-university engagement. One signifier for objectified capital is identified as Jonathon’s network across the institution, which enables him to reach and influence many colleagues in relation to their academic practice. Key attributes for institutionalised capital are signified by the status of the participants and how it enables them to influence the community-university engagement agenda at Greystone. For example, Michael acted as dean (head of school) and then pro-vice chancellor, and he was a member of the committee of deans and university-wide committees. Jonathon is an academic director and works in a university-wide role. For others, such as Rosa, it is perhaps a matter of carrying on with her community-university engagement activity despite the limitations of her situation within the school. She does not have institutionalised capital but she does have a strong commitment to her engagement.
6.1.3 Managing roles and ‘community’ boundaries (Fiona and Susan)

Community-university engagement is also important for Fiona in her teaching, ‘we try to link what we do in the classroom in year one and two, to the real world.’ (Fiona, C1p5) For her, it is important to maintain clear roles and boundaries for the service users involved in her teaching. This appears to be about protection as well as a perceived need for the academic coordinator to retain some form of control over the interaction for the benefit of all concerned (‘you have to now trust us’ Fiona C1p13),

It has to be kept quite safe and safe means small scale… everyone has to feel comfortable. But I think for the benefit of the community…for the benefit of the students that come, it’s great, and the professionals, it’s like a three way learning between the service users… the students and the professionals. (Fiona C1p5)

Susan’s collaboration with the PPI representative in her research was different to, ‘people who are telling their stories’. The PPI representative undertook a number of research tasks with Susan. She,

Sat and analysed interviews and analysed observations… going to a conference… present a poster together… that’s another sort of engagement but on a different level… engaging someone who’s got a label as a PPI representative and as a user and someone to represent patients… it’s very different to engaging with people who are telling their stories… the combination of those two in a research study has been really good, really rewarding… it’s taught us a lot of lessons. (Susan C2p19)

Through a series of case studies, McMillan explored the question, what happens when the university meets community? Conducting her research in South Africa, she was interested in understanding the role of educators and how they work at the boundary between higher education and the community in which service learning takes place. McMillan, who also refers to Wenger’s ‘brokers’, describes the educators as ‘boundary workers’. In seeking to understand service learning, or community-based learning as ‘boundary’ practice, she declares that boundary work is a ‘complex role’ – more than translation,

To do the work well, requires influencing the development of a practice and addressing conflicting interest, i.e. to assist with learning by introducing elements of one community of practice into another. To do this requires understanding the different communities of practice you are working across. (McMillan 2011)
Fiona and Susan, through their academic practice, are very clear in their interpretation and management of boundaries within their academic practice.

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Fiona and Susan are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘you have to trust us’, ‘has to be kept quite safe’ (Fiona); ‘really good, really rewarding’ (Susan). No objectified cultural capital was identified. Institutionalised cultural capital may take the form of Fiona’s position as the centre director that enables her to steer and control the participative activity in the teaching that takes place in the centre. In terms of her relationship with the PPI representative and with people who are telling their stories, Susan has institutionalised capital in the form of her status as a researcher. Whilst she is very committed to the egalitarian nature of her collaboration, it is Susan, not the representative or those telling their stories, who has the institutional authority and the control over the way in which the research is conducted.

6.1.4 Practice as an investment in the university or research and teaching community (Fiona, Edward, Bryan, Tessa, Ben and Susan)

All the participants, in different ways, invest in their university, and the research and teaching community through their academic practice. It is clear that management is a feature of academic practice and it affects the participants’ relationship with the institution. According to Henkel, becoming a manager is now a recognised component of the academic career trajectory, though most academics who were managers that she interviewed were in the process of working out what it meant to them (Henkel 2000). The challenge to Fiona’s line management brought about by the major administrative reorganisation, described in Chapter Four, heightens her awareness of the need to nurture her team. Fiona steals herself for a forthcoming encounter with her own line manager,

Tomorrow I have a meeting with my line manager about space and I think we are going to move. If he suggests that the two ladies that are doing admin is going to join a hub and split up I’m going to kick my toys out of my pram again and I’m going to be angry because I think that sometimes it’s not as easy as that. (Fiona C2p21-22)

For Fiona, the investment in her university community is not just about the students,

It’s about your staff as well and, and that goes back... I was a teacher in my young years and my headmaster gave me role in the school of nurturing the teachers; making the teachers feel happy because he believed that I would be a good person to nurture
the teachers. He felt I could be that person, and I thrive... inspire others... it worked really well and I felt that... I really believe in it. (Fiona C2p13 – 14)

Edward helps to nurture his research and teaching community by providing support to individual colleagues,

I’ve now been mentoring several people over the years and that’s been quite a rewarding process and it’s one where the mentors learn from the mentee as well. When do you observe teaching and look at their research plans etc. And so there is still a sense of, perhaps an ethos, we’re scholars and researchers together. (Edward C1p9)

Teams are important but appear to be increasingly fragmented. Bryan (for whom, as observed in Chapter Four, his sense of belonging is centred on his international networks), observes that the administrators were under a, ‘line management system’ (Bryan C2p21) and also reflects upon the differences in how teams are operationalised in a teaching and research context, noting that with large research projects there was a time when everyone was a part of the research team,

Every funded research project had at least one research secretary as well as there being secretaries who coordinated activities right across. And you couldn’t have secretaries that weren’t knowledgeable about the questions that were being researched. They were all part of your research team. And that was how I experienced things until the pots of money for research started drying up. (Bryan FG2 29.19 – 30.38)

Gough considers the role of administrators in his assessment of academic practice and cites Barnett’s view of what they do as, ‘integral to the ongoing project and conversation of the academic community, so their work has an academic nature.’ (Gough 2014) Jonathon would like to see more inclusive research and teaching communities centred on projects that in some ways, hark back to what Bryan recalls above,

It would be fantastic to see more projects emerging from schools, which actually involved all the academics as research participants or as researchers or both, all contributing to a generic project which covers the whole school and involves everyone [programmes]... If you have one project with a very specific aim and everyone contributed to it, I think it would help to mould some of these communities and combat what tends to happen in some large schools with complex programmes where you get silos emerging. Once those silos are in place they tend to fossilise, they become very, very entrenched and it’s very difficult to break down the barriers between them... I always thought there was a wonderful opportunity out there for one
school, perhaps several schools to do a project that was focused on CPD within the university. (Jonathon FG2 54.09 – 55.39 & FG2 56.22 – 57.30)

For some participants, networks are seen as important components of research communities and they require a great deal of investment. Tessa describes her international research network as, ‘the big bubble of community... the collaborators that we have, internationally’ (Tessa C2p17). Krejsler, in his study of Danish university reform, observes that health and science publications are predominantly oriented towards an international audience. He also observes that research takes place in teams and laboratories and that the department works as a unit, leading to a more coherent identity (Krejsler 2013). Also, according to Brew, researchers stress the importance of being part of and valued by an international community (Brew 2001). According to Nespor,

Practice is distributed across the spaces and times it produces so that ‘social interactions’, ‘settings’, and ‘events’, are intersections of trajectories that tie together distant times and spaces and give them form as social space... This is the natures of ‘interaction’ in a world shaped by disciplines, networks and multi-national organisations: where ‘face-to-face’ interactions are no longer strictly local events. (Nespor 1994 p16)

Fiona, Ben, Susan and Edward reflected on the difference between a network and a community and which felt more transient. Ben, for example, considered a network to be more transient than community,

I’m trying to work out if there’s a difference between network and community because the people I would network with are people who I would say are part of my research community...the academics I would network with, some non-academics who I would network with I would also see as part of that research community, although that’s not normally their primary interest in it as it were. (Ben C2p10)

The networking feels more transient to me... networks feels more transient... The term network feels a little more fast moving and impersonal to me whereas the term community is the motherhood and apple pie kind of idea... that it’s homely, sense of solidarity and building things together over a period of time. It does have a dark side but is generally seen as more positive. (Ben FG1 37.26 – 38.49)

Transient or not, it is at academic conferences (away from Greystone) where the participants do a lot of their networking, where they build affinity and feel most at home,

What community do I feel most at home? Conferences... you don’t find yourself at the coffee table with no one to talk to, you’re already in discussion. I certainly have come
away from those things more recently, feeling a sense of oh yeah... people know who I am and that’s quite nice. I guess that’s a sense of community there... the academic community I’m talking to in broad terms... the kind of theoretical side of things, and that’s I suppose where you feel a stronger affinity... people who use similar kind of theoretical and critical approaches that you do. (Ben C2p7-8)

Susan, who is keen to feel a part of the community at Greystone but at times feels excluded from it, benefits from reaching out to others away from the Greystone environment,

I suppose over the last two years I’ve reached out a little bit to be more involved with other people in the research environment... other people I’ve met a conferences and part of that research community... sharing ideas, listening to other people’s approaches to research... I just came back from the (subject) conference, which was brilliant... I felt very much a part of everything what was going on there... the talk, the narrative around. (Susan C2p5)

Fitzmaurice found that in terms of their identity formation, early-career academics are influenced by other early-career academics from other institutions and countries and there is a real desire to achieve in the same way as the peer community of researchers within the discipline (Fitzmaurice 2011). When attending conferences, Susan is representing research that she has done at Greystone, although she considers herself as subversive by choosing to represent her research findings in an unusual way, through poetry, which,

Didn’t feel like being part of the university, that felt like me being a little bit subversive because it wouldn’t be everyone’s idea of research...the feedback was just fantastic...that feels more like something I’ve tagged onto my identity as a researcher at Greystone. This is me really. (Susan C2p6)

Gale, who researched early career academics who had been appointed to the institution as ‘lecturers’ (academics whose own previous experience of academia had been as a university students some time ago), found that it was peers rather than senior colleagues or the wider academic community of practice who had more influence on early-career academics at the early stages of their academic career, ‘Peers are significant as influences in terms of providing teaching support, systems and organisational support, emotional support and support to progress in some way.’ (Gale 2012)

Certainly, peer networks have some significance for the participants in this research and they justified investment. McAlpine et al, whose research project on ‘The Next Generation of Social Scientists’ involved forty-one early career academics (of whom thirty-two were doctoral students), identified the practice of ‘prioritising community building’. Their participants
described positively their experiences of becoming part of a range of academic communities, both within and beyond the university. Activities that promoted a sense of academic belonging included attending departmental activities, peer interaction and being involved in research projects. Beyond the university they included attending conferences, articles being accepted for publication and engaging in fieldwork which brought doctoral students into contact with significant others. (McAlpine, Hopwood et al. 2009)

Expressions and signifiers of possible incorporated cultural capital for Fiona, Edward, Ben and Susan are denoted by terms and phrases such as ‘I thrive... inspire others’, ‘I really believe in it (nurturing)’ (Fiona); ‘a rewarding process (mentoring)’, ‘ethos, we’re scholars and researchers together’ (Edward); ‘the big bubble of community’ (Tessa); ‘feel most at home (conferences)’, ‘feel a stronger affinity’ (Ben); ‘I felt very much a part of everything (conference)’, ‘the feedback was just fantastic (at a conference)’, ‘something I’ve tagged onto my identity’, ‘This is me, really’ (Susan). Objectified cultural capital may be identified as the strong networks that are created and sustained via attendance at academic conferences. These include the international networks discussed in Chapters Four and Five. Signifiers of institutionalised cultural capital in this context may be demonstrated by the participants’ length of association with Greystone and their position within the research community, which enables them to influence community relations and discourse.

6.2 DISPOSITION

The focus on academic practice in this chapter moves the analysis on from considerations of position as they relate to ‘status’, to considerations of values. There are similarities with the analysis in Chapter Four on ‘Idea and elements of community’ where it was acknowledged that all the participants appeared to be strongly motivated to build and sustain their university community, whatever shape it took. ‘Doing’ academic practice gives the participants a sense of agency and the extent to which they can realise that agency affects their disposition. Unlike status, it may not necessarily be about survival (i.e. will I have a job at the end of this research contract?) but it is about conditions and habitus.

As explained in Chapter One, this research is aimed at finding the ‘authentic’ voices of academics in higher education. A tension between the individual’s perspective on academic practice and community and the way in which research and teaching is managed is palpable amongst the participants. There are concerns about the lack of truthfulness implied in the
discourse about, for example, the practice of participatory research, at school, institutional and sectoral levels. Rosa feels that her colleagues are practising community-university engagement at a surface level, that they are ‘ticking the box.’ Nicola, Ben, Susan and Bryan are committed to a more participatory approach in conducting their research but acknowledge the environmental constraints. Tim and Tessa did not talk about participatory research, which is perhaps not surprising in the context of their disciplines.

Tim and Tessa were both, however, involved in public engagement. Tim, as described above, has a sense of obligation to the public who fund his research. And he enjoys giving talks about his career. Tessa, as described in Chapter Three, gave a public lecture for the Greystone’s alumni association and was uncomfortable with the underlying fundraising motive of that particular occasion – it wasn’t like there was a ‘passion’ for her research. Michael and Jonathon, perhaps less concerned with the constraints upon the practice of research, are committed to sustaining Greystone’s relationship with communities from a civic perspective.

All this is much removed from Henkel’s view of academics as,

Struggling to hold onto the values and modes of working that belonged to an elite system... the kind of ancient Greek city state democracy that values equality and community among academics, not between them and other occupational groups... and individual autonomy, albeit with some concessions to collective responsibility. (Henkel 1997)

Writing in 2005, Henkel describes academic identities as a, ‘complex and heterogeneous mix of individual and community values, commitment to particular forms of knowledge or epistemological frameworks and a sense of worth or self-esteem.’ She states that academic idealism was a ‘potent influence’ upon how academics saw themselves and their work. (Henkel 2005 p255) Perhaps, for the participants, the academic idealism that Henkel describes is shifting to something that is more democratic (and less elitist) in its disposition; more towards Burawoy’s call for a ‘public sociology’, a discipline that, ‘brings sociology into a conversation with publics’, creating knowledge, ‘based on consensus between sociologists and their publics’, with a ‘democratic dialogue’. (Burawoy 2005)
6.3 INDIVIDUAL ACTION

Tim reflects on the notion of academic autonomy and the priorities of individual scientists,

You want people that are independent... freethinking... have their own ideas... and those people usually aren’t the kind of people that like being told what to do. So... it’s difficult... and they’re not usually team players either... their lab comes first and everything else comes second. (Tim C2p19)

According to Henkel, scientists in all types of institution were increasingly under pressure to generate more resources, partly to sustain their own research agendas, and partly to satisfy institutional needs and objectives. They had to become more flexible and entrepreneurial in the planning of their research, ‘seeking to accommodate extrinsic goals and pressures within their own aims... increasing flexibility and opportunism were required... in terms of maximising income possibilities.’ (Henkel 2005 p263)

Whilst Tim and Tessa are pursuing their research agendas, they are both acutely aware of the affect on their status (discussed in Chapter Five), and they have both adopted entrepreneurial strategies in their academic practice. Brew, who investigated how research is experienced by established senior researchers, identified four categories delineating the variation in the ways in which research is understood; the ‘domino’, ‘trading’, ‘layer’ and ‘journey’ conceptions. The trading variation conceived of research as a social phenomenon. Publications, grants and social networks, the products of research, amount to an ‘external product orientation’ on the part of the researcher who demonstrates connections between networks, publishing and recognition (Brew 2001).

Bryan is also pursuing his own research agenda, which takes his ‘communities’ away from Greystone but is still nevertheless rooted in the origins of his ‘science’ at the institution,

I’m heavily involved in what I would call the development of a pedagogical science... my communities have followed that agenda and that was rapidly globalising that way of fusing research with practice has been heavily globalised... In terms of community, I would say that whereas in my early days at Greystone which was way back in the seventies, when I was a member of a research centre and not a school that stood alone, independently, before the school ever came into being. From there, where I could say yes, (research centre) was my community... OK it floats on but it doesn’t fulfil the kind of role in generating new methodologies of educational research like it once did and so I find that my community now is much more international and I’m much more locked in to international discourses and networks and Greystone is my base.
from which I branch out and communicate with these groups but I would say that my community is much more out there in the world than it is now within Greystone itself... I enjoy the company of people at Greystone but basically my interactions are not within Greystone itself. (Bryan FG2 7.46 -11.14)

6.4 TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL FRAMES

The temporal frame as it relates to academic practice influenced the sense of community experienced by the participants in relation to the time spent on the administration of community-university engagement activity and the tension between the doing and the recording of academic activity. Henkel identified time as being the most widely shared problem of the academics in her study and she found a resentment at the erosion of academic time by the need to respond to administrative demands (Henkel 2000). Tessa reflected on how her time is spent,

Most of my focus is on management and research with a very small amount of time on teaching. And that’s most people at my level. That’s how it becomes whether you like it or not just because of time pressures. (Tessa, C1p3)

Participatory approaches and community-university engagement with research and teaching can also be time-consuming. Rosa, in her funded project, acknowledged that the administration was very time consuming,

I found doing research is time consuming, but also admin work is very time consuming, especially to keep everybody involved, up-to-date and to include as much as possible at all stages. But this is what I think public engagement means... as long as people feel they are included, by university research, I think this should be valued. (Rosa C2p12)

However, when Rosa moved from a position of having no formal status at Greystone to a position as a post-doctoral fellow at another institution, she realised that in her former position at least she had more freedom to what she wanted, ‘in the past, I was completely outside of the assessment... so I could do anything that I wanted but now, I’ve got other responsibilities... I fear my approach towards engagement becomes more conventional or more shortcut’ (Rosa C3p12-13). Rosa is not immune from time pressures.

Malcolm and Zukas found that temporal factors fragmented the experience of academic work. They contrasted the ‘official story’ of academic work with its ‘messy experience’ and revealed a ‘clear dislocation between the official and academic versions of academic work; for example,
the temporal experience of doing academic work is strongly at variance with the story told by
the workload allocation form (Malcolm and Zukas 2009) (though Gough declares that, ‘a mess
is a mess’ – it would not be a clear place to inhabit anyway (Gough 2014 p591)). The point by
Malcolm and Zukas is illustrated by Edward’s comments about the TRAC (Transparent
Approach to Costing) system introduced in 2005 (and ‘streamlined’ in 2014), the purpose of
which is to record the annual cost and income of teaching, research and ‘other’ core activity in
higher education institutions. ‘Other’ is a core activity that is ‘income generating’. All three
core activities include ‘outreach’ – not public engagement but again, income generating
activity e.g. via a Knowledge Transfer Partnership. Edward bemoans the demands of TRAC,

One of the things I found most alienating... forced on us by government... we had to
divide our day up in half hour segments... research, government funded teaching, admin. I found that absolutely ridiculous... reading a book or looking at some
government website... one just put down notional figures... within the university
there’s a lot of very fictional things, rules one has to play by which bear no
resemblance to reality. (Edward FG 1.04.10 – 1.05.32)

In relation to spatial issues, Jonathon reflects on the tendency for individual academics to work
in isolation and to avoid inter-personal communication,

My own experience of working in universities is that to a degree academics by their
very nature often tend to be loners and there is still tendency to exist in a monastic
cell... academics enjoy locking themselves away in their little monastic cells and
probably don’t talk to each other or interact as frequently in a way that I would like to
see, certainly, as much as they probably should. There’s still a tendency for academic
colleagues to email each other who are only two doors away down the corridor...
what’s that about. (Jonathon FG2 25.11 – 26.01)

6.5 THEMATIC CONCLUSION FOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE

What is the relationship between ‘academic practice’ and community? How does ‘academic
practice’ affect community as cultural capital and habitus? In the analytical framework,
‘academic practice’ traverses AGENCY and HABITUS, as it embraces institutional and individual
actions.
6.5.1 Incorporated cultural capital

The introduction to this theme in Chapter Three outlined aspects of the phenomena that emerged from the second thematic analysis and the final analysis. These included, ‘a commitment in principle to some form of community participatory research and teaching’, ‘clear roles and boundaries’ and ‘invested in their communities inside the university through their academic practice’. The expressions and signifiers as described in this chapter, build upon the analysis presented in Chapters Four and Five; Chapter Four revealed a strong motivation for building and sustaining an inclusive community; Chapter Five revealed issues more strongly associated with the participants as individuals, as agents who are dealing with conditions that significantly affect their sense of purpose and self-worth.

Ingrained in the participants’ academic practice is a sense of responsibility towards multiple constituencies within Greystone and beyond; peers, students, communities that are fundamental to their teaching and research and broader society; this is signified by the high
level of incorporated cultural capital – the participants are driven by a desire to be useful. Fitzmaurice finds evidence of a desire to contribute to society and a willingness to serve the wider public interest, a ‘virtuous discourse in the narratives of new lecturers, which affects the way in which they conceive of the work of a ‘good’ academic.’ She concludes that becoming an academic is experienced as a cognitive and emotive process, and is a moral endeavour, ‘grounded in virtues of honesty, care and compassion.’ (Fitzmaurice 2011) Watson examines, ‘The question of citizenship’ in relation to ‘obligations’ of the university and its members to civil society and coins the term, ‘soft citizenship’; a term that embraces self-awareness, awareness of others and ‘deeper senses of sympathy and connection than civic conformity will ever bring about.’ The ‘soft’ citizen will have, ‘a sense of loyalty; a balance or scepticism and trust; a commitment to progressive engagement with wicked or intractable problem; and a presumption that knowledge can inform responsible action.’ According to Watson, all these have been and can continue to be nurtured by the university. (Watson 2014 p59)

The participants also acknowledge and understand the reciprocal nature of their relationship with their constituencies and in particular, the groups and communities that they collaborate with. Benefits for the participants of what may be described as ‘engaged’ academic practice (a practice that connects with all their constituencies and not just communities outside Greystone) include an increased sense of belonging, a better sense of purpose, and a recognition of their contribution to the scholarship enterprise and of their identity as an academic. This recognition may not come from the institution although Ben does acknowledge that promotion is now associated with ‘engagement’. Recognition from one’s discipline is an essential component of community in relation to academic practice. According to Blackmore and Kandiko, the personal cannot be separated from the social,

A person may study history, but can only be recognised academically as a historian if his or her work achieves acceptance amongst the community of historians, acceptance that is gained through beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviours that are deemed appropriate. This indicates the importance of disciplinary and departmental communities as a principle site of academic identity. (Blackmore and Kandiko 2011)

The personal and professional benefits for the participant as an individual are significant and play an important role in their motivation. It is not entirely altruistic. For some participants, engaged academic practice does not appear to benefit their relationship with the university and it may even be problematic in some circumstances. It appears to depend upon the type of community-university engagement they are doing. Tim enjoys his traditional science
communication or outreach activity, which is closely related to the student recruitment agenda, strongly backed at an institutional level, like Tessa’s talk for the Alumni Association. Funding, supporting and conducting truly participatory or co-produced research is more challenging from both an institutional and structural perspective. Doing outreach and doing participatory research demands very different skills and a larger relational and administrative investment.

6.5.2 Objectified cultural capital

As stated in Chapter One, objectified cultural capital in academia in relation to community may exist as, for example, access to or ownership of laboratory facilities, and even a laboratory team (people as artefacts of objectified cultural capital) and membership of networks or access to communities that contribute to research and teaching. Manifestations of objectified cultural capital in relation to academic practice, described in this chapter as signifiers include membership and participation in networks with teachers, conference networks and the network across the institution itself. They feel a strong affinity with their peer group, though, as discussed in Chapter Four, their community or peer network is not necessarily centred on Greystone.

Whilst Ben does not appear to possess any objectified cultural capital in the context of the ‘idea and elements of community’ (see Chapter Four – he did not view his own networks as a significant element of his community), when focussing on academic practice, however, his peer networks do serve as objectified cultural capital. He feels ‘most at home’ at a conference (Ben C2p7-8). Susan feels very much a part of everything at the conference. Peer networks and their involvement in the affirmation of an individual’s membership of a given discipline are a critical element of community from an academic practice perspective,

No matter how intrinsically motivated an academic is part of a community of colleagues, whose shared epistemologies and social practices strongly influence thinking and discourse in the field and whose approval confers high intellectual standing. It is the disciplinary community that places a value on work by adopting or rejecting it. (Blackmore and Kandiko 2011)

Productive interaction with other academic scholars is particularly vital. Bexley et al conducted a large-scale survey of Australian academics, documenting their current work roles, attitudes and career objectives. Whilst they identified a widespread dissatisfaction with the
management and funding of higher education, they also identified, ‘an almost unanimous passion for the scholarly aspect of academic work.’ (Bexley, Arkoudis et al. 2013) Responses to the statement, ‘The most satisfying aspect of my academic work or career is…?’, included, ‘interaction with a community of scholars.’ (Bexley, Arkoudis et al. 2013)

But the research network for some participants is not confined to ‘academic’ scholars. Ben described an ‘extended researcher practitioner, kind of community’, seeing communities as co-researchers and not participants; Rosa felt that the status of the older people who are her research participants should be ‘very equal’; Bryan intends to write joint papers with teachers. The participants who are social scientists appear to view the membership of their ‘research community’ as extending beyond strictly academic circles. The participants who are natural scientists do not have the same opportunities to collaborate in this way, and indeed, may not wish to.

Jonathon emphasised the importance of his network across Greystone, in his university-wide role. In this sense, his position as an academic director affords him objectified cultural capital in relation to his academic practice and community. As an, ‘institutional broker’ Jonathon is strongly positioned to connect with and influence a wide range of constituents within and outside the institution.

6.5.3 Institutionalised cultural capital

Whilst individual position is not a strong feature in the academic practice theme, the institutional context for academic practice affects the extent to which the participants may realise their ideal academic practice as it relates to the ways in which they aspire to involving communities. Institutional cultural capital in relation to academic practice and community is the ability of the participant to influence community relations or the discourse about community relations at an institutional level. Community relations in this context, does not mean dealing with issues brought about by the behaviour of students in local residential areas. It is about managing the institution’s approach to collaborating with communities across teaching and research. Jonathon’s objectified cultural capital discussed above may also be interpreted as institutionalised cultural capital. This is illustrated by the way in which Jonathon’s university-wide role fits neatly with the expectations of the institution with regard to networks as stated in the Corporate Plans. Under the heading of ‘External Relations’ it is stated that Greystone has not developed and cultivated networks with sufficient zeal or
purpose to secure the reputation, influence or global reach that its quality deserves, ‘we need our senior academic and administrative staff to be well-networked and thoroughly well-informed.’ (Plan 1 p29) Under the heading of ‘Internationalisation’ it is stated that Greystone will ‘review and evaluate’ membership of international university networks and groupings (both collegiate and research-based). (Plan 4 p25) Michael also, when in the position of Pro-Vice Chancellor, possesses institutional cultural capital, which gives him the opportunity to shape the institutional agenda around academic practice and community.

### 6.5.4 Is this a ‘community of practice’?

This research explores the conditions necessary for the existence of community inside the academy, what purpose that existence may serve, and why it may or may not matter. An influential approach to thinking about types of communities that come about as a result of a shared practice or ‘enterprise’ is Wenger’s theory on ‘communities of practice’ (Wenger 1998). Clegg describes the concept as a seemingly, ‘self-evident’ candidate for theorizing relations in a field and argues that the communities of practice literature provides the tools to explore boundary work and boundary crossing in higher education. (Clegg 2012 p671) McAlpine, Jazvac-Martek et al on the other hand, conclude the concept is not particularly useful as an analytical tool in describing the dynamism and tensions inherent in the higher education system and in particular, it is insufficient in explaining the relation between structure and personal agency, the dialectical – competing and complementary – experiences of individuals with different roles within multiple embedded overlapping structures. (McAlpine, Jazvac-Martek et al. 2008 p118)

Whilst all the participants in this research are academics, and as such may be construed as members of the academic community, the notion of a unified ‘community of practice’ would be difficult to apply in this context. As Nespor states,

> People don’t participate as ‘individuals’ in pristine or local small-scale ‘communities of practice’, nor do they take on stable ‘identities’ by becoming ‘full participants’ in such communities. Such views ignore the fact that ‘communities’ aren’t just situated in space and time, they are ways of producing and organising space and time and setting up patterns of movement across space and time: they are networks of power. (Nespor 1994 p9 italics in original)

Skelton’s findings from his research on teacher identities within a research-led institution in the UK reflect some of the experiences of the participants in this research. He did not discover
a meaningful community of practice. He conducted in-depth interviews with eleven members of university staff and revealed a complex picture of ‘teaching specialists’, ‘blended professionals’ and ‘researchers who teach.’ Individuals expressed feelings of isolation and non-belonging, having internalised the ‘underlying dualistic logic’ of mechanisms such as the research assessment exercise and quality assurance which separate teaching and research as aspects of academic practice (Skelton 2012).

In his study of educational development based on a series of thirty-five interviews with educational developers in a range of UK universities, Land identifies a ‘fragmented community of practice’ formed of individuals with different academic and professional identities. He considers the agency of educational developers, its ‘context and strategic terrain’ comprising the organisational forms, academic cultures and subcultures within which they have to practice. They have ‘orientations’ which Land describes as, ‘attitudes, knowledge, aims and action tendencies… in relation to the contexts and challenges of their practice.’ These orientations are not innate personal characteristics and are not fixed. They are instead, ‘a way of making sense of a given situation or set of tasks that subsequently informs and influences action.’ They are aspects of their subjectivity,

constructed and brought into being by, or in reaction to, the social and historical contexts in which developers find themselves situated… they are rendered more or less stable, dependent on the strength of dominant discourses within an organisation. (Land 2004)

This interpretation, placing a greater emphasis on agency, fits more neatly with the experience of the participants in this research and points to the potential of collective agency in realising community (but not necessarily a ‘community of practice’) through their academic practice. Selmer, Jonasson et al describe communities of practice as, ‘self-directed and self-organising social systems… dynamic, fluid, existing also outside the institutional boundaries.’ (Selmer, Jonasson et al. 2014 p215) MacKenzie, McShane et al conclude that collective agency is the route to authenticity, ‘collegial, activist professionalism as a strategy for ensuring that academics’ experiences of performative fabrication and change are heard and acknowledged in university policy and planning.’ This is achieved through their group (as academic developers) which nurtures thinking, establishes a model of collective reflection and dialogue as ‘circles of care and critique that provide opportunities for paying attention to the values and issues that matter to academics.’ (MacKenzie, McShane et al. 2007 p52)
6.5.5 Academic practice

Unsurprisingly, the interpretation of academic practice as it relates to the object, reveal dispositions and habitus’ that have similar traits. Bourdieu, on the subject of class condition and social conditioning in ‘Distinction’, refers to the unity that is hidden, ‘under the diversity and multiplicity of the set of practices performed in fields governed by different logics and therefore inducing different forms of realization.’ He uses a formula to describe this – [(habitus) (capital)] + field = practice – and stresses the significance of the homogenous conditions of existence, ‘imposing homogenous conditionings and producing homogenous systems of dispositions capable of generating similar practices.’ (Bourdieu 1984 p95) (The implications of homogeneity are discussed in the conclusion to Chapter Seven). Gough cites a series of mutually inclusive theoretical lenses devised by Graham Gibbs for describing academic practice, one of which is, ‘Identity and membership in a community and encompasses taking on the discourse and behaviour of the discipline.’ Another is ‘The embodiment of academic values – understanding, subscribing, and being defined by a set of values: this view goes beyond adherence to ethical standards and is concerned with the fundamental and personal commitment to the academic enterprise.’ (Gough 2014) (note – the Gibbs paper could not be traced). The participants, whatever their motivation for investing in their academic community, are all committed to the academic enterprise.

The high evidence of incorporated cultural capital that has been identified in relation to academic practice demonstrates the depth of intrinsic motivation that infuses practice as it relates to the idea and experience of academic community. As cited in Chapter One, academic citizenship and community as a phenomenon is under strain (Tight 1988, Macfarlane 2007, Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014, Morgan and Havergal 2015) Perhaps the strong level of incorporated cultural capital that is mobilised in relation to academic practice is helping to create and sustain a greater sense of citizenship as habitus for the participants who, in the face of the pressures that they themselves have identified, have chosen to act in certain ways. Bourdieu states that habitus is,

At the basis of strategies of reproduction that tend to maintain separations, distances and relations of order(ing), hence concurring in practice (although not consciously or deliberately) in reproducing the entire system of differences constitutive of the social order.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p3)
Whilst the practices of the participants have homogenous tendencies as stated above, there is a tension between the extent to which their habitus’ do or do not serve to reproduce the social order. In opposing the ‘reduction of conscious calculation’ whereby agents are moved by conscious reason, Bourdieu poses the notion of ontological complicity between the habitus and the field,

Between agents and the social world there is a relationship of infraconsiousness, infralinguistic complicity: in their practice agents constantly engage in these which are not posed as such. (Bourdieu 2000 p79-80)

The next chapter analyses the institutional narrative on the idea and experience of community, and discusses doxic experience and the role of ontological complicity.

**VIGNETTE: THE VICE-CHANCELLOR’S ADDRESS**

The Vice-Chancellor of Greystone gives an address.

‘Let me state at the outset that it is our leadership that is at the forefront of an outstanding reputation. The major contributions we shall make will undoubtedly be our greatest impact. Our particular strength is that we are well equipped for the pursuit of excellence. We are agenda setting internationally, avowedly ambitious and world-leading due to exceptional strengths that make us world-class. Being among the best with our high-quality, high-achieving and highest standards, which are undeniably of the highest quality and thereby market-leading at a high-level. This high-class and high-impact status must be the highest possible. Our highest ambitions, driven by the highest calibre leadership, enable the highest achievements and therefore the highest possible global influence. Inevitably this highest possible performance from our high performing team ensures a high academic engagement. From such a high base we can gain an edge. Our standards will be ratcheted up, supported by a long and proud history with its international distinction making us excellent in our excellence. This excellent achievement, regarded by all as an exemplar of good practice, is not just exemplary but is regarded as internationally excellent. Being internationally recognised, and being internationally aware, our international significance ensures us the strongest international position. Such international recognition of our extraordinary potential keeps us firmly in the top, in the top flight and on the top tier. And we are not just ranked in the top; we are in the top 20 ranking. Recognised as globally strong, the University excels and we can contribute equally with the best universities in the world. And this enviable reputation delivers an exceptional education, and with excellent research our excellent achievement is second to none. Building on the successes, which put us well within the world top 100, our intellectual power and influence obliges us to play a leading role. Our consistent top-20 ranking is an outstanding contribution, which is ranked in the top quartile. Being successful, inevitably there is public good flowing from what we do. This public good ensures a strong culture and our pioneering work in this area is a powerful combination, and a powerful platform. We are, simply, inspiring and innovative.’ (this address is complied from the Greystone institutional documents)
Chapter 7
THEMATIC ANALYSIS: INSTITUTION AND ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

This final thematic analysis chapter examines the idea and experience of community at Greystone as a form of doxa, or potentially unquestioned truth. As illustrated in the analytical framework, the theme, ‘institution and environment’ features ‘the university and community’, and ‘documents and doxa’. Bourdieu describes doxa as a particular point of view,

The point of view of the dominant, which presents and imposes itself as a universal point of view – the point of view of those who dominate by dominating the state and who have constituted their point of view as universal by constituting the state. (Bourdieu 2003 p57)

In the context of this research, the Greystone documents listed below represent the dominant or ‘official’ discourse.

Consultation Draft Greystone Corporate Plan 2007-8 to 2011-12 (Plan 1)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2008-2012 (Plan 2)
Draft Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (Plan 3)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (Plan 4)
Greystone Corporate Plan 2012 – 2016 (designed version) (Plan 5)

Vice-Chancellor’s Inaugural Address, 1963
Vice-Chancellor’s letters to staff, September 2009 – December 2013

Official discourse, according to Bourdieu, performs three functions. Firstly, a diagnostic, that is, an act of knowledge or cognition which begets recognition and which, quite often, tends to assert what a person or a thing is and what it is universally, for every possible person, thus objectively.’ Secondly, it is ‘administrative discourse’, through directives, orders, and prescriptions of what people have to do. And thirdly, it ‘says what people have actually done, as in authorised accounts.’ The official discourse imposes the institution’s point of view, one that everyone has to recognise within the confines of a definite society. (Bourdieu 1989 p22)
The analysis and discussion in this chapter explores the extent to which the official discourse at Greystone becomes doxa through the complicity of the participants via their acceptance (or otherwise) of the institutional portrayal of community – are they choosing to or do they have to embrace the official narrative? In restricting the analysis to the above documents, other instruments of doxa are omitted such as the portrayal of community through Greystone’s official website and corporate social media accounts, and the organisation of community around Greystone’s various committee structures, administrative systems and rituals, which are usually clustered in accordance with organisational units such as schools, faculties and departments, or with topics such as ‘employability’, ‘internationalisation’ and ‘student experience’. In talking about their idea and experience of community, the participants, did not especially include these other elements. It wasn’t for example, the digital profile of Greystone that captured their attention when thinking about community and the institution, but the regular letters they received via email from the Vice-Chancellor.

Similarly to Chapters Four to Six, the sub-theme of, ‘the researcher & the return gaze’ is woven into the discussion. There are, however, two distinct differences between this chapter and those aforementioned; the focus on how the research object (the idea and experience of academic community) is represented through selected documents, and the absence of an analysis of individual cultural capital in favour of a discussion about the doxic experience. The utility of the concept of emotional capital as mentioned in Chapter One (used by Reay as a heuristic device in her study of mothers’ involvement in their children’s education (Reay 2000, Reay 2004)) is considered, as the chapter looks towards a broader reflection on emotion and affect in Chapter Eight which brings together the analysis in Chapters Four to Seven and concludes the thesis.

7.1 CORPORATE PLANS AND THE PORTRAYAL OF COMMUNITY

The Corporate Plans that were selected for analysis cover the period of the research. Plans 3 and 4 were presided over by the Vice-Chancellor who wrote the letters to staff (these are analysed below). Plans 1 and 2 were presided over by the previous Vice-Chancellor. Community is envisaged in different ways; as a physical environment or location, as an entity that has (scholastic) members, and as a community within a community.

We have remained true to the founding vision of a community united by corridors and walkways. (Plans 1 p4 my italics)
Celebrate the diversity of our campus community. (Plan 3 p2 my italics)

Objectives and values – provide an environment within which all members of the university community can be productive and fulfilled (Plan 1 p9 my italics)

A scholarly community (Plan 1 p9 my italics)

Greystone remains a community of scholars which is international in both its composition and outlook. (Plan 1 p29 my italics)

Success in the National Student Survey is attributed to, ‘the willingness of staff in all roles to go beyond the call of duty to ensure our students flourish. This is the ethos of a true community of scholarship. (Plan 4 p1 my italics)

We are a scholarly community within a wider community. (Plan 2 p4 my italics)

Ben sees the corporate plan as an important script, the content of which is of lesser significance than the role that the document itself plays in ‘performing’ community,

It might be one that I agree with, it might be one that I disagree with… the kind of text isn’t important it’s the one performance of community in the corporate plan. (Ben C2p39-40)

Nathan says one would be hard-pressed to find words more widespread in university rhetoric than ‘community’ and ‘diversity’. (Nathan 2005 p41) Tuchman observes in her semi-fictional account of Wannabe University, that many professors view slogans such as a ‘community of scholars’ (or a ‘community of learners’ as Wannabe’s administrators would have it), as gobbledygook, ‘not even worthy of resistance.’ (Tuchman 2009 p113) Ben does not resist but he does question; for example, what it means to ‘perform’ (or live) community day-to-day,

Is it through sitting at my desk writing a paper? Is it through going to a coffee morning with my colleagues in (research group)? Is it through giving a lecture… is it through saying, ‘no I’m sorry, I can’t give a lecture’ because I’m a hundred per cent research at the moment? Is it through ringing someone up and then arranging to go and interview them? You know, what are the moments or the performances of community that I’m doing? Are some more pertinent than others? (Ben C2p40)

According to Fiona, the lived experience, unlike community as ‘performed’ in the corporate plan, is not communal,
Everybody just look after themselves and survive, both personally and as a school. It’s not even a community feeling... Everybody’s just looking after their own place, their own leagues tables and their own research. (Fiona C1p11)

In unpacking the concept of ‘academic community’, Finnegan describes the ‘community of scholars’ as ‘mythical’ (Finnegan 1994 p193), and, according to Harris’ assessment of academic identities in neo-liberal times, whilst the university has been seen as representing a ‘community of scholars’, ‘it was and remains a site of exclusion, elitism and power.’ (Harris 2005 p3) Fiona believes the non-communal reality applies to the administrative staff also,

I think a lot of the admin people apart from the ones that work with me who are bumped in feel really isolated and they really feel a sense of them and us and they feel that they are just administrator which is really, really important part of the university. (Fiona C2p23)

Jonathon, a ‘university man’, believes there are varying understandings of community within Greystone at an individual level. However, at an institutional level, whilst he doesn’t think the university understands really what communities are, he would, ‘like to think that the university at least understood that communities aren’t just geographical things, that they go beyond to communities of practice and shared interest.’ (Jonathon C2p9)

7.1.1. In it together?

A presumption of shared interest is evident in the vocabulary of the Corporate Plans, which appear to take for granted, collectivism and a shared endeavour. Parker, who explores non-managerial alternatives to management, describes all organisations as communities, ‘in a very loose sense of that term. In order for an institution to hang together doing recognizably patterned things there much be some ‘sharedness’ of understanding, some kind of commonality.’ (Parker 2002 p73) As a form of doxa this collectivist language helps to promulgate the idea (and the feeling) that everyone is in it together, all part of one community. The Corporate Plans interchange between the collective voice and the third person, with the first person used by the Vice-Chancellor in his introduction. The use of the collective pronoun is particularly dominant in the introductions, although it is still prominent throughout all the plans. Phrases that depict a sense of collectivism and shared ownership include the following,

Our mission is...
Our aim over the next five years
We must aspire to
Everything we aspire to achieve
Guide our collective endeavours

We should remind ourselves that our credentials are impressive
The immense pride we take
Earned us an enviable reputation

We should make the best possible use of
If we live beyond our means
What we must change to meet the priorities
We will face some very hard decisions in the months and years to come

Once completed, the Plan will belong to all of us working at Greystone
The Plan belongs to us all working at Greystone

With the active support of the university community as a whole, we believe these strategies will make a difference

The strategies proposed are unlikely to be fully effective if they do not have the active support of the university community

The designed version of the Corporate Plan (Plan 5) contains an abbreviated text of the full Plan and a series of statements, starting with ‘we’, the final of which declares, ‘We are The University of Greystone.’ (Plan 5, p39)

Bourdieu claims that instituted discourses reduplicate the self-evidence of the world; a self-evidence, to which the whole group’s adherence is effectively affirmed,

The specific potency of the explicit statement that brings subjective experiences into the reassuring unanimity of a socially approved and collectively attested sense imposes itself with the authority and necessity of a collective position adopted on data intrinsically amendable to many other structurations. (Bourdieu 1972 p167 italics in original)

The collective responsibility for delivering the corporate mission, so clearly evident in the official Greystone narrative such as the Corporate Plans, is not strongly repudiated by the participants even if it does contrast with their lived experience. Fiona has thought a lot about the corporate plan and wants to hear more. She welcomes an opportunity to do so at a formal presentation by the members of the Greystone Executive Team (including the Vice-Chancellor and Registrar),
I asked some of my colleagues to come as well because I think that that aspect of community, i.e. the university as being a community. I think that is probably the first time I have ever seen that set up as to be invited to a panel like that which for me as a really positive experience as a staff member at Greystone and it made me feel that they really try to make you feel part of a community... I think that that attempt on their behalf in trying to build on community feeling; that we are Greystone; we are going to do this and all these things together also a really positive thing. (Fiona C2p4)

Fiona’s enthusiasm for the institutional role in building a community at Greystone, however, is tempered by her concern about the whether or not the University’s middle management is sufficiently skilled and attuned to play their part,

If you are going to do it, build a community, you have to make sure that each of the levels is working. You can’t just skip... I would just wish that some people at the middle layer above me or below the top sheet were better educated in terms of where we’re going and were on the same mind set. (Fiona C22p27)

7.1.2. One community, one story?

Susan, who also agrees with the formally stated aims, says, ‘if you read this [Corporate Plan] it sounds brilliant, this is what we should be doing.’ (Susan C2p9-10). However, she has difficulty in identifying with the idea of community as portrayed,

I tried to have an open mind and to just see how I could identify with anything that was in there given what we talked about before and I’m still struggling... the corporate plan, I guess, is a kind of statement of purpose... I read it almost like a piece of advertising material... this is us and this is what we do and this is what we do well. (Susan C1p2)

Churchman & King explored how academics make sense of changes to their work practices, which called into question their workplace identity; by changes, they meant the way in which universities have recently become more corporate and homogenized. They compared academics’ stories of their work life (stories of self-representation which the authors say must become ‘hidden’ or ‘secret’) with the official organisation-representative stories promulgated by the universities, those ‘academic stories’ which are ‘valued by, and even acceptable to, the institution’ and revolve around corporate measures such as funding and external validation.

The institution is in danger of ostensibly becoming one monolithic story that all workers can chant while living their academic life in the shadows... the attempted suppression of academic staff’ stories which do not entirely conform with corporate
objectives does not result in their demise, but rather in their manifestation in subversive forms. (Churchman and King 2008)

Susan sees similarities between the experience of community by vulnerable people outside Greystone, and her own experience at Greystone where she feels her own story is not being heard,

I have this very negative image of how the community takes care of individuals...vulnerable individuals within that community... it’s interesting, there’s parallels...my little unheard story within the community here [at Greystone], these people’s unheard stories in the communities they inhabit. ‘Community’ just sounds like such an all embracing, cuddly...we’re in the community. But sometimes they’re not very friendly. (Susan C2p11-12)

Watson, who states that it is important not to look at stories in organisations through rose-tinted spectacles, declares the ‘management’ trick is maintaining the connection between the big story and, ‘all of the little stories that parts of the organisation like to tell (about their students, themselves, and their achievements).’ (Watson 2008 p192)

The dominant story about community in the corporate plans is that of unity, at least unity of the ‘scholarly’ community, and this research is just focusing on members of that community (all the participants are academics). Overall, the lived experience of the participants appears to be different to the portrayal of community in the Corporate Plans. It is far from unified and when it is, it may not be for the most positive reasons, as Tessa observes,

You sometimes get a sense of community, but I think it’s a panicked community, trying to pull together things... to get the best money and best score as opposed to having a sense of community, that then draws together to work on REF. There’s a general feeling of panic and disarray and certainly from things I’ve heard at the (REF) meetings (Tessa C2p12)

Bryan, in contemplating the changes that he has witnessed at Greystone in recent years, particularly in relation to the research centre of which he was a founding member in 1970, describes what he believes is happening to research communities,

The marginalisation of research in certain departments and that means the marginalisation of the vestiges of that research... hidden communities maybe...academic communities, scholarly communities. It’s almost as though they’re being hunted down and flushed out so that research has become part of the corporate enterprise. (Bryan C2p23-24)
This perspective concurs with the CHERI UUK Changing Academic profession report, which states that business-like management styles and corporate style government arrangements have served to strengthen institutional management whilst leaving the academic community, ‘seemingly marginalised’, or even monopolised. (Locke and Bennion 2007 p17-18) Harris also concludes that the distinction between corporate identities and academic identities is no longer very clear (Harris 2005 p3).

As observed in Chapters Four and Five, those participants who had occupied a senior position at Greystone are more likely to identify with the notion of an overarching university community. This helicopter view, promoted via institutional documents such as the Corporate Plans, produces a particular representation of the object and one that can seem distant from the day-to-day habitus. Greystone, as an institution, is perhaps displaying what Barnett describes as ‘bad faith’; that is, a ‘dominant self-deceiving mode of being’ (whereby a university exhibits ‘bad faith’ as defined by Sartre; the deceiver and the deceived),

When the term ‘academic community’ is blithely used to capture a university’s self-image, even though the physicists will have nothing to do with the sociologists, and there is a constant state of tension between the academics and the managers. (Barnett 2011 p137)

The Greystone ‘bad faith’ narrative may be classified as doxa. The objective in this instance is to sustain a particular and dominant view of community. The University is creating and sustaining its own internal logic of community, and whilst the participants are not consciously colluding in ‘bad faith’, their actions and their accounts are affected by their investment in the university community, their stake in the game.

We have stakes (enjeux) which are for the most part the produce of the competition between players. We have an investment in the game, illusio (from ludus, the game): players are taken in by the game...they concur in their belief (doxa) in the game and its stakes... Players agree, by the mere fact of playing, and not by way of a “contract”, that the game is worth playing, that it is “worth the candle”. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p98 italics in original)

The participants believe in the idea and existence of a university community. That is the basis of their homologous relationship with each other and with the institution, on the topic of community. Leathwood & Read conducted email interviews with academics in Britain on current research policy trends and concluded that collectively, as academics,
We are enmeshed in endless contradictions: vehemently contesting audit technologies yet caught in their web; feeling we have no choice but to ‘play the game’, but also ‘choosing’ to do so because of the pleasures it offers. (Leathwood and Read 2013 p1172)

As Bourdieu declares, the ‘illusio’ demanded by scholastic fields, presupposes, ‘suspension of the objectives of ordinary existence, in favour of new stakes, posited and produced by the game itself.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p101) This is especially evident in relation to values. It has already been established that values are important to the participants in the context of their academic practice (Chapter Six), and whilst the institutional narrative on community may be different to the participants’ accounts of the lived experience, both are imbibed with the language of values.

7.1.3 Corporate plans and espoused values

The values declared in the Corporate Plans are presented as being universal and, as revealed in Chapter Three, community itself is declared to be a Greystone value,

VALUES: Community: We are a scholarly community within a wider community. We are committed to being an accessible institution that engages energetically with government, business and the public at large. The cohesion of our own community depends on parity of esteem and a sense of collegiality and mutual obligation. (Plan 2 p4)

Plans 1 and 2 refer to ‘values’, which ‘provide a backdrop’ to a series of objectives and ‘underpin’ the vision. The values are explained in the consultation draft (Plan 1 p9) and summarized in the final version (Plan 2 p4). These are academic freedom, collegiality, creativity, interdisciplinarity and good citizenship, and sustainability. Collegiality is described as being central to the maintenance of a ‘scholarly community that embraces academic staff, research officers, graduates, undergraduates and support staff.’ It is described as resting on four values: parity of esteem (between disciplines, research and teaching, academic and administrative staff), subsidiarity (in decision making), transparency (in the allocation of resources) and accountability (for academic and financial performance). ‘Good citizenship’ is encouraged in ‘everyday personal behaviour.’ Plan 2 cites ‘citizenship’ as a value as well as ‘community’.

Instead of ‘values’, Plans 3 and 4 refer to ‘guiding precepts’. Plan 3 (a consultation draft) states a guiding precept, ‘To cherish a collegiate ethos and pursue social inclusion in the profile
of students admitted and in staff selection, promotion and leadership.’ (Plan 3 p4). Plan 4 (the final version) states, ‘To promote the principles of fairness and equality and to nurture a collegial, socially inclusive environment for both student and staff (in profile, selection and career paths) to help fulfil their potential.’ (Plan 4 p4). Greystone strives to ensure that its graduates, ‘possess a strong sense of community’ and describes the environment at the university as, ‘a collegial one.’ (Plan 3 p4). The successful delivery of the Corporate Plan requires, ‘a collegial and congenial environment that enables all staff to flourish in their roles.’ (Plan 3 p24, Plan 4 p27) Each University Service to establish a forum to ensure ‘effective two-way feedback between the Director of the University Service and Faculty Executives, and nurture collegiality across the institution.’ (Plan 3 p25 Plan 4 p28)

7.1.4. Ambiguity reigns

Clegg describes the university itself as a deeply ambiguous space, referring to pressures and contradictions, which both restricted and made possible the living out of personal projects. The university is described as sending out ambiguous messages about what is valued at any particular time, and that espoused and actual values did not seem to match (Clegg 2008 p336). Watson also declares that academics have to live with ambiguity (Watson 2014). In his assessment of the relationship between values and academic identity, Winter discusses the implications of the perceived need to align all academics around corporate values and goals. He concludes that university leaders need to be seen, through words and deeds, to understand the academic value system; they need to ‘connect with the academic heartland.’ (Winter 2009 p128-129) Although the Greystone motto, ‘Doing different’, or ‘making a difference’, appeals to Ben who says it is about vocation, ‘it’s something that you are deeply, personally committed to, emotionally engaged with.’ (Ben C2p5)

Perhaps the ambiguity for the participants in this research is focused not so much on a mismatch between espoused and actual values but between espoused values and the lived experience. As discussed in Chapter One, Barnett bemoans the failure of universities to carry out their value framework to its logical conclusion. There is a need for academics and managers to stop colluding in a conspiracy of silence and to engage in a dialogue about values (Barnett 2003). By the same token, to move on from an ‘imagined collegiality of the past.’ (Kligyte and Barrie 2014 p166) Nixon also calls an ‘authentic’ dialogue, predicated on shared values (Nixon 2008). And as mentioned in Chapter Four, the participants themselves talk about the need for nurturing a sense of community and the community itself. Fiona says,
Greystone I would not say is happy staff generally. If you’re not really genuinely happy in your community, you will burn yourself out. People will not be able to last because they don’t get the feeding or the nurturing from their colleagues that they need to survive long term. This gap needs to be sealed… that’s how I feel people do feel. It should be a sense of community now. Greystone has to with all these tuition fees and outside pressures, we have to become a strong, tight community. And that is what they’re trying to say with the Corporate Plan but you have to nurture that. (Fiona FG1 1.07.05 – 1.09.47)

As discussed in Chapter Four, Tessa and Tim are seeking to create and sustain very tight communities as a form of protection from the rest of the institution. Bolden et al, in exploring the preoccupations of academics as citizens rather than employers, managers or individuals, concluded that a sense of disengagement and disconnect from their own institutional communities eroded commitment to principles of ‘academic citizenship’ and ‘collegiality’ (Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014 p764) This is possibly not what Fiona meant. According to Fiona, the Corporate Plan sets out how it should be but the vision cannot be realised without an open discourse about what the goal is and how to go about achieving it. To do this, she says you have to work together,

You have to think beyond of having isolated thing, things as in people working. You have to get it together somehow. So you have to maybe go out to the hubs and gives talks… There has to be some crossover. (Fiona C2p24)

Under the heading of ‘Partnership’, a corporate plan states, ‘We will nurture partnership and equity of esteem between academic, administrative and support staff.’ (Plan 4 p3). The same plan announces that Greystone will, ‘embed an ethos that values all staff.’ (Plan 4 p28). In response to the question of whether you need to nurture a sense of community within yourself or with the people you work with, Susan wondered if it should be the other way around,

Is it communities that aren’t looking after members of the community? That ends up with people feeling on the outside if you’re unhappy. (Susan FG1p3)

Susan poses the notion of a staff satisfaction league,

You know how there’s a student satisfaction league, maybe there should be a staff one. If it was an important outcome we’d all put more effort into it… If it highlighted areas where we’re really failing. (Susan FG1 1.42.24 – 1.43.40)
The *illusio*, as defined above, is possibly restricting the parameters of the discourse about community. That is, the participants appear to be willing disciples of the cause of reproducing the Greystone community, despite questioning the benefits of community as it currently exists and as they experience it. Through this research the participants were provided with a deliberative space in which to reflect on community, including their own thoughts about some of the institutional narrative such as Greystone’s Corporate Plan, what it means to them and how it compares with their day-to-day reality of living the university community. Jonathon reflects on the opportunity,

> As a practitioner... as a member of staff... as an academic... you don’t often actually get the chance to reflect on this kind of thing... normally we’re not asked. Normally... people don’t ask us about our roles and about our sense of community and how the role in that sense of community is wrapped... it’s been quite interesting actually, just getting it out into the open. (Jonathon C2p15)

And Ben acknowledges that it is inviting him to consider to what extent he agrees with the institutional narrative,

> This research project... is making me think about well ‘who do I agree with, who do I disagree with. To what extent do I agree with Greystone?’ You know, it made me look at the corporate plan so perhaps it’s creating that kind of link. (Ben C2p37)

### 7.2 SENIOR MANAGEMENT COMMUNICATIONS: AN INAUGURAL ADDRESS, LETTERS AND LEADERSHIP

The founding Greystone Vice-Chancellor welcomed the first student intake as ‘members of this academic community’ in his inaugural address. He said, ‘there are enough of you to form friendships, yet you are small enough to be a community.’ (Vice-Chancellor’s Inaugural Address, 1963) To-date, Greystone has had nine vice-chancellors. Two were in tenure during this research. The second started sending a regular email letter to staff in September 2009 when relatively new in his role. Up to December 2013, thirty-one letters from the Vice-Chancellor were emailed to all university staff, all addressed ‘Dear Colleagues’. The content is categorised in Table 3 below (the total word count of the letters is 22,018 and the net word count 21,550 after removing the addressees and signatures). There were also occasional emails to staff about the Integration Project, more formal in tone than the letters. These are not included in this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of issues covered</th>
<th>Percentage of word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Administrative reorganisation, announcing Open Forums, campus life, new facilities for students, a school closure, acknowledgement of staff achievements.</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Monitoring applications and admissions, open days, competition with other universities, acknowledgement of staff contribution to admissions.</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>The UK economy and the national higher education funding landscape, the Browne Review, university fee setting, major research and development awards.</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International collaborations</td>
<td>China.</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League table position</td>
<td>Greystone’s position in all the major league tables, competition with other universities.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Awards and prizes, moving on from 2009 event.</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff matters</td>
<td>Appointments of senior staff, staff terms and conditions, internal communications review.</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Announcing consultation with staff and the key elements of the draft plan.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University events</td>
<td>The opening of new facilities, inaugural and anniversary festivals.</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chancellor led campaigns</td>
<td>A governmental policy issue that affects overseas admissions, the need for students to work harder.</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** topics covered in the Vice-Chancellor’s letters to staff, September 2009 – December 2013

Written in the first person, the letters reveal something about the character of the Vice-Chancellor as a person, through the way in which he chooses to convey his message, his observations and the language he uses, although the extent to which the letters were composed solely by the Vice-Chancellor is unknown. Through them he appears to be speaking directly to the staff and is creating an impression of sharing an almost intimate perspective on what is happening. He is ‘grateful’ to the staff, he is ‘very conscious’ of their plight, he is
‘pleased’, ‘delighted’ and ‘thankful’, and he ‘urges’ staff to respond. Fiona believes he is sincere,

My sense is that (vice-chancellor) is on the right path... I feel he is talking that talk and believing it. I feel that. I don’t know if it’s true but when I look at him I feel that actually, I don’t know him personally, but I feel he gives the sense of self to me as a person anyway and I hope to others as well that gives inspiration. (Fiona C2p18-19)

According to Evans, a Vice-Chancellor is not a mere diplomat, not just a higher civil servant and certainly not merely an effective fund-raiser,

The style, the clarity, above all the visibility of personal values should be striking, and they should include, indeed make prominent, the long-term values. Here he is not ‘speaking for’ the university, but setting a standard, identifying an identity. (Evans 2002 p108)

The Vice-Chancellor has also, according to Schulz, become like a Chief Executive Officer, ‘referring to the university as a corporation.’ (Schulz 2013 p465) The Vice-Chancellor is in a position of authority. He is a leader with institutional cultural capital and, as such, his words can command a certain level of authority.

7.2.1. The significance of receiving

For Ben, receiving the letters is a matter of being kept informed about decisions that are being taken by the Vice-Chancellor and the senior management, and he appreciates the contact,

That actually is a real visibility and I do read them when I can, and I do quite enjoy thinking, OK, so he is talking about these different groups, he is concerned about fees and whilst I don’t always agree necessarily with them, it’s really nice to be put in position where I can say, OK, that was the logic and that was the decision that was taken... I hadn’t thought that before but just that digital contact, a click on an email. (Ben - FG1 1.15.37 – 1.16.19)

Edward acknowledges the role that the letters play and the topics that he assumes are of the greatest importance to the Vice-Chancellor,

At least he’s trying to put us in the perspective about the problems, the pressures that he’s facing... (Edward - FG1 1.16.03 – 16.28) What would be the high priorities of Vice-Chancellor’s perspective... improve the REF rating, improve the student satisfaction survey, improve the number of research
grants, produce a financial surplus, meet some enterprise, engagement and employability, these are big issues at the moment. (Edward – FG1 1.37.40 – 1.38.25)

Receiving the letters does appear to be just as important to the participants as their content. It is creating a connection between the Vice-Chancellor and individual members of staff through the written word. Though according to Fiona, it is not necessarily making the Vice-Chancellor more visible,

Over the years I’ve been here I can only remember when I was in the (school) as a scientist actually having a visit from the then VC, asking me how I felt, I was a very young researcher at the time. I have seen (vice-chancellor) and the other VCs as well but most communication has been by email and that is probably the same for 90% of my colleagues. Meaning that him or somebody is not very visible amongst us. (Fiona FG1 p5-6)

The letters form a part of the institutional doxa. They are stage managed, like the Open Forum, for example, which is organised and choreographed by the university management as an opportunity for staff to hear a presentation from the Vice-Chancellor and senior management, and to ask questions. Dowling-Hetherington found a variety of views amongst academics on the extent to which faculty meetings represented a real forum for participative decision-making. Whilst it was acknowledged that the meetings provided a forum for academics to, ‘stand up and be listened to’, there was also a sense that they were not, ‘particularly democratic’; that they were ‘managed’ and ‘highly choreographed’ with many decisions ‘made well before the faculty meeting’ (Dowling-Hetherington 2013 p226). The Vice-Chancellor referred to the Open Forum in his letters. Fiona, who had recently attended a leadership course provided by the staff development centre at Greystone, considers the link between the leadership at Greystone and the need for a sense of community for everyone, including the leaders,

I think (vice-chancellor) is probably a very good leader… I doubt if all the Deans or the senior people who lead are actually good leaders… I don’t think that all of them have actually gone to training… they’ve ended up in a position… If you’ve been here long enough you can sense the difference as different personalities come in… didn’t have the abilities or didn’t even try…At the moment the vision is that (the REF etc.) and you might think less about leadership and community but I’m wondering if that is the wrong way to go about it…because maybe the other thing is necessary for the sustainability of REF. (Fiona FG1p6)
According to Fiona, if there is no attention to community then good leaders, who also need to be happy, leave the organisation. For Edward, sustaining a sense of community is the responsibility not just of leaders,

It has to happen from both... the importance of the grassroots community, identity... leadership... vice-chancellor or super leader... lesser bodies such as the head of a research unit. (Edward - FG1 1.12.37 – 1.13.10)

Ben reflects on the implications of connecting with the staff,

It doesn’t demand of the leader or figurehead a huge amount of flexibility... if you’re going to say to people, I’m going to support you to build your own bottom up community, you cannot then say but you’re getting it wrong, this is the way to do it. Because otherwise you’re not doing what you said you’d do. As a leader you can come in with your strategic vision but you also have to be very flexible to respond to what it is that your organisation or community wants to do... hugely risky. (Ben FG1 1.13.08 – 1.13.52)

Edward considers what it is like to wear the Vice-Chancellor’s shoes,

It’s all very well for us to sit around the table say that there should be this attention to the grassroots... you can just imagine his timetable and all the political interactions at a national level... which isn’t to say it shouldn’t be done or there shouldn’t be mechanisms... certainly it’s very beneficial that people in high positions do try to find out what’s happening at the grassroots level. (Edward - FG1 1.14.05 – 1.14.43)

7.2.2. The portrayal of community

The word, ‘community’ appears in the letters five times. Three times in the context of celebrating Greystone’s league table position in conjunction with a special anniversary, once in the context of the Corporate Plan on celebrating the diversity of the campus community and once in the context of encouraging community engagement and to generate new income sources and stimulate enterprise to counteract the financial constraints in the region. For example, Greystone’s community is described as, ‘the community of Greystone’ and ‘our campus community’. The word ‘campus’ appears 23 times including, ‘the community atmosphere on campus’ and ‘life on campus’. Phrases from the letters that signify a possible intention to convey a sense of the collective, or shared endeavour include the following,
Renewed thanks for such hard work from every quarter and to everyone for keeping Greystone so free of friction – even about the car park disruptions – over this challenging year. (Topic – Administration)

The Greystone campus looking so attractive, the Square full of students basking in the sun between lectures, the ice-cream seller doing a roaring trade and temperatures firmly in the mid-twenties. (Topic – Administration)

I have sent deepest condolences on behalf of us all. (Topic – Administration)

My thanks to everyone for their struggles, once the snow set in, to deliver business as usual at the University. I am particularly grateful to all of those colleagues who have spent time making the campus as safe as possible underfoot for everyone. (Topic – Administration)

Let me thank each and every one of you for all you have done for Greystone, for your creativity, your collegiality and your sheer hard work. (Topic – Administration)

I love the fresh thinking about educational strategy that seems to be coming from all corners of the campus. (Topic - Admissions)

Much will depend on our collective effort in the weeks and months to come. (Topic – Admissions)

I want to thank everyone who plays a part in running, refining and enriching the Open and Visit days. The intellectual stimulus and personal friendliness of those days have again proved crucial and demonstrated how attractive those who make the journey find Greystone. (Topic – Admissions)

I hope colleagues working in every single School and every single Service take real pleasure in your success in making Greystone such an agreeable place to study. (Topic – League table position)

I love seeing Greystone shine simultaneously for its academic, cultural and social provision. Every single member of staff, as well as our Students’ Union and every single student, should take enormous pride in the accolade: we owe it to our consistently high score on each of the 21 aspects of student life tested, and Greystone stands out for the community atmosphere on campus. (Topic – League table position)

It is a pleasure to pay tribute to every colleague and student who has contributed to driving up the quality of all we do. (Topic – Staff matters)

Once completed, the Plan [Corporate Plan] will belong to all of us working at Greystone and we need your help in getting it right and embedding targets that are challenging yet realistic. (Topic- The Corporate Plan)
7.2.3. Difficult times and doxa

What do the letters and the response of the participants to them reveal about the Vice-Chancellor’s role in performing the institutional doxa? How might this affect the idea and experience of community at Greystone? The Vice-Chancellor, through his letters, can appear to understand at an individual level, and even empathise, in the face of difficulties that are imposed by conditions over which he, and the institution, have no control. This is illustrated by the way in which he deals with the impending closure of a school. The dominance of the economic field and the associated marketisation is explicitly acknowledged,

In my message about the (school closure), I underlined the increasing challenges of a market-focused environment and the hard decisions which are forced upon us as a consequence of competition over diminishing resources. (Topic – Funding)

And the response of the staff to the situation is skilfully handled,

I have been struck by how constructive even the most pained reactions have been, and by the collegiate spirit in which colleagues in the School and across the University have responded to the news [the announced closure of the aforementioned school]. Concern for the current students and appreciation of the role that [subject] activity plays in enriching life on campus have been consistent themes. (Topic – Administration)

Whilst the impact of external forces is acknowledged, some culpability on the part of the institution is still assumed. For example, Tim believes the school was deliberately run left to fail,

I think Greystone ran that school into the ground to be honest... I don’t think they were trying to save it because didn’t have a head of school for about ten years. They didn’t invest any money in it... in getting new people in... to try and build up their research... they just let it flounder... so it was almost a deliberate sabotage so they could get rid of it. Don’t tell the VC I said that... actually I don’t really care. (Tim C2p20)

The explicit acceptance in the letters of the dominance of the economic field is illustrated by the following,

Public policy is to intensify competition and tighten the link between quality and income for both teaching and research. There is greatest safety on the high ground: the further we raise the quality of what we do, the less Greystone will be damaged by the cuts. (Topic – League table position)
Greystone is drawing up its new Corporate Plan (2012-16) at a time of great economic uncertainty and profound changes in the way that Higher Education is funded... the retrenchment of the British state is giving the University unprecedented economic and regional as well as cultural and social responsibility. (Topic – The Corporate Plan)

Pressed home, these quasi-market measures will open up a widening gulf between universities which recruit strongly and can charge what it takes to deliver a cracking good education, and those which do not. We must make certain Greystone takes the high road. (Topic – Admissions)

Growth will enable us to expand the University’s economic as well as cultural and social role, including our direct and indirect contribution to job-creation. The ominous financial climate is steadily increasing the University’s wider regional responsibility for nurturing new jobs. (Topic – Funding)

That the first (Local Enterprise Partnership) convention should have been at the University reflects the growing role we mean to play in helping to generate new jobs and trying to reduce the risk of a double dip. (Topic – Reputation)

The field of higher education may be weak and may lack autonomy in relation to other fields and the institution may be weak in relation to the field as it emulates the vocabulary of the dominating economic field. However, the institution as it relates to its individual members, is strong. An example of this is illustrated in the letters by the ‘integration project’. The letters on this subject portray a sense of inevitability, there being no alternative in the context of the economic climate that the sector finds itself in,

I am very conscious that the Project involves uncertainty for many individuals and downward pressure on income at a time when there is all too much of that from every side. (Topic – Administration)

I am afraid the steps needed are unsettling, but the urgency of cost-saving continues to mount. (Topic – Funding)

Financial pressure and determination to increase the number of academic posts made it imperative for us to integrate and slim our support services. Every ambitious university is being forced in that direction, but I am conscious of the demands that such slimming-down places on support staff and academic staff. (Topic – Administration)

The integration project was an institutionally led cost-saving initiative that directly affected the idea and experience of community and habitus, as revealed by the participants themselves in the conversations and focus groups. In his letters the Vice-Chancellor acknowledges how individuals may be feeling,
Turning to matters much closer to home, I was struck by how measured and courteous the many questions were at my Open Fora, especially given the regrettable but sadly inevitable strength of feeling over the pain involved in the Integration Project. (Topic – Administration)

Nicola was aware of the strength of feeling about the integration project, ‘there’s a lot of grumbling. I think the grumbling is less about the re-structure and more about the way it’s been handled’ (Nicola C2p10 – 11). Fiona wonders to what extent the Vice-Chancellor himself was aware of what went on,

Some of this is very personal, not necessarily to me but to the team that I’m sitting in and what we provide but it affects a lot of people at this university… I wonder what he would say if he knew what happened here because I know he doesn’t know. (Fiona C2p33)

7.3 DISPOSITION

The discussion in Chapters Four to Six considers how community as cultural capital and habitus affect the participants’ dispositions and view of community. The emphasis in this chapter, which builds upon that discussion, is on disposition and the doxic experience. Bourdieu acknowledges that agents are not always comfortable, ‘The homology between the space of positions and the space of dispositions is never perfect and there are always some agents ‘out on a limb’, displaced, out of place and ill at ease.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p157) Bryan, Rosa, Susan and Fiona all feel ‘out on a limb’ at different times and in different ways. Bryan has a strong sense of wanting to feel needed,

You have not learnt that your institution will not love you unconditionally. You have to, if you like, get your satisfaction in terms of your need for scholarship and research, you have to get the acknowledgement of your work outside your institution, because if you look for the acknowledgement of your work inside your institution, you’re going to be a very unhappy person... it’s a lesson I have not fully learnt... that I still want my institution to need me. (Bryan C2p21-22)

Rosa desires to have a sense of attachment to a community that is derived from its institutional context,

The one thing I want to do is feel a sense of community within the institution... I want to have colleagues. I want to share my research findings and also personal interests, so all these things excite me. This is what I didn’t get... I really hope to have a sense of community within the institution. (Rosa C2p8-9)
Susan, who as time goes on feels less excluded, is working towards a sense of belonging, ‘The community at Greystone, I’m trying to join it, trying to feel part of it and increasingly do so but it is a work in progress, I think.’ (Susan FG1p1)

Whilst Fiona, who feels optimistic or hopeful, about the intentions outlined in the Corporate Plan, is anxious about how the delivery of the cited targets will affect her as an individual,

I know that it will involve myself but I am sitting here thinking so what if like this doesn’t happen to me, what will then will happen to me. And this is what lots of other people will wonder and that’s what create anxiety... little bullets which has no real meat to it... exactly how is that going to happen... people then feel insecure... lots of people wondering what’s going to happen to me... am I going to be wanted here or not? (Fiona C2p28)

This is in the context of Fiona’s emotional state following the consequences of the administration issues which had led to a challenge to her role as a line manager and a threat to her teaching programme (these are discussed in Chapters Four and Five). She considered resigning,

And about three weeks ago I felt I am not going to fight anymore for, for this, not us but for Greystone or for (Centre) because do you know what, if that is what it is to be a family of people that believe and if that is how people are treated then I don’t know if I want to be a part of it anymore. (Fiona C2p11)

Fiona reflected on how things had been handled at an institutional level,

Possibly because (subject) is very small in some respect with a big purpose but... they don’t see the importance of it. And I think reading the corporate plan, reading what we are suppose to be all about, I think they are making a mistake a bit. Not necessarily in changing it all but I think they made a real sad mistake of how they went about it. (Fiona C2p11)

She felt the Greystone leadership could have dealt with things differently,

I felt so disappointed with their leadership or managerial skills in cracking those views and handling and supporting this team. Because obviously I’m here to support my team but if they tie my hands around the back and I can’t do anything about... That’s not working together I don’t think. (Fiona C2p15-16)

In sharing stories of women leaving academic medicine, Levine, Lin et al found that leadership played an important role in shaping individual experiences and was vital for creating an
environment and culture of ‘transparency and inclusion’. (Levine, Lin et al. 2011 p756) After the significant events, which took Fiona to the brink of resignation, she regained her sense of belonging,

My own sense of belonging today is to, is back in (Centre). I feel still that I respect the upper layer at the university... I feel that I still believe in what we are trying to do. (Fiona C2p24)

7.4 INDIVIDUALS ON ‘INSTITUTIONAL’ ACTION

Nicola describes how uncertainty and the lack of ground rules affect community,

A lot of people don’t actually know what the rules are for the institution let alone the basic day-to-day stuff so a lot of stuff gets pushed onto other people and you go round and round ... that degree of uncertainty is destructive towards the sense of community because people will hide away... That degree of anxiety and uncertainty doesn’t help community.’ (Nicola FG2 27.22 – 29.19)

According to Poole, complexity taxes us cognitively, whereas uncertainty taxes us emotionally. Academics are trained to deal with complexity but not uncertainty. Security comes from knowing the rules as well as the genre, it ‘reinforces discipline-based thinking and helps maintain these rules as principal sources of a faculty member’s identity.’ (Poole 2009 p51) There is the possibility therefore that the discipline stays insular and homogenous, ‘Without some clearly defined patterns of thought, there is no discipline – uncertainty reigns and we are homeless.’(Poole 2009 p53)

It is observed in Chapter Four that the participants want certainty but would like to be less regulated and more supported in their aim to be more communal. They reflect on how Greystone could create a sense of community in the context of how they presently experience it. Michael believes that a university should embody certain values and that to strengthen the sense of community, bureaucratic regulation should not really be necessary. These values, however, which he terms as ‘values and forms of human excellence’, are under stress,

Why do you have ethical codes? They’re rather more to protect university form being sued than anything else but it’s also I argue, a reflection of a failure, of a breakdown in the social practices through which people are socialised into certain values and principles... you shouldn’t have to require an ethical code for university researchers to show respect for the people they’re engaged with in the research process... that ought to come from habits and dispositions cultivated by the social practices, by what people
see as modelled in the university, by the way people behave, by the shock and the horror that people exhibit if certain things aren’t done. (Michael C1p20-21)

He concludes that what we have instead of the ‘cultivation of virtue’, is, ‘regulation by a bureaucracy according with codes and norms.’ (Michael C1p20-21)

Edward also considers universities to be different in some way from other types of organisations,

There is something beyond the individual which probably comes from certain social morays or historical expectations that a university community or department or research outfit will be subtly different from a commercial firm or business which might be much more structured or hierarchical… there must be sociological norms or historical patterns. Of course they change… the move from collegiality to managerialism but there must be expectations that focus our views of community. (Edward FG1 24.22 – 25.22)

And Jonathon believes that individual academics shy away from the communal, or at least from meetings,

One of the problems with academics is that they don’t actually like meeting. I’ve noticed this. Colleagues will go out of their way to avoid having meetings and I can understand why because of course every time you’re in a meeting you can’t be doing something else. But actually I think there is a need for colleagues, if you’re going to develop a sense of community and a sense of shared endeavour, whatever it may be you’ve got to meet and talk to each other. (Jonathon FG2 32.12 – 33.34)

Fiona responds to a question about whether a sense of community can be created and measured without it becoming a part of new management,

That doesn’t mean that the communication shouldn’t happen but it only means that the communication shouldn’t happen via a survey… some communication exists at Greystone but others clearly it doesn’t and that is possibly the problem… some people don’t understand what’s going on and feel isolated and lonely… like saying thank you… in many ways, and quite small in terms of time, investment but it’s those things… I’m a mother and I say to my son, do you understand how much a smile means, how much your face can tell other people or you say something, it’s the same at work. (Fiona FG1 1.45.34 – 1.46.39)

The personal connection, no matter how small, does seem to matter. Edward focuses on saying ‘thank you’,

One of the most important things that people in responsibility can do is to always remember to thank people… when they get a research grant… even if it’s just sending
out an email... if there’s been a particularly good public lecture series [would that be a KPI, how many times you’ve said thank you this week?] maybe it should be... [staff satisfaction league]... the NSS is a sort of surrogate. (Edward FG1 1.41.52 – 1.42.25)

Edward gave up a year of research in order to manage a successful quality assurance submission for his school and was never thanked for doing so,

It still rankles with me... I had to get trained, went out to other places to find out how it had been done.... in the end we got 24 out of 24, only the second time it was done, mind you it was a bit of grade inflation, everyone got skilled at doing it... the dean was happy... you would have thought a letter from the Vice-Chancellor or something like that... some sort of note, a two line note. (Edward FG1 1.46.40 – 1.48.03)

Macfarlane, writing about academic citizenship, found that service activities carried out by academics were poorly rewarded, received limited recognition and were affected by power relations within the academic community, particularly the most disesteemed forms or service, which lead to a sense of resentment (Macfarlane 2007 p267). Also, many faculty in Lindholm’s study of thirty-six professors, viewed their institutional role as more obligatory than compelling, although as reported in Chapter Six, some were motivated by the idea of ‘institution-building’ and promoting institutional change (Lindholm 2004 p626).

Ben wonders if there should be some form of key performance indicator to help gauge the staff’s reaction to the corporate plan, ‘Greystone might well say ‘well our corporate plan’s been downloaded by fifty people, or a hundred people, a thousand people’ and that’d be a kind of KPI.’ (Ben C2p37)

7.5 TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL FRAMES

The institutional narrative places great importance on funding and assessment structures and temporal cycles, all of which have a direct impact on habitus. Nicola talks about the uncertainty of funding and quality assessment cycles,

People are unclear about the emphases in which to place their effort... and it seems to come in cycles. So at the moment we’re in the research REF cycle so it’s all ‘do research; abandon everything else.’ And then when you’re in a funding cycle it’s ‘get money in get money in, abandon everything else’ and of course none of these things ever stop so you can’t abandon everything else. (Nicola C2p9)
This corresponds with Henkel’s observation about effect on individuals, ‘The sense that rigid external time structures were being imposed on what were felt to be individual rhythms could be daunting, despite individuals’ commitment to their research agendas.’ (Henkel 2000 p137)

The participants’ reflections on the effect of the office reorganisation imposed by the ‘integration project’ mirror the link that Bourdieu has outlined, between physical and mental structures, what he describes as,

> The mute instructions and silent calls to order from structures in appropriated physical space are one of the mediations by which social structures are gradually converted into mental structures and into systems of preferences. (Bourdieu, Accardo et al. 1993 p126)

The participants’ comments are made in the context of an institutional narrative that emphasises a relationship between the physical layout of the campus and the inter-disciplinary nature of the academic endeavour that is seen to be a unique characteristic of Greystone. This is doxa. For example, on the topic of the development of Greystone’s estate, it is declared in a corporate plan that,

> Skilfully managed development lends physical substance to our deeply-rooted interdisciplinarity academic ethos: facilitating formal and informal collaborations across the disciplines in offices, seminar rooms and laboratories that are a few minutes’ walk from each other. (Plan 3 p29)

This chimes with Michael’s assessment of the Greystone architecture as described in Chapter Four, as being designed to get people meeting and talking together. Ben, however, is sceptical about Greystone’s interdisciplinarity agenda, ‘that doesn’t appear to have changed anything really... there’s a kind of wash over something that’s gone before but nothing more.’ (Ben C2p21-22) Nicola, who became a member of a new school, formed by the splitting of an existing school (administratively and physically), says that everything is individualized,

To the extent that a body of academics get moved from one building to another and we stop talking to each other just because we’re not bumping into each other in the corridor. That stops communication so I think the environment is really, really strong influence of what happens... and it will be with the admin move I think. Physical spaces really influence what happens a lot... the geography of the academic community’s not really thought through in terms of the implications of where people are... in terms of management of office space, it’s very much kind of just plugging people in to holes just because that’s where the space is and there’s a number of
people, rather than thinking about how those people are going to try to work together. (Nicola C2p 17-18)

Cox, Herrick et al concluded, ‘we also do not entirely fit the spaces offered up by the university because they are always being reimagined and re-appropriated. The same space can change its meaning from one moment to the next.’ (Cox, Herrick et al. 2012 p705) Nicola wonders what the strategy is behind the integration project, ‘it just seems at the moment that there’s a lot of office moves going on... it’s just completely bananas. It’s like, why spread everyone around? Let’s not bother having faculties and schools, just bung people wherever then. It just seems a bit odd.’ (Nicola C2p 17-18) The rumours about the integration project plans were rife,

There’s been talk about you’re not allowed personal items on your desk. And I’ve heard about this outside the university and this is this new management thing they do. They de-personalise everything... I can understand it when you’re doing hot-desking, but I don’t really understand it when you’ve got a permanent desk. (Nicola C2p10 – 11)

7.6 THEMATIC CONCLUSION FOR INSTITUTION AND ENVIRONMENT

The social world is mainly experienced through doxa and Bourdieu describes this experience as,

An adherence to relations of the social order which, because they structure inseparably both the real world and the thought world, are accepted as self-evident. Primary perception of the social world, far from being a simple mechanical reflection, is always an act of cognition, involving principles of construction that are external to the constructed object grasped in its immediacy; but at the same time it is an act of misrecognition, implying the most absolute form of recognition of the social order. (Bourdieu 1984 p473)

Is the real world of community and the thought world of community connected by doxa in this context? Which version of the object (the idea and experience of academic community) is dominant; the version promulgated by the institution through corporate instruments such as those discussed above, or the day-to-day version lived by the participants, as expressed above in their responses to the institutional version? How is that dominance sustained or reproduced? How is it validated? Aspects of the institutional doxa on academic community explored in this chapter illuminate ways in which ‘community’ may function as a policy instrument, employed by the institution and the field as a way of sustaining a specific social order. In the analytical framework, ‘The university & community’ and ‘Documents & doxa’ traverse FIELD and HABITUS.
Illustration 7: the analytical framework highlighting the theme, ‘institution and environment’

According to Bourdieu, ‘Doxa is the relationship of immediate adherence that is established in practice between a habitus and the field to which it is attuned, the pre-verbal taking-for-granted of the world that flows from practical sense.’ (Bourdieu 1990 p68) This research goes beyond the pre-verbal and provides the opportunity for conscious reflection on the object. As stated in Chapter One, the intention is to raise a ‘discursive consciousness’ (May and Perry 2011 p43) through which the participants may reflect upon their idea and experience of community.

Bourdieu states, ‘Like the artistic field, each scientific universe has its specific doxa, a set of inseparably cognitive and evaluative presuppositions whose acceptance is implied in membership itself.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p100) That membership is crucial. As stated above, the agents or participants believe in the game; they are complicit players and they have a stake in the game. They are all members of an academic community and even if they do not always feel a strong connection with Greystone as an institution or indeed, the academic community
as they themselves perceive it, and even if their stories are multifarious, they are still connected, however tenuously. That is the fundamental homology that helps to shape the object, binding together all the elements. The game not only provides the participants with some, or all of their financial livelihood but more fundamentally, it connects with their values and serves their need to do what they do and their need to belong,

To the outsider the game may appear insignificant but to the players it becomes the meaning of their life, mystifying the underlying conditions of domination that make the game possible. (Burawoy 2010 p24)

7.6.1 Ontological complicity and symbolic violence

In different ways, the participants demonstrate a ‘feel for the game’ when negotiating their own position and dealing with situations that they are faced with, particularly in relation to the institution. They appear to fully understand the nature of Greystone and of their environment. They are not totally consumed by the institutional doxa – they are neither naive nor entirely complicit. However, as Bourdieu claims, ‘non-naivety does not exclude a form of innocence’ (Bourdieu 1990 p148). Their ‘innocence’ is borne out by a belief and a hope (underpinned by values and according to Lucas, a ‘passionate commitment’ (Lucas 2006 p64)) that possesses them in ways that contribute to their doxic experience and to their habitus. This involves what Bourdieu describes as ‘ontological complicity’ or mutual possession whereby,

Social reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside of agents. And when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a “fish in water”: it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted. (Bourdieu 2003 p103)

This is where the real world of community and the thought world of community come together, through the act of ontological complicity, or as Mann would say, a ‘dynamic of compliance’, towards surface harmony (Mann 2005 p50). The nature of the relationship between the objective and the subjective is significant. Bourdieu describes the relation of ontological correspondence between objective structures and subjective structures, stating that the most obscure principle of action lies, ‘neither in structures nor in consciousness, but rather in the relation of immediate proximity between objective structures and embodied structures – in habitus.’ As ‘socialised organisms’, agents are ‘endowed with a set of dispositions that imply both their propensity and their ability to enter into and play the game.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p38)
Does such complicity or ‘tacitly accepted constraint’ amount to a form of symbolic violence, which, according to Bourdieu, not only characterises doxic experience but is also an essential prerequisite for sustaining the social order? (Bourdieu 1989 p4) As mentioned in Chapter Four and above, Ben reflects on the ‘dark side’ of community discourses, observing that the more strongly something is cherished, the easier it is for it to be used, ‘against us’ (Ben C2p42-43).

Does the participants’ disposition, especially their emotional attachment to the academic community, or at least the idea of the academic community, help to provide the factors that shape and dominate their habitus? Bourdieu’s habitus, as a system of dispositions, ‘is a potentiality, a desire to be which, in a certain way, seeks to create the conditions most favourable to what it is.’ (Bourdieu 2000 p150) Does the existence of that desire pave the way for what Bourdieu describes as a form of insidious or deep-rooted domination? According to Krejzler, academic subjects (free agents that continuously negotiate their working conditions) are, ‘required to code desires in modes that express – or at least successfully pretend – commitment to the organization’s visions and goals.’ (Krejzler 2013 p1158)

This is possibly the route by which the version of the object in this context, promulgated by Greystone through corporate instruments, is validated and becomes dominant. Where, as Reay states, the subjective structures, the habitus and objective structures are in accord with each other (Reay 2004 p37). Bourdieu says he never talks of influence, ‘It is not a logic of “communicative interaction”… It is much more powerful and insidious than that.’ (Bourdieu 1989 p4) It requires no inculcating. According to Bourdieu, the analysis of the doxic experience of the world, due to the immediate agreement of objective structures and cognitive structures, is the true foundation of a realistic theory of domination and politics. All the participants, however, demonstrate a level of complicity through their desire for community, for whatever reason. They all believe it should be nurtured. In this sense, that desire is a collective one and may also mirror Bourdieu’s interpretation of the role that symbolic violence plays in socialisation,

Symbolic violence is the violence which extorts submission, which is not perceived as such, based on “collective expectations” or socially inculcated beliefs... the theory of symbolic violence rests on a theory of the work of socialization necessary to produce agents endowed with the schemes of perception and appreciation that will permit them to perceive and obey the injunctions inscribed in a situation or discourse. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p168)

Assessing symbolic violence in academia, Reay describes academia as having an ethos of, ‘at best, mutual instrumentalism, at its worst, individualistic, competitive self-interest and self-
promotion’, lacking any intrinsic ethic of care (Reay 2004 p37). So, does symbolic violence involve inculcation or not? Whilst, as the participants themselves acknowledge, community is generally perceived to be a good thing, Bourdieu’s interpretation as applied to this context is possibly over-deterministic, particularly in relation to the act of misrecognition whereby the given state of things is internalised and perceived as self-evident. It is not that that the misrecognition does not occur but in this instance it becomes more of a conscious act as the participants reflect on the institution’s doxic instruments. For example, Bryan says it is the academics’ job to question,

The administrative system is about the development and sustenance of a corporate image and anything that appears to be slightly dysfunctional to that... Anything that doesn’t meet its purpose that appears to be lacking in functionality can be disregarded but then the academic’s job is to offer a certain amount of resistance to that. (Bryan C2p30-31)

And yet he still wants his institution to need him. He has an emotional attachment to Greystone and to the academic community. He wants to belong. He wants to be useful. As Bourdieu states,

Symbolic violence, to put it as tersely and simply as possible, is the violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity... social agents are knowing agents who, even when they are subjected to determinisms, contribute to producing the efficacy of that which determines them insofar as they structure what determines them. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p167-8)

7.6.2 Limiting the possibilities

As indicated above, the participants’ desire for community or community of communities is not unlike the sense of community that is portrayed in the institutional documents, and it may in fact limit the possibilities. Essentially, ‘the agents’ aspirations have the same limits as the objective conditions of which they are the product.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p166) Their agency is conditioned by their own desires and by their habitus. The dominant version of the object as propagated through the corporate documents (a cohesive academic community), is desired by all and is reproduced through the doxa – as illustrated in the framework, traversing field and habitus.

According to Bourdieu, the truth of doxa is only fully revealed, ‘when negatively constituted by the constitution of a field of opinion, the locus of the confrontation of competing discourses.’
It is clear that the participants do not lack opinion but does the discourse reveal the truth of the Greystone doxa? The institutional portrayal of community may not be an unquestioned truth but is it heterodox to question the institutional narrative or position on community? Bryan referred to the potentially political repercussions of the research encounter, affected by the issue of reputational risk from an institutional perspective,

My concern is whether one’s position and role inside the organisation acts as a significant constraint on speaking the truth as you see it or speaking the truth as it is substantiated by the evidence... my view is that, probably exacerbated by (2009 incident*), the university is particularly sensitive about its corporate image... and I think that the development of the university in terms of a corporate enterprise... has implications for the academic feeling of individual members of staff pursuing research, particularly pursuing research, that impinges upon the public image of the university. (Bryan C2p2)

* In 2009 the computers at one of the university’s research units were hacked.

Bourdieu identifies crisis as a necessary condition for a questioning of doxa but says that crisis is not in itself, ‘a sufficient condition for the production of a critical discourse.’ (Bourdieu 1972 p169) Whilst this is not the place for an assessment of Greystone’s response to the 2009 incident (described by Holliman as an ‘unstructured form of public engagement’ (Holliman 2011 p9)), it is significant that a participant with a long association with the university (42 years at the time of the research encounter) did consider it to be relevant. Maintaining a positive institutional reputation appears to be critical to sustaining the social order and accordingly to Steiner et al who devised a multi-dimensional model for university identity and reputation strategy work, reputation plays a significant role as prompter for university reform and development work (Steiner, Sundström et al. 2013 p408). MacDonald, on theorizing university identity development, also concludes that image, reputation and identity are ‘tightly connected’; the challenge is that universities have multiple images (MacDonald 2013 p160).

**7.6.3 Institution and environment**

In exploring the implications of new public sector reforms for the culture of higher education, Lynch concludes that ‘the lack of resistance to neoliberal regimes, and for many the endorsement of its values, are in part explained by the prior allegiance of scholars to the doxas of their own trade.’ For Lynch, the doxa is centred on the notion of carelessness, predicated
on the Cartesian view of education whereby scholarly work is separated from emotional thought and feeling, and fact is separated from value. (Lynch 2010 p59) This is in contrast with the analysis above and in Chapters Four to Six whereby all the participants demonstrate some form of emotive attachment to the idea of community. All have a strong motivation for building and sustaining community, all appear to desire, or need, a sense of community, all need to feel validated in their membership of the university or research community and all are intrinsically motivated to include aspects of community in their academic practice.

In observing the recurrence of intense emotions (both positive and negative) in her research on mothers’ involvement in their children’s education, Reay suggests that the notion of emotional capital may be a useful construct for, ‘unravelling some of the confusing class and gender processes embedded in parental involvement in education.’ (Reay 2000 p583) More recently, Reay describes that suggestion as her ‘first attempt’ to develop Bourdieu’s conceptual framework to encompass the emotional dimensions of lived experience, as she goes on to examine ‘habitus and the psychosocial.’ (Reay 2015 p9)

The confidence of the institutional discourse (and of the institution itself) described above, is emblematic of the grand narrative that tends to be a strong feature of institutions in this field, and contrasts with the fluctuations in the disposition and habitus of the agents. In his assessment of higher education, globalisation and the knowledge economy, Michael Peters describes institutional discourse, or grand narratives, as, ‘stories that cultures tell themselves about their own practices and beliefs in order to legitimate them. They function as a unified single story that purports to legitimate or found a set of practices in a cultural self-image, a discourse or an institution.’ (Peters 2004 p72) The institution is mirroring the doxa of the field. The participants’ experience of the academic community is not a single story. It is affected by their idea of community, by issues that relate to their status and their academic practice and by their doxic experience at an institutional level. All these elements serve to inform and underpin the concluding discussion in Chapter Eight as we move towards the task of building the final conceptual model that is informed by the research as a whole.
Chapter 8  
LOST AND FOUND

INTRODUCTION

The research set out to explore ‘community’ as perceived and experienced by twelve individual academics associated with one higher education institution. It did not set out to define or explain community per se and instead focused on the meaning and experience of community from the perspective of the participants – that meaning and experience is the research object. The research sought to answer the following overarching question,

‘How do academics conceive of and relate to the idea of ‘community’?’

The research object is defined and constructed in Chapter One through a review of the literature on academic community. In relation to defining the object, the various theses hark back to a golden age (which may or may not have existed), delineate tribes and territories, dwell on the challenges of corporatization and the opportunities of citizenship, and seek redemption through the coming together of individual and collective identities, possibly brought together in a community that is realised though a ‘virtuous’ ideology. A dialogistic approach is taken to constructing the object, engaging with the literature and the object in ways that recognises how the act of construction may itself develop new ground and perhaps even lead to what Barnett describes as a ‘responsible and yet poetic anarchy.’

The tone of the literature on academic community implies a sense of something that may have been lost but is on the brink of being found, if only we knew where to look. That is where the specific contribution of this thesis comes into play, by setting out where we may look and by developing a framework that helps us to do so. In this concluding chapter the object is interpreted and (re)constructed in a way that blends its disparate elements, as revealed through the research itself. Wacquant, in commenting on Bourdieu’s relational conception of social life, observes that social reality consists of relations, ‘webs of material and symbolic ties’ and to capture them one must adopt a, ‘thoroughgoing methodological relationalism capable of grasping the tricky dialectic of social and cognitive structures in history, the tangled dance of dispositions and positions from which practice springs.’ (Wacquant 2013 p2) The research has been methodical and meticulous in tackling the overarching question and the aim has been to make it, ‘genuinely reflexive social science.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p784)
This chapter presents an understanding and interpretation of the empirical dimensions of this research in the context of the theoretical framework, an appraisal of the reflective dimension, an introduction to and explanation of the final conceptual model, and suggestions for future research and action.

8.1 BUILDING ON THE EMPIRICAL DIMENSIONS

The empirical dimensions (the analysis and findings presented in Chapters Four to Seven) focused on answering a number of questions via data gathering and an in depth heuristic analysis, channelled through four key themes and one sub-theme, seeking the agent’s idea and experience of community and its orientation to their status, their academic practice and their institution and environment. As explained in Chapter Two, the analysis was conducted in the context of the overarching question and the story that I was aiming to tell with the research, exploring the following,

‘How do academics conceive of and relate to the idea of ‘community’?’
Does ‘community capital’ exist inside higher education and if so, what does it comprise of?
How might it be accumulated and utilised; by whom and to what ends?
What conditions are necessary in order to realise and reproduce community in a university environment?

Addressing these questions through the empirical analysis brought to light two distinct hypotheses about the significance of value and values in constructing and understanding the object. These are combined in the final conceptual model introduced below. This section sets out the distinctive properties, drawn from the empirical analysis, that form the foundation for the reconstructed object and explains what underpins the focus on value and values.

8.1.1 Value and validity

Chapter One explains how the notion of exploring ‘community’ as capital came about – whether it exists as a form of capital and if so, what it may comprise of, perhaps as cultural capital, in a diffuse or symbolic form, depending on its manifestation and how it is mobilised. In the empirical analysis, expressions and dimensions of community as cultural capital (in its
incorporated, objectified and institutionalised form) within each theme were attributed to the agents and assessed in the context of the theme, helping to determine what it is that gives the experience of community its value or worth to the agent, as it relates to other members of the academic community, to the community itself and to their institution. It is this value that reveals the potential existence of community as a form of cultural capital, which may be identified and explained. Informed by the analysis, community as cultural capital has the following properties:

As incorporated community cultural capital:

**Attachment**: expressed as a feeling of association that creates a strong community connection.

**Recognition**: expressed as a sense of status that provides an unambiguous acknowledgement of position in and membership of the community.

**Utility**: expressed as a sense of purpose and worth realised through practice that enriches the experience of community.

**Care**: expressed as a sense of responsibility towards others that helps to nurture individuals and the community as a whole.

**Exchange**: expressed as an expectation of reciprocity that leads to a community characterised by mutual benefit.

**Survival**: expressed as a feeling of being protected and in turn, protecting others and the existence of the community itself.

Interpreted as including a sense of belonging, the above attributes are complex and strongly influenced by the agent’s habitus and disposition. Agents are mindful of the need for a sense of belonging (in themselves and in others), and of how that sense may be created and sustained.

As objectified community cultural capital:

**Network**: signified by active discipline or practice centred linkages that enable community connections to thrive.

**Proximity**: signified by a physical or networked presence that reinforces membership of the community.
Resources: signified by the command and control of people, facilities and financial assets, denoting community power.

Interpreted as access to or ownership of facilities and teams, and membership of networks or access to communities that contribute to research and teaching, the above attributes have strong associations with discipline and where a sense of community may lay.

As institutionalised community cultural capital:

Constituency: signified by the representation of an institution or community that has a shared interest.

Position: signified by a hierarchical status or institutional role that permits an elevated or holistic view of the institution or community.

Influence: signified by the ability to shape and change relations in and between institutions and communities.

Duration: signified by the length of association with an institution or community combined with an in depth experiential knowledge of that institution or community.

Interpreted as academic status and length of time at the institution, including the possession of titles bestowed by the institution, the above attributes can give an experiential edge to a sense of community.

As demonstrated by the experiences of the participants in this research, the importance of position and trajectory and how it affects the accumulation and mobilisation of capital cannot be over-estimated. The possession of capital and its mobilisation determines the agents’ social position, influences practices and affects the reproduction of capital itself. The profiles and trajectories of the participants affects the way in which community as cultural capital is accumulated and utilised by the participants in relation to their idea and elements of community, their status and their academic practice. This research has contributed an understanding of a specific variant of capital – community as cultural capital – and how it is valued within the field of higher education. According to Lucas, capital is arbitrary and the determination of what capital is valued is constantly being defined and redefined. The variants of forms of capital are different across and within fields, at different times and analysis of social fields is a process of understanding the different forms of capital and how they are valued within it (Lucas 2004 p38-39) As a general principle, community as cultural capital may
be accumulated if the (arbitrary) attributes described above are fulfilled. It is the mobilisation or conversion of community cultural capital that gives it value.

Note the emphasis on value, as opposed to values. This research demonstrates that whilst it does not necessarily tell the whole story, value, as defined and realised through an economically defined instrument such as community cultural capital, is a useful construct. Value is determined by the accumulation of community cultural capital and in particular, it’s extrinsically designated, or assigned attributes such as those that relate to recognition, resources and position. Value helps to reinforce the agent’s validity in the academic community. The absence of value makes them feel less valid members of that community. And so, whilst, as noted in Chapter One, Roscoe laments that we are shut into the panopticon of economic thinking (Roscoe 2014 p199) and whilst Bourdieu refers to the ‘scholastic illusion’ of economics (Bourdieu 2000 p60), value, as demonstrated by this research, is both relevant and critical for understanding the object.

However, that is not all. In order to fully comprehend the object, the findings demonstrate that it is necessary to look beyond an economic reading. Chapter One explains why an extended concept of cultural capital is devised for the purposes of this research, a version that goes beyond the limits of the scientific prestige that Bourdieu emphasises in Homo Academicus, and relates more strongly to intrinsic values and the motivation of the individual.

As this research shows, this form of legitimacy through capital, even including cultural capital in its incorporated form, does not tell all. Macfarlane believes that if someone does not feel part of a community they are less likely to commit to the social and moral obligations of kinship (Macfarlane 2007 p26). Spurling, a contributor to the recent publication on Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century, asserts that whilst individual academics are concerned with accumulating capital (recognition, prestige and income), the deliberations they face in their everyday work cannot be reduced to these struggles,

> Academics also strive for access to valued practices and ways of life. They seek the intrinsic satisfactions that come from doing research, and are often driven by their commitment to reveal something new about the world. Focusing on capitals – as institutions often do – undermines this aspect of research work. (Spurling 2012 p79)
Skeggs refers to ‘affective moments’ that help to take us beyond the economic domain,

As sociologists we have a duty not to reproduce the logic of capital in everything we analyse, not to assume that everything is commoditised... look for those moments, to find those places where we challenge and to actually turn that into sociology, not just to reproducing the economic domain. (Skeggs 2013)

Consideration of the agent’s disposition and habitus from the empirical analysis takes us towards an understanding of the affective dimension and the role that values (as opposed to value) play in our understanding of the object. As Nathan states on community,

The same things that make us feel connected and protected are the things that make us feel obligated and trapped as individuals and/or cut off from other groups with different agendas. (Nathan 2005 p48)

Contradictory ideas of community range from a sense of belonging to a sense of limited freedom and obligation.

8.1.2 Disposition and habitus

Historically and during the period of the research encounter, the participants experienced a range of circumstances and situations in relation to their idea and experience of community, and their dispositions varied as they reflected on what community means to them. All appeared to be strongly motivated to create and sustain their university community, for different reasons (some more altruistic than others). Their own status (including contractual status) and any changes to their position, significantly affected their disposition. However, whatever their status, all appeared to seek the realisation of community through their academic practice, an aspect of their experience of community, which to some extent, they felt they had more control over and which closely related to their intrinsic values. Disposition can be fragile, strong or indifferent. Habitus is derived from the synchronicity of the conscious in the form of dispositions and actions and the unconscious in the form of the putative material conditions that make up the everyday world. In the context of this research, habitus is apprehended interpretively, as the nature and meaning of the participants’ idea and experience of community is explored through a heuristic analysis. The nature of the habitus is revealed through the social practice and the relations of the homology that bring together the different elements that make up the agent’s experience of community.
The habitus of each participant (or agent) is at work, generating the conditions that create the experience of community. Habitus acts as a medium for disposition, practices and values, and is related to (and affected by) the accumulation and conversion of the community cultural capital that is described above. For example, the extent to which agency may realise community in whatever form through status or through academic practice is affected by conditions and habitus. The agent is constantly reflecting on their position and engaging in position taking in relation to community. That is the durability and deliberateness of their habitus. And as noted in Chapter One, Bourdieu acknowledged that the agents ‘remain in command’. (Bourdieu 1972) The existence of ontological complicity, driven by the agent’s desire for community, a desire that concurs in part with the institutional portrayal of community, does not mean that reflexivity is not present. Reflexivity and values appear to be strong characteristics of the object. This research revealed habitus’ that are not wholly deterministic – reflexivity is present. It exposes a contemporary habitus in academia likened to Archer’s ‘world apart’ described in Chapter One. That is, academics may well be more inclined than others to a habitual reflexivity. This supports Sweetman’s concept of ‘reflexive habitus’ whereby reflexive engagement is characteristic of certain forms of contemporary habitus. According to Sweetman, a reflexive stance may be unreflexively adopted. That is, for some contemporary individuals, reflexivity and flexibility is deeply embedded in their habitus. Contemporary conditions do not simply demand a heightened degree of reflexivity, but may contribute to the development of a particular type of habitus, characterised by a pervasive and habitual reflexivity. (Sweetman 2003)

8.1.3 Values

The research revealed an enduring link between practice and values at an agential level. The mechanisms that the participants employ in order to realise their values and to bring community into their practice, include participatory approaches in research and teaching, community-university engagement (including public engagement), facilitating community relations and protecting the survival of the epistemic community. Many of these are far removed from the image of the academy as an elitist entity and from the institutional perspective. What or whose values prevail in the academy will vary, as discussed in Chapter Seven, which considers the dominance of the institutional story and the issue of ontological complicity. Winter, for example, identifies a ‘values incongruence’ between the academic and corporate values and goals, resulting in an ‘identity schism’ centred on the notion of professional identity (as defined by Nixon), and observes the extent to which an academic
seeks to separate his/her inner professional self from an outer organisational self that privileges commercial principles and practices,

Academics are constantly negotiating their roles and positions related to their intellectual work, their academic community and the structures of the department and university... Management actions, including incentives, which ignore the complexity of academic motivation, are likely to be ineffective. (Winter 2009)

The significance of values for the participants is in no doubt. As Watson says, for those in academia, higher education is a question of morale and a question of conscience (Watson 2009, Watson 2014). Noting that higher education has ‘deeper and lasting values’ and is not an instrument to the delivery of economic aims, he called for the education community to, ‘better articulate and defend these values.’ (Watson 2009 p65) Neame, who reviewed Land’s taxonomy of orientations of practice, posed a dichotomous classification of ‘interventionist’ vs ‘democratic’ orientations and suggested that a sense of academic community is likely to be stronger amongst those academics who seek development based on collaboration and consensus (Neame 2012). Bolden, Gosling et al found their participants wanted to find ways to have more of a voice and engage in active debate about the changes in HE and how to stay true to academic values, ‘They expressed a desire to find ways to participate more activity in the civic life of their institutions and the communities that surround, feed into and support them.’ (Bolden, Gosling et al. 2014)

8.1.4 Emotion

This research also revealed the presence of a significant affective dimension as a consequence of some participants being excluded, rejected, used and used up, by-passed and even forgotten, leading to feelings of resentment, sadness, pain and regret. The affective dimension is influenced by disposition and values, and the presence of this dimension in academia has been acknowledged elsewhere. Focusing on employee wellbeing in the higher education workplace, Woods conceived of emotion as ‘self-referent and bound up closely with individual values and identity (e.g. sense of self-worth).’ (Woods 2010 p173) According to Fitzmaurice, for the academic, there is considerable emotional and intellectual work involved in the ongoing process of identity construction and deconstruction. (Fitzmaurice 2011) Gourlay explores the tensions around academic identities and values for those individuals in transition into academia from established careers elsewhere. Emotional, ideological and subjective struggles result in an individual’s experience of alienation and consequent decision
to leave the academy. Gourlay identified a ‘mismatch of values, ethos and desired subjectivities, in particular a perceived lack of caring community in the academic context.’ (Gourlay 2011 p595 italics in original) The university department was perceived as being entirely task-focused and unresponsive, lacking in ‘emotional literacy’ and care.

Emotion clearly should not be ignored as a factor in habitus and Reay’s recent focus on the relationship between habitus and the psychosocial whereby the notion of habitus is extended to include affective dispositions, is helpful here. Reay acknowledges the potential of enriching the understanding of habitus and better understanding the, ‘emotional underworld of individuals.’ (Reay 2015 p22) Earlier, Reay had observed that,

The rational abstract intellectual denies emotion. Yet, academia relies upon desire, greed, ambition, pride, envy, fear, betrayal and inequality within an increasingly privatised, competitive market. Unsurprising then that there is so little real as opposed to contrived collegiality when collegiality requires emotional capacities such as empathy, intuition, trust, patience and care. (Reay 2004 p35)

Kligyte & Barrie suggest that collegiality cannot be viewed as a self-evident and unproblematic fundamental value. Rather, it seems to be and ‘extraordinary and elastic concept – an idea in flux, a notion without fixed meaning’ but very powerful in shaping academics’ and academic leaders’ beliefs about academic work (Kligyte and Barrie 2014 p162).

Cotterall finds that emotions pervade the doctoral experience and that almost one quarter of her participants’ references to emotions concerned interactions with members of their different communities. Their experiences within their departments were uniformly negative, while in their disciplinary communities, all but one were positive. (Cotterall 2013 p180) She concludes that by acknowledging the emotional dimensions of doctoral students’ experiences, supervisors, departments and institutions can better support their research trajectories. Investigating knowledge-creating agency for doctoral students involved in collective doctoral training and becoming members of academic communities, Hakkarainen, Wires et al noted how, ‘emotionally laden’ the participants’ interview talk truly was, ‘participation in a research community involves... its own traps and risks.’ (P.K., Wires et al. 2014 p97)
8.1.5  Values and virtue

Assembled below are dispositions associated with the object derived from the analysis in Chapters Four to Seven. As declared in Chapter One, these are gleaned from authentic voices that are not abstract but honest, sincere and firmly rooted in the day-to-day lived experience. They all reflect aspects of the idea and experience of community from the perspective of the participants.

*Understanding* one’s own role, the roles of others in the community, and of the community itself.

*Maintaining a presence* in the community so that others can see who you are and what you stand for.

*Reaching out* to others in the community, nurturing attachment and a sense of community.

*Tending* to one’s own needs and those of others in the community and of the community itself.

*Taking an empathic approach* in dealing with others in the community.

*Giving a voice* to others within the community and to the community itself.

*Being useful* to others in the community and to the community itself.

*Valuing others* in the community and being valued in turn.

*Working with others* in the community towards a shared purpose.

*Striving for* the nourishment, protection and survival of the community.

*Being open to critical reflection* on the community’s purpose and existence.
Taking responsibility for the impact of the community on its members and on other individuals and communities.

Transposing the above dispositions into values helps to tell the rest of the story, taking the (re)construction of the object beyond the accumulation and realisation of value (or capital) to a more inherent, deep-rooted level that embraces disposition, habitus and the affective dimension. The values revealed by this research are predicated on perceptibility, visibility, connectivity, care, compassion, advocacy, service, reciprocity, mutuality, preservation, openness and obligation. In reviewing the literature on the topic of academic integrity, Macfarlane, Zhang et al observe the barriers to forming a positive frame of research in this areas, including researchers focusing on ‘bad’ behaviour, leading to much research identifying ethical shortcomings rather than, ‘seeking to identify sets of norms, values or behavioural characteristics that might be considered ‘good’ or ‘ethical’.’ (Macfarlane, Zhang et al. 2014 p352) They state that conducting research on ways to identify and establish better practice is methodologically challenging and ‘demands courage to tackle taboo topics in some cultural contexts.’ The results of such research do not neatly transfer into (simplistic) policy statements and, ‘fine-grained analysis is needed to untangle the complexity of such issues and contribute to a gradual process of cultural change in enhancing professional self-awareness within academe.’ (Macfarlane, Zhang et al. 2014 p353) This research and the values revealed all contribute in some way to that process.

The disposition of the participants revealed in this research is characterised by a strong sense of responsibility for others. This is in contrast with Lynch, who concludes that care is only valued in the academy when it is professionalised. Observing a declining sense of responsibility for others Lynch concludes that a ‘New individualised academic capitalism breeds an organisational culture marked by increasing egocentrism.’ (Lynch 2010 p57) The participants care about the community and those within it. Personal values and practice are unified in a way that concurs with the character or ‘virtues’ of the researcher that Macfarlane identifies in his exploration of researching with integrity. He examines a number of virtues and their attendant vices (courage, respectfulness, resoluteness, sincerity, humility and reflexivity) and in doing so, he adopts the idea of integrity as the integration of a person’s true self, linking their values and identity as a person with their practice as a researcher. (Macfarlane 2009 p45) It is about developing an, ‘integrated identity’.
Overall the values that have emerged from this research help to redefine the discourse of academic practice by reinforcing the link between practice, virtue and community. Chapter One outlined Nixon’s approach to realising a ‘virtuous university’ through an authentic dialogue that is predicated upon shared values. The relationship between values and virtue provides for an important dimension to the object, giving what Nixon describes as, ‘structures of affiliation and association within which to develop and flourish.’ (Nixon 2008 p128) Nixon also states, on professionalism, that we need a,

Language of ‘telos’, of imagined ends and purposes, if we are to restore professional credibility and legitimacy. What we profess is fundamental to, and informs, how we practice; how we practice is dependent upon what we profess. What we require are not new practices, but new evocations of the values underlying those practices. (Nixon 2001 p183)

This research contributes a fresh semantic that will help to extend the discussion in ways that Nixon is calling for.

8.1.6 Temporal and spatial frames

Whilst these aspects were not extensively explored in the conversations, it was clear that time does indeed play a role, and that both time and space are associated with destroying as well as creating a sense of community and indeed, community itself. Spurling, who calls for more nuanced theorisations of contemporary experiences of academic time and approaches to its management, noted ways in which three mechanisms (work-leisure boundary making, organisational structuring of time and the intrinsic rhythms of practices) were socially patterned, reproducing, ‘the structures of the university field and the hierarchies of the academic profession.’ Qualities as well as quantities of time have an important part to play in the everyday politics of academic life. (Spurling 2015 p20)

Transition of various kinds appears to be key. For example, a change to contractual status which leads to unemployment or conversely, greater security in a permanent post; a change to a routine that has been disrupted by the imposition of additional (and often organisational) tasks; and a management re-organisation that transforms the physical environment and divides teams that had previously functioned effectively. In relation to length of association, whilst those with a long association with Greystone have gained experiential knowledge of the institutional shifts, cycles and trends, they have not gained a stronger sense of belonging or
community; they are still waiting for that to happen. In relation to academic practice, taking a more community-based approach is time-consuming and can add to time pressures. Having to work with institutional procedures for recording how their time is spent, makes the participants more conscious of how their time is divided up and how challenging it is to account for activities that do not fit neatly into the bureaucratically defined formula. Cox, Herrick et al focusing on space, reflect on how space in universities shapes identity and experience, ‘In querying and de-familiarising the fabric of the environment around us we trace links to wider institutional processes and structures, with a view to expanding our understanding of academic identity.’ (Cox, Herrick et al. 2012 p697) The management and control of physical space as experienced by the participants, demonstrates the relationship between space and the experience of community. When reflecting on spatial issues, the participants observed that space could act as either a connector (social glue) or a barrier, depending on how it is organised and managed. The participants themselves appear to have little control over how space is managed, particularly in the context of an extensive administrative reorganisation, which they refer to as the ‘disintegration’ project because it is resulting in a more fractured community. However, not everyone wants to be integrated and it is observed how some academics choose to work in isolation.

8.2 REFLEXIVITY AND LESSONS LEARNED IN DOING THE RESEARCH

As declared from the outset, I have an established relationship with the object though my occupation of a professional position at Greystone and my stance is that community matters. This does not diminish the validity of the knowledge claim. As Bourdieu states,

The discovery that someone who has discovered the truth had an interest in doing so in no way diminishes his discovery. Those who like to believe in the miracle of ‘pure’ thought must bring themselves to accept that the love of truth or virtue, like any other kind of disposition, necessarily owes something to the conditions in which it was formed. (Bourdieu 2000 p3)

For most of the research period I worked as a middle manager at the site of the study (until 2014 when I moved to an academic role) and from the outset of this thesis I declared that problematising my experience of academia enhanced my reflexivity. Chapter Two discusses the implications of insider research, of confidentiality in a ‘political’ climate and of my position as a ‘marginal native’. Some of the participants wanted to change the culture of Greystone, making it more of a community and more engaged with communities, and indeed, the Beacon
for Public Engagement project that I worked for was specifically tasked with changing the Greystone culture in relation to community-university engagement. Doing the doctoral research did not change my view about the Beacon initiative, which I had always described as a ‘government intervention’. And that was unproblematic because I was (and still am) ideologically committed to the notion of community-university engagement. However, doing the doctoral research did significantly deepen my knowledge and understanding of the academic community itself as I gained a level of comprehension and appreciation that I would never have gained in my professional role. At same time I was gaining this richer understanding of the academic community through the research, my professional role was moving in a very different direction as it became dominated by the marketisation of the institution and the sector, particularly when moved into Greystone’s Communications directorate in 2012. The institutional voice, as seen in Chapter Seven, is confident and strong. The dominant institutional version of the object is propagated through corporate documents, including letters written by the Vice-Chancellor to the staff. Chapter Seven asks if it is heterodox to question the institutional narrative or position on community. Certainly, I became more bemused as I observed on the one hand, territorial scuffles over the engagement agenda at a corporate level, and on the other, an academic community that seemed far removed from the ruckus of new management. I also began to question the utility of the somewhat evangelistic approach taken by the Beacon initiative to culture change. Talking with the participants through the research helped me to reflect on these matters and on my own position in the organisation as I increasingly felt in my professional role that I was drowning in an alien discourse that bore little or no resemblance to my academic practice and to my values.

Mercer questions whether or not the heightened familiarity of insider research leads to, ‘thicker description or greater verisimilitude.’ (Mercer 2007 p6) Whilst my proximity to the object has given me a better understanding, how close to the truth did I get? Through the research I revealed multiple realities, essentially, multiple truths about the object. Sandelowski states that, ‘All inquiry entails description, and all description entails interpretation.’ (Sandelowski 2000 p335) Descriptions always depend on the perceptions, inclinations, sensitivities, and sensibilities of the describer. The fined grained ‘description’ of the object in this thesis was achieved via a heuristic analysis, combining my practical knowledge and experience of the object with my newly formed scholarly knowledge gained through this research. Both inform the three fictional vignettes at the end of Chapters Four, Five and Six, all of which illustrate the institutional culture and the day-to-day lives of the
participants. Bryan is subject to a surprise move as, in his absence, his office (and his status) is eradicated; Jonathan introduces a new member of staff to a different way of meeting the team, and the Vice-Chancellor gives an address that is steeped in the language of excellence that pervades the institutional discourse, a language from which there is no escape.

My contemporaneous knowledge and experience of the object, including my professional role, formed the habitus of this research through a, ‘dialectic of objectivity and subjectivity.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p782) The research was a two-way process. I learned a great deal from the participants about how the tension between the conceptualization of ‘community’ as an object of research and the function of ‘community’ as a policy instrument can influence one’s perspective. The coming together of my practical and theoretical knowledge transformed my own habitus. The participants wanted to know, for example, if I felt inhibited by the institution, they wanted to know if Greystone’s concept of community married mine and did my position serve as a constraint on speaking the truth? Those whom I had had a previous working relationship with appeared to take reassurance from the trust in that relationship as they shared their experience of community inside Greystone. I was seen to have a shared affinity with the participants, seen as being native to the research. This helped the participants to be more open about their views, it helped me to understand what I was being told and it ultimately contributed to the authenticity of the knowledge claim. I was hearing and understanding authentic voices, taking up the point of view of the agent and being a, ‘subjectivistically-inclined sociologist’ who is, ‘less prone to indulge in those all-encompassing and arrogant visions of social life that place the scientist in a position of divine mind.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p782) The reflection that the research generated contributed to what was in practice, a methodology of trust.

Doing the research also taught me a number of practical lessons about doing doctoral research that others may learn from. In particular, researching researchers who share your discipline can make it easier to communicate concepts through a common vocabulary. It is important, however, not be surprised if the participants turn the questions back on you and such exchanges may enhance reflexivity. And whilst I have always enjoyed writing, doing doctoral research part-time whilst occupying a professional role that entails different forms of writing makes it more important to distinguish between academic and managerial forms of writing. At the end of the day, all writing aids thinking and all writing is beneficial.
8.3 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS: A MODEL AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Roscoe concludes that a commoditised higher education means that it exists in its most limited form. That is, there is a resistance to understanding education as a process involving reflection, trust, empathy and risk, and instead many students see education as a set of targets, of boxes to tick. Opportunities for developing a thoughtful, reflective and self-aware individual are missed. (Roscoe 2014 p114) In echoing Mary Beard, Roscoe calls for dissatisfied students, driven to a critical examination of their preconceptions. This research reveals that as the participants constantly strive to create and sustain the conditions for realising and reproducing community, they are perhaps more aware of their preconceptions than the students they are teaching. Watson’s ‘Hippocratic Oath’, mentioned in Chapter Four, also includes the injunction, ‘Never be satisfied’, as he acknowledges the ‘merciless and asymptotic nature of our business’; the academic project is never complete or perfect (Watson 2014 p97 italics in original). Rather than dissatisfaction, which at times appears to be in abundance, what we appear to lack is a cohesive framework for critically appraising academic community, a framework that balances the extrinsic and intrinsic elements (value and values), taking us beyond the idea and experience of academic community in its most limited form.

This final section introduces and explains a conceptual model informed by this research, and discusses directions for future research and action that utilises the model. The purpose of the model, entitled ‘The Infinity Model of Academic Community’ (the Infinity Model), is to provide an interpretive framework for describing and understanding the relations of the homology that is the idea and experience of academic community. Whilst the aim is not to be deterministic or predictive, it is acknowledged that as Macfarlane states in his assessment of research integrity, developing an understanding of what to do is always more challenging than issuing an edict about what is not right. (Macfarlane 2009 p3) The Infinity Model will not act as a rulebook but as a framework within which to consider what conditions are necessary in order to realise and reproduce community in a university environment.
As discussed in Chapters One and Three, the research was aimed at securing a unified understanding of the object without claiming to over-generalise; that understanding is informed by the multiple perspectives of twelve members of one higher education institution. The aim has been to expand, to proliferate rather than narrow the knowledge of the object, in the same way that Stake declares the case study does (Stake 1980 p72). The research explores the human experience in relation to community in a particular setting. Whilst anonymising that setting is important for protecting the identity of the participants, it is not actually necessary for the purpose of theorising about the object. In defending his own ‘abstract’ account of academic identity and practice, Gough emphasises the utility of a theoretical argument, which he believes lends greater integrity to the call for change, in both the academy and in the wider world, ‘allowing the academy to stand taller in its own terms is the ground in turn for its legitimacy.’ (Gough 2014 p603-4) Apart from noting a few distinctive characteristics, identifying the location of this research is irrelevant. It does not matter.

Despite appearances, the Infinity Model should not be interpreted dualistically. Macfarlane rightly bemoans the insidious effects of a ‘collective over-dependence on dualisms’ in the understanding of higher education, ‘simplistic dualisms that play a significant role in the cognitive assumptions of the academic community’. These include collegiality/managerialism and academics/non-academics, ‘the power of dualism retards the process of thinking critically about knowledge claims... imprisoning debates within and either/or framework.’ (Macfarlane
All the aspects interrelate and they are not in binary opposition. Bourdieu and Wacquant describe the peculiar difficulty of sociology, which is,

To produce a precise science of an imprecise, fuzzy, woolly reality. For this it is better that its concepts be polymorphic, supple and adaptable, rather than defined, calibrated and used rigidly. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p23)

The Infinity Model brings together the various elements that form the object through a relational construct represented by the symbol of infinity. The key difference between this final conceptual model and the analytical framework introduced in Chapter One is the relational dimension expressed as a continuum – it is infinite. As Cox concludes, there are no simple experiences of belonging, ‘rather, there is a constant project of identity-formation and change within mutable spaces.’ (Cox, Herrick et al. 2012) This applies also to the formation of community, a continual or infinite dynamic in which value and values are intertwined at the intersection of agency. Value (predicated on capital) is closely related to status and institution, and values (predicated on disposition and habitus) are closely related to practice. ‘Elements’ in the model are the features of community that are strongly related to practice.

The Infinity Model can be interpreted at an individual or collective level; agency can be individual or collective. Connections, or social relations, are critical to both interpretations. Bond and Paterson conclude that academics in England and Scotland are, ‘very much ‘of’ their communities, no matter how that term is understood.’ (Bond and Paterson 2005 p348) According to Nespor, any setting or ‘community of practice’,

Can’t be understood on its own terms, but only by looking at how its practices are enmeshed in much more expansive networks. One part of a network doesn’t create another, but lines of connection and the people and things flowing through them are always under stresses, always contested. Things are defined by their connections. Places are constructions made up of other spaces that have been mobilized and circulated through networks distributed across, and constituting, space and time. ‘Face-to-face’ interaction is a misnomer: in addition to people and things in the immediate setting people are always interacting with distant entities that have been materially or semiotically transported into the encounter. (Nespor 1994 p132-3)

Specific settings or contexts may be explored. For example, Nathan describes the ‘American Way: The Individualism in Community’ whereby individuals resist the claims that community
makes on their schedule and resources in the name of ‘individualism, spontaneity, freedom and choice.’ (Nathan 2005 p47)

8.3.1 Using the Infinity Model: context and application

The participants’ desire or need for a sense of belonging, to feel validated in their membership of community, and their allegiance to specific values, is clearly evident. Zipin & Brennan refer to the ‘special logics’ of a given field that are continually renewed and changed by those who inhabit it, in interaction with surrounding conditions and events. A field is, Socially populated by players diverse enough to contest what should be the values of the field, but who also share some ‘core’ dispositional sense of the value this field holds for them, as compared to other fields in social space.’ (Zipin and Brennan 2004 p23)

Whilst the values identified above are not shared by all the participants all of the time, they do represent a core dispositional sense of the object. Chapter One raised the question of the extent to which the idea and experience of community in the form of dispositions and practices, manifests itself as a material construct of community inside academia that is normalised. What is different about the academic community and how does it become normalised?

The Infinity Model may be utilised to interpret what represents the ‘common sense’ world and what is normalised by exploring value and its association with validity, and values and their association with virtue. This may be done by applying the two concepts, community as cultural capital, and virtue as disposition, and by exploring their relationship with status and institution, practice and elements. Any analysis will need to establish the means by which the object is reproduced through the doxic experience as well as through social relations, as discussed in Chapter Seven in this case. It is not the intention to describe the ideal academic community, not to hark back in the way that some authors have done so. The intention is more along the lines of exploring the modality of community making in higher education as suggested by Wacquant in his reading of Bourdieu’s inquiries on class, power and culture,

Bourdieu reformulates the problem of domination by questioning the ontological status of collectives and by forging tools for elucidating the politics of group-making: the sociosymbolic alchemy whereby a mental construct is turned into a historical reality through the inculcation of schemata of perception and their deployment to draw, enforce, or contest social boundaries. (Wacquant 2013 p1)
The theoretical constructs devised through this research may also be utilised by applying Barnett’s,

Communicative language through which the university can be described as reclaiming itself as an academic community in which individuals are encouraged to engage and in which claims over the university’s mission can be developed. (Barnett 2003 p170 italics in original)

His language of being, through which the university reminds itself that it has real live individuals within it... the university becomes a space for re-forming human and academic being.’ Like Barnett’s languages, the Infinity Model contains, ‘projects of critique and of hope, of dissolution and of reconstruction.’ Watson suggests that a ‘grown up’ university culture embraces emotionally intelligent interactions at all levels of the institution, pragmatically responsible decision-making, a commitment to corporate self-knowledge and regular practice of self-care by all groups in the organisation. (Watson 2009 p130)

The Infinity Model may be used not only to identify the conditions necessary in order to realise and reproduce community in a university environment but also to devise strategies, at an individual or collective level, for realising agency in relation to community. In examining the evolving nature of discipline-based tribal groups and the territories they occupy in the twenty-first century, Krause acknowledges the fluidity of community and argues the need for academic communities to develop a critical awareness of the change vectors in their environment, along with the capacity to engage with these changes in ‘productive, proactive’ ways. (Krause 2012) The application of the Infinity Model would help to identify some of those change vectors.

8.3.2 Using the Infinity Model: research potential

According to Stake, because of the universality of experiential understanding and the compatibility of qualitative research with that understanding, the ideal for case study research is to add to the existing experience and humanistic understanding of the reader. (Stake 1980 p72) Future research using the Infinity Model to enhance the humanistic understanding of community may be undertaken in relation to individuals, research and teaching communities, institutions and fields. Clegg states,
The context for any research that seeks to explore academic identities is always local, in that while the particular position of an institutional site(s) can be read across national and global hierarchies, they also operate at the micro level of difference. (Clegg 2008 p332)

All levels may be subject to research and the literature points to a few specific areas where the Infinity Model could be applied.

At an individual level, Levine, Lin et al, who interviewed twenty women who had left academic medicine, highlight the importance of exploring the nuances of very personal stories to better understand each issue and its associated context, and contend that by openly discussing the causes of the misalignment between institutional expectations and the values of individual faculty members, the breach between them could be diminished. (Levine, Lin et al. 2011 p756)

In delineating a new social science understanding of affect and emotion, Wetherell calls for research on affective practice and social formation that provides an elaborated and complex account of the nature of affect and the emotional social actor – treating affect actually as practice,

The affective cannon... which becomes characteristic of community, a social group, an institution or a social formation, is likely to be a mix of different manifestations of affective practice as well as varying in content and in typical distributions. (Wetherell 2012 p115-116)

Wetherell declares that it is time now, after a generation of thinking about habitus and structures of feeling, to reconsider solidifying affective patterns in ways that also focus on sites, scenes, actual practices and contexts of use, and the messiness of social life. She encourages us to think in ‘affective intersectional’ ways. The Infinity Model embraces both the affective dimension and intersectional thinking. As mentioned in Chapter One, Reay has recently called for an exploration of habitus that provides a window on the psychosocial; a take on habitus that Wetherell, who cites Reay’s interpretation of affective order, is likely to approve of. (Reay 2015)

Hey considers the gender politics of academic theorising and the need to transect the social by the psychic and vice versa. Hey’s argument, in the context of the outcome of this research, is compelling,

To conceive of people as holding identifications within social space offers a productive way to conceive power intersecting the personal and institutional, the conscious and
the unconscious, and thus to explain the process through which the desire of individuals could be articulated into affect-laden social orders, including those of Higher Education. (Hey 2011 p214)

Hey concludes by asking, ‘Can we recognise the crucial importance of the social and emotional aspects of our professional relations with our students, our work and with each other?’ (Hey 2011 p219) The Infinity Model may also provide a framework for researching care in the academic community, thereby responding to Lynch’s observation that the neglect of care as a subject for research and teaching is a serious educational deficit. (Lynch 2010 p62)

Selmer et al observe a lack of research on the engagement of faculty members (as opposed to students) and examine the impact of knowledge location and knowledge sharing on behavioural, cognitive and emotional engagement. They describe, ‘group knowledge processing’ – the ability of individuals in a group to handle, distribute and apply relevant information – and state engaged individuals have an, ‘energetic and effective connection’ with their work activities. They found strong positive associations and concluded that social exchanges in the form of internal knowledge processing are beneficial to engagement. Engagement is a, ‘positive, fulfilling, yet pervasive and persistent cognitive state of mind.’ (Selmer, Jonasson et al. 2014) The Infinity Model may be used to explore these and other areas at all levels, from the individual to the sector or field. Also to facilitate a move away from bifurcation in higher education in response to Macfarlane’s call to challenge such approaches with the aim of improving the quality of research design and question received wisdom. (Macfarlane 2015)

Relatively unexplored topics that may benefit from an application of the Infinity Model also include the relationship between academic community and technology; identity and connections, what is the role of technology and does it contribute to the formation and maintenance of community? According to Clegg, we are not quite sure of the effects that technology has on academic life; there is very little empirical data as opposed to theoretical argument,

The bricolage of newer and older technologies and social relations that make up academic work is open to negotiation and contestation in relation to how we re/assemble them and make meaning. (Clegg 2011 p176)

The overall research potential is wide-ranging and the application of the Infinity Model would help to redress what Morley views as an absence of sociology in higher education policy
where, academics as a professional group are rarely consulted on higher education policy. (Morley 2012 p353)

8.3.3 Using the Infinity Model: agentic potential

The Infinity Model has agentic as well as research potential in its application. As declared in Chapter One, a limitation of this research is the potential for stimulating collective action, particularly in the face of ‘supercomplexicity’ and the paradoxes of academia. That does not detract, however, from the potential of utilising the Infinity Model as a framework for investigating the intrinsic properties and social relations of the intellectual field, which may yet take us closer to realising both individual and collective agency. Academics, for example, may use the Infinity Model as a tool for examining themselves and their communities, and generating the, ‘appropriate weapons for grasping and fighting the social and historical determinants of scientific practice.’ (Bourdieu 1988 p784)

Whitchurch identifies three processes, ‘contestation, reconciliation and reconstruction’, as the means for individuals to contribute in the formation of the new ‘third space’ in which organisational fragmentation and bureaucracy is resisted (Whitchurch 2010). The Infinity Model may be used to facilitate a process of critical reflection as part of a discourse about management, in small or larger groups inside higher education. It could be used as a nexus for conversations, as a story telling device, as a framework for examining scenarios and for exploring issues from different viewpoints, and as a tool for challenging assumptions and seeking alternative explanations. Mann’s ‘communication ideal’ for realising an ethical learning community combines critical reflexivity and the opening up of conversation. The individual’s right to have voice brings with it a requirement to be open and to have responsibility to the other (Mann 2005 p53) This is where the agential potential of the Infinity Model may be most effective. The literature points to several areas where agency is needed in this context.

Making conversation

Chapter One refers to Heinrich’s suggestion that conversation, or ‘talking’ contributes to a sense of belonging amongst academics. In her review of academic development, Heinrich identifies the importance of context around academics for developing their teaching, including the importance of community, ‘the individual needs the support of the community...
community can benefit from the improvements made by the individual.’ (Heinrich 2013 p459) By community, she means the departmental and academic environment. Winter also suggested that (generative) conversation may well be a useful response to developing ‘academic identities in the interests of mutual understanding.’ (Winter 2009)

Taylor considers an urgent need for academics to revisit their sense of identity and cultural values, with a view to adapting these to the existing and prospective circumstances of their conditions of work, and to differentiating these values and their culture from the range of other values and cultures within these places of work. These outcomes will only be possible if academics find and take the time to engage in extended conversation to achieve ‘collective convictions’ about the nature of their work, the values that they share, and the material and symbolic practices which are characteristic of academic work as this work changes. (Taylor 1999 p92) Fitzmaurice stresses the need for dialogue,

A professional life is not without its difficulties, and there is a need for a dialogue about the academic role where the focus is on values and practice not regulations and output. Such a dialogue is important so that the university can be a place in which academic staff can grow personally and professionally, and serve their students and the wider society. (Fitzmaurice 2011 p621)

The Infinity Model may be utilised for fostering creativity in all the ways that Churchman and King call for; promoting a space where multiple stories can resonate, grow and sustain identities, providing a communal site of resistance, collegiality, sustenance and innovation, acting as a symbolic repository of organisational histories, or facilitating the self-representation of moral, theoretical and practical positions. (Churchman and King 2008) In their auto-ethnographic inquiry, MacKenzie, McShane et al argue that performative, managerial, and instrumental ideologies have seeped into HE as universities have become non-reflexive. As practicing academic developers, they see individual, not organisational, reflexivity as the first step towards creating and sustaining ideology critique within the university. They say that ideology critique is healing and refer to the decline of the grand narrative in universities which established the conditions for the entrenchment and exclusivity of positivist mechanisms for legitimising knowledge, notably performativity (MacKenzie, McShane et al. 2007).
Making space

Making space for the discourse is seen to be critical,

It is essential to recognise, help foster and fully utilise the remaining spaces within universities for promoting and realising (sometimes competing) academic values and purposes, including the commitment to de-commodified knowledge, counter-cultural critique and civic engagement. (Cribb and Gewirtz 2012 p348)

This includes imaginative space, ‘imagining is understood here to be a socially constructed capacity to be, a form of subjectivity.’ Writing about imaginative resistance in the academy, Grant and Knowles see themselves as members of a community of writers and through the lived experience of being a member, of ‘this different, social, scene of writing… a messy process of engagement with the word and the world’, there is existential ground for feeling part of a community. (Grant and Knowles 2000) According to Gourlay,

The challenge for academic development is to provide the means to explore tacit practices, and the ‘safe space’ to discuss struggles and mismatches around identities – which may in fact not be ‘in transition’, but rather in a state of long-term hybridity and complexity. (Gourlay 2009 p4)

Whatever the space, it must be safe. Kleijnen, Dolman et al conclude that preferred values (‘human relations’ values) can be blocked by defence mechanisms and structural barriers, and also by sudden environmental changes and unexpected problems, embarrassed and inept responses or failing leadership. They emphasise the importance of a safe climate and of developing, ‘a culture of collegiality and open communication, external orientation and willingness to change within a department.’ (Kleijnen, Dolfmans et al. 2014 p123) Nixon encourages academic workers, students and the communities of which they are a part to, ‘work together, think together and talk together for the common good’ in the pursuit of the ‘virtuous’ university that is committed to the building of the ‘good society’. (Nixon 2008 p144)

8.4 CONCLUSION

Whilst the aim of this research was not to, ‘undertake a revolution’ in the field, the importance of the field and of the game, is not in question. (Bourdieu 2003 p78) The close attention afforded to the object has reaped a significant reward, a discovery that opens up several exciting research and agential possibilities. In establishing the role of value and values in
apprehending the full meaning of the idea and experience of academic community, and in formulating the Infinity Model, this thesis helps to constructively extend the discussion on the meaning and experience of academic community. This is not, therefore, the last word. The Infinity Model may be taken forward and used as a conceptual framework to explore, through research and through dialogue, the conditions that create, define, sustain or destroy community inside the academy. The opportunity to discover and to challenge has indeed been grasped.
References and bibliography


Combined research information sheet and consent form

INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH

The academy and community: seeking authentic voices in higher education

This combined information sheet and consent form is being sent to you by Julie Worrall, a part-time postgraduate researcher in the (school) at the University of Greystone. It accompanies an invitation to participate in the research, also issued by Julie Worrall. You are being invited to consent to the research in accordance with the University of Greystone’s Research Ethics Policy Approved by Senate on 23 November 2005 (with revisions on 21 June 2006).

About the research

Julie Worrall’s research is, at the broadest level, on the culture of higher education as it relates to the idea of community; she is in the third year of her degree and is working towards a doctorate, having transferred from an MPhil in February 2011.

Method: extended conversations

The method includes an element of co-construction. Julie Worrall will converse with individual academics. That is, participate in a series of ‘extended conversations’ with academics in one university, with a view to exploring their idea of community, in such a way that will ‘make room’ for her own subjective reality in the field. An ‘aide memoire’, jointly constructed by Julie Worrall and the research participant, will be used to frame the second conversations instead of an interview schedule or questionnaire. In addition, each participant will be asked to select any institutional documents that they would like to use or refer to in the conversation. Each aide memoire is, therefore, unique to the particular exchange. The order for the conversations is set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning:</strong></td>
<td>first conversations timed at 20 mins each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft aide memoires &amp; check with research participants, gather documents selected by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle:</strong></td>
<td>second conversations not time limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts, identify themes from second conversation &amp; send to participants with any other documents selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>third conversations timed at 45 mins each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts, complete final analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time commitment

Participants are asked to commit time for the conversations themselves (as cited), and in addition, time to respond to the draft aide memoire (after the first conversation), to select any institutional documents they would like to use or refer to, and to review transcripts and communications e.g. written up transcripts with themes from the second conversation.

Confidentiality

All information about any individuals will be kept strictly confidential and any data generated by the research will be anonymised and retained in accordance with Greystone’s Research Ethics Policy.

As Julie Worrall’s research is focussing on the University, where she is employed as the Project Director for (Beacon for Public Engagement), you may have concerns in relation to her research and to her position as an ‘insider researcher’. If you would like to discuss her
research and any concerns that you may have, please contact Julie Worrall either by email or by telephone -

Email:
Telephone:

Conduct of the research
This research has been approved by the Chair of (school’s) Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the way it has been conducted, please contact (name), Head of the (school), email:

CONSENT FORM

Research:
Postgraduate research, The academy and community: seeking authentic voices in higher education
Researcher:
Julie Worrall, Postgraduate Researcher, (school), Greystone
Email: Telephone:

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information about the above research and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that should I give my advanced consent, I may still at any time thereafter withdraw my consent at a later date.

Please tick box

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations from the extended conversations and associated communications by Julie Worrall in her thesis and associated publications.

_________________________________________  ___________  __________________________
Name of Participant                  Date                  Signed

_________________________________________  ___________  __________________________
Julie Worrall                      Date                  Signed
Dear Vice-Chancellor,

We finally got round to reading your lengthy communique on communication during a lull in essay-marking, seminar preparations, admissions interviewing, advising, teaching, working parties, meetings and research. After the first page, we realised what the problem (oops! challenge, opportunity) is. You are engaged in a dialogue of the deaf. You are acting as though you were the managing director of Greystone plc while some of us down here at the chalkface still think that we and our students are members of a community of scholars. You claim that we are all agreed on the way ahead, that we have responded magnificently; you write about managers, cost-centres and decision makers (a bit rich to include the senate here – would the anti-humanities cosa nostra be nearer the mark?) We do not see it that way. We see a fundamental division of philosophies, with business/scientific values confronting and overcoming humanist ones. Our magnificent response felt much more like suffering down here. Suffering the scandalous neglect of Library funding, which should be the university’s top priority bar none; suffering the sweeping aside of effective and proven arts and social science programmes and procedures that have taken years to evolve in order to substitute a science-led structure (for which no market research on student demand was conducted); suffering the torture by a thousand cuts dictated by a deeply unsympathetic centrist university administration; suffering imposed uniformity in place of organic diversity. All this suffering had added another ripple to the tidal wave of Thatcherite philistinism. The community of scholars does not recognise managers, chains of command, decision makers. It is profoundly egalitarian, collegial and democratic. Intellectual achievement matters more than rank, more than age. We elect our reluctant deans apologising for distracting them from scholarship. Most of them breathe sighs of relief when they can return to the life of the mind. We arrive at decisions through messy, protracted, opinionated debate and compromise. We think of communication not as piles of arid bumph, but as talking and listening to each other and especially our students about ideas, as scholarly reading and writing, as conferring and reviewing, as helping to run our schools and sectors as centres of learning. We do not have too many problems in this kind of communication. Perhaps this is because we are talking the same language.

Since another part of our magnificent response has been standing endlessly in line, like frozen Muscovites, waiting for a few stale sausages of promotion, you will realise the need for us to remain simply Humanist Scholars’
AIDE MEMOIRE QUESTIONS
The questions from the aide memoires have been grouped by topic; the position of the author; defining community; identity, roles and community; discipline and academic practice and organisation, the university and community.

Questions about the position of the author
• Julie and (participant) are both members of the same university and Julie has a professional role that is related to the research subject.
• What implications does this have for the conversation?
• There are other such ‘institutional’ documents that Julie has written and that have played a role in promulgating the institutional presentation of ‘community’. What implication does this, and Julie’s professional role, have for the conversation and for her research?

Questions about defining community
• What does community mean to (participant)?
• What does (participant’s) community(s) consist of?
• What or who does (participant’s) community(s) consist of?
• How does (participant) define community(s)?
• How does (participant) deal with community(s)?
• How might we describe or conceive of (participant’s) sense of community? What might it look like?
• Is (participant) a part of a community within a community and if so, how separate are the different communities that he is describing?
• Is (participant’s) research group a community within a community?
• How does (participant’s) idea of community relate to the concepts of participation, democracy and citizenship?
• A new academic school - another research participant has referred to a similar situation and process in another part of the university whereby the culture of new school changes as it matures. What implications does (participant) think this has for her own idea and experience of community?

Questions about identity, roles and community
• What does having different roles mean to (participant), particularly in relation to her identity as an academic?
• What does being in the different roles mean to (participant), particularly in relation to her identity as a researcher?
• Does (participant) have a sense of belonging, and if so, to what?
• How does (participant) experience and express a sense of belonging?
• How does (participant) experience and express a sense of belonging in her different roles?
• How does (participant) experience and express his sense of community in his academic role?
• How does (participant) experience and express her sense of community in her researcher role?
• What does community mean in relation to (participant’s) values and to his identity as an academic?
• What meaning may ‘community’ have had at different stages in (participant’s) career, outside and inside Greystone?
• How does (participant) experience and express his sense of community as an emeritus professor at Greystone?
• Does the autonomy that (participant) has as a researcher affect the way she perceives community?
• Does (participant) feel that s/he is ‘inside’ higher education?
• Looking to and beyond (participant’s) retirement this year, how is his own experience and view of community likely to change and develop?

Questions about discipline and academic practice
• How important is (participant’s) discipline to his/her idea of community?
• What does ‘community’ mean in the context of (participant’s) teaching and her professional practice?
• Are connections to people and to groups important to (participant’s) research? Are these connections related to her sense of community?
• Are communities a research resource for (participant)?
• Does ‘community’ matter to (participant’s) research?
• What role does (participant) think that communities should play in helping to deliver research impact, if at all?
• What does (participant) think is the relationship between ‘Public Engagement’ and ‘community’?
• (participant) has been involved with community activities over the years, though perhaps not so much recently. Does (participant’s) own idea of community, and maybe his discipline also, affect how he views the role of the academic the community e.g. in delivering community education?
• Does (participant) feel that she is distancing herself from her discipline by engaging with communities in her research in a way that appears to contradict the traditional stance that her discipline takes toward community engagement?
• These activities (community engagement referenced) relate to different aspects of community engagement that (participant) has been involved with. Does (participant) think that his own sense of community affects how he relates to his different audiences for these activities?

Questions about organisation, the university and community
• The organisational and funding structures clearly affect the behaviour of individuals and communities. What implications does (participant) think this has for her own idea and experience of community?
• How does (participant) think the University views ‘community’, academic or otherwise?
• What relationship does (participant) think the University has with different communities, including the academic community?
• What relationship does (participant) think the University has with its surrounding ‘community’?
• Is research conducted locally not valued by the institution, even if it is demonstrated to be excellent research? If so, what implications does this have for (participant’s) idea of community?
• There appear to be varying degrees of detachment in (participant’s) experience, certain of his academic community. Are there tensions between the current culture of the university and (participant’s) idea of the role that different communities may play in relation to his research?
• The rise of managerialism, the audit culture, more students, training for academics, all of which have helped to change the character of the scholarly community. How does
(participant) think the character of this community has changed since he started work at Greystone in 1975? Are there any constants?

• Does (participant) think that communities shape people’s behaviour and if so, how might her ‘community’ at Greystone be shaping her behaviour?

• Is there a difference between (participant’s) own perception of ‘community’ and ‘community engagement’ as institutionally defined?

• Are there tensions between the university’s official role of engaging the community with research and (participant’s) idea of the role that community plays in her research?

• There is clearly a divide between disciplines within (school) – what implication does this have for how (participant) thinks the University views ‘community’?
Appendix D

Research information sheet and consent form

Please complete the form and return it to (name of author) by 17th January 2010

Write Out Loud Workshop 2010
Postgraduate research on the culture of GREYSTONE in relation to public & community engagement

INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH
This combined information sheet and consent form is being sent to you by the Write Out Loud Workshop organisers on behalf of Julie Worrall, a part-time postgraduate researcher in the (school) at the Greystone. You are being invited to consent to the research in accordance with the University of Greystone’s Research Ethics Policy Approved by Senate on 23 November 2005 (with revisions on 21 June 2006).

About the research
Julie Worrall’s research, which is independent of the Workshop, is on the culture of GREYSTONE in relation to public & community engagement; she is in the second year of her degree and is working towards a doctorate. She is proposing to attend the Write Out Loud Workshop 2010 as a participant observer for the purposes of gathering pilot data for her upgrade paper which will be presented to (school) in May 2010.

What will happen if you agree to the Workshop being observed by Julie Worrall
Julie Worrall will use participant observation and field notes. She will not audio or video record the Workshop proceedings and she will not produce transcripts accordingly. Workshop participants will not be asked to commit any extra time to contribute to the research, over and above that required by being a workshop participant.

Confidentiality
All information about any individuals will be kept strictly confidential and any data generated by the research will be anonymised and retained in accordance with GREYSTONE’s Research Ethics Policy.
As Julie Worrall’s research is focussing on the University, where she is employed as the Project Director for (Beacon for Public Engagement), some participants may have concerns in relation to her research and to her position as an ‘insider researcher’. If you would like to discuss her research and any concerns that you may have, please contact Julie Worrall either by email or by telephone –
Email :
Telephone:

Conduct of the research
This research has been approved by the Chair of (school’s) Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the way it has been conducted, please contact (name), Secretary to the Committee, email:

What will happen if you do not agree to the Workshop being observed by Julie Worrall
This research is independent from the Workshop and will only go ahead with the consent of all participants. Agreeing or not to it will have no implication on your participation in the workshop itself.

CONSENT FORM
Research:
Write Out Loud Workshop 2010
Postgraduate research on the culture of GREYSTONE in relation to public & community engagement
Researcher:
Julie Worrall, Postgraduate Researcher, (school), GREYSTONE
Email: Telephone:

Please initial box

2. I confirm that I have read and understand the information about the above research and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that should I give my advanced consent to the Write Out Loud Workshop being observed by Julie Worrall, I may still at any time thereafter withdraw my consent after the Workshop has begun. Should I do so, I understand that the participant observation by Julie Worrall will cease with immediate effect.

Please tick box

Yes  No

4. I agree to the Write Out Loud Workshop being observed by Julie Worrall as proposed in the information sheet.

5. I agree to the use of anonymous quotations from the Workshop by Julie Worrall in her upgrade paper and thesis.

__________________________  _____________________  ______________________
Name of Participant          Date                      Signed

__________________________  _____________________  ______________________
Julie Worrall                Date                      Signed
Focus group information and consent form

INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH

The academy and community: seeking authentic voices in higher education

This consent form is being sent to you by Julie Worrall, part-time postgraduate researcher in the (school) at the University of Greystone. It accompanies the Focus Group Briefing and pack dated 14th June 2012, also issued by Julie Worrall. The form can be signed and handed to Julie at the beginning of the session on 21st June 2012 or alternatively, sent to Julie in advance.

You are being invited to consent to the research in accordance with Greystone’s Research Ethics Policy Approved by Senate on 23 November 2005 (with revisions on 21 June 2006).

About the research

Julie Worrall’s research is, at the broadest level, on the culture of higher education as it relates to the idea of community; she is in the fourth year of her part-time degree and is working towards a doctorate, having transferred from an MPhil in February 2011.

Method: extended conversations and focus groups

The method includes an element of co-construction. Julie Worrall will converse with individual academics. That is, participate in a series of ‘extended conversations’ with academics in one university, with a view to exploring their idea of community, in such a way that will ‘make room’ for her own subjective reality in the field. An ‘aide memoire’, jointly constructed by Julie Worrall and the research participant, will be used to frame the second conversations instead of an interview schedule or questionnaire. In addition, each participant will be asked to select any institutional documents that they would like to use or refer to in the conversation. Each aide memoire is, therefore, unique to the particular exchange. The order for the conversations and focus groups is set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning:</strong></td>
<td>first conversations timed at 20 mins each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft aide memoires &amp; check with research participants, gather documents selected by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle:</strong></td>
<td>second conversations not time limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts, identify themes from second conversation &amp; send to participants with any other documents selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>third conversations timed at 45 mins each (for participants unable to attend a focus group) or a focus group arranged by Julie Worrall at a location off-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up transcripts, complete final analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time commitment

Participants are asked to commit time for the conversations themselves (as cited), and in addition, time to respond to the draft aide memoire (after the first conversation), to select any institutional documents they would like to use or refer to, and to review transcripts and communications e.g. written up transcripts with themes from the second conversation. Participants are also asked to commit time for a focus group of up to 2.5 hours and some preparation by way of reading (or perusing) a set of papers using Julie Worrall’s theoretical framework as described in the accompanying focus group briefing.

Confidentiality

All information about any individuals will be kept strictly confidential and any data generated by the research will be anonymised and retained in accordance with Greystone’s Research Ethics Policy.
As stated in the original consent and information form, Julie Worrall’s research is focussing on the University, where she is employed as the Project Director for (Beacon for Public Engagement), you may have concerns in relation to her research and to her position as an ‘insider researcher’. If you would like to discuss her research and any concerns that you may have, please contact Julie Worrall either by email or by telephone -

Email :

Telephone:

**Conduct of the research**

This research has been approved by the Chair of (school’s) Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the way it has been conducted, please contact (name), Head of the (school), email:

**CONSENT FORM**

**Research:**

Postgraduate research, The academy and community: seeking authentic voices in higher education

**Researcher:**

Julie Worrall, Postgraduate Researcher, (school), Greystone

Email: Telephone:

Please tick box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information about the above research and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

Please tick box

Yes No

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that should I give my advanced consent, I may still at any time thereafter withdraw my consent at a later date.

Please tick box

Yes No

3. I agree to the use of anonymous quotations from the extended conversations, focus groups and associated communications by Julie Worrall in her thesis and associated publications.

Name of Participant ___________________________ Date ___________________________ Signed ___________________________

Julie Worrall ___________________________ Date ___________________________ Signed ___________________________
Focus Group Briefing
Thursday 21st June 2012
(venue – off campus in the city centre)
Afternoon tea will be available from 1.45pm. We will start our session at 2.00pm and hope to finish by 4.30pm at the latest.

Julie’s mobile –
Please note that I intend to audio record the session. I will not be transcribing the recording but will take some notes during the session and use the recording itself as an aide to subsequent analysis.

AGENDA
At 2.00pm we will start the session with introductions to everyone present. I will also briefly introduce my theoretical framework and initial analysis (see below). I suggest that we then decide as a group how to structure the rest of the session. I imagine that it will be difficult to cover in the time available, all four aspects of framework and the many themes that are already emerging from our conversations. Also, you may feel, having seen my initial analysis, that there is a particular aspect that you would like to explore. If so, please do say. Following our main discussion, I would, however, like to ensure that for the last 30 minutes of the session, we explore as a group the following question –

How may we conceive of and picture your idea and sense of community?

This is the question that we would have explored during our third and final individual conversation which this focus group is replacing for a majority of my research participants.

CONFIDENTIAL Focus Group pack
Please find enclosed a set of papers for your perusal in advance of the focus group next week. I cannot emphasise enough that these papers and their contents are confidential and are not to be disclosed or shared with anyone outside the focus group membership. They comprise of the following documents -

- J Worrall theoretical framework at June 2012
- Focus group 21st June – epistemic reflexivity
- Focus group 21st June – agency
- Focus group 21st June – agency & habitus
- Focus group 21st June – habitus & field
- Consent form (this can be signed and handed to me at the beginning of the session)

Theoretical framework
I have used as a basis for my framework, the social theory of sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu and in particular, his concepts of field, habitus and agency. I have given below a few references which may be of interest. Please note, however, that I am not expecting anyone to have read these publications, or indeed every word of the above papers!

Initial analysis
You will see from the papers that I have quoted extensively from the conversations that we have had to date. I have, for the purpose of this particular analysis, used data from conversations with five of my eleven research participants. All quotes are anonymous except for my own. I have also anonymised the relevant school/faculty/centre but not the university at this stage (all will be anonymised in my thesis).
Participants
Five of my eleven research participants will be attending this session, drawn from all four faculties. I will not disclose their identity in advance of the session and clearly anonymity is critically important.

Questions
Please do contact me at any time before 21st June if you have any questions or concerns.

I am, as ever, deeply grateful for your contribution to my research and I appreciate the need for confidentiality at all times. I very much look forward to seeing you next week.

Best wishes,
Julie

References
The second analysis revealed different perspectives. Some aspects may be construed as idiosyncratic (agency - the unique perspective of individuals) and some may affect and be affected by institutional, collective and individual and actions (habitus).

### IDEA AND ELEMENTS OF COMMUNITY

#### Agency
- Tiers, levels & layers
- Communities of practice, of interest, of place
- Creating communities, a sense of community
- Individuals and their (hidden or unheard) stories and voices
- Parallels between experiences inside and outside the university, exclusion

#### Agency & habitus combined (Structural conditions: the relationship between agency and habitus)
- Story: curriculum change in the making
- Story: an interaction with the ‘Integration Project’
- Out in the open
- ‘It’s an automatic thing’
- Banal community or collateral reality of community?

#### STATUS

#### Agency & habitus combined (Status, career & contractual matters)
- Early career
- No formal status or recognition by school or faculty
- Served my usefulness
- Seeking permanence but what comes with it?
- Changing academic profession & hybrid roles
- Engendering a sense of loyalty
- The tenuous position of PGRs
- ‘Contractual’ criteria for Christmas lunch?
- PGRs a part of the research community?
- PGR seminars

- Decision making
- Research and the corporate enterprise
- The long view – which faculty?

#### Vocation and autonomy
- Dependent, yes and no
- The imperative to teach
- Individual reputation & mobility
- Representing research or the university?
- A trade-off
- On the margins
- Work and labour
- The rise of ATS status
ACADEMIC PRACTICE

Agency & habitus combined (community & discipline)
Separate compartments Qualitative, quantitative camps
An overview Across the faculties
‘Academic’ communities centred on theoretical practice?

Agency & habitus combined (community & research)
No research without communities False impressions
Meaningful connections No research solidarity
Volunteering to enhance research & understanding of community Research community beyond the institution
Equality & respect for research participants Not just a hit and run
Representing Greystone in a subversive sort of way The challenges of getting funding for co-produced research
Researchers and communities: communities and researchers Action research equals community involvement equals co-production?
Who is doing what and to whom? Uncoupled from the research enterprise
Research participants: are they members of the research community? Brown bag meetings and the research environment
Facilitating a research community

Agency & habitus combined (community & teaching)
Interprofessional learning Teaching as ‘volunteering’
A community of teaching practice More of a school common room

INSTITUTION AND ENVIRONMENT

Habitus and Field combined (documents – perspectives on the Corporate Plan)
Advertising material with good bits Making a difference
How is it going to happen, does it involve Greystone & the RCUK Concordat on Engaging the Public with Research – lack of affinity with the institution
Changing academia, the new corporate plan...wait and see This research and looking at the Corporate Plan
Emulating the spirit of the vice-chancellor The Corporate Plan and performing community
Big and little stories

Habitus and Field combined (document-research centre annual report)
Habitus and Field combined (The university and community)
The composite university definition is not mine A school closure
Does the university understand what communities are? Ranking – research intensive
Corporate image
Networks, individuals & the academic’s
A really cohesive community engaging with a really cohesive community?
Disengaged from the official narrative
Meaningful engagement?
More community feeling
Practice lagging behind the theoretical
The community engagement rhetoric & drive
Knowledge informing knowledge?

**EPISTEMIC REFLEXIVITY**

**Epistemic Reflexivity**

Does Julie feel inhibited by the university in the way she performs her professional role?
Does Greystone’s concept of community marry hers? (Julie has written some of the corporate material)
Are there ways in which she can’t do or be as much as she would like?
A constraint on speaking the truth?
Julie as a marginal native – to what?
There isn’t a single unitary Greystone community. (Julie is native to the research)
Are we creating our own research community?
Julie is a researcher researching researchers; how does this influence the response?

Julie has collaborated in her professional role with some of her research participants
It does not make any difference
Recognise the potential for bias in interpreting the data
An existing rapport and a feeling of trust
Anonymity of Julie’s research participants is important
The growing importance of the university’s corporate image and what is means for staff pursuing research
Research flushed out and becoming a part of the corporate enterprise
Slipping into supervision
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The author, an insider researcher, is exploring community as perceived and experienced by a purposive sample of academics at a UK university, through a series of extended conversations and focus groups. The work at the institution is in a new management role related to the research area, and has recently delivered a national pilot aimed at changing the culture of higher education.
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COMMUNI-TEA PARTY AT THE ACADEMY

INFUSIONS: BLENDS THAT REFLECT DISPOSITIONS OF THE LEARNED

1. Bonded
   - Emotionally engaged
   - Networked
   - Deeply committed
   - At home
   - Rooted

2. Marginalised
   - Distanced
   - Flushed out
   - Uncoupled
   - Hunted down
   - Invisible
   - Frustrated

3. Used up
   - Overlooked
   - Disengaged
   - unheard
   - Edge of my experience
   - Segregated
   - Uncertain

4. Liberated
   - Confident
   - Autonomous

BLEND

CONVERSATION PIECES ON COMMUNITY:
What do you say? What do you hear?

- Our sense of community is too big here
- Sometimes people grow into spaces that don’t exist... It’s just something that happens because of who you are and what drives you
- It’s a lesson I have not fully learnt... that I still want my institution to need me
- Community doesn’t serve people... it doesn’t support people... it can be very excluding
- If we’re not actually a real community ourselves... how do we actually engage with the community out there?
- I haven’t really ever thought of my definitions of community having anything to do with a composite university definition
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CONVERSATION PIECES ON COMMUNITY:
What do you say? What do you hear?

- Our sense of community is too big here.
- Sometimes people grow into spaces that don't exist... It's just something that happens because of who you are and what drives you.
- It's a lesson I have not fully learnt... that I still want my institution to need me.
- I haven't really ever thought of my definitions of community being anything to do with a composite university definition.
- Community doesn't serve people... it doesn't support people... it can be very excluding.
- You'd just stroll up and sit down and have a face to face... that's a sense of community.

- Academics still enjoy locking themselves away in their monastic cells.
- It's individuals and their stories that for me, you know sort of encapsulates the idea of community.
- It's an institution rather than necessarily a community.
- Scholarly communities... it's almost as though they're being hunted down and flushed out.

- Everybody's just looking after their own place, their own league tables and their own research.
- Our common rooms were undemocratically whipped away.
- We don't provide the social spaces... the social cement.

- The degree of uncertainty is destructive of a sense of community.
- Our common rooms were undemocratically whipped away.
- We don't provide the social spaces... the social cement.

- The work of the academic is become more like labour than scholarly endeavour.
- The more strongly we cherish something the more easy it is to use it against us.
- And they're having another reorganisation down in our hub just now.

- I don't think the university understands really what communities are.
- I don't think the university understands really what communities are.
- There's no natural area for congregation.

- I still struggled with the concept of community that is put across in the corporate plan.
- Communities can die.
- I don't see why a sense of community in a university should be any different to anywhere else.
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