New Zealand Sociology

2007

The Journal of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand

New Zealand
Sociology
2007

ISSN: 0112 921X

New Zealand Sociology

Volume 22 Number 1 2007

Special Issue Editors: Deborah Jones, Tamika Simpson
Editors: Mike Lloyd, Chamsy el-Ojeili, Lincoln Dahlberg
Book Review Editors: Avril Bell, Lesley Patterson

Objective: To foster a refereed journal to disseminate and promote research and thought that has, as its objective, the clarification and development of theoretically informed research in sociology and related disciplines, with a predominant, though not exclusive, concern with New Zealand.

Contributors: For information on the contribution of articles, see Instructions for Contributors at the end of this issue.

Books for review to: Book Review Editors, New Zealand Sociology, c/- School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, PO Box 756, Wellington.

Subscriptions: One Volume per year, two issues per Volume.
Per Volume: Students NZ$25; Individuals NZ$35; Institutions NZ$50.
Surcharge for overseas postage: NZ$7 per Volume.
Mail to: New Zealand Sociology (subscriptions), c/- School of Social & Cultural Studies, Victoria University, PO Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand.

The editors acknowledge the assistance provided by the School of Social & Cultural Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

ISSN 0112 921X

The Journal is abstracted in the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences and Sociological Abstracts.

For further information about the Journal go to
http://saanz.rsnz.org/journal/index1.html

Contents

Splits and Shifts: The Study of Work and Organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand

Deborah Jones and Tamika Simpson

The premise of this special issue of *New Zealand Sociology* is that the study and critique of work and organisation are central to considering issues of power, identity and social interaction. In other words, we think it is important and we want to foster it. We also argue that it is essential to develop perspectives on work and organisation specifically from Aotearoa New Zealand. We have distinctive local issues and also distinctive local academic institutions and interdisciplinary relationships.

The study of work and organisations in their social context tends to be split between the disciplines of "sociology" and "management", in this country and internationally (Parker, 2000). Institutional arrangements further enact this split. However, the study of work and organisations is now shifting, partly through the development of Critical Management Studies (CMS) - an interdisciplinary move which considers the topics of "management" from the perspectives of critical theory (CMIG, 2004; Fournier and Grey, 2000). The purpose of this special issue is to make connections between "sociology" and "management" in this country. In Aotearoa New Zealand a strong group of CMS practitioners is emerging in commerce faculties, some with backgrounds in sociology and other social sciences, others with more traditional management backgrounds (Prichard, Jones and Stager Jacques, 2006). At the same time, within sociology departments, research and teaching on work and organisation seems to be sparse and fragmented.

Disciplinary shifts can be accepted or contested, depending on our agendas. Splits that result in non-recognition and disciplinary forgetting (Parker, 2000), create missed opportunities. Splits in the study of work and organisation in Aotearoa New Zealand diminish our archive and undermine our chances to contribute as critics and scholars to major local issues. This does not mean that we advocate attempts to paper

over disciplinary politics, or to mount a rearguard action to put organisational studies back in old bottles. In this issue we bring together researchers of work and organisation, no matter what their own workplace location or label may be. We want to create a sense of what research is being done here, and, where possible, to make connections. We also offer a platform for exploring the relationship – connections and disconnections – between the sociology of organisations and work, CMS, and other disciplinary approaches. In our call for this issue we invited participants to see this special issue as a space to engage with a wide range of possible topics relating to work and organisation in their social context, and to reflect on the related disciplinary issues.

As the papers in this issue testify, a lot of interdisciplinary research is being carried out on work and organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is not a lack of activity that is of central concern, but rather the question of whether we and our efforts could be organised more effectively, especially to provide critical commentary on workplace practices here in this place. We are all engaged in creating the possibilities of projects (Law, 1994) that are not only important to us personally, but that will also be accepted by funders and publishers (depending on how core your proposal is to the funding body you are approaching). Are there advantages (funding, conferences, co-operation, motivation, enjoyment) to there being a more visible and recognisable body of Aotearoa New Zealand work and organisations research? How might we work towards achieving this? This special issue is a contribution to this collaborative project.

In this introductory essay we start first with stories of our own (inter)disciplinary locations. We invite readers to reflect on their own. In these related stories are enacted the disciplinary preoccupations and politics of the study of work and organisation in Aotearoa New Zealand. We go on to talk about the sociology/CMS relationship via some exemplary texts in the related literatures, drawing out some of the issues that are important to us. Finally we discuss the papers in this journal in the context of these issues.

Disciplinary locations

Deborah Jones: You can't go home again

I work in the Victoria Management School. Since I was first employed in "management" in the early 90s I have spent many hours, both amusing and painful, in responding to peoples' reactions when I tell them I work in a management school. My activist ego has smarted when people assume I am an apologist for big business or for capitalism. My academic origins are in the humanities – English literature and language as it was called then – and my humanities ego has been bruised by the elitist assumption that I am as ignorant of cultural matters as all "management" scholars are assumed to be. And of course my intellectual ego has had to toughen up a lot in the face of assumptions from academic colleagues and intellectuals of all variations who assume that, as I am in a management school, I am a bit dim. In among all these rigorous experiences are the shifts and splits in power/knowledge formations, and the various academic identities that they constitute. I have no doubt that if I had not travelled across these various boundaries myself – as have many others – in search of work and companionship, I would retain the same unexamined prejudices, the same nostalgia for old epistemes posing as critique. It is rather obvious to me now that all disciplines are subject to power/knowledge relations, and that none are innocent. As Foucault argues, "everything is dangerous" so "we always have something to do... The ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger" (Foucault, 1984, p. 343).

I have given up the search for a perfect disciplinary home. My humanities background is shared by a number of colleagues in CMS both here and overseas (Fournier and Grey, 2000). The shift in enrolments and resourcing to "management" from humanities (and some social sciences) in the west over the last decade or two has complex constituents, not least of which is the reframing of universities as mass rather than elite institutions (Easton, 2006). The result is that a now sizeable and increasingly influential number of scholars who take critical perspectives – politically and/or theoretically – are located in "management" schools (criticalmanagement.org, 2007). These

academics may have in previous generations taught elsewhere, but are now seeking to influence both broader public discourse, and management practitioners and students, from within management schools, as several of the papers in this issue show. By "practitioners" I mean here a whole range of groups who struggle with issues of work, organisations and management – not just those designated as "managers".

Since I tried rather unsuccessfully to combine humanities and social sciences in my own graduate work long ago, the disciplinary ground has swayed under my feet many times. At Victoria, sociolinguistics split off from "English". In my first academic job at Waikato I worked in a communication department inside a management faculty. Back at Victoria, an attempt to initiate a "communication studies" project failed (Jones, 2005). In the "English" department, media studies has exploded, occupying some of the same ground as the cultural studies tendencies in sociology.

Luckily for me, in the time since I have been a "management" academic the boundaries of the field have gradually bulged and popped. Unless you want to be a mainstream academic publishing in the so-called "top", so-called "international", journals - the (US) *Academy of Management Journal* being the apex - there is a lot of space to take a critical perspective and to write about any aspect of work, organisation and management. In this country we are lucky that there is a very short history of "management" (Stablein, 2007), and among my colleagues those with original degrees in a "commerce" discipline are in the minority. Looking around the corridors, I see that we have degrees in geography, engineering, psychology, medicine, English, chemistry, education, classics, economics, and yes, sociology.

I personally have no desire to try to put the old disciplinary boundaries back together again. I am sceptical about fixed academic identities, which, while deeply felt in many cases (I am pretty emotionally attached to my own "English" background), tend to distract from more important issues such as the work one wants to do and the political agendas that it serves. In particular I see my own job as an academic in Aotearoa New Zealand as a mandate to write for and about "here". At the moment this

seems more difficult than getting critical work published from a "management" space. This project is one of the key tasks of the emerging CMS group in Aotearoa New Zealand, known as OIL - Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL, 2007). Increasingly our interest is in gathering scholars and resources studying work and organisation in this country from critical perspectives, rather than starting from disciplinary locations. We are also committed to local contributions, to work which is most intelligible here, rather than to "international" publishing alone.

Tamika Simpson: No demands and not much belonging either

I came to be working on this special issue after attending Organization, Identity and Locality in 2006. In the wrap-up session of OIL 2006 initiatives were called for that might further the aims of the group gathered. I offered to explore the possibility of this special issue because I was being supervised for my PhD by one of this journal's editors and enrolled in the department where it was produced. Sharing the editorship of this special issue has become an exercise in belonging. Coming from a strongly social sciences disciplinary background, with a double major in sociology and political philosophy (with a couple of English Literature papers and many cross-labelled papers), I regard the PhD I completed last year as a work of sociology (Simpson, 2006). However, as I outline here, it was not completed entirely in sociology spaces. At the same time that I am firm on it being sociology I also see how open to question, and not especially relevant, this position is.

My PhD experience was characterised by physical and administrative shifts, but not of splits. Though I moved within sociology and management spaces I encountered no demands to state whether I was, for certain, involved in one thing (sociology) and not another (critical management studies). Yet, despite having moved easily in both places, and having benefited from the resources of each, I had little sense of a specific place where my work belonged.

Trying to specialise in studying work in my undergraduate and honours degrees proved quite difficult at Victoria. The range of BA undergraduate and honours papers available between 1998 and 2001

included just one work-specific paper - Work and Society, a third year sociology paper taught by Claire Toynbee in 2000. My strategy was to take related papers (for example, Charlotte Macdonald's "history of sport and spectatorship" and Bob Gregory's "bureaucratic power") and devise essay topics elsewhere. I ended up with some research interest coherence and a mixed honours programme (the "other" papers to my surprise are listed separately on that degree certificate: "...Honours in Sociology with one paper in History and one paper in Public Policy").

The mixing and shifting continued in my PhD with one supervisor in sociology and one in management. My examiners also followed this same locations mix. I spent time in the offices and conferences of both, presenting at the Sociology Association of Aotearoa New Zealand conference (SAANZ) in Auckland (Simpson, 2003) and Critical Management Studies (CMS) in Cambridge (Simpson, 2005). I also attended the Labour, Employment and Work conference in Wellington in 2002 and SAANZ in 2004. There were many advantages to the experiences that flowed from what was mostly a funding split but after each conference I returned somewhat disappointed that I had not found that elusive sense of contributing to some specific, combined effort.

Within the small but active PhD groups in both schools I felt most at home amongst the frequent discussions about the social justice issues involved in events happening around us (both inside and outside the university) amongst we anthropology, sociology and criminology students (something akin perhaps to Stinchcombe's "supply of indignation" as discussed by Austrin and Farnsworth this volume). Using "sociology" and "critical" interchangeably - as I realised I did only after moving to the management school - sometimes resulted in being asked to clarify my position. I do not think I ever achieved competence in explaining how I was critical, I just felt saying "sociology" was enough. My research site (a workplace) and methods however, were more similar to the research being done in management.

I do not want to imply that my experience was one of total acceptance at all turns of my disciplinary shifting, only that shifts in disciplinary locations were not commented on as being at all unusual. Neither do I want to convey the impression that I was not made aware of the potential

risks involved in disciplinary and methodological shifting. Two examples from my trip to England in 2005 to present at the Critical Management Conference come to mind. While discussing my future plans and career possibilities it was suggested that I should be aware of the implications for getting published in sociology if I published in management journals first (see discussion of a similar experience in Parker, 2000). Secondly, after presenting my paper I was flattered to be engaged in discussion by someone whose work I was familiar with though surprised when he insisted that I answer which I would choose if I was forced to - actor-network theory (ANT) or conversation analysis (CA). I refused to accept that such a choice would ever be necessary.

Now coming up for air after my PhD, I see how little attention I paid to research conducted in New Zealand. I headed straight off to the big names elsewhere in order to write proposals that would pass so I could get underway with my fieldwork. As with my physical and administrative shifting, I have the impression that mine was a standard, acceptable, if not universally desired, practice. Reflecting back as I work on this special issue, I wonder whether perhaps if I had developed a better awareness of the work being done here in this place I would have at the same time developed a greater sense of belonging and contribution. My work on this journal issue is a contribution to Aotearoa New Zealand work and organisations research which is shifting but not split.

In the next section we widen our scope to consider the literatures of sociology and CMS.

Sociology and the study of work and organisation

The term "sociology" has so many meanings that it has been rendered not especially useful. Answering questions about what we do with "sociology" often requires some kind of further elaboration. Rather, "sociology" is just a starting point for what you actually do with or within it. There are many practical reasons for being concerned where critical research is done and under what labels. Researchers carefully negotiate their way through the requirements of employers and funding bodies,

the preferences of students, the receptiveness of research participants, the support of practitioners, and the demands of academic colleagues, critics and publishers.

It is student enrolments, tied as they are so tightly in our market system to how smoothly other elements in this list flow, that are of particular concern. However, putting aside worries about boundaries and student numbers allows us to consider how to do critical work and may attract more resources overall. For example, what use are judgements about whether one place rather than another is best placed to be critical? The new editors of *Organization* have argued that recently:

> The study of organization is not confined to business and management schools. Indeed we should be thankful that this is not the case because we know that in these contexts, there are strong pressures to see the world from one particular direction - that of management and its 'problems' of control. Other disciplines address the issue of organization without this not-so-hidden agenda hanging over them. (Calas, Morgan et al., 2006, p. 7).

A similar view was expressed by one of the reviewers for this special issue, in terms of making a difference, "CMS is more compromised than sociology, if only because of its location within commerce faculties". Are these not the kind of unexamined statements we accuse others of? Perhaps we as editors made such a statement in our call when we said that "within sociology departments, research and teaching on work and organisation seems to be sparse and fragmented"? Debate about where and how was certainly what we were hoping for but there are always alternative views. Those within management schools could argue that their close proximity provides more opportunities to be directly critical, adding a voice that might otherwise be absent from those spaces. Writing from London, Strangleman notes that business schools have provided careers for many sociologists which "has resulted in a fragmentation of the subject and arguably a dilution of its critical edge" (2005, para 5.1). Our reviewer makes an interesting point about the employment of sociologists and the growth of CMS, suggesting that:

> It might be worth noting that one causal factor in a putative decline of the sociology of work / organisations is the growth of commerce faculties and the crowding out of sociologists qua sociologists. This is an international trend in which the forced relocation of Marxist and Freudian sociologists to theoretically sterile environments in schools of business kick started CMS.

Writing in 2000 from within a management department, Martin Parker is concerned about a split in the UK between those studying organisations and sociology (2000). Professor of Organisation and Culture at Leicester University's School of Management, Parker has degrees in anthropology and sociology and held posts in sociology and management (see more at Parker, 2007). In his paper Parker worries that the divide and hardening of differences will become firmer as new books on culture increasingly rely on post 1970s work and sociologists see the study of organisations properly belonging in management. Using his experience of being in a management department and trying to publish in sociology journals, and the growth of interest group conference networks, Parker argues that "organization studies is no longer talking to, or with, sociology" (2000, p. 141). Like this special issue, Parker makes a plea for engagement (2000).

The tenor of Parker's article (and the continuation of this discussion in *Sociological Research Online* in 2005) is that we should be thinking carefully about how and where the study of work is carried out. Those involved in this particular debate seem to be worried about disciplinary splits. For instance Strangleman says that "too often ... *interdisciplinarity* is used as a cover for a lack of *disciplinarity* attention and consideration", using the *Work, Employment and Society* journal and conferences as an example of the lack of development of a "distinct sociology of work" (2005, para. 7.3). On the other hand many argue that the very practice and tradition of sociology is one of shifting methods, boundaries and concerns. Illustrating sociology's lack of disciplinary coherence, Austrin and Farnsworth (in this issue) draw on John Urry's paper to argue that sociology's scavenger tendencies and constant borrowing are strengths of the discipline (Urry, 1981).

Our appeals for co-operation and respect may seem unsophisticated, but what we are trying to indicate is that we could collectively come out with more by adding to, rather than subtracting from, each others' efforts through small acts such as increased awareness and engagement. As Bruno Latour suggests, there are positive ways forward (for him, into "nonmodernism") for the practice of academic criticism (2004, p. 227). Frenchman Latour, professor at the *Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris*, trained in philosophy and then anthropology (see more at Latour, 2007) and is known for his fieldwork studies of science. His vision is one of offering, contribution and addition rather than taking apart, which provided tools for disbelieving. He asks: "What would critique do if it could be associated with *more*, with *multiplication*, not *subtraction*" (Latour, 2004 p. 248). This type of critic is one who assembles rather than debunks, who offers opportunities to gather rather than dash belief, and when coming across that which is constructed, recognises fragility and is cautious in their response (Latour, 2004 p. 246). As many of the papers within this special issue address, Latour refers to the lack of sure ground and the shifting involved when engaging in critical practices. He suggests that academic criticism has not kept up with the worlds around us, and like any other project we need to constantly revise our strategies to meet new challenges (Latour, 2004 p. 231):

> Is it not time for some progress? To the fact position, to the fairy position, why not add a third position, a fair position? Is it really asking too much from our collective intellectual life to devise, at least once a century, some new critical tools? (Latour, 2004 p. 243).

Critical Management Studies and the study of work and organisation

In this section we introduce the field of Critical Management Studies, and make some connections with sociology. The term "Critical Management Studies" started to emerge in the early 1990s, mainly in management schools in the United Kingdom. This grouping is now distinguished by its own conferences, textbooks, journals, and so on (see criticalmanagement.org, 2007). While increasingly institutionalised,

the term is still of course debated. Most general statements about what CMS "is" comprises some kind of change-oriented politics; some form of "emancipatory project" (Fournier and Grey, 2000, p. 27). For instance, the CMS interest group of the Academy of Management has this domain statement (CMIG, 2004):

> The Critical Management Studies Interest Group serves as a forum... for the expression of views critical of established management practices and the established social order. Our premise is that structural features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility often turn organizations into instruments of domination and exploitation. Driven by a shared desire to change this situation, we aim in our research, teaching, and practice to develop critical interpretations of management and society and to generate radical alternatives. Our critique seeks to connect the practical shortcomings in management and individual managers to the demands of a socially divisive and ecologically destructive system within which managers work.

However, "critical interpretations of management and society" and "generat[ing] radical alternatives" seem to operate much of the time as a binary within the field. CMS includes a range of projects of varying political and theoretical positions. At the end of one possible continuum might be the "high theory" project, in which the variously named fields of "organisational studies" or "management studies" are intellectually authorised by the inclusion of mostly European social theorists – many of the usual suspects influencing sociology over the same period. A typical text of 2004 mentions, for instance, Foucault, Derrida, Kristeva, Baudrillard, Lyotard, Derrida, etc. (Linstead, 2004). At the other end of the spectrum would be the more explicitly political and activist stance – this is where some feminist, postcolonial, antiracist and environmental work would show up, for instance (Calas and Smircich, 1992; Cooperrider and Khalsa, 1997; Nkomo, 1992; Prasad, 2003). In a review article, Fournier and Grey (2000, p. 26) have argued that CMS is a "slippery and fragmented domain, fractured by multiple lines of division which to a large extent reproduce divisions in the social sciences more generally". But there is one important difference between CMS and, for instance,

sociology – its intimate association with the practice-based field of "management". Many CMS scholars recoil from association with practice, or, as Grey and Fournier describe it, the "performative", associating performativity with what they see as the politically damaging project of management itself. "Management" then becomes the object of critique for CMS rather than a site of engagement. But as Grey and Fournier point out, CMS could - but tends not to - engage supportively with "the managed" (ibid.) – trade unions, social movements, and so on. CMS could go further, of course, and problematise what is meant by "managers" – after all, a wide range of political possibilities are encompassed by the position of "manager", including the jobs of many academics of course. So while CMS has the potential of becoming *both* a critical *and* an engaged field of social science centred around the topics of work, organisation and management, this possibility of engagement is not necessarily taken up. One outstanding local example of these possibilities in action is the work of Maori scholars investigating Māori organisations, and/or Maori participation in Pākeha-dominated organisations. This scholarship is both *critical* and concerned to *support and make a difference to* Maori organisations (e.g. Panaho, 2007; Pihema, 2006).

Perhaps the diminishing institutional power of "sociology" in the last couple of decades has intensified defensiveness in some quarters. At times it seems that the influx of sociologists and/or sociological theory into management schools has lead to a reinforcing, rather than a troubling, of disciplinary boundaries from the sociology side. We have already referenced Martin Parker as "someone who 'used to be a sociologist'" and now works within Critical Management Studies. Parker's (2000) discussion of "sociology of organizations and the organization of sociology" goes wider than a comparison of sociology with Critical Management Studies: in fact, he grants that the gaps and weaknesses that he identifies in organisational studies – methodological debates, theoretical complexity, and emancipatory intent – could be argued to have been brought into organisational studies by CMS. But Parker argues that sociology – in this case, especially sociology journals – are intensifying the organisational sociology/ organisational studies divide

by rejecting work produced in management schools, and thus the opportunities for sociology and organisational studies to learn from each other are diminished.

But there are counter examples – of which this special issue is one. Another is the more recent collection *Contemporary organization theory* (Jones and Munro, 2005), originally a special issue of *Sociological Review*. This collection is coedited by CMS theorist Campbell Jones and by Rolland Munro, who is Professor of Organisation Theory and Director of the Centre for Culture and Social Theory at the University of Keele, and has published in both sociology and organisational studies. (And for the New Zealand connections: Campbell studied management at Otago with Ralph Stablein (now Massey) and Roy Stager Jacques (now Massey Albany), while Rolland was one of Tamika Simpson's PhD examiners). The blurb for this collection argues:

> Organization, once a mainstay of sociological inquiry, has become a key site in the rethinking of the social sciences. This work brings together important contemporary work in the study of organization. It serves as an introduction for students of organization and is useful for scholars across the social sciences.

About the papers

In the first paper, "Franchise, margin and locale", three writers from the management department at Massey University put the question of local knowledges at the centre of the agenda. They have developed an argument first presented at the OIL conference 2006 (Prichard, Sayers and Bathurst, this issue), setting out possible parameters for "a critical management studies locale in Aotearoa New Zealand" by examining how researchers in this country typically respond to our geographic location. By way of exemplar, they use various projects in which they have all been involved which connect music and organisation. In the *franchise* model, which "favours technical, uniform methods of expansion", we in New Zealand try to simply replicate methodologies and or theories from elsewhere – normally the "NATO" countries, as the authors put it. As the writers explain, this transposition either breaks

down or can only be maintained by some violence to the local context. Unfortunately this model is rather popular in the type of management studies which set out to establish a universalised "best practice". The authors also argue that it is encouraged – or even required - by PBRF practices with their emphasis on "international" publication. Even where New Zealand is recognised as a legitimate "case study", methods and theories are typically imported. By contrast, a "margin" position acknowledges our difference, but, the writers argue, "is a two edged sword" because "if the margin is defined by the centre, then we are in an uncomfortable position". While "we are unique and special... our research is unlikely to be recognized as internationally competitive or of 'world-class standing'". The preferred position of Sayers et al. is to turn "*location into a locale...* [which] attempts to re-invent or re-imagine [franchise and margin] as part of a response to the empirical and theoretical materials found or experienced in a particular location. This involves explicitly speaking *back* to the dominant theoretical and conceptual machineries of the metropolitan centres".

The next paper by Austrin and Farnsworth is also interested in location. In an extensively referenced paper, they use material from recent debates about current situations to produce a thorough examination of sociology as a discipline in various locations and eras. Austrin and Farnsworth explore whether sociology exists as a discipline, whether disciplines matter, and note the trend towards orderings by research interest. They suggest that messiness rather than coherence is part and parcel of investigating our social worlds. Problems for maintaining closed disciplinary coherence result from creating a flow between our institutional settings (universities) and those around us by engaging in and through empirical research of how things get done. The more critical and engaged we are the weaker and more permeable the boundary of "discipline".

They comment on a number of potential frameworks (Howard Becker's (2005) field and world, Michael Burawoy's (2004) four sociologies and Boltanski and Thevenot's (1991) orders of worth) that could be usefully combined to reflect on where we find ourselves within "the moral sciences" in New Zealand today and provide more ways to

describe our "necessarily messy work" and its "untidy organisational arrangements". Burawoy shares concerns with Bridgman (this volume) regarding "the limited influence of sociology on public life" though Austrin and Farnsworth question the stability of Burawoy's neat formulation of boundaries and categories. Austrin and Farnsworth's calm presentation of how messy work and lack of disciplinary coherence are part of our endeavours leave the impression that mess and lack can be coped with. Disciplinary coherence is perhaps neither here nor there in such a project apart from what it could help us achieve.

In the next paper, Edgar Burns reviews various versions of sociology via a review of the theorisation of professions. In his paper, *Positioning a post-professional approach to studying professions*, Burns provides and argues for the development of a post-professions perspective. Drawing on sociology and organisation studies/CMS literatures, Burns suggests a shift towards an inclusive cross-disciplinary approach. Sharing a call with Latour for new tools, he argues that changes to professions in recent decades, including the increased use of the terms "profession/ professionalism", the blurring of professional and lay boundaries, the effects of technologies, and the involvement of central states, drive the need for new theorisation.

By sketching the multiple influences in the study of professions, Burns provides us with an example of the messiness Austrin and Farnsworth raise in their paper. While suggesting that sociology of professions is a field looking for coherence, Burns is careful not to put a boundary that cannot hold around the perspectives involved, suggesting that post-professionalism refuses to resolve or be constrained by the old problems in the sociology of professions by "simply 'walking past' them on the basis that the empirical situation has changed". In his argument for an inclusive sociology, Burns provides us with a way to think about how to have a programme of research concerned with a particular topic (here, professions) that does not require the closing off of particular disciplinary or methodological loyalties and concerns. The sense is that by not holding on too tight, a collective effort that is collective without insistence on consensus can be achieved.

The next two papers in this collection argue in different ways for political engagement by organisational studies scholars. Writing as management academics from the University of Waikato, and from Illinois State University, Humphries, Dyer and Fitzgibbon argue that a position in management education not only enables, but morally requires, "the articulation of an emancipatory discourse". In particular, they set out a critique of neoliberalism and its local political effects, arguing that management education can be a site for developing such a critique and presenting it to those – management students – who may be in a position to create transformation. This involves a shift from "the instrumental ethic by which we govern ourselves and Earth to a relational ethic". This relational ethic is one "in which each human being is considered, not as a means to an end, but as a free being, entitled to the wherewithal to live a life of dignity and self respect. This notion of freedom is deeply different to the liberty offered by the neo-liberals". While the writers present a series of examples from the New Zealand context of the damaging effects of "third way" politics, they also emphasise the importance of looking at our local issue in the context of "the relentless intensification of global capitalism". While we are in various ways damaged by global capitalism, we are also in others "complicit... in the current world system".

The writers point out that New Zealand universities are mandated by the Education Act (1989) to be "critic and conscience of society", and that critical theory provides tools for this task. They make a series of moral arguments in favour of this mission, sourcing key aspects of their emancipatory project from the work of Habermas.

Todd Bridgman, from Victoria Management School, also addresses the potential role of management academics as "critic and conscience of society", also arguing that they can have "a vital role" as "a force for democratic change". However, his theoretical approach is different. He begins with coverage of media attacks on Craig Prichard (an author in this issue) for having raised questions about the value of the recent sale of "Trade me" for millions of dollars. As Bridgman points out, "there is a presumption that management schools should be unquestioning supporters of the workings of the capitalist system, rather than critics of

it". In contrast he invokes the possibilities of CMS to inform public intellectuals to be such critics, and he goes on to consider the "relationship between intellectuals and society" from various perspectives. In contrast to Humphries et al., he is critical of a Habermasian notion of the public intellectual as a "bearer of universal values", one who speaks for the oppressed. He turns to the theories of Laclau and Mouffe to argue that intellectuals can be politically engaged, yet not claim to represent universal moral truths. In Laclau and Mouffe's "radical and plural democracy", political work can address "justice, equality and freedom" while rejecting a foundationalist epistemology such as Habermas', which envisages a rational consensus through communicative action.

In considering possibilities for "critical and engaged experts" in New Zealand, Bridgman addresses that crucial issue of how you can be an intellectual here without being considered "a wanker". Like Humphries and colleagues he considers the pressure of "enterprise culture" on academics, and like Sayers et al. he discusses the effects of the PBRF. The Humphries et al. and Bridgman papers provide excellent and contrasting examples of modernist (Humphries etal.) and poststructuralist (Bridgman) critical theory approaches to the politics of management education and scholarship.

The preceding papers have been mainly concerned with disciplinary and political issues in the study of work and organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand. In the final paper, Catherine Casey and Kate Williamson draw on critical theory to analyse a local empirical study. They are concerned with how young people in tertiary education combine work and study. This is one of the few papers submitted for this special issue to contain material from research conducted here in New Zealand. They bring together political and theoretical concerns, regarding the impact of part-time student workers on labour market structure, with an empirical study of contemporary university students and their relationship to part-time employment. Casey and Williamson ask whether this combination is a significant part of changing work practices in New Zealand as it follows OECD policies of knowledge-based economies and mass participation in higher education.

Using this example and drawing on critical labour process traditions and critical organisational studies they examine and question the effects of the liberalisation of the labour market since the 1980s including the normalisation of "non-standard" work practices. They question the consequences of this change in terms of demands on working students, and workplace relations amongst part-time workers, arguing that ultimately it is employers that gain more from students as low-cost, low-investment, and highly flexible labour. A major concern is with the longer-term consequences for power and control over work and in workplaces in New Zealand and the expansion of the tertiary sector and the change of focus accompanying it.

In conclusion

There are many ways for sociologists and CMS scholars to make connections: the partnership that produced this special issue, for instance, arose from a joint supervision relationship. The relationships between sociology and CMS arise not only from a common concern with research "topics" – work, organisation, management - but with shared interests in social theory and in contributions to local social projects.

In December 2007 the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand (SAANZ, 2007) will be holding a Joint Conference with the Australian Sociological Association (TSA) in Auckland – *Public Sociologies: Lessons and Trans-Tasman Comparisons* (TASA and SAANZ, 2007). Key speaker Michael Burawoy has a history of work located in the centre of the concerns of this special issue: he is a long-time researcher and critical theorist of industrial workplaces, and his work is discussed by Austrin and Farnsworth in this issue. As they explain, he has recently considered the disciplinary issues of sociology as an occupational and knowledge practice, advocating "public sociologies", engaging "multiple publics in multiple ways", and closing the gap between the practice of sociology and "the world we study" (Burawoy, 2004). In CMS there is similarly an increasing concern with political engagement. An editorial in the "neo-disciplinary" journal *Organization: the interdisciplinary journal of organization, theory and society* looks back over ten years of publication,

and argues that the commitment to work *against* disciplinarity reflected in contributions are, in retrospect, less important than "*the institutional conditions ensuring our increasing loss of relevance, as academics, in the corporatizing, privatizing, globalizing world*" (*Organization* Editorial Team, 2003, p. 404). A debate about "relevance", especially *local* relevance, can be the basis for making and strengthening connections between sociology and organisational studies in Aotearoa New Zealand.

We hope that critical management scholars will attend the SAANZ conference (TASA and SAANZ, 2007), and that sociologists will attend the next OIL conference in February 2008 – or, at least, check out the growing local resources on the OIL website as a basis for both teaching and research (OIL, 2007). Both organisations run e-lists which can be accessed from their websites.

Thanks to *New Zealand Sociology* editor Mike Lloyd and to SAANZ for the opportunity to create this special issue. And thanks to contributors and reviewers from sociology and management studies who have created the issue itself.

References

Burawoy, M. (2004). *For Public Sociology.* Address to the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August 15th., 2004. http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/burawoy/burawoy_pdf/2004PresidentialAddressASR.pdf

Calas, M. B., Smircich, L. (1992). "Using the 'F' word: feminist theories and the social consequences of organizational research", in Mills, A. J., Tancred, P. (Eds.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 222-233) . Sage, London.

Calas, M., G. Morgan, et al. (2006). Editorial. *Organization, 13*(1), 5-7.

CMIG (Critical Management Studies Interest Group of the Academy of Management). (2004). [USA]. *Domain Statement.* http://group.aomonline.org/CMS/

Cooperrider, D. and Khalsa, G. (1997). The Organization Dimensions of Global Environmental Change. *Organization & Environment, 10*(4), 331-341.

criticalmanagement.org (2007) *criticalmanagement.org* [Web portal to CMS sites]. Accessed 14.3.07. http://www.criticalmanagement.org/

Easton, B. (2006). The uni split. [originally published *Listener*, 4 November]. *Brian Easton's website*. [Wellington]. http://www.eastonbh.ac.nz/?p=806

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1984). On the genealogy of ethics: Overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Foucault: A reader* (pp. 340-372). New York: Pantheon Books.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations, 53*(1), 7-32.

Jones, C., and Munro, R. (Eds.) *Contemporary organization theory.* London: Blackwell.

Jones, D. (2005). Spot the Difference: Discourse in Organizational Communication, Organizational Studies, and Workplace Sociolinguistics. *Management Communication Quarterly, 19*(2), 288-298.

Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry, 30*(Winter), 225-248.

Latour, B. (2007). Short CV. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from Bruno Latour's Web site: http://www.bruno-latour.fr/biography.html

Law, J. (1994). *Organizing modernity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Linstead, S. (Ed). (2004). *Organization theory and postmodern thought.* London : Sage.

Nkomo, S. (1992). The Emperor Has No Clothes: Rewriting "Race in Organizations". *The Academy of Management Review, 17*(3), 487-513.

OIL (Organization, Identity and Locality) (2007). *Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL).* [Homepage]. Hosted Palmerston North: Department of Management, Massey University: [Accessed 14.3.07] http://www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/oil.htm

Organization Editorial Team (2003). Why neo-disciplinary? Why now? [Editorial]. *Organization, 10*(5), 403-420.

Panaho, J. (2007). Who is afraid of the postcolonial? *Proceedings of Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) III,* Massey University, Albany Campus, Auckland, February http://www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/OIL/OIL3%20papers/Panoho_Who%20is%20afraid%20of%20the%20postcolonial.pdf

Parker, M. (2000). The sociology of organizations and the organization of sociology: Some reflections on the making of a division of labour. *The Sociological Review, 48*(1), 124-146.

Parker, M. (2007). Brief biography. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from Leicester University Web site: http://www.le.ac.uk/ulmc/academics/mparker.html

Pihema, W. (2006). Deploying renditions as modes for indigenous critique. In Prichard, C., Jones, D., Stager Jacques, R. (Eds.) (2006). *Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) II: A one-day conference on Critical Management Studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* [10 February, 2006, Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington]. Conference Proceedings. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Management, Massey University. http://www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/OIL/pihema.pdf

Prasad, A. (2003). *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prichard, C., Jones, D., Stager Jacques, R. (Eds.) (2006). *Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) II: A one-day conference on Critical Management Studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* [10 February, 2006, Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington]. Conference Proceedings. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Management, Massey University. www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/Oil%20Conference%20Proceedings_revised.pdf

SAANZ (Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand). (2007). *SAANZ* . [Homepage]. Accessed 14.3.07. http://saanz.science.org.nz/

Simpson, T. (2003). *Bringing "out there" in: Contact stories in a workplace meeting*. Paper presented at the Annual Sociology Association of Aotearoa New Zealand (SAANZ) Conference, 9-11 December, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.

Simpson, T. (2005). *What is "out there" doing in here: Talk of "out there" in workplace meetings*. Paper presented at the Fourth Critical Management Studies Conference, 4-6 July 2005, Cambridge University, Cambridge, England.

Simpson, T. (2006). Workplace meetings: Following the action in making organisation around the table. *School of Social and Cultural Studies*. Wellington, Victoria University of Wellington. Unpublished PhD dissertation in Sociology.

Stablein, R. (2007). Management education in New Zealand: the foundation professors. *Proceedings of Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) III*, Massey University, Albany Campus, Auckland, February. http://www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/OIL/OIL3%20papers/Stablein_Foundation%20Professors.pdf

Strangleman, T. (2005). Sociological futures and the sociology of work. *Sociological Research Online, 10*(4).

TASA & SAANZ (2007). *TASA & SAANZ Joint Conference 2007: Public Sociologies: Lessons and Trans-Tasman Comparisons*. http://www.cce.auckland.ac.nz/conferences/index.cfm?P=9518

Urry, J. (1981). Sociology as a parasite: Some vices and virtues. In *Practice and progress: British sociology, 1950-1980*. P. Abrams, R. Deem, J. Finch and P. Rock Eds.). London: George Allen & Unwin.

Deborah Jones is a senior lecturer at Victoria Management School. She currently teaches research methods and organising creative industries. She has qualifications in English, sociolinguistics, women's studies and Management Studies. Her research focuses recently on work and careers, especially in relation to the film industry, gender, ethnicity, age and nationalism. She is a coordinator of CIRANZ – a local Creative Industries Research Network.

Tamika Simpson is currently working towards creating journal articles from her PhD completed at Victoria University in 2006. Her research interests include workplace practices, socio-technical associations and processes of accountability, responsibility and dividing labour.

Franchise, Margin and Locale: Constructing a Critical Management Studies Locale in Aotearoa New Zealand

Craig Prichard, Janet Sayers and Ralph Bathurst

Abstract

Most academic disciplines have their symbolic and material "homes" in the metropolitan centres of the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK). Consequently researchers working in Aotearoa New Zealand face a choice as to the kinds of relations they develop with these metropolitan centres. We argue that researchers tend to adopt three particular modes of response: *franchise, margin* and *locale.* In this paper we illustrate each mode by reflecting on a joint research programme, Music and Organisation. We suggest researchers need to move beyond franchise and margin responses and develop methods of research that explore local issues using local empirical materials, but that also re-appropriate, in distinctive ways, imported theoretical and conceptual machineries.

Introduction

Research, like any organised social practice, is never unique to a particular location. It is something of a hybrid constituted through local conditions, histories and circumstances as well as drawing on the political, symbolic and economic relations of other locations. Researchers working in organisational studies in Aotearoa New Zealand are deeply embedded in traditions of work that express the political, symbolic and economic relations of other locales. These *other* locales are largely in the metropolitan centres of the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA). Researchers based here in New Zealand thus face a choice as to the kinds of responses they develop with the core of their fields.

In this paper we first establish some of the broad contours of the *geography* of academic disciplines as they relate to our particular location (using bibliometric studies). We then argue that researchers often

respond in three particular ways which we label *franchise, margin* and *locale.* To illustrate each mode we present reflections on our joint Music in Organisations research project. The project contains elements of all three modes but also attempts to move beyond franchise and margin approaches towards a position that not only takes up local issues and empirical materials, but re-appropriates, in distinctive ways, imported theoretical/conceptual machineries. We begin this discussion by critiquing the context of our research, particularly the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) initiatives, and how the *location* of research *centres* inevitably affects how research is done.

The (extra) challenge of location: PBRF and the tyranny of distance

National and institutional research audit processes such as New Zealand's newly developed PBRF assigns a premium to "world class" or "internationally competitive" research. In the introduction to the 2003 PBRF results, the higher education funding body, the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), reported that it

> ... makes no apologies for establishing a high benchmark for the achievement of world-class standing and for requiring the 12 peer review panels to apply the agreed assessment framework in a rigorous and consistent manner. A relentless focus on verifiable quality is essential if the tertiary education sector is to achieve and sustain internationally competitive levels of research excellence (TEC, 2003, p. 85)[1]

But what does "world class standing" refer to? On what basis would one's "standing" in the *world class* be established? One way would be to check if the activity one performs locally is recognised by those involved

1 The audit process involved the evaluation of a research portfolio from more than 8000 New Zealand academics in 2004. Each of 12 subject panels assigned individuals a 'quality category' (A, B, C, R) based on a numerical formula. An 'A' category was identified as 'world class' or 'internationally competitive' research activity. The secrecy of the panel deliberations, the lack of any review or possible challenge, together with the numerical method, aimed to assure those involved that the ascription of a quality category is an objective measure which is unsullied by personal, political, disciplinary or institutional differences and dynamics. Just 5 percent of the 8013 submissions to the PBRF were rated 'A' – that is world class.

in the same activity elsewhere. In other words, are we participating in the *same class* of activity? For example, dairy farmers in Ireland, Australia, China, the USA, and New Zealand would no doubt recognise that work done in each location belongs to the same class of activity they themselves perform. Is this what TEC has in mind? For them "world class standing" does assume participation in the same class of activity, but it also assumes qualitative differences in the performance of this same class of activity between those participating. It also tends to assume that there are competitive relations between those involved. The problem in attempting to categorize performance differences is what criteria to use. Depending on the criteria used, different rankings will be produced and from these, different hierarchies of performance constructed.

The Ministry of Research Science and Technology's (MORST) recently released *National Bibliometric Report* notes that New Zealand leads the world in scientific publications per US$1million investment (MORST, 2006, p. 13). In other words, if we compare New Zealand researchers with those located elsewhere, New Zealand researchers are among the most efficient producers of scientific papers (on a cost per output basis). Such an indicator may be helpful in supporting claims for funding and rebuffing charges that research money is wasted. The problem is that the "international" research *game* is not played with a scoreboard that ranks players in terms of the efficient production of research papers. The generally accepted qualitative criteria used to measure "world class standing" is the standing of the journal in which the work is published, the number of citations the publications attract, and to some degree the number of papers produced. On these criteria – status of journal, citation, and number of publications – New Zealand researchers do not score quite so well.

New Zealand-based researchers publish about 5600 (ISI-recognised)[2] papers per year (MORST, 2006). This places New Zealand about midway along a scale of publications per capita (10th out of 22 countries). However, in relation to citations (which are strongly

2 ISI Web of Knowledge is an internationally recognised citation index, available at http://portal.isiknowledge.com

dependent on particular journal of publication), the MORST study found that just three fields of work – Ecology, Pharmacology and Physics – have citation rates *above* world citation averages. In other words, in all other fields, including agriculture and social sciences, where researchers produce higher than world average numbers of papers[3], New Zealand-based researchers are cited at *less than the world average* in their particular fields. How is this possible? How can a group that is among the world's most efficient producers of scientific papers and who also publish above average number of papers in particular fields (like agriculture and social sciences where arguably New Zealand has some advantages) fall below the world average in citation recognition?

Bibliometric studies of New Zealand research sketch out some of the general features of research produced here. This analysis is important in the production of league tables and hierarchies. But such studies are largely unable to interpret or explain the features we have described. How might we explain below average citation? One superficial response might be that the papers are not good enough. This might be the case with some papers, but could it be the case for all the 5600 New Zealand-sourced papers published annually? We think not. In order to explain what is going on with the citation rates we need to know some more about the context in which these works are published.

The MORST study notes that on average, papers published in some fields (agriculture and social sciences for example, where New Zealand researchers publish above average numbers of papers) are fields that have below average citation rates as compared with other fields – particularly those in the core sciences. In other words, if we take citation as a meaningful measure of research performance, then New Zealand-sourced papers tend to be in the *wrong* fields (fields with lower than average citation rates) relative to other fields. This measure is not only shaped by citation within the field but also of the ranking of the journals in particular fields[4]. Thus, in order to understand the dynamics of citation

3 Since 1992 the number of New Zealand-sourced social science publications has nearly doubled (from 0.4 to 0.8) as a proportion of total world production. This proportion is nowadays almost twice the proportion of science papers sourced from New Zealand.

at the level of the journal, we need to *drop down* and explore the geographies of particular academic fields. Our argument is broadly that citation, as a measure of recognition, better suits researchers located in some places than others. Of course we are not discounting the possibility that the New Zealand-sourced work is poorly done. Rather, we suggest that *location-related factors* help to explain lower than average citation records for researchers located here. We are not bemoaning this, however. We are using it to establish a basis for a particular kind of response to metropolitan research.

Music and organisations in New Zealand: Or "Six months in a leaky boat"

We now consider the issues discussed above by reflecting on a joint research project. The project which is made up of three separate case studies explores music in and around organizations. Our discussion shows why location is important in reseerach.

The broad research question of our project is: how does musical consumption and/or performance help to organise work and the management of that work? Our research involved three case studies of: a refugee community that supported a music group; a factory where managers had banned the use of personal music machines after more than 20 years of supporting their use; and an investigation of music in commercial exercise regimes (in group fitness sessions). We discuss this project, using illustrative experiences from each discrete part of the research, to show the different approaches that can be used to engage with the *centre* of social theorising – the centre in our discipline being the USA and Europe.

To begin, we need to make three general points. First, we contend that in general our project and its dilemmas reflect the predicament of other management/social science researchers in New Zealand. Theory about music as an organising system, like other theory with which we engage, primarily originates in the USA and Europe (e.g. Adorno, 1976;

4 Each journal in each research field is ranked (Thomson ISI) on the basis of the number of citations papers published in the journal have received in the previous two years and this is divided by the number of papers published in both years. The calculation gives an impact measurement that can be used to rank journals against each other.

Barthes, 1977; Ingarden, 1986; and for more contemporary citations Albert & Bell, 2002; De Nora, 2000; Hatch, 1999; Hazen, 1993; Nissley, Taylor & Butler, 2003; and a special edition of the journal *Group and Organisation Management*). Second, Music and Organisation can itself be seen as a marginal research pursuit. However, to dispute this point, music has long been of interest to philosophers and social science researchers: its rather belated entry into organisational and management research belies its importance in social, economic and organisational life, rather than confirms its insignificance.

The third general point we wish to make concerns how *location* currently works in our particular field of research endeavour. Recent scholarship that explores the character of research practice highlights the centrality and dominance of the USA and the UK in the construction of "international research" (Paasi, 2005; Uskiken & Pasadeos, 1995; Westwood & Clegg, 2003). This is not simply due to the numerical concentration of researchers in these locations, or the sheer number of papers produced (as noted above). It is also an effect of the concentration of publishing outlets (particularly journals), the home of learned societies, and of citation technologies. Consequently the various mechanisms of academic research (publications, societies, publishers etc.) are strongly tied to and draw from the conditions, histories and circumstances of those locations, and are consequently *a priori* recognised as "international" work.

In our particular field of work — management and organisation studies — the dominance and centrality of North Atlantic journals, conferences and societies means that "North Atlantic Theories of Organisation" (NATO) comes to be regarded as "international studies of organisations" (Clegg, 2004; Clegg, Linstead & Sewell, 2000; March & Sullivan, 2005; Prichard, 2004; 2005a; 2005b; Westwood & Clegg, 2003; Usdiken & Pasadeos, 1995). Researchers located *here* therefore confront a problematic that their colleagues closer to the "NATO nexus" can largely ignore: how to engage in research whose content, method, and format is at a distance and to varying degrees distinct from that produced

by the particular location in which they find themselves. Of course other locations outside the NATO nexus also experience the effects of their locations, for instance Latin America (Ibarra-Colado, 2006).

How do we as researchers respond to this challenge? We in New Zealand use a variety of mechanisms to reduce these divergences, including directly engaging USA and European researchers here, training our researchers at NATO HQ (hoping they later return to the periphery, see Lander & Prichard, 2001; 2003), international collaboration, and conference and study leave. These tactics do not, in and of themselves, lead to what our local research community identifies as "international recognition", although they may facilitate responses to the challenge of the *centre-periphery* issue. To address this, we discern three main responses in our research – franchise, margin and locale – and we now discuss each in turn in relation to our research project as an illustrative example of the practice and problems we face as management and social science researchers located *here* in New Zealand.

Modes of responses to centre-periphery relations

Franchise

During a trip to the UK to attend Critical Management Studies (CMS) and Standing Conference on Organisational Symbolism (SCOS) conferences in 2003, Janet Sayers visited a UK-based University, and was graciously hosted by academics who were rapidly disseminating work in an area of research interest – aesthetic labour (Nickson, Warhurst & Watt, 2000; Nickson, Warhurst, Witz & Cullen, 2001). An outcome of this visit was that Janet undertook to be part of an "international study" looking at "styles" of aesthetic labour in different countries. Her intention was to explore "Kiwi" styles of labour, using the existing UK survey and contributing to international comparative work.

The New Zealand fitness industry was chosen as an appropriate focus for the study in New Zealand (the hospitality industry was used in the original study). The survey was adapted to the New Zealand context and the fitness industry, and then administered, collated and analysed. The research has so far been disseminated in two conference papers (Bradbury & Sayers, 2004; 2005) aimed at the fitness industry. As part of

this project, group fitness instructors were interviewed about their aesthetic labour, and particularly how they experienced music when they work. In explanation, music is central to the production system of group fitness: music is effectively the *technology* of the system that binds the participants together through exercise and dance routines. To date several conceptual papers on how music is used and interpreted in the highly organised system of group fitness sessions have been presented in European conferences, and submitted to NATO journals (e.g. Sayers & Bradbury, 2004; Sayers, 2005). The research area also led to a research opportunity that occurred more by chance during a later visit to the UK when a conference paper on Charlie Chaplin's use of music and dance to critique service work, was picked up for a forthcoming collection of critical essays (Sayers & Monin, 2007, forthcoming). This eventuation was largely serendipitous. In short, sometimes getting published in the "right" places is dependent on being *in the right place*, at the right time (that is, where the editors are, and the decisions are made).

As this work has progressed it has moved away from the initial "franchise" arrangement. Initially the *franchisors* – the UK researchers – were keen to promulgate and extend their work world-wide. However, this attempt to promulgate a theoretical idea foundered on problems with adapting and interpreting the survey, and of distance. In terms of the theoretical dissemination of the "aesthetic labour" idea, the theoretical paradigm within which it is framed originates as an extension of Hochschild's (1983) work on emotional labour. If one wishes to publish back into the UK or USA journals, then the material demands to be framed back into this debate, and the field moves very rapidly.

The franchise model favours technical, uniform methods of expansion. Like the business franchise system, it is all about mimesis, although, like the biggest franchise system of them all, McDonalds, some local adaptations are possible. However, global cultural domination and profit remains the central strategy, and what emanates from the centre has vast theoretical and financial resources (see Felstead et al., 2006). The intrinsically radical approaches of interpretive methods of inquiry that question the assumptions that emerge from the centre, are not ideal for the franchise system.

Janet's experience is not unusual for an organisational/ management researcher. Perhaps the most widespread response to centre-periphery relations in any particular research field is imitation, or the franchise response. Work done *there* is repeated here in similar or refined forms: institutions and frameworks are imported, and efforts are made to reproduce the practices, processes and frameworks of the centre in peripheral locations. Such work inevitably demands high levels of international mutuality, engagement, support and interconnectivity. There is no guarantee that a local franchise will succeed. Not only is it difficult to establish the same epistemological traditions, conceptual models and theoretical stances in a new location, but particular economic, social, political and historical contexts provide distinctive features that shape or constrain their reproduction. The franchise may simply not make sense in a different location. Local empirical conditions and resources might enliven certain features and repress others. This may lead to lower or weaker levels of recognition by metropolitan researchers. For example the population and size of institutions in New Zealand make institutional governance research problematic and potentially weakens the relevance of the findings based on samples from this location.

Other attempts at franchise research can be more "successful". For example, Howard Frederick's survey of New Zealand small businesses using the Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring framework is one example of such work (Frederick, 2005; Prichard, 2006). Here a strict methodology is applied to local conditions. Results are reported back to the centre and used to demonstrate international comparison and relevance. Alternatively, franchise research might consist of analysis of distinctive local features, such as Maori-Pakeha relations, as part of the elaboration of Northern Hemisphere theory. An exemplar of such an approach is Maria Stubbe and Janet Holmes' analysis of different patterns in Maori and Pakeha English (Stubbe and Holmes, 1999) using "politeness theory" produced by the British linguists Brown and Levinson.

The key feature of franchise research is the particular relations it establishes through the transmission and reception of theoretical and conceptual approaches. The theoretical work is done at NATO HQ and the status of this work as being of global standing is established through empirical elaboration in peripheral locations such as New Zealand. The franchise, in other words, helps to establish the status of the framework as a "global enterprise" and in the process it takes its place in (neo) colonial relations of power and influence (Said, 1978).

Margin

Ralph Bathurst conducted research among musician-refugees, research that grew out of two important life experiences. He began his working life as a music teacher in a large secondary school, in an age of booming science departments. The arts, and especially music, were at best considered irrelevant and at worst a waste of time. For many of Ralph's students, music was a marginal activity that bore little or no relevance to their future working lives, and they resented being forced to study it and take it seriously. In response, he found himself being as much a persuader as an educator – persuading students of the value of music to their becoming fully rounded human beings. Ralph's passion for music is an essential part of his own identity and he strongly believes in its ability both for personal development, and as a way to help turn around the lives of troubled young people. Secondly, in recent years, Ralph has acted as a volunteer support person for refugee families settling in New Zealand. Families, estranged from their home lands (Middle East, Asia and Africa) are invited to settle into an unfamiliar country, where the cultural values are often at odds with their past experiences. As a result, they feel marginalised and uncomfortable with their new surroundings, and many struggle for years before finally, if ever, identifying with the label *Kiwi*.

For Ralph, musical refugees represented an ideal opportunity to discover how people at the margins use their cultural capital (their music) as a way of integrating into their new surroundings and enter into New Zealand economic and social life. Following Bourdieu's notion of capital (1986), Ralph observed how these musicians used their talents to integrate into New Zealand society and exchange their skills for social

and economic capital. He spent time with the Burundian Drummers, a group of musicians who rehearse each Saturday afternoon in the back yard of a state housing area on Auckland's North Shore.

Important events within this community, most notably the Burundian National Day, are marked with lively drumming and dancing. During his research Ralph found that this group do not use their musical skills as a means of employment or of assisting them to become Kiwis. Rather, they use their drumming as a way of preserving their culture and inducting their New Zealand-born children into the Burundian way. Here a marginal group chooses to remain at the margin, for it is in this marginality that their unique identity is preserved.

Ralph describes one critical incident which illustrates the importance of the margins when it is to do with fundamental questions of identity and culture. The leader of the Burundian community in Auckland exclaimed to an assembled audience at their National Day Celebrations in July 2004, after a stunning performance of drumming and dance, "Don't you wish *you* were Burundian?" This leader invited the audience to the margins, inferring that the margin is where uniqueness and difference is experienced and where identities are formed. The performance of his music brought the Burundian drummer, momentarily and ecstatically, into the centre of where meaning was made.

The concept of margin is infused with paradox, and this paradox provides a dilemma for researchers in New Zealand, as it does for researchers in other marginal locations. The centre and the margin depend on one another; they cannot exist without each other because the very concept of centre comes with a margin, and vice versa.

A research response from the margin may be based on a reaction to some of the features of location. Marginal research seeks traditions whose very character, motifs and sensibilities speak to one's context and allow a level of *non-compliance* with the field's core traditions. Some of the difficulties in creating this work may be that it is experienced and received with indifference, subordination, subjection and even exploitation. It may be that a margin response is inevitable in the face of such difficulties and the realization that the same levels of

commitment, sharing, engagement, and participation are unlikely to be extended equally over time and space. This indifference may cause withdrawal to the margins which may also be read as an attempt to signify difference and divergence without attempting to resist, challenge, or mount a conflict with the centre.

On the other hand, and more positively, the pursuit of the margin might be presented as the construction of a *niche* through the celebration of the local and/or disengagement from the *orthodoxy* of metropolitan agendas. Even more than celebration, and as illustrated by the Burundian drummers, a marginal position can be used knowingly to transmit culture and meaning.

Margin then, is a two edged sword. The margin can be celebrated as a place where creativity and culture *happens*, but if the margin is defined by the centre, then we are in an uncomfortable position. We are unique and special, and so of value to the colonising centre, and at the same time, while we attempt to claim and preserve our identity, we experience powerlessness and vulnerability. Specifically, in the research field, if we take up a marginal position, our research is unlikely to be recognized as internationally competitive or of "world-class standing".

Locale

For Craig Prichard the music in the workplace project arose out of a strong sense of disassociation that had been developing between his professional (research and teaching) and amateur (music performance) work. This was bought on in part by the gradual loosening of ties with his professional community based in the UK (he moved back to New Zealand in 1998). On the amateur side he had joined a local Ceilidh band in 2000 as a guitarist and singer and in the following five years spent many evenings chopping out Irish and Scottish dance rhythms (jigs and reels) behind a group of highly talented fiddle, accordion, pipe and whistle players.

Craig's research investigated the removal of personal music machines (walkmans) from the shop floor of an agribusiness factory after more than twenty years of use by production workers (Prichard, 2005c). In addition he has been involved in looking at the use of *charivari*[5]

by academics involved in challenging change processes at Massey University in 2001 (Prichard, 2004). Music and noise has a long history of use by organisational actors as both a form of protest and control (Thompson, 1993). Both these empirical targets aim to explain the particular dynamics that music and noise unlocks as a weapon for re-ordering and organising social relations. In the particular case study of the factory, the struggle over the use of personal music machines on the shop floor could be simply represented as part of the general struggle between workers and managers over the inclusion of non-work practices in the workplace. Yet at another level it can also be analysed as the use of a specific technology that creates or changes relations between a particular kind of work and those that perform it. In relation to the latter point Craig suggests in his research that the project begins to *speak* back to literature on the management of technology and the political economy of organising.

Craig's own experiences and reflections as a musician using music to organise audiences, and communicate, helped him to reflect on the theoretical implication of his empirical cases. His inspiration to think about locale partially came from structured reflections between his experience as a practising musician and his research observations (see Prichard, Korczynski & Elmes, 2007). In short, he observed that the presence and absence of music makes a difference to the performance of work as a cooperative and coordinated activity (Prichard, 2004; Prichard, 2005a; 2005b; 2005c), and that to fully appreciate the significance of music as an organising technology, a sense of place must be properly incorporated into theorisation.

---

5 Wikipedia describes charivari as: originally a French folk custom, a noisy mock serenade for newlyweds. It was also sometimes used as a form of social coercion, to force an as-yet-unmarried couple to wed. Charivari is the original French word, while 'shivaree' is used in North America. In charivari, people of the local community gather around to *celebrate* a marriage, usually one they regard as questionable, gathering outside the window of the couple. They bang metal implements or use other items to create noise in order to keep the couple awake all night. Sometimes they wear disguises or masks.

Craig's research struggles with questions of locality and locale. Music is an embodied, emotional and aesthetic experience tied to the circumstances of *place* and location. Consequently we can see that alongside franchise and margin response modes, a third response to centre-periphery relations is possible. This involves turning *location into a locale* (Fiske, 1993; Prichard, 2000; Prichard & Willmott, 1997). A *locale* does not ignore the centre's research problems or theoretical machineries, and nor does it react to these by tracing out the boundary positions. Rather it attempts to re-invent or re-imagine these as part of a response to the empirical and theoretical materials found or experienced in a particular location. This involves explicitly speaking *back* to the dominant theoretical and conceptual machineries of the metropolitan centres.

This third route is, in our view, the necessary next step for CMS scholars in New Zealand and other non-metropolitan locations. It does not make a virtue of marginality, nor seek to replicate the work underway in metropolitan centres, and neither does it provide empirical produce for the metropolitan theoretical *chefs* (Prichard, 2005b). Of course creating a locale is not easy. It involves having to respond to the assumptions and frameworks provided by NATO HQ in the midst of what are colonial and neo-colonial processes of academic knowledge production. The creation of a locale recognises that one cannot do without the centre, but neither should one attempt to emulate it or run from it. What is involved is a move that *appropriates* and *changes* the ideas, concepts and voices in such a way that the centre is destabilised.

The next part of our discussion turns to two crucial issues that emerge from our discussion so far. The first of these is the relation of locale to oneself, and is a discussion of this point through our research experiences, which provides a challenge to the predominantly ocular, rather than aural, ways that we perceive our research and its place in the world. The second issue has to do with asking the question, "So what", or specifically in our case, "Is creating a CMS locale a contradiction in terms?"

To constitute a locale start with oneself

Craig writes of his Ceilidh experiences:

> It struck me that there is something quite magical and largely unconscious going on via the music between band and audience ... What can occur is highly organised – orchestrated – and rather spontaneous and euphoric ... What continually struck me during our performances was just how compelling music was as a means of engaging people, organising crowds, creating cooperative activity (dancing/singing), and generally raising spirits and changing moods. If I attempted to make sense of my amateur work from a professional reference point it struck me that the band drew on a set of practices that amounted to a highly evolved and effective form of organising technology. But just how did this technology achieve these effects? This was something of a mystery and in response I began to read the social science literature.

When one reads the social science literature, what is apparent is that, when it comes to music, there are many fascinating possibilities in understanding music's use in organisational contexts. There is an enormous array of explanatory positions within relatively discrete literatures. Each takes different objects as their point of engagement such as the unconscious and symbolic mind; the cognitive mind; the social structure; or business. Yet, despite this enormous array of possibilities, relatively little has been done in organisation studies.

Craig's reflections on this issue – of starting with oneself – provides a key insight into why music offers such a powerful metaphor for organisational research as well as an audience of listeners. The epistemological starting point of an aural frame of reference questions the very nature of the way we perceive our research communities. In short, it becomes apparent that when we *look* at ourselves and others, vision dominates our practice as researchers.

At the same time organised sound presents itself as an interesting epistemological starting point. Epistemologically the study of organisations has, not surprisingly, been strongly guided by the metaphor of visibility. The mode of investigation in the field is strongly ocular-centric. The field's dominant textbook is called *Images of organization*,

and investigators attempt to *see* what is going on *in* organisations or to place organisations in a *field* or *context*. Despite the obvious difficulties that we cannot in anyway *see* organisation, but merely its effects, investigators continue to privilege perception, images and visibility as appropriate modes of engagement (see Prichard et al., 2007).

In a sense, understanding music from the point of view of the self undermines this ocular metaphor, which is intrinsically tied to colonialism, surveillance and visibility (see Prichard, 2007). Music and its production and consumption, requires different cognitive processes of perception. Aural modes of perception are intrinsically about place, because musical meaning is communicated and sensed physically in the body, and emotionally in a system of symbolic meaning (Langer, 1962). Music is intrinsically associated with time and place, and with melody, rhythm, tone, timbre, lyrics and genres, music signals where it originates from. To illustrate this point, Janet writes from the perspective of someone consuming (rather than producing) music, from her research journal for this project:

> I stood in the light rain at the Auckland Zoo and watched Tim Finn performing on stage, to family groups, songs from 'Split ENZ' and his own repertoire. Tim, the local Levin boy made good, successful musician, famous global rock star, returned home to New Zealand with his family and reside permanently. At one point in his performance he bemoans the lack of attention he has been getting lately and some wag in the audience calls out, ironically, 'We love you Neil Finn'. Tim laughs with surprise, and seems to appreciate the wit of the interjector, and the 'take the piss' in-joke. As his band starts to play a song from his own repertoire, *Freedom* he launches into a monologue about what he thinks about when he plays this song. 'I imagine myself under a waterfall in Karekare', he says. 'That feeling you have when the water is pouring down on you. There is nothing like it in the world,' and several people in the audience hoot out with recognition. They have clearly been under the same landmark waterfall. The next song he plays is *Six Months in a Leaky Boat*, a 'Split ENZ' song. This song is basically a sea shanty about New Zealand's place in the Pacific, the journey to get from *there* to *here*, the *tyranny of distance* and the spirit of adventure. Everyone in the audience knows the words, and a moment of collective recognition breaks

> out as spirits surge and voices sing along. This is a Kiwi moment. I hear New Zealand themes of isolation, alienation, of adventure, of place, language, and of culture, interwoven into a centuries-old tradition of sea shanty songs and the newer form of contemporary rock music What occurs is an impenetrable moment of confidence. This is a small family concert, for a good cause (raising money for protecting native animals), good natured, bound together by familiar music, with New Zealand themes that matter to New Zealanders, using the now universal, but UK and USA originating technologies of traditional folk music and rock and roll. But, what I notice most is the audience. This matters here and now, to these people. We have a collective moment of relationship and recognising ourselves. Not as individuals, but in relationship to each other as people who share a common history and repertoire of experiences. It was a *World class* moment, in New Zealand.[6]

Is creating a Critical Management Studies locale a contradiction in terms?

The Music and Organisation project, aside from the empirical projects themselves, can be read as an attempt by the researchers, each in sometimes different ways, to address the problem of responding to centre-periphery relations. While in some respects the overall project and each case study itself could be read as a search for the margin, or entertains the sensibilities of the margin, each project is also an attempt to produce a locale. We start in each case with our own experience and concerns – subjective experiences, embodied experiences, emotionality, our self-reflexive relation with others' experience, and in community relations, in whatever form these take. As such the projects are all inevitably located within a critical interpretative tradition (one that begins with people and *their* understanding and experiences). But beyond this none is tied to or attempts to flatter particular NATO research problems or questions. Rather, each is involved in what could be called the *number-eight wire* activity of attempting to cobble together and move between sets of conceptual resources that in terms of the particular location seem to make sense.

6 (see http://www.tsrocks.com/s/split_enz_texts/six_months_in_a_leaky_boat.html for the lyrics to this song).

Of course at the same time we are not unconcerned about the problematics of getting some attention for such work from *there* (there being the place that seems to anoint us with credibility as far as the PBRF is concerned). But rather than attempt a franchise or margin response, our work points toward the attempt to constitute a locale. A locale, in research terms, is a space that begins with the local and non-local resources and attempts to fashion something distinctive from both. This might seem to some to be haphazard and to even violate the coherency and consistency of some ideas, concepts and frameworks. This is inevitable: turning a location into a locale involves altering to some degree the meaning and purpose of the resources and material used to construct that position. Improvising involves putting something to work in ways that were not intended by the original authors. Thus constructing a locale is not without its disappointments and challenges in relating to those original authors and the traditions that support them. This is not to dismiss NATO debates, theoretical frameworks and methodological traditions but rather to beg, borrow and steal from them in ways that turn location into a locale, a space from which to address both local issues and concerns and to speak back to the centre.

Of course as members of a community engaged in a competitive PBRF system we are caught between a rock and a hard place. We have little option but to participate and compete (for an example of this from the Music and Organisation group see Barry, Bathurst & Williams, 2005). If we want to continue to work in this critically inclined research community then we need to find ways that speak critically about management in ways that *can* be recognized in Europe and the USA. And yet this ought to be done, in our view, in ways that not only draw on strong, evocative empirical materials that are distinctive of this place, but improvise with imported frameworks and concepts and develop and use concepts that are distinctive and resonate with "this" place.

Yes, the research audit processes will continue to use terms like "internationally competitive" and "world-class standing". The task, then, is not to see this as the inevitable necessity and slavish pursuit of franchise research, but as an invitation to appropriate and fashion our

own and the centre's terms and practices into those that make sense in this place. Surely this is what is *really* meant by "internationally competitive" or "world-class"?

CMS is a metropolitan creation (Fournier & Grey, 2001). Its key protagonists are located on both sides of the Atlantic and its key conferences and events are held in the UK and as part of the US-based Academy of Management. These very facts on the face of it may undermine the above argument. And yet as various commentators note, CMS has never been a theoretical enterprise. Rather it is a political movement (Hassard, Hogan & Rowlinson, 2002; Prichard forthcoming, 2007; Tinker, 2002; Zald, 2002). It is a loose collection of marginal groups brought together by this marginality as a consequence of various changes in academic funding, student growth, and broad political and economic change. CMS is an attempt to bring discussion of domination, discrimination and exploitation to the analysis and engagement with management knowledge and practice. In recent times it has begun to explore the problematics related to the global distribution of resources, forms of knowledge and post-colonial themes. CMS, then, is a means of recognising the centre without building a new theoretical enterprise at NATO HQ. In this sense CMS, as a project, provides a point of convergence by which researchers located here might re-imagine centre-periphery relations outside of franchise or margin responses. CMS provides a point of convergence where local issues and concerns might be explored in ways that critically appropriate and challenge the theoretical and conceptual machinery of metropolitan centres.

Conclusion

As we have shown, there are many features of the projects that make up this work that illustrate all three response modes (franchise, margin and locale). Our work shows that constructing a locale does not involve us in dismissing franchise or margin responses but in working with them. A locale is not one place; it is many places created out of a deliberate reflection on and responses to established modes of relating to centre-periphery relations.

On reflection, the Music and Organisation project contains franchise and margin modes of organising. As a research project it is a margin response built on weakening franchise relations (with one's academic centre) that began with responses to very localised embodied experiences. As a margin response it is also a product of a search for a niche empirical topic. And yet, as it has developed, the work has turned to face the centre, particularly its dominant epistemological traditions. It has also begun to question conceptual divisions that make up centre traditions.

References

Adorno, T. W. (1976). *Introduction to the sociology of music* (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). New York: The Seabury Press.

Albert, S. & Bell, G. (2002). Timing and music. *Academy Of Management Review 27*(4): 574–593.

Barry, D., Bathurst, R. J. & Williams, L. (2003). Cadences at Waco: A critique of "Timing and Music". *Academy of Management Review, 28*(3): 367–368.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, pp. 241–258. New York: Greenwood.

Bradbury, T. & Sayers, J. (2004, 25–27 November). *Appearance management and fitness workers: A survey into recruitment practices.* Paper presented at the Sport Management in Australia and New Zealand Conference, Melbourne.

Bradbury, T. & Sayers, J. (2005, 7–10 September). *The power of appearance: The aesthetic labour of fitness workers. Paper* presented at The 13th Congress of the European Association for Sport Management, Newcastle Gateshead England.

Clegg, S., Linstead, S. & Sewell, G. (2000). Only penguins: A polemic on organisation theory from the edge of the world. *Organisation Studies, 21*, 103–117.

Clegg, S. (2004). Platypus at play: Nomadic theorizing with a power compass, *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*(1), 146–170.

De Nora, T. (2000). *Music in everyday life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Felstead, A., Bishop, D., Fuller, A., Jewson, N., Lee, T., & Unwin, L. (2006, 11–13 April). *Moving to the music: Learning processes, training and productive systems – the case of exercise to music instruction.* Paper presented at the International Labour Process Conference, Clore Management Centre, Birbeck College, University of London.

Fiske J. (1993). *Power plays power works*, London: Verso.

Fournier, V. & Grey, C. (2001). At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations, 53*(1): 7–32.

Frederick, H. (2005). *New Zealand Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*, 2003-4 Report, Auckland: Unitec (Available at: http://www.gemconsortium.org/)

Hatch, M. J. (1999). Exploring the empty spaces of organizing: How improvizational jazz helps redescribe organisational structure. *Organisation Studies, 20*(1), 75–100.

Hassard J., Hogan, J & Rowlinson, M. (2002). From labor process theory to critical management studies. *Administrative Theory and Praxis, 23*(3), 339–362.

Hazen, M. A. (1993). Towards polyphonic organisation. Journal of Organisational Change Management, *6*(5), 15–26.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organisation studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking otherness from the margins. *Organisation, 13*(4), 463–488.

Ingarden, R. (1986). *The work of music and the problem of its identity* (A. Czerniawski, Trans.). London: Macmillan.

Lander, D., & Prichard, C. (2001). Life on the verandah: colonial cartographies of professional identities. In S. Whitehead and M. Dent (eds.). *Managing professional identities: Knowledge, performativity and the 'new' professional* (pp. 235–251). London: Routledge.

Lander, D. & Prichard, C. (2003). A critical conversation between author-managers and management-authors. In D. Holman and R.Thorpe (eds.). *The Manager as Practical Author* (pp. 172–190). London: Sage.

Langer, S. K. (1962). *Philosophical sketches.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

March, J. & Sullivan, B. (2005). Notes on the evolution of a research community: Organisation studies in Anglophone North America, 1945–2000. *Organisation Science, 16*(1), 85–95.

Ministry of Education (2005). *Briefing to the Incoming Minister.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Research Science and Technology (2006). *National bibliometric report 2001–2004: International benchmarking of New Zealand research.* Wellington: MORST.

Nickson, D., Warhurst, C. & Watt, A. (2000). Learning to present yourself: Aesthetic labour and the Glasgow example. *Hospitality Review, 2*(2), 38–42.

Nickson, D., Warhurst, C., Witz, A. & Cullen, A. (2001). The importance of being aesthetic: Work, employment and service 'music and organisation'. In A. Sturdy, I. Grugulis & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Customer Service: Empowerment and Entrapment* (pp. 170–190). New York: Palgrave.

Nissley, N., Taylor, S. & Butler, O. (2003). The power of organisational song: An organisational discourse and aesthetic expression of organisational culture (In A. Carr & P. Hancock (Eds.), *Art and aesthetics at work* (pp. 93–114). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Paasi, A. (2005). Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A, 37*, 769–789.

Prichard, C. & Willmott, H. (1997) Just How Managed is the McUniversity? *Organization Studies, 18*(2), 287–316.

Prichard C. (2000). *Making Managers in Colleges and Universities.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Prichard, C. (2004, February). *Towards a Genealogy of resistance.* Paper presented to the research workshop 'Resistance in Organizations: Processes, Forms and Discourses', Work and Organisational Studies, School of Business, The University of Sydney.

Prichard, C. (2005a). Blood on the tracks: Critically re-reading a government occupational health and safety inquiry. *Culture and Organisation, 11*(2), 97–110.

Prichard, C. (2005b, December). *Class re-union? Using the institutional Marxism of Resnick and Wolff to re thinking class in Organisational Studies,* APROS Conference, Victoria University, Melbourne.

Prichard, C. (2005c). Challenging academic imperialism: Some tactics for constructing an organizational communication of the elsewhere. *Management Communication Quarterly 19*(2), 1–9.

Prichard, C. (2006). A warm embrace? New Zealand, universities and the 'Knowledge-based Economy'. *Social Epistemology, 20*(3), 283–297.

Prichard,, C. (forthcoming) ' Responding to Class theft: Theoretical and Empirical Links to Critical Management Studies,

Prichard, C. (forthcoming) 'Responding to Class Theft: Theoretical and Empirical Links to Critical Management Studies, *Rethinking Marxism,* 19 (3).

Prichard, C., Korczynski, M. & Elmes, M. (2007). Music at work: An introduction. *Group and Organisation Management, 32*(1), 1–18.

Prichard, C. (2007, February 16). *Visibility machines and organizing the postcolonial: Towards an institutional analysis of 'location' and New Zealand's computer graphics firms.* Paper presented at the OIL III Conference, Massey University, Auckland.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* London: Penguin Books.

Sayers, J. (2005, July 8–10). *The use of music to facilitate 'flow' in excessive exercise regimes.* Paper presented at the Standing Conference on Organisational Symbolism (SCOS), Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm.

Sayers, J. & Bradbury, T. (2004, September). *"Let the music take your mind": Aesthetic labour and 'working out' to music.* Paper presented at the Work, Employment and Society Conference, Manchester.

Sayers, J. & Monin, N. (forthcoming). Comedy, pain and nonsense at the Red Moon Cafe: The Little Tramp's death by service work in Modern Times. In M. Korcynski & C. McDonald (Eds.), *Service work: Critical perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Stubbe, M. & Holmes, J. (1999). Talking Maori or Pakeha in English: Signalling identity in discourse. In A. Bell & K. Kuiper (Eds.), *New Zealand English* (pp. 249–278). Amsterdam: Walter Benjamin.

Tertiary Education Commission (2003). PBRF: *Overview and key findings.* Wellington: TEC.

Thompson, E. P. (1993). *Customs in common.* New York: New Press.

Tinker, T. (2002). Spectres of Marx and Braverman in the twilight of postmodernist labour process, research. *Work, Employment and Society, 16*(2), 251–281.

Uskiken, B. & Pasadeos, Y. (1995). Organisational analysis in North America and Europe: A comparison of co-citation networks. *Organisation Studies 16*(3), 503–526.

Westwood, B. &Clegg, S. (2003). The discourse of organisation studies: Dissensus, politics and paradigms. In B. Westwood and S. Clegg (Eds.), *Debating organisation: Point-counterpoint in organisation studies* (pp. 1–42). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Zald, M. N. (2002). Spinning disciplines: Critical management studies in the context of the transformation of management education. *Organisation, 9* (3), 365–385.

Craig Prichard teaches organisational change papers from the Department of Management on Massey's Turitea Campus. His PhD explored managerial practice in the tertiary sector in the UK in the 1990s and was written at the University of Nottingham. His core research interest is in the organisational dimensions of political economy.

Janet Sayers teaches managing diversity, and managing services papers at Massey University. Her primary research interest is with 'new' forms of service experiences and the role of service employees in delivering these experiences. Her most recent publications have covered the following topics: home-based business; service work's representation in the comedy of Charlie Chaplin; the use of corporate buildings to display art; and using methods of parody to help students think critically about management texts.

Ralph Bathurst is a lecturer in management at Massey University, Auckland New Zealand. Ralph's PhD from Victoria University of Wellington is in organisational aesthetics and is an ethnographic study of a symphony orchestra. His background as a music educator and orchestral musician inform his research practice.

Assembling Sociologies: Following Disciplinary Formations In and Across the Social Sciences

Terry Austrin and John Farnsworth

Abstract

The paper considers disciplines as hybrid assemblages and takes up the case of sociology as a key means of following how disciplines are both constituted and reworked across varying national, historical, institutional and interdisciplinary arrangements. It traces English, European, North American and New Zealand sociologies in order to show how the occupational work of sociologists is necessarily reassembled under the impact of different national arrangements and tensions.

Sociology (like history) will remain, as it is and always has been, a very disorderly and wholly provisional enterprise." (Hawthorn, 1976, p. 137)

Introduction

How are we to make sense of the disciplinary shifts which have seen a central preoccupation of sociology, work and organisation, move to an area such as critical management studies? In this paper, we argue that one answer is to look at the processes of disciplinary formation out of which specific constellations such as sociology or critical management studies are created. Seeing such rearrangements this way allows us, we argue, to trace how particular practices and narratives, representations and identifications, crystallise into different disciplinary formations at different stages and places. Doing this enables us to make sense of how practices, formerly in one discipline such as sociology, appear to migrate to another, such as management or organisation studies.

Given the attention now paid to work and organisations within management studies, this might seem to put the cart before the horse: why not simply focus on how these areas are investigated in critical management studies? The answer, indirectly addressed by Parker (2000),

is that sociology's long-running history foreshadows some of the possible issues for both domains in management studies.

To understand this more clearly, we examine the work and organisational practices of sociologists themselves. Tracing the investigators rather than the investigated highlights how particular problematics and tensions turn up over and over again in different times and places. From here, it is a short step to suggest that if critical management studies (hereafter, CMS) has increasingly adopted these fields of study, it is likely to have adopted their problems too. It is an equally short step to place the specific concerns of local, New Zealand sociology in relation to the varying solutions arrived at in other societies (Lazarsfeld, 1973).

Given the constraints of space, we have left the links to CMS – the first step – implicit; but have taken the second step, the cross-national relations to New Zealand sociology, and developed this more fully. This allows us to trace the patterns of cross-national disciplinary formations more fully and, in particular, to relate them to local circumstances.

We refer to disciplinary formations as hybrid assemblages: assemblages which can be both stabilised or destabilised according to the institutional, occupational and representational tensions to which they are subjected over time. Assemblages, typically, draw on networks of connection that bring together diverse ensembles of working practices, relationships and technologies (Latour, 1993, 2005). To frame disciplines in this fashion allows us to follow how a given discipline, such as sociology, might coalesce or fragment over time according to the social and institutional currents with which it is engaged: seen differently, it can be a way of assessing the relative success or failure of any given discipline, and sociology has certainly been the focus of just such scrutiny (e.g., Soffer, 1982; Goldman, 1987; Kumar, 2001; Rocquin, 2006a).

How, then, are we to make sense of the tensions and reconfigurations that are a continuous part of disciplinary formation? In what follows, we first outline three arguments to make sense of disciplinary formations, particularly that of sociology. Second, we discuss disciplinary assemblages and then trace their variation across different national, institutional and historical settings: specifically, those of English,

European, American, Canadian and, finally, New Zealand sociology. This provides a means of locating an indigenous sociology alongside these variants and to follow how key aspects of its activity have shifted to become the focus of attention in another disciplinary formation.

Accounting for sociology

The first argument we take up is based on Howard Becker's discussion of "world" and "field" (Becker and Pessin, 2006). Becker develops these as two alternative metaphors. He does so first by contrasting Bourdieu's notion of field as a fixed, bounded force-field of social relations where there is a "zero-sum game" of continuous struggle over scarce resources (Becker and Pessin, 2006, pp. 276-277). In this account, Becker argues, power and domination over rules and practices are central. By contrast, the metaphor of "world" is founded on the collective activity of "flesh and blood people" whose interaction is neither necessarily bounded nor pre-constituted; it is also directly observable and empirically grounded (Becker and Pessin, 2006, p. 280). In short, it is a world of "real people who are trying to get things done, largely by getting other people to do things that will assist them in their project" (Becker and Pessin, 2006, p. 280). Sayer (2000, p. 85), writing from a British perspective makes the same point a different way, suggesting that "Moving from abstract questions...to concrete societies typically requires us, therefore, to ignore disciplinary boundaries and follow the ideas and processes wherever they lead. However, progress in this direction is usually limited by disciplinary priorities." Urry (1981) also develops the same theme in a highly suggestive way arguing that sociology has always been a parasite, ingesting and metabolising other disciplinary discourses in a way that constantly destabilises its capacity to function as a unitary discipline itself.

For our purposes, the contrast of field and world is useful for identifying contrasting disciplinary tensions. One, as we discuss below, is the struggle to organise a discipline within increasingly patrolled sets of rules, procedures, affiliations and practices in ways that produce forms of domination and subordination: in effect, a particular disciplinary or sociological ordering. The other is a more fluid, networked form of

organisation where unanticipated projects are assembled and mobilised around common sets of research or teaching interests. Becker himself points to some of the consequences of these alternatives, commenting:

> a Bourdieusien might say that, well, of course, you could do something that would look like sociology and might even be sociology ... but, let's face it, it wouldn't really be sociology because the people who own the trademark wouldn't recognize you as doing the real thing (Becker and Pessin, 2006, p. 278).

It is exactly here that rules and practices are mobilised to create a disciplinary field that is both bounded and produces distinctions about what constitutes legitimated sociology.

We relate the notions of field and world to a second argument: Michael Burawoy's recent and influential categorisation of sociology into four "sociologies" of public, professional, critical and policy sociology (Burawoy, 2004, 2005; Burawoy et al., 2004). Different versions of this paper have attracted widespread critical attention. Burawoy develops this typology to answer questions about the role and purpose of sociology. Such questions are central to sociology in part because of its dwindling student numbers and because of numerous disciplinary competitors (Stinchcombe, 2000).

We examine Burawoy's typology, and the responses to it, in relation to Becker's metaphors of field and world; but we also place it in relation to recent discussion about sociology's historical development. This highlights the very different patterns of development across diverse national contexts and institutional settings. This includes, for example, the forms of professional sociology that have emerged within the North American context of particular institutions and markets (McLaughlin, 2005). This is in striking contrast to the late development of English academic sociology where the discipline has competed against long-established rival formations of literature, history and public administration as dominant accounts of social patterns and practices (Kumar, 2001).

Placing Burawoy's typology in this context has several advantages. First, it locates it within a distinctly North American perspective and a set of debates that are formed from the very disciplinary practices he is examining (Baiochi, 2005). The second advantage is that it allows us to draw on Burawoy's typology as a heuristic device to trace how different forms of sociology – public, professional, critical and policy-oriented – are foregrounded in different national and institutional settings. Third, it allows us to situate local sociological and disciplinary ambitions more effectively within these cross-national tensions and arrangements. Lastly, drawing on the tension between field and world alongside Burawoy's four-fold typology enables us to trace how the hybrid assemblages that constitute sociology were first constituted as disparate ensembles, were consequently reconstituted and, more recently, became increasingly reworked into related assemblages from management studies to cultural, feminist or media studies (Sayer, 2000).

This brings us to the third argument. Here, we draw on recent work by Thevenot and Boltanski (Boltanski and Thevenot, 1999, 2006 Thevenot and Boltanski, 1991) in which they develop an analysis based on forms of justification for action, or "orders of worth". Each of these are moral orders – distinctive ways of evaluating preferences, patterns of action and order in separate moral worlds. Boltanski and Thevenot distinguish these from pre-existing moral schemes, such as Weber's ideal types, by looking at the interaction between the ideals and models that typify each order and the way this is realised under different social or sociotechnical conditions. It enables them to show how, for instance, standards in the market can be evaluated or co-ordinated so that they may either privilege a good's trust or reputation (the domestic order), the way it is standardized (the industrial order), or its "civic qualification in terms of safety or health (civic worth)" (Thevenot, 2006, p. 9). Several orders may be active simultaneously: each involves different ways of dealing with uncertainty through their particular set of ordering principles. Together, they can identify how particular decisions are arrived at, whether these are as concrete as the building of a road (Thevenot, 2002) or more abstract, such as the complex arrangements under capitalism (Boltanski and Thevenot, 2006).

Although we don't pursue the analysis in detail here, it is possible to see how Burawoy's four sociologies can, in a disciplinary context, be seen as four orders of worth, with sociologists assembling around one order of worth (e.g., the importance of undertaking policy sociology) over another (e.g., professional sociology) and justifying their work accordingly. Lauder, Browne and Haley's (2004) emphasis on the renewed importance of policy sociology in the British context, and ensuing debate in the *British Journal of Sociology*, can be viewed in just this light as attempts to justify a particular order of worth.

For our purposes, orders of worth provide a means of identifying how disciplinary debates and practices might be ordered and organized. Vedres (2006) examines researchers and research practice, showing how multiple frameworks of evaluation may be in operation but, equally, that those around creativity ("the inspired regime of worth"), trust (the domestic order) and opinion (order of fame or reputation, here through publications) are likely to be most valued. Where disciplines are concerned we note, for example, that Becker's contrast between field and world distinguishes between a closed, hierarchical order of the field most typical of the professional and the more open-ended mutations of networks that facilitate innovations and the production of new things.

In the next section, we turn to look at the different historical formations of sociology: in particular, to discuss how, historically, the discipline of sociology has always emerged as a hybrid assemblage held together by diverse and sometimes countervailing impulses. From here we move on to the case of New Zealand sociology and to critical management studies.

Following hybrid assemblages

According to Burawoy, there are four sociologies: public, professional, critical and policy. His concern is the limited influence of sociology on public life and the problems of visibility and engagement this brings in its wake. By contrast, he sees an active, if often removed, professional sociology with highly developed methods, internal organisation and sub-fields of study. Critical sociology "is the conscience of sociology", a reflexive discussion of "what we are up to" (Burawoy, 2004, p. 1609). A

policy sociology "focuses on solutions to specific problems defined by clients" and "is often of a contractual character in which expertise is sold for a fee" (Burawoy, 2004, p. 1608). He puts these four forms into a table which links professional and policy sociology with the production of instrumental knowledge whilst critical and public sociology are connected to reflexive knowledge (Burawoy, 2004, p. 1607). Neat as this four-fold taxonomy is, it has brought, and continues to bring, a variety of critics (ESA, 2007).

There are a variety of alternative accounts (e.g., Tiryakian, 2006; Turner, 1986). Stinchcombe (2000), in particular, has developed an influential argument which pinpoints the nature of the academic marketplace in which sociology operates. He highlights the problems of demand and supply of academic sociology, the very thing on which Burawoy's and Tiryakian's accounts are implicitly founded. For Stinchcombe (2000, p. 3), there is a profound and continuing tension between "the supply of indignation", the social problems that bring undergraduates to sociology in search of understanding or articulation, and graduate work which caters for "a body of indignant young people who would like to make their living studying and teaching the stuff they are indignant about". This is the ebb and flow of the academic social science market which attempts to organise and recruit a university population in order to sustain its disciplinary life. Yet, the popular impulse around indignation is always at odds with the restricted, elite practices of research and graduate work; in addition, other disciplines can produce equally powerful claims to satisfying moral indignation, so sociology's disciplinary career is always dependent on balancing these internal and external tensions.

Moral indignation, however, foregrounds a related theme to do with the success or failure of sociology as a disciplinary enterprise. In Stinchcombe's version, if the "supply" of indignation dries up, or sociology fails to engage it, the discipline itself is faced in the long run with failure. In light of this, what is it that holds sociology together, either as a discipline or, perhaps, as a moral vision? Responses have run the gamut from the technical to the moral: from the difficulties of securing or practising a distinctive method to imposing a persuasive or

effective moral analysis. Such dilemmas are found equally in the questions of method raised around the social survey (Halsey, 2004; Wilks-Heeg, 2005) and the ethnographic life history, or, alternatively, around sociology's status as a "floating discipline" (Rocquin, 2006a) where it remains parasitic on other disciplines' methods (Urry 1981) or operates as a "parvenu profession" (Halsey, 1989, p. 354). The success of its efforts to mobilise a consistent moral consensus have also prompted critical attention, whether it is over the absence of a persuasive social theory as part of a larger vision (Rojek and Turner, 2000) or, perhaps, of a social vision or a "plausible message" at all (Turner, 2006).

In many ways, these concerns can be seen as reworking the tensions Stinchcombe identifies between the moral (undergraduate indignation) and the technical (research and graduate teaching). They point, however, to the key problem of how a discipline such as sociology is organized: how it is built and how its practitioners are assembled; this in turn is central to tracking how the discipline may or may not be linked to different patrons and publics (Turner, 1986; Spinuzzi, 2004). In each case, these dilemmas also indicate how the seeming tidiness of a disciplinary field invariably slips towards the messiness of social worlds that are studied empirically. Similarly, debates over sociology's success or failure point to the provisional constitution of different orders of worth: what sociology is supposed to "do" and how its practitioners should assemble around this.

Wilks-Heeg (2005) and Becker (1994) provide alternative local instances of this. Wilks-Heeg traces the case of Liverpool sociology, one organized by local circumstances and a style of work typified by the social survey. Becker (1994) suggests the history of Chicago sociology was similarly linked to the particularity of local circumstances but with a style of work typified by ethnography. Together, Liverpool and Chicago highlight alternative messy social worlds studied empirically and alternative modes of sociological practice: whether to extend or follow networks rather than to build disciplines. Similar problems emerge in the context of different national associations.

National associations

Institutions and sociological associations emerged from the late 1880s onwards and their activities have been the subject of considerable debate (e.g., Abrams, 1968; Anderson, 1968, 1990; Annan, 1991; Kumar, 2001; Rocquin, 2006a, b). At root, as Kumar (2001, p. 50) argues, this was over the attempts to marry "science" and "reform". In England this took place through the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, known more usually as the English Social Science Association (hereafter, the S.S.A.). This body was the forum for the investigation of social problems and the development of "a science of society" (Goldman, 1987, p. 147). The motive for the formation of such a sociology was:

> to deal with the novel problems of industrialization. The urgent need seemed to be to do something, and to do it quickly, to alleviate the condition of the great body of people subjected to unprecedented stresses (Kumar, 2001, p. 49).

The English Victorians were far from alone in such an endeavour, as Kumar (2001, pp. 49-53) documents; yet the formation, success or failure of other social science associations has often been quite different, as we discuss shortly (Goldman, 1987). What is evident in the English case is the attempt to translate moral issues into political solutions through the indisputable documentation of social troubles. It is from this that disagreements about the relative success or failure of sociology as a discipline arise particularly, in the English case, in its slow national acceptance as a university discipline (Kumar, 2001).

The emergence of social science associations is important for a number of reasons. First, they highlight the diverse tensions out of which the hybrid formations called "sociology" were forged. These bound together ideas about method as a form of "rational and scientific scrutiny" (*Social Science Rev* 1861, p. i) and moral, interventionist aims that saw social practice as a "remedy" for "social pathology" (Goldman, 1987, p. 144). As Goldman (1987, p. 144) comments:

> The emphasis on science as method, on science as a common mode of procedure for all disciplines, inevitably encouraged definitions of social science in terms of its practical applications in "common life".

Second, the English S.S.A. was a model of amelioration, one widely admired in Europe (Kumar, 2001; Goldman, 1987) as a model which translated representations of social "ills" into political and policy solutions, binding liberal elites together as part of a movement in pursuit of an enhanced "civilization" (Goldman, 1987). Third, associations, particularly in England, stood as an important counterpoint to purely academic sociology: in this light they can be read as contributing to either the failure of sociology as a discipline - because, in the English case it was perceived to have delayed its academic institutionalisation (Abrams, 1968; Annan, 1991; Fuller, 2006; Kumar, 2003; Soffer, 1982) - or as a success - because the very pragmatism of its hybrid mix of social science with reform politics "proved unattainable elsewhere" (Kumar, 2001, p. 50). It also points up the gap between the empirical work central to the associations and the ambitions around the production of social theory more typical of academic sociology.

Fourth, and last, the model of the S.S.A. identifies variances in the formation of sociology as a discipline. There are two aspects to this. One is to do with how sociology was practised in Britain. The other is to do with the quite different constitution of sociology in Germany, France, the United States and Canada respectively.

National variance: The English case

On the first aspect, Kumar (2001, 2003) mounts a powerful argument to show that, far from there being a failure to establish sociology as a discipline in the UK, sociology was, in effect, undertaken by other means. These means were threefold. Kumar (2001) relies on Lepenies (1988) and Mazlish (1989) to show that, historically, one involved literature and literary studies, a tradition running from Arnold in the nineteenth century to F.R. Leavis in the twentieth, functioning as a "vehicle for a particular kind of social and moral analysis" (Kumar, 2001, p. 57). Most recently, this has been, in part, translated into cultural studies, despite Rojek and

Turner's (2000) disparagement of it as merely "decorative sociology".

The second means involved history. Like literature, it was established in the universities only in the late nineteenth century but its central role was as "a preparation for statesmanship and public life" in an empire ruling a quarter of the world's population (Kumar, 2001, p. 57). Its appeal was that "History, blessed from the top, promoted by its elite institutions and some of its most prominent public figures ... established itself in the national culture in a way impossible for sociology" (Kumar, 2001, p. 58). In addition, the tradition of postwar historians from Hilton to E.P. Thompson "arguably made a significant contribution to social theory – more so, indeed, than English sociologists" (Kumar 2001, p. 59). Sociology was, by contrast, "a critical and questioning discipline" caught between a variety of influences that made it an "easy target for the criticism of anthropologists, economists and historians" (Kumar 2001, p. 58). In part for these reasons, Lepenies (1988) refers to sociology as a "third culture" between science and literature (Boudon, 2001). This ambiguity was compounded by the third means, in which "much of British sociology historically" took place through the great state bureaucracies in the form of "applied administrative research" (McLaughlin, 2005, p. 17).

We draw out two implications from these tensions and the production of sociology by other means. The first, again, is to highlight the problem of representing sociology as one coherent disciplinary discourse and to emphasise how, historically, the elements of social and moral analysis can be distributed across, and assembled within, a variety of disciplinary entities. Indeed, as Kumar and other researchers argue, its rivals and competitors sometimes offer more persuasive sociological accounts than sociology itself. The second implication is to highlight a problem with Burawoy's categories of public, professional, critical and policy sociology. As with literature, history and social administration, these can be seen to be distributed not just across sociology but across different disciplines altogether. And in each setting they are assembled according to the identities, narratives, representational practices and networks of audiences with which they are implicated. Even within

sociology itself, as the S.S.A. suggests, these categorical distinctions are constantly blurred or reworked according to the investigatory, moral, reformist or even social engineering purposes to which they are put.

National variance: International cases

The so-called "Englishness" of English social theory (Kumar, 2001) throws alternative national constructions of sociology into relief and highlights the second aspect we noted earlier, of sociological variance across societies. Goldman (1987, 2002) charts the tensions between the practices of science and the ambitions of reform that led to their bifurcation in different national contexts. As Kumar (2001, p. 50) summarises this:

> In considering the efforts of the American Social Science Association, founded in Boston in 1865 on the English model, the German *Verein für Sozialpolitik*, started in 1872 as a reform association by liberal thinkers and publicists, and even the Franco-Belgian International Social Science Association, also modelled on the English example, Goldman finds a record of marked failure to influence policy making in their respective countries in any serious way. The consequence was a turn to academic sociology, to "theory" as a refuge from the unaccommodating world of practice.

In each case, sociology was assembled quite differently in response to institutional and national pressures, and often around the inability to retain a combination of "science" and "reform" objectives. It was also bedevilled by the inability to become firmly institutionalised (Kumar, 2001). Turner notes (1986, p. 280) the implicit parochialism not just of the British "peculiarity" highlighted by Kumar but that all national sociologies are experienced as parochial: "it is perfectly understandable that sociologists should typically experience their world as parochial when they are embedded in national sociology cultures".

In the German case, Goldman (1987, p. 164) argues that Bismarck's intervention in social politics from the late 1870s marked the declining potential for the German *Verein* to influence policy so "the Association gave up its activities of agitation and replaced propagandist with academic discussion". However, academic discussion produced no

systematic tradition of teaching or research, despite the powerful individual figures of Weber, Tönnies and Simmel (Kumar, 2001, p. 52). The same outcome, Kumar argues (2001, p. 52), was true in France. Durkheim, who worked mostly as a professor of education, established sociology in France "mainly through his own individual effort, not through institutional provision". The consequence, according to Shils (1970, p. 767), was that on his passing "the study of modern society practically disappeared for a quarter of a century". Yet, as Rocquin (2006b, p. 7) details, European sociologists did remain "thinkers of a system" of a kind much at odds with English "common sense" traditions.

By contrast, the bifurcation of social science and reform in the US produced very different arrangements: ones which emphasised systematisation, professionalisation and market-driven competition between institutions. Goldman (1987, p. 156) argues that despite similar ameliorist aims in the A.S.S.A., it "consistently failed to interest and involve the local and political elites in the United States, and without their patronage ... substantive reform via the statute books was impossible". Its response, he suggests (1987, p. 158), was "to become a learned society with the university as its chosen field of influence", with Sanborn (1866, p. 61) arguing that "by systematic teaching in the lyceums, colleges, and universities of America" the Association's goals would be achieved. The professionalisation of the social sciences did take place (Church, 1974), bolstered by a massive expansion of US universities that secured, over time, the professional status of social science. It also saw an emergent pattern of cross-institutional rivalry for students and resources within the market system of higher education. This produced, as McLaughlin (2005) notes, elite institutions and disciplinary formations along with rich, often informal sociological networks that created interdisciplinary rivalry (Burawoy and vanAntwerpen, 2001) but also "with powerful incentives to improve the public standing of the discipline, providing a competitive and professionalizing edge ... that runs through the American Sociological Association" (McLaughlin, 2005, p. 13).

In one sense, these developments imply a tension between (European) institutions and (US) market arrangements in the organisation and assemblage of sociology in different national settings.

Yet, as we have already noted, such a reading omits other cross-currents that include the tensions between science and reform, academic institutions and disciplinary associations, social theory and empirical investigation, elite or mainstream versus marginal practices of sociology. Each of these is evident in the hybrid assemblage that constituted different national disciplinary arrangements. Such currents, likewise, point to the tensions we outlined at the start between closed disciplinary fields and the open, messy, investigatory worlds articulated by Becker in how actual sociological work was, and is, undertaken. These currents, and the differing national responses to them, also highlight the ways that Burawoy's categories of public, professional, critical and policy sociology are readily disrupted or recombined in the untidy social worlds of disciplinary formation themselves. Such currents, too, point up the organisation of different orders of worth across historical and territorial frames: these include the kinds of social science or reform work that has been valued; or how the varieties of social analysis, investigation and theorising, teaching or research, are implicitly co-ordinated along different axes that privilege, variously, the market, honour or prestige, civic or public worth, or other forms of moral evaluation (Thevenot and Boltanski, 1991). In short, the working out of disciplinary arrangements is, as Thevenot and Boltanski (1991) insist, always around moral and sociotechnical categories of evaluation and justification: it is these that produce the disposition of different sociological assemblages across different national settings (cf. Platt, 1996, 1998, 2003 on the International, American and British associations respectively).

The Canadian case adds one further variant; it also orients us towards local, New Zealand experience and its own internal disciplinary dilemmas. McLaughlin (2005) discusses the incipient crisis of Canadian sociology, contrasting it with both UK and US experience. His extensive survey of the discipline's Canadian career has provoked considerable local debate (*Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(4) and McLaughlin, 2006). He argues that Canadian sociology is in danger of becoming an "impossible science". This arises "because of the relatively flat nature of Canadian institutes of higher learning, the discipline's historical and

contemporary colonial relationship with England, and the starting point of the discipline in the social turmoil of the 1960s in a small democratic oriented nation" (McLaughlin, 2005, p. 2). He contrasts this to the elite and professional strengths of US sociology (2005, p. 13) and, following Fuller (2000) and Kumar (2001), he traces a legacy of weakly institutionalized sociology emanating from its late development in England to its consequentially early slow growth in Canada (McLaughlin 2005, pp. 16-19). As Helmes-Hayes (2002, p. 84) comments, "scholars in traditional disciplines, many schooled in England, either ignored sociology entirely or worked actively (to) prevent its development".

In brief, McLaughlin (2005, 2006) depicts Canadian sociology as a marginal sociology in relation to the US professional and elite system, one limited by centralized state funding where disciplinary solidarity is undermined in the ceaseless search to secure state patronage (McLaughlin, 2005, p. 22). Not only do these arrangements emphasise policy research over public sociology (2005, pp. 22-23) but they underline Canadian sociology's vulnerability to interdisciplinary scavenging. Here, McLaughlin (2005, p. 14) points to the threat of playing "a service teaching" role to other disciplines and its continuing decimation by new "spin-off studies ... like media and communication studies, criminology and gerontology" (2005, p. 29). As a result, sociology is faced, he argues (2005, p. 32), with becoming "a shell of a discipline, a junior partner to the welfare state doing policy research for the Canadian government" or else a ""grab-bag" discipline with no intellectual coherence or scholarly status". This vision is the worst version of Urry's "parasite" version of sociology, with its "inability to resist intellectual invasions" (Urry, 2000, p. 35).

Sociology in New Zealand

This depressing scenario brings us to the case of New Zealand. In the first instance, where sociology in New Zealand is concerned, it is easy to count the immediate national parallels to McLaughlin's Canada: a powerful welfare state patron with centralized state funding; a "flat" university public university system, albeit one organized along competitive market lines – a point to which we return – and an English

colonial legacy which saw a similarly late, and slow, emergence of sociology as a discrete discipline (Baldock, 1994). In a recent article, Spoonley (2006), has highlighted not only local sociology's liberal leanings but also underlines the importance of a policy sociology over a public sociology of already limited visibility. Indeed, he emphasises this limited visibility by pointing to the prominence of historians and literary figures (2006, p. 9) in a way which echoes Kumar's (2001) comments on English culture. Spoonley (2006, p. 6) notes that as sociology's "attractiveness at undergraduate levels in universities has waned, and as the numbers teaching the discipline" age, or are diminished, it is "often reduced to a service discipline or is required to be subsumed under catch-all majors such as social sciences".

Such laments directly link to the historical and disciplinary experience of sociology as an unstable assemblage across different national settings. At the same time, there is a distinctively local variant that means sociology is assembled differently in New Zealand circumstances than elsewhere. Austrin and Farnsworth (2004) indicate this, outlining the way "the new institutionalism" of the entrepreneurial and corporate university has shifted increasingly, like Canadian experience, towards the market (cf. Doughty, 2001). It includes the growth of managerialism (Fitzsimmons, 2004), the transformation of students into "consumers" and institutions into "providers" (Peters and Roberts, 1999), and the introduction of audit systems across teaching and research practice (Austrin and Farnsworth, 2005). Together, these serve to undermine the prospects for either disciplinary closure or autonomy through the combination of institutional top-down practices of managerial surveillance (Austrin and Farnsworth, 2004) or external regulation and standardisation (Strathern, 2000). The upshot has been a pressure towards the fragmentation of disciplines and the emergence of mobile, attractively packaged "studies": branded "spin-offs" from disciplines aimed to secure increasingly transient student publics.

In this context, Stinchcombe's (2000) account of sociology meeting the supply of indignation has to be translated into the local market setting in which social and moral analysis are, again, faced with bifurcation in order to constantly resecure student publics (Davidson,

1999). Ironically, Stinchcombe's analysis was itself developed in a market setting, yet current local arrangements threaten to further decouple the popular and elite linkages he identifies between undergraduate teaching and graduate research and, as Spoonley (2006) indicates, to increase the pressure on sociology to function as a service department for other disciplines.

Under these circumstances, long-term empirical research is also faced with risk – subject, as it is, to repeated funding and review by external agencies. This provokes a potential reworking in this environment of the divide between dominant and marginal forms of sociological research, with a renewed emphasis on the value of short-term, policy-oriented activity that is more readily supported by state patrons over the ambiguities of long-term empirical research (see Austrin and Farnsworth, 2005; Spoonley, 2006; Thorns, 2003).

One emergent disciplinary defence has been to rework the idea of indignation to reflect local circumstances, linking it both to articulations of national identity and ethnic solidarities. Spoonley's (2006) article, to take one instance, is entitled "Mahi awatea : A sociology for the twenty-first century in Aotearoa". Such attempts both point to, and simultaneously reconstitute, the critical and reform impulses noted by Goldman (1987), but within the ambit of local rhetorics.

Indeed, the significance of indigenous sociology is a theme that has marked local sociological debate much more than the significance of either specific schools of theoretical thought or the importance of method (e.g., Timms and Zubrzykci, 1971; Crothers and Pavlich, 1995; O'Malley and Kemp, 1999; *New Zealand Sociology*, 1999). This tension is expressed in a number of different ways: the problem of recruitment of overseas staff (e.g., Thompson, 1971); the severing of the link with the Australian Sociological Association in 1988 and the establishment of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa / New Zealand (Crothers, 2006); the significance of policy research for feminist sociologists (Saville-Smith, 1998); and the problem of the dominance of European social theory and issues of research and publication in that tradition (Perry, 1991). More recently, the theory issue has been coupled with teaching of this tradition, with local content as example (McManus, 2006).

According to McManus (2006), the discipline is not "unravelling" under neo-liberal pressures but it is changing. Although she does not explicitly argue it, there is a sense that the discipline is being *indigenised.* The McLennan et al. (2004) text book, *Exploring Society,* is another version of this process: general theory imported and applied in local settings.

In short, local sociology both aligns itself with and differs from disciplinary formations in other societies. It is equally prone to disciplinary reassemblage as sociology elsewhere and is subject to the same pressures and tensions. Yet its local working-out is shaped by colonial legacies (Belich, 1996; King, 2003) along with the market and institutional arrangements within which this takes place. In a word, and despite McManus' (2006) more positive reading, it is a specifically local crisis that resonates with, and frequently reproduces, the global disciplinary tensions noted by many sociologists (Eldridge et al., 2000).

How, then, do we relate local sociology to the frameworks we set out at the start? Local sociology, for example, sits awkwardly in the context of Becker's contrast between disciplinary field and investigatory worlds, in part because of the immense, fragmenting pressures with which it is currently faced. Indeed, the argument can be made that New Zealand provides a further case of sociology by other means: as Kumar (2001) and Lepenies (1988) suggest for Britain, social analysis appears to be distributed across a range of practices and occupations from the older disciplines to the newer studies: feminist, media, cultural, postcolonial and, of course, CMS amongst them. In the case of CMS, Meyer Zald (2001, p. 2) highlights the increased tensions surrounding the importation of Stinchcombe's indignation into the business academy: he remarks trenchantly on "the dilemmas of attempting to incorporate critical perspectives into a professional training and research institution some of whose members seem to be apologists and glorifiers of managerial capitalism".

Such tensions underline two points. First, the extraordinary variety of disciplinary assemblages that attempt to combine the old tropes of science and reform into different configurations. Second, the equally mobile recombinations of Burawoy's four sociologies, where public, professional, critical and policy are combined not just within sociology

but across disciplines and occupations (viz. Easton, 2003, 2005).

All of this emphasises the fragility and vulnerability of sociology as an enterprise with its struggles to constitute a canon or distinctive methodology (viz. Tolich and Davidson, 1999), or local publishing possibilities against interdisciplinary rivals. In some ways, local sociology could appear as an extreme case of Urry's (2000, p. 55) comment about sociology's "inability to resist intellectual invasions". Such boundary crossings also problematise Boltanski and Thevenot's orders of worth. The co-ordination around axes of justification, whether these are trust and reputation, honour and prestige, civic and public worth, or even the newest order of interactive networking (Boltanski and Chiapello, 1999), appear focused less on the case of sociology itself and more on interdisciplinary assemblage and the social sciences as a whole. Why? Because, in the local context, debates around postcolonialism, gender, culture or difference can be found as readily in any of the newer studies already mentioned as in sociology (for instance, Bell and Matthewman, 2004; Goode and Zuberi, 2005; McNaughton and Lam, 2006).

Conclusion

We return to our starting point. Whether we consider sociology or critical management studies (Zald, 1996, 2002), we are faced with continuous evidence of disciplinary assemblages: hybrid constellations formed, and sometimes split, out of the attempts to combine "scientific" method and moral aspirations across different national, institutional and interdisciplinary arrangements. We have argued that a combination of Becker's (2005) field and world, Burawoy's (2004) four sociologies and Boltanski and Thevenot's (1991) orders of worth are illuminating ways to identify the movement and reworking of disciplinary configurations across institutional and national settings.

We have also suggested that these three sets of arguments are useful in a number of other ways. They allow us to trace the recurrence of certain themes: academic social theory and empirical sociology; mainstream and marginalised sociological practice; the alternative roles of associations and institutions in the formation of sociology and so on.

Equally, the patterns they highlight also suggest limitations to the arguments themselves; we have indicated, for instance, that Burawoy's four sociologies are a useful heuristic device but are also shaped by the American disciplinary experience from which they are derived.

Nonetheless, such arguments provide a way of charting the necessarily messy work and untidy organisational arrangements that, historically, characterise the moral sciences. They do so, too, because, as we noted with Becker, such messiness is characteristic of the open-ended mutations of networks, in and across disciplines, that facilitate innovations, investigation and the production of new things. As a consequence, they highlight, too, the work and organisational practices of that occupational grouping called sociologists. Lastly, they provide a way of charting how these same tensions are imported to related domains and practices in the assemblage of new sets of studies, whether these are feminist, media, cultural, postcolonial or, in the present context, critical management studies (Zald, 1996, 2002).

References

Abrams, P. (1968). *The origins of British sociology 1834-1914. An essay with selected papers.* Chicago : University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, P. (1968). Components of the National Culture. *New Left Review,* 50.

Anderson, P. (1990). A Culture in Counterflow. *New Left Review,* 182, 85-137.

Annan, N. (1991). *Our Age: The Generation That Made Post-war Britain.* London: Manley Christopher & Associates.

Austrin, T. & Farnsworth, J. (2004). *Ceaseless conferring: The corporate university and the construction of opaque transparency.* Paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference, 12 December, Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Austrin, T. & Farnsworth, J. (2006). *A Very Rugged Landscape.* Paper presented at the Future of Social Sciences Conference, 25 May, Royal Society of New Zealand, Wellington.

Baiochi, G. (2005). Interrogating connections: from public criticisms to critical publics in Burawoy's public sociology. *Critical Sociology,* 31, 339–51.

Becker, H. (1994). Professionalism in Sociology: The Case of C. Wright Mills. in R. Rist, (Ed.), *The democratic imagination: Dialogues on the work of Irving Louis Horowitz* (pp. 175-87). New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Becker, H. & Pessin, A. (2006). A Dialogue on the Ideas of "World" and "Field" *Sociological Forum,* 21 (2), 275-286.

Belich, James (1996). *Making Peoples.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bell, C. & Matthewman, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot L. (1999). The Sociology of Critical Capacity, *European Journal of Social Theory*, (2) 3, 359-378.

Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, E. (1999). *Le Nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Gallimard: Paris.

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot L. (2006). *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boudon, R. (2001). Sociology that really matters. First Annual Lecture to the European Academy of Sociology, 26 October. Swedish Cultural Center.

Burawoy, M. (2004). Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities. *Social Forces*, 82, 1–16.

Burawoy, M. (2005). For Public Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70 (1), 4–28.

Burawoy, M. & VanAntwerpen, J. (2001). *Public sociology at Berkeley: Past, present and future*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/burawoy/burawoy_pdf/PS.Berkeley%20Sociology.pdf

Burawoy, M., Gamson, W., Ryan, C., Pfohl, S., Vaughan, D., Derber, C. & Schor. J. (2004). Public Sociologies: A Symposium from Boston College. *Social Problems* 31, 103–30.

Church, R. (1974). Economists as experts: The rise of an academic profession in America: 1870-1917. In L. Stone, (Ed.), *The University in Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Baldock, C. (1994). Sociology in Australia and New Zealand. In Germov, J. and McGee, T. *Histories of Australian Sociology*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Crothers, C. (2006). History of sociology in New Zealand, In J. Germov and T. Mcgee (Eds.), *Histories of Australian sociology*, (pp 67-80). Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Crothers, C. & Pavlich, G. (1995). Directions for Sociology in New Zealand / Aotearoa. *New Zealand Sociology*, 10 (1), 63-100.

Davidson, C. (1999) Selling Sociology: Better Brands or Bargain Bins? *New Zealand Sociology*, 14 (2): 223-240.

Doughty, H. (2001). Universities for Sale: Resisting Corporate Control over Canadian Higher Education. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 38, (1), 121-124.

Easton, B. (2003). The new intellectuals? Panel Presentation for *Public Intellectuals* Seminar, Friday 26 September. Retrieved December 23, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.eastonbh.ac.nz/?p=446.

Easton, B. (2005). *On the future of the sociology profession in New Zealand: Response to Paul Spoonley paper*. Paper to SAANZ Conference, 27 November. EIT, Hawkes Bay, New Zealand.

Eldridge, J., MacInnes, J., Scott, S., Warhurst, C. & Witz, A. (Eds.). (2000). *For sociology: Legacies and prospects*. Durham: sociologypress.

ESA (European Sociological Association). (2007). *8th Conference of the European Sociological Association: Public Sociology and commitment in action*. Retrieved Jan 7, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.esa8thconference.com/show.php?contentid=57.

Fitzsimons, P. (2004). Managerialism and the university. *New Zealand Journal of Tertiary Education Policy*, 1, 1-3.

Fuller, S. (2000). A Very Qualified Success, Indeed: The Case of Anthony Giddens and British Sociology. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 25(4), 507-516.

Fuller, S. (2006). Notes towards a Renaissance in British Sociology: Response to Turner. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57 (2),199-204.

Goldman, L. (1987). A Peculiarity of the English? The Social Science Association and the Absence of Sociology in Nineteenth-Century Britain. *Past & Present*, 114(1),133-171.

Goldman, L. (2002). *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Social Science Association, 1857–1886*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goode, L. & Zuberi, N. (Eds.). (2004). *Media studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Auckland: Pearson Longman.

Halsey, A. (1989). The Prospects for Sociology in Britain. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 40 (3), 353-373.

Halsey, A. (2004). *A History of Sociology in Britain: Science, Literature and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawthorn, G. (1976). *Enlightenment and Despair: History of Sociology*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Helmes-Hayes, R. (2002). John Porter: Canada's Most Famous Sociologist. *The American Sociologist*, 33(1), 79–104.

King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kumar, K. (2001). Sociology and the Englishness of English Social Theory. *Sociological Theory* 19, 41-64.

Kumar, K. (2003). *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lauder, H., Brown, P. & Halsey, A. (2004). Sociology and Political Arithmetic: Some Principles of a New Policy Science. *British Journal of Sociology*, 55 (1), 3-22.

Lazarsfeld, P. (1973). *Main Trends in Sociology*. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Lepenies W. (1988). *Between Literature and Science: The Rise of Sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mazlish, B. (1989). *A New Science: The Breakdown of Connections and the Birth of Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McLaughlin, N. (2005). Canada's Impossible Science: Historical and Institutional Origins of the Coming Crisis in Anglo-Canadian Sociology. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 30(1), 1-40.

McLaughlin, N. (2006). Whither the future of Canadian sociology? Thoughts on moving forwards. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 31(1), 107-130.

McLennan, G. Ryan, A. & P. Spoonley, (2004). *Exploring Society: Sociology for New Zealanders*. 2nd ed. Auckland: Pearson.

McManus, R. (2006). Shifting practices in New Zealand sociology. *New Zealand Sociology*, 21 (2), 270-288.

McNaughton, H. & Lam, A. (Eds.). (2006). *The reinvention of everyday life: Culture in the twenty-first century*. Christchurch, NZ: Canterbury University Press.

New Zealand Sociology (1999). Symposium: The state of sociology. *New Zealand Sociology*, 14 (2).

O'Malley, M. & Kemp, S. (1999). New Zealand Sociology and Difference. *New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 14 (2): 249-253.

Perry, N. (1991). Review of P. Spoonley, D. Pearson, I. Shirley, *New Zealand society: A sociological introduction. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 27(3), 396-402.

Peters, M. & Roberts, P. (1999). *University Futures and the Politics of Reform in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Platt, J. (1996). *A History of Sociological Research Methods in America, 1920-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Platt, J. (1998). A Brief History of the ISA, 1948-1997. *International Sociological Association*.

Platt, J. (2003). The history of the British Sociological Association, *International Sociology*, 17, 179-198.

Rocquin, B. (2006a). *The floating discipline: British sociology and the failure of institutional attachment (1910-38)*. Unpublished M.St. Thesis, Oxford University.

Rocquin, B. (2006b). *Two sciences, a common concern: A comparative insight in the emergence of sociology in France and Britain (1895-1935)*. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.britishsociology.com/.

Rojek, C. & Turner, B. (2000). Decorative Sociology: Towards a critique of the cultural turn. *Sociological Review*, 48(4), 629–48.

Sanborn, F. (1866). The opportunities of America. *Journal of Social Science*, 24, 59-63.

Saville-Smith. K (1998). Tinkering and picturing; The affinities and tensions between policy analysis and sociology. In R. Du Plessis and G. Fougere (Eds.). *Politics, policy and practice; Essays in honour of Bill Willmott* (pp 173-12). Sociology Department: University Of Canterbury, Working Paper.

Sayer, A. (2000). For postdisciplinary studies: Sociology and the curse of disciplinary parochialism and imperialism. In (Eds.) J. Eldridge, J. MacInnes, S. Scott, C. Warhurst and A. Witz (Eds.). *For sociology: Legacy and prospects*. Durham, UK: sociologypress.

Shils, E. (1970). Tradition, Ecology, and Institution in the History of Sociology. *Daedalus*, 99, 760-825.

Social Science Review (1861) unpaged.

Soffer, R. (1982). Why do disciplines fail? The strange case of British sociology. *The English Historical Review*, 97 (385), 767-802.

Spinuzzi, C. (2004). *Describing assemblages: Genre sets, systems, repertoires, and ecologies*. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/node/158>.

Spoonley, P. (2006). Mahi awatea : A sociology for the twenty-first century in Aotearoa. *Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand Newsletter*, February, 1, 5-9.

Stinchcombe, A. (2000). Making a living in sociology in the 21st century (and the intellectual consequences of making a living). *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 44, 4-14.

Strathern, M. (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26 (3), 309-321.

Thévenot L, & Boltanski L. (1991). *Les economies de la grandeur*. Paris: Gallimard.

Thévenot, L, (2002). Which road to follow ? The moral complexity of an "equipped" humanity. In J. Law, A. Mol (Eds.). *Complexities: Social studies of knowledge practices.* (pp 53-87). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Thévenot, L., (2006). Convention school. In J. Beckert, M. Zafirovski, (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Economic Sociology.* (pp. 111-115). London, Routledge.

Thompson, R. (1972). The Development of sociology in New Zealand. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 8, 188-193.

Thorns, D. (2003). The challenge of doing sociology in a global world: The case of Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Current sociology*, 51(6), 689-708.

Timms, D. & Zubrzycki, J. (1971). A rationale for sociology teaching in Australasia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 7(1), 3-20.

Tiryakian, E. (2006). A vista for research in the history of sociology: Schools as the unit of analysis. *Timelines* e-newsletter, 6, 1-7.

Tolich, M. & Davidson, C. (1999). *Starting fieldwork: An introduction to qualitative research in New Zealand.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Turner, B. (1986). Sociology as an Academic Trade: Some Reflections on Centre and Periphery in the Sociology Market, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 22 (2), 272-282.

Turner, B. (2006). British sociology and public intellectuals: Consumer society and imperial decline", *British journal of sociology*, 57 (2), 169–88.

Urry, J. (1981). Sociology as a parasite: some vices and virtues. In P. Abrams, R. Deem, J. Finch and P. Rock (Eds.), *Practice and progress: British sociology, 1950-1980.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies.* London: Routledge.

Wilks-Heeg, S. (2005). The appliance of social science: A hundred years of sociological teaching and research at the University of Liverpool. *BSA Network.* Retrieved November 12, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.liv.ac.uk/sspsw/conference/100_years_of_sociology_at_the_University_of_Liverpool.pdf, (13 May 2006).

Zald, M. (1996). More fragmentation? Unfinished business in linking the social sciences and humanities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41 (2), 251-261.

Zald, M. (2001). *Spinning disciplines: Critical management studies in the context of the transformation of management education.* Plenary address, Critical Management Studies Workshop, 4 August. Washington, D. C.

Zald M. (2002). Spinning disciplines: critical management studies in the context of the transformation of management education. *Organization*, 9, 365– 85.

Terry Austrin teaches sociology at the University of Canterbury. He has research interests in the sociology of work, gambling, media, and ethnography.

John Farnsworth teaches at the New Zealand Broadcasting School in Christchurch. His recent research has been in the area of media sociology, methods, ethics, and ethnography.

Positioning a Post-professional Approach to Studying Professions

Edgar Burns

Abstract

The term *post-professional* has had minor use outside sociology but has not been deployed within the sociology of professions. A post-professional approach is argued to have major utility for studying professions, against the backdrop of the traditional trait and power approaches. First, a range of empirical changes in recent decades, such as the conjunction of professions and organisations, constitutes new data needing new theorisation. Second, inspection of changing theoretical configurations in these decades indicates the field has multiple contributory perspectives available. Finally, several key elements of a post-professional perspective are outlined, indicating potential for elaboration of the idea.

Introduction

Sociology of professions remains a significant site of intellectual endeavour and engagement today despite having lesser visibility than topics in the academy such as post-modern themes, globalisation, pluralist theorising or the politics of identity. Sociological inquiry, as with other fields, changes foci through time, and disciplinary boundaries in the academic marketplace are permeable. The study of professions and professionalism is a strong candidate for cross-disciplinary investigation. Contributing positively to such conversations, however, requires a greater refinement of a distinctively sociological contribution that can be made from the standpoint of sociology of professions.

This article proposes the notion of *post-professional* as a strategic new framework for the sociology of professions. It is argued here that approaching the sociology of professions post-professionally offers fresh interpretive possibilities at both theoretical and empirical levels. Analysing occupational expertise within a post-professional perspective

removes the restrictive vision that traditional trait sociology of professions absorbed from functionalist theorising. The present proposal stands in contrast to the two most identifiable theoretical perspectives in the field, preferring to draw upon the multiple perspectives available today. These two perspectives are the trait approach which was dominant for much of the twentieth century, especially in North America, and the power (or power/conflict) approach which emerged subsequently in the 1970s in opposition to the inadequacies of trait theorising. The power approach chronicled types of self interest (occupational closure, status and economic rewards) as key drivers of professional action, instead of unreflectively accepting the definitions of professions themselves, the idea that altruism and public service defined who could really be counted as professions, as the trait approach had done.

Today the trait model is considered inherently ideological in presuming professional goodness. It fell out of favour along with functionalist theory, having been savaged by the power critique in the 1970s. From a New Zealand perspective, the time-bound and culturally specific assumptions of the trait model had severe limitations cross-nationally as an analytic tool. Its benchmark importance, however, persists today: it continues as the de facto model of professionals themselves, there is some covert use within academia, and it is self-consciously used as a template by professionalising groups. The present-day status of the power approach is less obvious, and will be returned to later in this article.

Trait theory claimed professions could be defined by cataloguing traits (the number varied) said to constitute such occupations. Flexner (1915) and Greenwood (1957) are often cited. Pavalko's (1971) list of traits provides a window: (1) theory or intellectual technique, (2) relevance to basic social issues, (3) substantial training period, (4) motivation - the service orientation, (5) autonomy, (6) sense of commitment, (7) sense of community, and (8) code of ethics. Absence or presence of these characteristics positioned an occupation along a professional-non-professional continuum. Wilensky's (1964) article entitled "The professionalisation of everyone?" used a five step chronological

sequence to identify professions according to how far along the sequence they had progressed: (1) a substantial body of people begin doing full-time some activity that needs doing, (2) a training school is established, (3) a professional association is formed, (4) the association engages in public agitation to win support of the law for the protection of the group, and (5) a code of professional ethics is developed. The cultural and time-bound specificity of these definitions was not appreciated at the time, but gave significant ideological and empirical limits to the accuracy of these definitions (Vollmer and Mills, 1966). They were imbued with such modern Western meta-narratives as progress, individualisation, formal rationality, scientific epistemology, but overlooked inherent contradictions.

As the main twentieth century perspective in the sociology of professions, the trait approach provides the departure point in proposing any new interpretive or integrative perspective in the field. Even today it is "continuously sedimented into sociological research and practice" (May, 2007, p. 32). Having said that, however, the proposal here is not an oppositional stance either, such as that attributed to the power approach. There is a proper place for functional analysis. Any full explanation of professions greatly benefits from identifying and describing how components function in relation to one another, in manifest and latent forms, and tracing consequences within the larger social systems of which they form a part. It is simply that explanation is always more than the sum of functional description. For professions as other social phenomena, this *more* can be made up, as it was during the ascendancy of the trait approach, by ideological gloss masquerading as factual description.

As an example of the interplay of social theory and everyday civil society, Freidson's (1970) concept of professional dominance challenged the triumphalism of 1960s American medicine, at the same time as it challenged the tidiness of trait theory. In New Zealand, feminist challenges to Herbert Green's medical research eventuated in the cervical cancer inquiry (Coney, 1988), paralleling the debates and pressures for change occurring elsewhere in first-world countries across many professions. Tensions implicit in the Green scandal, including the

god-like status of top professions versus performance/quality assurance measures, individualisation of the lay-profession relationship versus national and sectoral contexts, and client rights versus expert knowledge, paralleled the modernist meta-narratives presumed within the academic sociology of professions trait model.

At the same time as considering the contribution that a post-professional sociology of professions might make to other disciplines, the concern here is to articulate a common sense of purpose in studying professional occupational groups sociologically, for those *within* the field itself. The politics of identity, whether ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability or class, are endlessly played out in professional lives and settings. Further, the proportion of the professional workforce employed in large complex organisations inscribes those professional identities and responses in organisational contexts to an extent and in ways that may in the future be regarded as characteristic of this century.

A post-professional approach builds on contemporary insights and is not a challenge to the detailed work undertaken from a range of perspectives such as critical theory, feminism, post-structuralism, neo-Weberian, and cultural/post-colonial analysis; quite the contrary. Although such perspectives have not all been equally focused on professions and professionalism, the concepts they deploy have provided a wealth of new insights into professions, power and knowledge in modern society. Together such insights constitute an alternative voice to the hegemonic modernist trait approach to sociology of professions. This alternative comprises *multiple* voices in fact, since the concerns and critiques of such current perspectives can be quite different from one another, and at points incommensurable.

In proposing a post-professional approach this article aims to pre-empt suggestions that this merely adds to an overcrowded category of *posts* in social science debate. The intransigence of the dominant model and the diverse critiques and analyses being made today create the changing theoretical landscape of the recent past affecting analysis of professions. We are now *post* the sociology of professions trait paradigm, yet it continues often semi-invisibly to encroach on analysis. It is the

continuing engagement with, and challenge to, the presuppositions of the standard trait model that invites description of contemporary sociology of professions as post-professional.

The proposal for a post-professional framework for the sociology of professions is developed here in three parts: changing empirical data; changing theoretical terrain; and foci of a post-professional approach. In the next section, eight areas of change concerning professions are used to argue that these new social realities increasingly undermine the credibility of trait suppositions, and are also sufficiently diverse to exceed the individual scope of currently available paradigms. The middle section mounts the argument that inconclusive meta-positioning of theoretical change in the sociology of professions constrains clearer analysis of professions and professionalism as well as limiting exchange with other disciplines. The final section identifies four key elements in post-professional sociology of professions serving as a more satisfactory basis for theorising professions and professionalism today.

Changing society, changing professions

The empirical changes within and around professions and professionalism mean the phenomena being investigated are rapidly changing even as they are being studied. Such changes occurring within late-modern society as we enter a new global information age create an imperative for new theoretical framing and explanations. Many of these recent changes, a selection of which is listed below, are being chronicled in a variety of disciplines including sociology, and this development also calls for a new integrative post-professional perspective.

The labels *professional* and *professionalism* are in ever-widening use. Rightly or wrongly what these words are used to mean, or are taken to mean, in everyday and other contexts is of importance just by the generality of such usage. A New Zealand example is Burns' (2007) study of media usage of these terms. Claims of commodification of expertise (de-professionalisation), the emergence of new professional claimant groups (e.g., public relations; town planners), expected attribution of professional qualities to new functions and roles (e.g., professional

sportsmen and women); and explicit commercialising dimensions of professional practice, sometimes related to earning capacity (business professionals) and sometimes seen in terms of the cost of government provision of services (professional performance), all involve structural and discursive change. Traditional sociology of professions does not adequately theorise them.

Boundaries between professional and non-professional occupations continue to shift. As a wider range of occupations and functions adopt the appurtenances of professional activity, mistakes or misbehaviour of individual professionals is newsworthy. The Arthur Andersen auditing failure in the Enron scandal has parallels in legal conduct in New Zealand's Winebox enquiry (Molloy, 1998). Expansion of tertiary education, and correspondingly the number of professionals in the latter part of the twentieth century, means that professional advice or consultation is often provided to persons who are equally or more expert/professional in another sphere. The simple dichotomy of lay-professional (May, 2007) in earlier conceptions of professions has now been disrupted in a number of ways: the multiple professionalities within which modern people exist; countervailing forms of expertise engaging with professionals; and new forms of lay informational resources.

The internal constituencies of even mainstream professions are changing. The most apparent of these changes is the feminisation of the professions. Main professions today have at least half their incoming membership comprising women even in traditional masculine occupations like law. Early-modern professionalisation excluded or marginalised women's involvement in professions (Witz, 1992), so the consequences of this fundamental shift in professional membership will continue to work through. Equally important in the expanded membership numbers of professional groups is the broader socio-economic range from which professional recruitment is made, and also the more diverse ethnic communities now represented. Again notwithstanding rearguard actions, these are fundamentally new pressures, the consequences of which have decades yet to work through as these cohorts move up the professional age profile. Fletcher's (2001, p. 6) post-structural/critical study of how women engineers' advice to

colleagues is "disappeared" in masculine environments where only own project completions count, is an example of shifts and splits in this kind of work. Conventional trait sociology of professions has been blind to these particularistic features within a universalistic ideology.

The boundaries between professions and organisations are less sharply defined than in the past. Professional and employee status can no longer be considered opposites as they were often portrayed in the mid-twentieth century (Scott, 1966). The substantial proportion of professionals working as employees within governmental, commercial and non-profit sector organisations today contradicts such formulations of incompatibility. The profoundness of this change, which is linked to the others described here, is a key aspect of post-professional sociology of professions. Tensions reflecting this profession-organisation conjunction include: positioning of technical/professional versus managerial authority; increased numbers of women professionals versus re-gendered hierarchies within organisations; increased number and size of corporations versus access and client rights; expansion of tertiary qualifications versus commodification and de-professionalising pressures; professional productivity versus compliance and quality assurance. The model of an independent, largely self-employed, professional dispensing disinterested advice in a one-to-one relationship continues to have tremendous importance as an ideal and ideology (May, 2007), but should not be confused with the contours of contemporary professional practice in organisational settings. Further elaboration of this as one of the bases of a post-professional framework is made later in this article.

New technologies continue to alter the relativities of occupational power and skill within existing groups, and between groups (Abbott, 1988). Professions (medicine being the exemplar) have shown longstanding adeptness in institutionalising skill domains and absorbing new ones into their existing frameworks (e.g., Willis, 1983, p. 26-43). However, new patterns of technological innovation continue to pressure existing divisions of labour in the de-skilling of professional work or creating demarcation of subaltern functional areas within professional work. Computer technology, the most far-reaching technological change,

includes not solely electronic equipment and technical measurement (e.g., MRI, DNA, geodesic surveys), but the capacity to manage, audit, and communicate professional knowledge, information and expectations. Applying Braverman's (1974) deskilling thesis rather than Pavalko's (1988) trait model to New Zealand small-business use of accounting software, and the dramatic reduction of accountants' expert domain, illustrates the need to go beyond the capacity of conventionally understood theories of professions and professionalisation.

Managerialism and professionalism have been the two most successful occupational projects of the twentieth century (Martin, 1998). Their conjunction in late modernity is a key element in the legal-rational society Weber foresaw, even as contradictions can also be seen: on the one hand efficiencies and client service delivery are maximised, yet on the other as O'Neill (2002) describes, compliance regimes quickly stultify productive professional performance. Theorising the empirical conjunction rather than unsatisfactorily persisting in assertions of simple oppositionality or difference is necessary. The role of New Zealand government's Pharmaceutical Management Agency (Pharmac) shows these dual modes of contestation and authority in setting Ministry of Health spending on medicines. Regular iterations of media and lobbying controversy concerning Pharmac's operations (e.g., access to Herceptin for breast cancer) attest the boundary significance of its function.

Emerging economies follow modernising paths that only partly correspond to the Western account, leapfrogging some stages, and developing educational, regulatory and labour force practices to meet their own needs and compete in the global marketplace (Johnson, 1973). Professional training in third-world countries is often marginalised by Western technical and regulatory standards (e.g., Sri Lankan doctor retraining); drain of professionals to first-world countries; and by third-world countries producing graduates for export (e.g., Philippines nurses). What does it mean in terms of professionalism when two thirds of the population go on to tertiary training as they do in the United States (Derber, Schwartz and Magrass, 1990): is more professionalism created, or is it diluted? Further sequences of change are occurring, like the export of professional jobs *to* less expensive countries (e.g., IT

professionals in India); the production of services *in* first-world countries *from* third-world countries (e.g., Indian English tutor in India instructs children in the United Kingdom); navigation of national restrictions on the production *of* first-world professional services *in* third-world nations (e.g., law; architectural design); and *travel* of first-world clients to receive their professional care *in* third-world professional hands (e.g., medical tourism). These changes are well beyond the scope of conventional models of professions.

The role of central states has been under-theorised in analysing professions in the Anglo-American literature. Historically informed studies of professions have made the best assessments of state involvement (Berlant, 1975; Burns, 1979; Johnson, 1973; Krause, 1996). Writings by sociologists in the continental European tradition put a different perspective on the role of the state in actively defining its own needs and how these were to be met through professional groups (Torstendahl and Burrage, 1990; Evetts, 2003). More pragmatically, the current role of the state in introducing new compliance and governance regimes and quality assurance legislation or regulations for major sectors in society again challenges the adequacy of the autonomous profession trait model (Noordegraaf, 2004). Such programmes are established across traditionally demarcated professional boundaries, despite objections. Two New Zealand examples, The Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003 and the parallel Social Workers Registration Act also in 2003, are illustrative of similar shifts in other first-world countries. The cost of professional services directly or indirectly funded by the state reflects a number of tensions: the desirability of national provision versus taxation funding (e.g., health, education, welfare); the economics of monopoly versus managing quality and risk (Carillo and Zazzaro, 2001); or scandals of institutionalised poor practice versus rewarding mid-level social propriety (Molloy's 1998 case study of one large New Zealand law firm). Adequately theorising professions and comfortably including the role of the state sits beyond the passive capacity of trait descriptions.

This sample of contemporary changes demonstrates the need for re-orienting sociology of professions, not simply on a concept-by-

concept basis, nor solely on the undoubted advances in examining gender, colonial and global shifts, production of risk, markets for technique, or knowledge production and circulation. Because of the obviousness of these and other changes, the question arises of how to make sense of these changes within the sociology of professions? Writers in a range of fields outside sociology such as law (Kritzer, 1999), medicine (Stevens, 2001), and education (Ball, 2004; Hargreaves, 2000) have struggled to explain and account for such changes. They have debated what has become of their profession's circumstances, explicitly wondering if a *post*-professional condition has become predominant in their sector. It is the empirical situation of individual professional groups that has provoked their re-thinking about how best to describe and interpret their professions. Such writers address both internal and external factors, but so far there has not been an attempt to integrate these insights into a wider post-professional theoretical framework across professions within the sociology of professions.

Changing theoretical situation

This section argues that the changing theoretical domain invites a similar call to that presented by this empirical evidence. A basic contribution that post-professional sociology can make to the sociology of professions field is to challenge the periodisation of theory in the field. From a post-professional perspective, the power approach is not a period *after* the trait era, and possibly before some other period. The advent of the power approach is better seen as the breaking edge of the ontological security that trait theory's self-approbation gave to professionalisation in modern Western society up to around 1970. This challenge thus centres on the location and interpretation of how the power approach is positioned in relation to the trait approach and alternative perspectives. This common periodisation fails to appreciate the inputs of varied perspectives within social science today, and thus invites misperception of the empirical data sketched. This in turn reduces the ability of academic investigation to satisfactorily theorise contemporary professions and professionalism.

Few would disagree that trait functionalism dominated sociology of professions until around 1970 in Anglo-American jurisdictions, particularly in the United States, though professions in European sociology have been positioned differently and recent development of theoretical focus there has not made the same assumptions. Further, most commentators would identify the decisive challenge in the 1970s by what came to be known as the power or conflict approach. Freidson (1970) and Johnson (1972) on either side of the Atlantic led the way with new attention to historical data. Freidson's notion of professional dominance by autonomous physicians within a medical division of labour, and Johnson's identification of professionalism as simply one form of occupational control in the producer-consumer relationship, opened the way to highlight power, self-interest, the economic and cultural consequences of professions - a quite different vocabulary than expertise, altruism, and public service (Larson, 1977). Illich's (1975) critique of hubris, wealth and power in organised medicine contributed to this watershed period of broad social critique of the pillars of modernity. The ethnocentrism of the trait approach (to not even bother) to account for historical, cultural, global or national variations, became evident.

The implication from conventional discussions is that there has been a succession of paradigms or perspectives in the field. This seems uncontroversial until questions are raised about what is less clear: what does the power approach encompass, or during what period was the power approach active? Such questions are not however commonly asked. Researchers working in the sociology of professions today more usually conceptually frame their work by drawing on ideas from the paradigms mentioned previously such as critical theory, feminism, post-structuralism, neo-Weberian, or cultural/post-colonial analysis. Implicit in such choices is the absence of selecting concepts from the power approach. Sometime between the 1970s and today, the power approach has dropped out of formal utilisation. It continues to receive acknowledgement, but not self-conscious use. This oddity is significant. Three responses illuminate the positioning of power and conflict in recent decades.

Holding on to earlier trait analysis

In the post-professional challenge, Pavalko is an uncommon example in sociology of promoting the old model so publicly. His confident, unreflexive reiteration of the trait model of professions was published at the very time of the decisive shift to centring conflict and professional power (Pavalko, 1971). Pavalko reissued his text in 1988 with, unbelievably, the merest reference to the intellectual shifts of the previous two decades. The continued confidence to do this, and the inappropriateness of doing it, is a significant commentary on the North American milieu; other contributions, however, such as Larson's (1977) dual project formulation by which professions improve status and market position, provide pivotal insights in this period of change. Piper (1994) is an Australian example of functionalist theory applied to the academic teaching profession in the mid 1990s.

The unmasking of trait accounts by the power approach has not been accepted by all sociologists. In the United States Abbott (1988) and Halliday (1987) aimed to maintain the connection to existing functional work even as they each established their own oeuvre - Abbott by stressing competition and the structural significance of occupational jurisdiction, and Halliday by insisting that public-mindedness amongst lawyers goes beyond monopoly and self-interest. Even Rossides (1997) writing a decade later, and setting out fresh ways of relating to the contemporary empirical world of professions, still used the earlier terminology of "functional and conflict perspectives" in his subtitle to frame the significantly new things he had to say about culture, deviance, policy and social adaptation. Implicit attachment to the old trait formulas in the uncertain perspectival terrain that emerged in the field led Macdonald, Ritzer and Hall (1988) to suggest the possible demise of the sociology of professions. Yet studies of professions and professionalisation all round the world have continued to grow. Anglo-European sociology of professions has in recent decades developed on a broad front: application of critical, feminist and post-structural debates; reviews of the role of the state (Torstendahl and Burrage, 1990);

responding to European Community evolution; and exchanges such as the International Sociology Association Research Committee 52 on Professional Groups, and similar fora.

Moving towards a new integration

Programmatic statements illustrate the uneven theoretical journey of the field. MacDonald's (1995) attempt to answer his own earlier question is one of the few publications aiming to theorise the sociology of professions field in general. His chapters covered necessary ingredients to integrate contemporary sociology of professions: social stratification; cultural context; professions and the state; patriarchy and professions; knowledge and the professions. His proposed synthesis (1995, p. 32) of earlier work around the idea of professional project is a major advance, and it is incorporated here in the final section. But it can be argued that while he identified key components needed in a new perspective, the outline promised more than it delivered, not fully addressing the empirical evidence sociology of professions theory faces. As such, this is a movement towards a perspective rather than the provision of one. MacDonald's (1995, p. x1) misguided belief in "the demise of functionalism" was balanced to a considerable extent by his caution about the supposed coherence of the power approach, noting quite diverse strands within the rubric, and the unsuitability of the term applied generically to "nearly all post-functionalists" (p. 5). This is an important insight. However, Macdonald (1995, pp. 5-6) cavilled at Johnson's typology suggesting that it had been less productive of research than Freidson's version which "attained considerably more popularity" in the United States. This favouritism appears to have stood in the way of his programme of developing a synthesis in the sociology of professions, such a view creating distance from what the power approach offered rather than engaging in development from it.

Producing a tidy chronology

Another programmatic statement can be found a decade later in Epson's (2006) outline of what she termed a "conceptual overview" of the field. Research on professions, she said, can be divided chronologically into

three periods. In the first, the trait-based approach, she somewhat ambiguously blended structural writers like Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) with American functional theory (Parsons, 1939). In the second period, named as the power perspective, she identified Johnson (1972) and Larson (1977) but inexplicably omitted Freidson's 1970 path-breaking text. The third period Empson identifies as framed by the neo-institutional perspective. She makes the surprising claim that it "has come to dominate the study of professions in recent years," identifying DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Abbott (1988) with it. No timeframe is suggested when the change from the power to the institutional perspectives supposedly occurred, although the early 1980s might be inferred from DiMaggio and Powell's publication date.

However, while most sociologists of the professions would recognise the importance of the first two perspectives, few would name neo-institutionalism as the current main perspective, let alone see themselves as pursuing a neo-institutional agenda, even allowing for numerous citations of Abbott's work. This perspective is no more compelling as a description of this recent period of theorising professions than other vantage points of analysis or critique. Understanding Epson's research focus into large-scale professional service firms in law, accounting and commerce illustrates the value to be gained from cross-disciplinary interchange.

These generally unsatisfactory theoretical claims - not shifting from trait certitude (Pavalko), incomplete disciplinary paradigm (Macdonald), or the privileging of one view (Empson) - show the irresolution of the field despite important work continuing to generate new insights. Sketching several theoretical/disciplinary influences in analysing professions (it would over-concretise their role to term them sociology of professions perspectives) indicates more of the multi-paradigm nature of the situation that exists in this field. Post-professional critique is not against periodisation; merely that it needs to be appropriately grounded. An era of multiple perspectives makes it difficult to know how best to organise analysis of this new world of professions and professionalism.

Not periodisation, but analytic contribution

Brief comments on several perspectival offerings suggest that it is not just the new empirical world, but a certain kind of reframing that produces post-professional analysis in a theoretical sense. The neo-institutional analysis of professions, Empson (2006) claims, provides a synthesis of trait and power perspectives:

> Neo-institutionalists such as DiMaggio and Powell and Scott, view professionals as key institutional agents in society, promulgating rules and principles of apparently universal applicability and, therefore, encouraging isomorphism within institutional fields. Neo-institutionalists are, therefore, interested in the professions not just because they are agents of isomorphism in society as a whole, but because they offer insights into the creation and maintenance of specific institutional fields.

Systems perspectives are indeed important and sometimes underappreciated components in analysing professions and professional work, and the idea of isomorphism might corroborate Bourdieu's notion of homology (Swartz, 1997, p. 121). However, Foucault's *disciplines* or Bourdieu's *fields* would seem to offer more promise in their articulation of structural, discursive and historical lines of inquiry. Neo-institutionalism struggles to avoid a continuance of the professo-centrism of the trait perspective, rather than the broader view of value and normativity in society which Bourdieu and other sociological work addresses.

In fact, neo-institutional analysis does to professions what policy analysis tends to do with Bourdieu's notion of social capital, namely inappropriately concretising the concept as a real thing that can be defined and explained in terms of boundaries. To explore this congruence would take the present discussion away from its main focus, so to stay with the specifics of professions, the point is that institutional analysis all too easily and sensibly maps onto the commonsense notions of boundaries as fields - the legal field, the medical or health field and so on. Bourdieu's (1987, 1991) contention is that it is the very boundaries that are key sites of contestation; it is not a matter of getting down to or through to the real line of demarcation, but that the lines separating

domains are socially and culturally constructed and contested. Boltanski and Thevenot's (2006) exploration of six worlds or polities in society, which each have their own hierarchies of justification, is the kind of analysis needed to address the simplicities of neo-institutionalism.

Bourdieu wants to avoid either the reification of institutional patterning or the radicalising of total subordination, but he does use the language of symbolic violence, domination and similar terminology that fit uneasily into the system functioning of neo-functionalist and neo-institutional forms. These are contributors to the discussion, but insufficient conceptual tools to re-position professional analysis. Neo-institutional modes of analysis address one important part - structure - of sociological description and explanation, but inadequately incorporate the discourses that either produce, or result from, structural facets of social existence. This analysis inaptly solidifies professions and professionalism into something they are not and credits them with a substantive rationality they do not have.

The economics discipline is in some ways the maintainer of key insights of the conflict/power approach to the sociology of professions. It is in economics that critique of anti-competitive behaviour and monopolistic structures of professions (Lees, 1966; Carillo and Zazzaro, 2001) has most strongly questioned the general socio-economic benefits of the professions. There is an irony here, however, that despite this clarity, the structuralism inherent in rational theory or neo-institutional models is often attractive to a different kind of commercial/economic assessment of professions and organisations which ignores the socio-cultural and political discourses that shape value and arguments about legitimacy and focuses more on cognitive or rational actor conceptions. The often positivist (economic not philosophical) commitment to real-world analysis is tied with this difficulty in handling normativity, or incorporating national and cultural specificity.

Gender analysis of professions and professionalism, by contrast, applies a standpoint position to the social creation of professions, in critique of their universal truth and legitimacy claims. Professional projects were historically contested on gender grounds by men excluding women, something that is still largely unproblematised by those outside

the field who have not studied this aspect of professions. Witz (1992) is an example of applying carefully and consistently the binarising logic of gender to the historical facts of medical professional specialties; other studies have made similar inspections of most professional groups. Davies (1996, p. 661) aims to integrate gender analysis and professions theorising by drawing on work from organisational studies to focus on professions. This conjunction is an important identification in the present concern to elaborate a post-professional way of viewing professions. She says, "In an era where professions are under unprecedented public scrutiny, sociological attention to their renewal needs to recognise that a key feature of profession, as presently defined, is that it professes gender". Gender is thus of substantive interest in itself, but also raises key post-professional issues of normativity/legitimacy and discourses that dichotomise (Fletcher, 2001). Its limitation is that it is necessary to draw on other than solely feminist work to incorporate analogous features in relation to power/knowledge, lay positioning and other discourses of professionalism: post-colonial-feminist writing has already moved down this path.

Post-structural critique, growing out of general consideration of modernity and the post-modern, has had a widespread influence on feminism, post-colonial theory and studies of sexuality as well as social theory in general. A juxtaposition not often made explicit in sociology of professions discussions is that post-structural theorising emerged around the same time as, not after, the emergence of the power perspective. Post-structural work at many points analyses the roles, functions, and performance of professions and has been central to development of new social theoretical perspectives. Foucault's body of work, for instance, *Birth of the Clinic* (1973), could be viewed as a sustained critique of modernity in terms of the production and circulation of disciplinary power and knowledge embodied in professions and professionalism.

The realm of post-structural debate is a central area where the firmly realist orientation of neo-institutional study baulks, yet discourse is basic social science terminology today. While there is no need for analysis to be constrained by post-structural critique, the professions are primary

producers and circulators of what is constituted as knowledge and acceptable solutions in the meta-narratives of modernity. This requires extensive and sustained analysis of their discursive positioning in society and their co-option of such discourse to achieve both their official effects, and their social and economic positions. Fournier (1999, p. 280) in an example of the useful application of post-structural terminology described the "appeal to 'professionalism' as a disciplinary mechanism" over workers, an important insight into empirical changes in professional employment today.

Important other perspectival ideas include Hochschild's (1983) concept of emotion work, which has been applied to many professional situations, although less commonly to lay persons. Various forms of new professionalism such as Human's (1991, p. 216) "democratic professionalism," voiced within a background of critique of professional self-interest, would need to concomitantly identify the many other new things that have been occurring in and around professions to build a satisfactory overall new perspective. Risk analysis (Beck, 1992), is not especially thought of as a sociology of professions perspective, but his analysis of early-modern experts being perceived as producing *goods*, but only in late-modernity being understood to produce *bads* as well, constitutes a major proposal to reposition the field, even allowing for debate over concepts like reflexive modernisation and Beck's early/late periodisation.

Such variety of theorising professions reflects an era of change. This section has proposed that the power approach is best seen as the break-up of the *older* trait hegemony (but not the break-up of the structures of professions), rather than a new period of theorising in itself. Each of the newer perspectives, in parallel, engages in one respect or another in critique of the functionalist trait model. Conflict, marginalisation, power are important in all of them, but so are other concepts and framings. In terms of an overview, if the power approach is the ragged end of an academically sanctioned trait mode of analysing professions, the whole period since the 1970s is broadly post-professional. Limitations of several attempts to chart a new theoretical course have been noted, and then brief attention was given to the

perspectival multiplicity available. These limits, and these theoretical possibilities, it is argued, lead towards an understanding that we are currently in a period of post-professional theorising - not every piece of research fits this description, but inquiry that engages with such problematics in at least one of a range of ways does.

Towards a post-professional sociology of professions

The present post-professional vision suggests four key conceptual foci for engagement with the changing phenomenon of professions and professionalism. These can be seen in the best work in examples cited, and provide guidelines for further research activity. Such framing also recognises that changes in academic specialisation mean that theorising professions in this newer way is occurring and indeed has to occur within a variety of disciplinary fields. Post-professionalism is thus inherently cross-disciplinary both in terms of its subject matter and in terms of its intellectual and conceptual provenance; an inclusive sociology rather than a narrow specialising project.

Professional discourses and discourse around professions

Substantial elaboration of professional discourses and the texts of professions and professionalism in recent work at several levels can be counted as a most valuable advance (Gunnarsson, 1997). Clearly this appropriates the deconstructive capabilities of post-structural, post-colonial and feminist ideas of discourse. Some commentators argue that post-structural analysis is conservative in terms of activism, and this critique alerts us to the distinctive post-professional task of continuing engagement with structural components in professional performance and change. If genealogies of professions give insight - then what? Legislated position remains just that; education conduits continue to channel the production and circulation of professions and professionalism. One solution is that some analysts combine post-structural concepts with a critical ethnographic approach, or post-structural terms and a standpoint position. However, even as post-professionalism utilises the conceptual armoury of post-structural and

other perspectives, it needs to articulate its own points of theoretical engagement (Brint, 1997). Further, the complex gender blindness of traditional professions continues to find challenge using analyses such as Smith (1987), and Harding (1991) and others. By building discourse into the centre of post-professionalism, the absorption of universalist values and presuppositions from professions to the analysis of professions is at least problematised (Foucault, 1980; Gunnarsson, 1997), allowing a more global understanding of the role and effects of professional activity the chance to emerge.

Historian Barton (2003, p. 73) provides a New Zealand example in her analysis of nineteenth century scientists looking at "language, identity and professionalisation in the mid-Victorian scientific community" (without using the term post-professional). This focus on language and identity is characteristic of a post-professional approach influenced by post-structural and other recent perspectives. Barton names the concerns she has with conventional explanations of professionalisation of that group: dissatisfaction with existing professionalising interpretations; the significance *or not* of the standard binary of professional/amateur; and focusing on the categories and boundaries people use themselves. Her agnosticism to interpretations of professionalisation distinguishes her work from others' which simply use it as a convenient organizing variable in studies of occupational groups and processes.

Professional project

The idea of professional project has continued salience. Extensions of the concept beyond Larson (1977), Witz (1992) and Macdonald (1995) promise further capacity to integrate description and explanation of changes. To the contingency of projects and the variety of each occupational group's differing project, can be added the concept of professional *maintenance project* in defence of present or anticipated positions. Other professional projects are exercises in emulating established professions within the exigencies of changing cultural expectations. Associating professional project with discourse as well as structural concerns extends its use in theorising conflictual, adaptive

and paradoxical elements in professional activity (Larson, 1977). Abbott's (1988) jurisdictional analysis could also be read in terms of the idea of project.

Watson's (2005) study of the gendered professional project of New Zealand funeral directing is post-professional (again, she does not use this term) in at least these senses: it occurs after the eclipse of the academic acceptance of traits as being sufficient explanation of profession; it unpicks a cluster of masculine closure strategies; it identifies both structures (sponsored training) and discourses (especially gender) in the recent three-decade feminising professional project; it backgrounds the cultural modelling of funeral directors on their masculinist conception of professionalisation; and it draws on organisational theory to theorise insights relevant to professional work.

Interpenetration of professions and organisation

The interpenetration of professions and organisations that was so problematic for trait sociology of professions earlier in the twentieth century is being viewed in quite different ways today. Whether issues of gender (Alvesson and Billing, 1997; Fletcher, 2001), ethnicity (Mirchandani, 2003), or leadership are the centre of investigation, the old problematisation (Etzioni, 1969; Hall, 1968; Haug, 1971) has dissolved into different and broad themes of critique (Alvesson and Billing, 1997; Davies, 1996; Fournier, 1999; Harding, 1991). It is not often that sociologists celebrate the cessation of something being rendered problematic, yet the passing of such attention in a multi-paradigm post-professional perspective, removes this false problem of profession-organisation incompatibility from the sociology of professions. Further, other work situations previously thought of as antithetical (business versus profession, union versus profession) are today quite commonly combined, as seen in the phrase "professional manager" (Kitchener, 2000, p. 130; Martin, 1998).

A post-professional viewpoint realigns the professional-organisation conjunction to the forefront in refiguring the sociology of professions. It also recognises the empirical shift in recent decades of the predominant pattern of professional employment within large organisations.

Organisational contexts need to be the site of professions research not left to management disciplines. Since currently only one New Zealand university sociology course focuses on complex organisations (although health and other subjects deal with aspects of professionalism) this limits analysing professional work. As sites of profession-to-profession and professional-non-professional interaction, functioning and contestation millions of times every day of the year, tracing the sociological consequences is a valuable domain of study. Psychology of organisations and management studies bring overlapping but different emphases.

Academics from a number of disciplines working in business management schools have over the last decade developed the broad approach called Critical Management Studies (CMS) (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002) addressing changes central to this special journal issue. CMS uses concepts from critical theory, post-structural, feminist, post-colonial and other perspectives to inform research, and critique conventional organisational analysis beset with many of the same functionalist and positivist assumptions and failings that have been described earlier here of trait sociology of professions. Alvesson and Billing (1997, p. 45), for instance, wrestle with theoretic-methodological issues in their critical-interpretive perspective locating themselves between standpoint and post-structural stances. As CMS has expanded, the importance of professional cadres within organisations gains greater attention. The 2007 fifth international CMS conference has one stream dedicated to the topic, "New perspectives in the study of professionalism". In investigating this conjunction, CMS inquiry has a primary focus on organisations (Fournier and Grey, 2000), but CMS' interpretive theoretical programme has points in common with post-professionalism. Examples that link both fields include Kitchener's (2000) study of bureaucratisation of medical directors in the UK National Health Service, Hudson's (2005) study of performativity and subversion amongst project manager professionals, and May's (2007) explicitly anti-Parsonian review of individualised interpretations of the professional-patient relationship.

Professional normativity

Post-professional attention to professional normativity can be defined on the one hand as the naming of and explanation of the following: the search for, assertion of, and demand for professional goodness in one moral terminology, or legitimacy in another. On the other hand, post-professional attention to professional normativity can be defined as the challenge to, subversion of, and the demand for such things as: accountability for professional adverse impacts (not necessarily in Beck's 1992 terms of risk-creation), self-interest, official identification, class, and other forms of identity. Post-professional research recognises the importance of both kinds of claims. Substantively it asks the question, within the unresolved tensions of contemporary professional performance, "How are professionals to be understood as "good"?" in the light of these contradictions. Only with the decisive break of the power approach were fresh insights generated in a field that was dominated by justificatory rather than explanatory variables (traits). Post-professionalism progresses that conversation by analysing the cultural positioning of professionals; claims of being professional; techniques of audit; and professional assurance regimes. Post-professional studies of law, for instance, eschew belief in more moral times (Kronman, 1995) but nevertheless engage with standpoint critique (Molloy, 1998; Nader and Smith, 1996) of normative and economic ramifications of recent growth of large-scale professional service firms, and law as the apparatus of modernity.

Extending the starting points

The potential theoretical use of these four foci within post-professionalism can be seen in its ability to deconstruct a number of old problems as these have been conventionally formulated in the sociology of professions. Post-professionalism reframes these as artefactual problems, generated from previously accepted theoretical assumptions. Even before resolving them, however, post-professionalism refuses to be constrained by them, simply walking past them on the basis that the empirical situation has changed. Post-professionalism addresses in new

ways each of the following old conundrums that have persisted long after the empirical situation out of which they were formulated has changed in major ways.

First, profession-organisation incompatibility is replaced by the issues in and around their mutual and near-universal contemporary interaction. Second, the so-called problem of semi-professions (Etzioni, 1969; Toren, 1972) is similarly dissipated by declining to accept autonomous professionalism as an historic endpoint. Third, the deprofessionalisation or proletarianisation of professions is neither simply a cause of celebration (House, 2003) nor commiseration (O'Conner and Lanning, 1992), but is better conceived as the continuation of the rational-legal logic of late modernity. Such capability of a post-professional sociology of professions, and new configurations offered to both old and new empirical situations, are indicative of a how a wider articulation of the perspective might be developed.

These observations are merely suggested starting points for wider explication of a fuller theoretical post-professional framework, clearly beyond the present sketch. This does, however, take the discussion further than merely programmatic statements, indicating possible substantive integration of work in the sociology of professions field. For instance, Johnson (1995), a supposed leader in the power approach to professions, exemplifies a more nuanced shift incorporating governmentality into his analysis. The connection to broader social change in contemporary society underpins each of these starting points. This outline does not constitute a claim for insisting on the use of the term itself. Rather, the use of a term like this simply provides a useful description of what is in fact transpiring in modern and global society today.

Conclusion

A post-professional approach to studying professions has been argued here in three stages. First, recognising a span of recent decades, a list of observable empirical changes in how professions actually function today was sketched, the mere listing of which demonstrates empirical newness outside the scope of conventional functional explanations of

professions and professionalism. Second, against the background of previous trait theory, the variable adequacy of the academic project of studying professions and professionalism within sociology of professions in recent decades was considered. Third, a start was made on charting some main foci necessary for critically engaging professions and professionalism today. Its integrative intent for contemporary sociology of professions theory can be seen in the possibility of re-reading several chestnuts in conventional trait theory.

The notion of *post-professional* is an extension of, and critical engagement with, the central concepts of professions and professionalism. It is *post* in the multiple socio-theoretic sense of not merely (or even) chronologically after; but also in some senses as oppositional or contrasting to prevailing explanations or hegemonies; as well as resistant to, and revisionist of, existent orthodoxies and associated terminologies about professions. Post-professionalism is *post* in each of these ways in relation to the hegemonic trait model of what constituted a profession. It shares these multiple epistemological meanings overlapping other *posts* such as post-Fordism, post-Marxism, post-structuralism, post-feminism, and post-colonialism. Post-professionalism reaches across disciplinary and perspectival boundaries, addressing multiple new empirical configurations of professions and professionalism that are occurring in contemporary society. New paradoxes and oppositionalities are emerging in this post-professional milieu that can only partly be grasped through gender, culture, structure or institutional modalities.

In simple terms, post-professional sociology of professions looks to identify what is new about professions, professionalisation and professionalism and account for this theoretically. It is *post* because it addresses the situations, roles, resistances, innovations, skills and training of professionals, and the migrating applications of the idea of professionalism in the period since the confidence and certitude of mid-twentieth century professionals and Western society began to be seriously questioned. Sociology of professions passed this watershed around 1970.

Post-professional has the merit of being a term that is indigenous to the sociology of professions field. Clearly theorising society's institutions and cultural processes at any given point in time may have congruence across many social phenomena, but without contesting voices that paradigmatic framing can lead to the construction of an artificial coherence that is not really present. Such was the case with the North American functionalist emphasis in mid-twentieth century. It seemed virtually impossible to break with the professions-are-good/beneficial rhetoric which built the normative claim of professions themselves into most core definitions of professions and professionalism. Hence the definitional Gordian knot, "What is a profession?" had no hope of being unravelled before the advent of the power/conflict critique. Post-professionalism, however, steps away from simply oppositional critique or challenge to professional actions: it investigates discourses, structures, as well as contexts and cultural milieux beyond the certainties of professions and professional goodness and competence.

This new perspective also helps frame concerns faced by today's sociologists of professions. The aim has been to open up fresh ways of looking at professions and generating theoretical and empirical insights. While the *post* in post-professional shares the ambivalence of other posts, it is offered here as having value in three ways. First, empirically, globalising, feminising, commercialising and technology trends have simply burst through the conventionalities of the former standard trait model. The unspecified end-point eschatology of *becoming* a profession is contradicted by this new material. Second, in a theoretical sense, the multiple perspectives within sociology of professions reflect sustained effort to deconstruct this historically specific modern social formation inscribed at the heart of first-world, text-based, formalist society. Each perspective generates strategic insights, yet substantive focus on professions necessarily co-exists with the central theoretic agenda each perspective has. Third, professions continue to be central agents in the functioning of late-modern societies, in both structural and cultural terms. Here, too, engagement with the *performance* of professional practice, ideology and change is *post* the hegemonic era of mid-century professionalism.

The theoretical purpose of riding the ambivalence of such a term is to avoid settling into the simple oppositions of either old or developing hegemonies, which are inscribed in professions and professionalism as central cultural products. This is the key point, although aggravating to those simply desiring functional or realist clarity based on taken-for-granted beliefs. There are also implications for other topics in sociological research. Achieving some disciplinary coherence in a post-professional field which includes competing interpretations offers some possibilities for challenging other fields of research in terms of the cultural significance and certainty with which they approach their work, and suggests new ways of reframing such enterprises.

References

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding gender and organisations.* London: Sage.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (2002). *Studying management critically.* London: Sage.

Ball, S. (2004). *Education for sale! The commodification of everything?* King's Annual Education Lecture (pp. 1-29). University of London. Retrieved from the Web August 15, 2005: http://www.asu.edu/educ/epsl/CERU/Articles/CERU-0410-253-OWI.pdf

Barton, R. (2003). "Men of Science": language, identity and professionalisation in the mid-Victorian scientific community. *History of Science, 41*(1), 73-119.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: towards a new modernity.* London: Sage.

Berlant, J. (1975). *Profession and monopoly: a study in the United States and Great Britain.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: economies of worth.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). The force of law: towards a sociology of the juridical field. *Hastings Law Journal, 38*(5), 814-853.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labour and monopoly capital.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Burns, E. (1979). *Occupational control in the development of the veterinary profession.* MA thesis, Sociology Department, Massey University, NZ.

Burns, E. (forthcoming, 2007). Exploring the usage of the term "professional" in New Zealand work contexts. *New Zealand Journal of Business Research.*

Carillo, M., & Zazzaro, A. (2001). Innovation, rent seeking and social prestige: towards a dynamic theory of professions. Retrieved from the Web June 14, 2006: http://growthconf.ec.unipi.it/papers/Carillo.pdf

Carr-Saunders, A., & Wilson, P. (1933, 1964). *The professions.* London: Frank Cass.

Coney, S. (1988). *The unfortunate experiment.* Auckland: Penguin.

Davies, C. (1996). The sociology of professions and the profession of gender. *Sociology, 30*(4), 661-678.

Derber, C., Schwartz, W., & Magrass, Y. (1990). *Power in the highest degree: professionals and the rise of a new mandarin order.* New York: Oxford University Press.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Empson, L. (2006). Professions. Retrieved from the Web September 14, 2006: http://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/ccc/Profession.htm (Forthcoming in S. Clegg & S. Bailey (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organization studies.* London: Sage.)

Etzioni, A. (1969). *The semi-professions and their organisation: teachers, nurses and social workers.* New York: Free Press.

Evetts, J. (2003). The sociological analysis of professionalism: occupational change in the modern world. *International Sociology, 18*(2), 395-415.

Fletcher, J. (2001). *Disappearing acts.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Flexner, A. (1915). Is social work a profession? *School & Society, 1*(26), 901-911.

Foucault, M. (1973). *Birth of the clinic.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge.* New York: Pantheon.

Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to "professionalism" as a disciplinary mechanism. *The Sociological Review, 47*(2), 280-307.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations, 50*(1), 7-32.

Freidson, E. (1970). *Professional dominance.* New York: Atherton.

Goode, W. (1957). Community within a community: the professions. *American Sociological Review, 22*(2), 194-200.

Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. *Social Work, 2(3),* 45-55.

Gunnarsson, B., Linnell, P., & Nordberg, B. (1997). *The construction of professional discourse.* London: Longman.

Hall, R. (1968). Professionalization and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review, 33*(1), 92-104.

Halliday, T. (1987). *Beyond monopoly.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching, 6*(2), 151-182.

Haug, M., & Sussman, M. (1971). Professionalization and unionism: a jurisdictional dispute? *American Behavioral Scientist, 14*(4), 525-540.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hodgson, D. (2005). "Putting on a professional performance": performativity, subversion and project management. *Organization, 12*(1), 51-68.

House, R. (2003). *Therapy and modernity: Deconstructing and transcending profession-centred therapy.* London: Karnac.

Hugman, R. (1991). *Power in caring professions.* Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Illich, I. (1975). *Medical nemesis.* London: Marion Boyars.

Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power.* London: Macmillan.

Johnson, T. (1973). Imperialism and the professions. In P. Halmos (Ed.), *Professionalisation and social change* (pp. 281-309). The Sociological Review Monograph no. 20.

Johnson, T. (1995). Governmentality and the institutionalization of expertise. In T. Johnson, G. Larkin & M. Saks (Eds.), *Health professions and the state in Europe* (pp. 7-24). London: Routledge.

Kitchener, M. (2000). The "bureaucratization" of professional roles: the case of clinical directors in UK hospitals. *Organization, 7*(1), 129-154.

Krause, E. (1996). *Death of the guilds: professions, states, and the advancement of capitalism, 1930 to the present.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kritzer, H. (1999). The professions are dead, long live the professions: legal practice in a post-professional world. *Law and Society Review, 33*(3), 713-759.

Kronman, A. (1995). The lost lawyer: falling ideals of the legal profession. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Larson, M. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: a sociological analysis.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lees, D. (1966). *The economic consequences of the professions.* London: Institute of Economic Affairs, Research Monograph no. 2.

Macdonald, K. (1995). *The sociology of professions.* London: Sage.

Macdonald, K., Ritzer, G., & Hall, R. (1988). The sociology of the professions: dead or alive? *Work and Occupations, 15*(3), 251-273.

Martin, B. (1998). *Transforming the contemporary "new middle class": from professionals and managers to "bricoleurs"?* Retrieved from the Web August 18, 2005: http://hi.rutgers.edu/szelenyi60/martin.html

May, C. (2007). The clinical encounter and the problem of context. *Sociology, 41*(1), 29-45.

Millerson, G. (1964). *The qualifying associations: a study in professionalization.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mirchandani, K. (2003). Challenging racial silences in studies of emotion work: contributions from anti-racist feminist theory. *Organization Studies, 24*(5), 721-742.

Molloy, A. (1998). *Thirty pieces of silver.* Auckland, NZ: Howling at the Moon.

Nader, R. & Smith, W. (1996). *No contest: corporate lawyers and the perversion of justice in America.* New York: Random House.

Noordegraaf, M. (2004). Professional management of professionals: Towards professional organisations in public service delivery. Conference, Utrecht, August 7-8. Retrieved from the Web October 17, 2005: http://www.wetmaatschappelijkeondersteuning.nl/Docs/Congressen/PROFESSIONAL%20MANAGEMENT%20OF%20PROFESSIONALS.pdf?&

O'Connor, S., & Lanning, J. (1992). The end of autonomy? Reflections on the post-professional physician. *Health Care Management Review, 17*(1), 63-72.

O'Neill, O. (2002). *A question of trust.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parsons, T. (1939). The professions and social structure. *Social Forces, 17*(4), 457-467.

Pavalko, R. (1971, 1988). *Sociology of occupations and professions.* Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Piper, D. (1994). *Are professors professional? the organisation of university examinations.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Rossides, D. W. (1997). *Professions and disciplines: functional and conflict perspectives.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Scott, W. (1966). *Professionals in bureaucracies: areas of conflict.* In Vollmer, H., & Mills, D. *Professionalization* (pp. 265-275). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sharpe, V., & Faden, A. (1998). *Medical harm: historical, conceptual and ethical dimensions of iatrogenic illness.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, D. (1987). The everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Stevens, R. (2001). Public roles for the medical profession in the United States: beyond theories of decline and fall. *Milbank Quarterly, 79*(3), 327-353.

Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Toren, N. (1972). *Social work: the case of a semi-profession.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Torstendahl, R., & Burrage, M. (1990). *The formation of professions: knowledge, state and strategy.* London: Sage.

Vollmer, H., & Mills, D. (1966). *Professionalization.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Watson, B. (2005). A gendered undertaking: the feminisation of after-death work in Aotearoa New Zealand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, NZ.

Wilensky, H. (1964). The professionalisation of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology, 70*(2), 137-158.

Willis, E. (1983). *Medical dominance: the division of labour in Australian health care.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Witz, A. 1992. *Professions and patriarchy.* London: Sage.

Edgar Burns has until recently been Senior Lecturer in sociology and research at the Eastern Institute of Technology, also serving as Research Mentor for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in the new PBRF period. He is interested in the sociology of profession and professionalism, and implications for social theory and research, and the practice of tertiary teaching.

Managing Work and Organisations: Transforming Instru*mentality* into *Relation*ality

Maria Humphries, Suzette Dyer and Dale Fitzgibbons

Abstract

Management education, we argue, is a significant hegemonic force, but a force that holds potential for the articulation of an emancipatory discourse. In contemporary management education, explicit and implicit commitment to narrowly conceived ideas about economic efficiency and growth as proxies for human wellbeing has diminished the conditions of service in employment for many and has exacerbated poverty and its associated distress for the vulnerable. The transformation of this situation requires a change in the way we see and treat ourselves and each other. It requires the transformation of the instrumental ethic by which we govern ourselves and Earth to a relational ethic. The New Zealand experience is examined for its revealing and revolutionary lesson and promise.

Introduction

This special edition of *New Zealand Sociology* invites an examination of the splits and shifts in the study of work and organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand. Our response to this invitation is a discussion of the explicit and implicit commitment to economic efficiency and growth as proxies for human wellbeing now normalised in management education. These proxies have dominated political, social, and economic thinking in this country for several decades. Promising enhanced wellbeing for all (Humphries, 1998) this focus has diminished the conditions of employment and exacerbated poverty and its associated illness and distress for the vulnerable (Child Poverty Action Group, 2006). In our classrooms, the supposed validity of these proxies underlies the often unspoken, unexamined assumptions of those business students who have rarely been required to think beyond profit maximisation as the

sole purpose of business. This perspective is now under challenge as seen in the growing body of work in Critical Management Studies (CMS) (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000; Deetz, 1992; Forester, 1985; Jermier, 1985; Rose, 2000). These theorists have an opportunity to influence the next generation of managers and leaders who may guide our organisations with a more complex mandate than simply to make more money. Our contribution to this discussion is to argue that the predominance of an instrumental ethic will intensify any negative outcomes associated with it. We advocate for the critique and transformation of this predominating ethic. We extend an invitation to articulate and develop a relational ethic in the organisational disciplines.

Parker (2000) argues that the study of work and organisations tends to be split between the disciplines of "sociology" and "management". CMS is an interdisciplinary move that considers the topics of management from the perspectives of critical theory (CMIG, 2004; Fournier & Grey, 2000; Prichard et al, 2006). The authors of this paper have long engaged in efforts to bring CMS to the management classroom at the level of undergraduate, graduate and MBA studies, in New Zealand, the US and Europe. We are concerned about the consequences of the ahistorical, apolitical, functionalist, and often amoral, education of management students as it has been established in many western countries for several generations (Humphries & Dyer, 2005, 2001; Steingard & Fitzgibbons, 1995). This doctrine is increasingly exported to those developing countries, volunteering or pressed to open their markets and serves to embed the gospel and consequences of market societies the world over. New Zealand is a leader among the missionaries.

Bringing our critique closer to home, we argue that the historical move to embrace neo-liberal economic and political directives in New Zealand has harnessed and constrained social thought in this country for over two decades (Boston, 2000, 1996; Britton et al, 1992; Easton, 1997; Hazeldine, 1998; Kelsey, 2003, 1999, 1997; The Treasury, 1987, 1987a, 1984). Neo-liberalism became the ethos of our time. Nowhere in the western world was this model of development been taken up more deeply and more swiftly than in New Zealand. Local and international

critics warned of the consequences (Chomsky, 1996; Kelsey, 1997). These critics were ignored, peripheralised or even demonized. Yet we have lived to see the validity of their concerns. By February 2007 the Prime Minister, in her address to the opening of Parliament, announced that the "invisible hand of the market doesn't deliver a sustainable nation, as an earlier era of New Zealand politics showed only too well" (Clark, 2007). Critics of neo-liberalism, it seems, have been vindicated. Our Prime Minister now leads the reflection on how we might bring this nation to sustainability. However, in this endeavour, this government remains committed to a free trade agenda, to a doctrine of economic rationalism and the pursuit of economic growth. This commitment still dominates the curricula and scholarly writing in our business schools. Those academics attempting to bring any alternative form of social understanding to the minds of aspiring managers and organisational leaders are challenged from every direction. They have a difficult job inviting a critique of the neo-liberal viewpoint as it appears to have become as natural to students and staff as the air we breathe.

Our graduates represent the next generation of organisational managers. Their decisions will have significant effects on the lives of the people they will organise and manage. They will be required to use a template of compliance with market demands that they can barely sense until its squeeze causes them personal distress in the form of harm they must inflict on themselves or others (Estes, 1994). We have devised a number of experiential exercises that brings such sensations to the fore. In examining with our students why they knowingly comply with this squeeze, they say that they do so in order to preserve the Goose they believe will lay the Golden Egg. They are, by and large, convinced that "there is no other way" and the most responsible thing they can do for themselves and their loved ones is get onto the treadmill and attempt to stay there (Humphries & Dyer, 2005, 2001). This compliance to an unreflective ideology, long embedded as truth for a whole generation of future leaders, does not bode well if we believe universities should act as a critic and conscience of society; that through our teaching and research we are to contribute to the generation of the potential for creative innovations in all fields of human endeavour. How

has this state of affairs come about in New Zealand, and how might this situation be transformed? A lot can be learned about the successful, rapid and widespread imposition of classical neo-liberal economic policies on a country that generally prides itself on commitment to democratic values and "a fair go" for all. A critical reflection is a necessary first step for a transformational response.

Imposing Neo-liberalism

New Zealand has a long history of state involvement in economic enterprise and regulation, and a tradition of socialist initiatives. The break to an almost unfettered market driven society has been so complete that the *Economist* magazine has referred to New Zealand as "Adam Smith's other islands" (Britton et al, 1992, p. xix).

Led by Finance Minister Roger Douglas, an accountant and businessman, and followed by parliamentarians who were, according to historian Michael King, economically illiterate, a major reform of the Public Service ensued. A number of government departments were formed into State Owned Enterprises and were required to turn a profit. Others, such as the telephone and banking aspects of the Post Office, and the New Zealand Steel and Shipping Corporations were sold. Agriculture and consumer subsidies were phased out. The financial market was deregulated. Goods and services taxes were introduced and a heavy surcharge was placed on superannuation. The marginal tax rate was reduced from 66% to 33% (King, 2003). The stated intent of this reorganisation of our society was to reduce inflation, to curb the national debt and to increase economic growth. Decisions were driven by an instrumental logic based on narrowly defined notions of efficiency and cost effectiveness. By the time politicians had concluded that the social cost for this achievement was too high "it was too late: the policies were entrenched" (King, 2003, pp. 491-492).

The National Government that took office in 1990 appointed Ruth Richardson as their Minister of Finance. She further reduced welfare spending, increased pharmaceutical charges and imposed market rents for public housing. The confidence and determination of these reformers might be characterised as zealous and arrogant, or as courageous and

determined depending on one's political perspective.

Critics of the experiment in neo-liberalism in New Zealand and elsewhere began to emerge in the mid 1990s. Just as Jane Kelsey's book *The New Zealand Experiment* was about to appear in 1995, for example, the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London published the 75th Anniversary issue of its journal *International Affairs*, with survey articles on major issues of the day. Here, contributor Paul Krugman, a leading figure in international and development economics, argues that knowledge about economic development is very limited and recommends humility in the face of the limits of understanding, and caution about sweeping generalisations. However, he argues, sweeping generalisations are constantly offered by policy intellectuals and planners (including many economists) to provide the doctrinal support for policies that are implemented, when circumstances allow. Despite the instability of their ideas, their prescriptions brim with confidence as they impose the new orthodoxy. When things do not work out as projected, it is commonly agreed in retrospect that the policies didn't "serve their expressed goal" and were based on "bad ideas." And, argues Krugman, "bad ideas flourish because they are in the interest of powerful groups..." (in Chomsky, 1996).

According to Chomsky, the pattern of rhetoric harnessed to serve the interest of the elite has been a commonplace at least since Adam Smith condemned the theories designed in the interests of the merchants and manufacturers. These folks were the principal architects of Britain's economic policies. They were able to mobilize state power to ensure that their own interests were attended to no matter how grievous the impact on others, including the people of England. It not only happened then, but continues to do so with impressive consistency. The New Zealand experiment with neo-liberalism breaks no new ground when "the benefits [of the policies] rapidly accrued to the corporate sector that embedded strategic influence in their design", and "political actors stack the deck in favour of constituents who are intended beneficiaries" (Chomsky, 1996). "The consistency of the record is no less impressive than the flights of rhetoric hailing the latest "showcase for democracy and capitalism" and "testing area for scientific methods of development"

as a remarkable "economic miracle" — and the consistency of what the rhetoric conceals. The New Zealand experiment is just another case in point (Chomsky, 1999).

A decade into the formal implementation of economic liberalization in New Zealand, Shirley (1990) provides a useful historical summary of its effects. He argues that this transformation began in this country in the 1960s but was intensified from the mid 1980s:

> The free market revolution sponsored by the fourth Labour Government (later endorsed by National following the 1990 election) carried the doctrine of laissez faire to its logical conclusion. The extreme version of economic individualism which was ideologically driven by Treasury (1984; 1987), the Business Roundtable (1987) and by leading politicians in the Labour Party (Douglas, Prebble, Bassett) and National (Richardson, Upton, Luxton) cabinets, undermined the 'historic compromise' which was forged between capital and labour in the immediate post war period. The disinflationary periods of the late 1980s and early 1990s saw income and employment security traded for an inflation rate of 0-2% per annum, a low wage regime and a highly speculative development path. Short term profitability and financial speculation gained at the expense of productive economic growth, while competition between individuals for resources in health, education, housing and employment progressively reduced the value of the social wage (Shirley, 1990, p. 143).

Neo-liberalism's seductive and dangerous association with democracy

Universally, strategies of war, competition for resources, and impositions of control are the way in which we protect our selves and our own – self, family, tribe or nation. This way of acting is based on an instrumental ethic – how we can use others, the earth, things, people to meet our ends (Kant, 1964). This has always been a dangerous way to live. The danger is intensified as resources for wealth and wellbeing come under increasing pressure, as our war machines are unimaginably more powerful than the hand to hand combat of our ancestors, and as our tools of psychic manipulation and population control are ever more sophisticated (Orwell, 1949). How then are we to proceed?

All over the world, "the market" is proffered as the vehicle that will bring riches, security and justice. As management educators we do not diminish the importance of trade and industry, of markets and investments. We do, however, signal a caution. Our caution is articulated well in the work of organisational theorists who develop their position from the writings of Jurgen Habermas (e.g, Deetz, 1992; Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000; Paine & Humphries, 2006). Markets and wars are predicated on an instrumental ethic, an ethic of winning and losing, of using and exploiting. Markets and wars have rules for engagement, rituals and customs to be adhered to. Regardless of how well one plays by the rules, however, the games are still designed for the instrumental harnessing of some interests over others. In this paper we invite a re-think of the very games that are known to harm, maim and kill some even as they bring riches to others.

Among the processes through which we instrumentalise people, earth and relationships, commodity fetishism must rank as one of the more significant colonising energies of human history. This form of organising humanity assumes a transactional ego (as contrasted with a transcendent ego) and equates with the epitome of possessive individualism. The bonds of reciprocity that strengthen a society are weakened through commoditisation of all: people, planet and the artefacts of our creativity. A paid-for commodity represents a completed transaction that entails no further obligation on the part of buyer and seller, and buyer and seller need have no sense of us-ness with one another. In the legal literature, McNeil (1981) makes the distinction between "discrete" (transactional) and "relational" (transcendent) contracts. His distinction rests on the assumption that contractual relationships can only be understood in the context of the social relations that surround them and not merely on the exchange of commodities. In the organisational literature, Fitzgibbons (1992) argues that the employer-employee relationship can be better understood as a relational contract rather than as a discrete transaction between the buyer and seller of (in this case) labour. Discrete transactions are more impersonal,

ahistorical, noncontextual and often monetized. Turner (1999) claims that this large-scale consumption of standardised goods has led to a "coolness" in society, and a weakening of our solidarity with one another.

When people place a strong emphasis on consuming and buying, earning and spending, thinking of the monetary worth of things, they may become more likely to treat people like things or at least means to an end (Kant, 1964). Philosopher Martin Buber refers to this interpersonal stance as I-It relationships, in which the values of others, their subjective experience, their feelings and desires are ignored, seen as unimportant, or viewed only in terms of their usefulness to oneself (Kasser, 2003, p.67). Irigaray (2002) argues that instrumental relationships like these are not only alienating for the objectified person, but also for the objectifier, who loses touch with their own subjectivity.

According to Session (1995), rather than the atomised individuals of neoliberalism, we are each a part that embodies the whole, so this loss of subjectivity equates to a loss of "intuition" or ability to tune in to the morphic field. Altruism, us-ness, compassion and even understanding of oneself are lost when a transactional way of communicating replaces communion and willingness for shared understanding. These values expressed as a holistic approach to development are increasingly linked to the growing effectiveness of indigenous populations in manifesting a more holistic way of being in the instrumentalised world imposed on us all by the colonising influence of western ways of organising. Again New Zealand provides a complex case in point.

The imposition of neoliberalism among the general population in New Zealand was based on a rhetoric of "crisis" and "fear" regarding the prevailing economic circumstances and exhortations to take personal responsibility to contribute to redress the situation through increased productivity and a "tightening of belts" (Humphries, 1998). Among some of the Maori population of New Zealand, however, another strand of this rhetoric was particularly appealing. From the mid 1980s, many Maori were attracted to the ethos of liberalism because of its concomitant rhetoric of freedom from government intervention. Neo-liberalist rhetoric offered opportunities to reclaim the resources illegally confiscated in the process of colonization and provided the mandate to

control these assets for the development of their own economic, social and political aspirations. Neo-liberalism came to be seen as a path to the restoration of sovereignty. Maori, just as every other New Zealand citizen, would be free to invest their resources on the open market and along with this, bear an increasing responsibility for their own well being. The rhetorical connections between neo-liberalism and economic wellbeing for all, and the sovereignty aspirations for Maori, however, were less evident in real outcomes. A decade into the experiment, the general unemployment rate rose well above 10% of the total population while Maori unemployment reached a record high of 20% of the Maori population (Easton, 1999, 1997).

Rising concern among the voting public has put pressure on governments to re-examine the espoused connections between economic policies and social outcomes. By the time they came to prepare for the 1999 elections, Labour strategists had detected a public yearning for "nationhood". This yearning was expressed as a search for remedies for the disgruntlement that had beset the land. James (2000) records that many New Zealanders no longer felt that they could "exercise... control over their fates...sensing a loss of "sovereignty" to big companies, to foreigners, to shadowy forces they do not comprehend" (p. 72). Ironically, in the mind of the people, deregulation of the economy now came to be associated with loss of sovereignty rather than its facilitation as Maori had seen it. Much of the family silver had been sold off. Many of the benefits of the pain associated with the restructuring of our economy and society appeared to take the form of profits for off-shore investors and increasing foreign ownership of land and businesses.

Relatively moderate critics of the prevailing model of economic development, such as Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Laureate in Economics, and former Chief Economist at the World Bank, now says that the sacrifice and pain that accompanied this economic experiment generated less benefit than achieved in countries that set other economic directives to meet social and political priorities (cited in Chatterjee, 1999). Political parties could not continue to ignore the rising disillusion of the voting public in the way they had ignored the clarion

calls of the few critics in the Academy who had been able to sustain their positions over the 1980s and 1990s. A "New Way" was called for! "The Third Way" was the response.

The Third Way

The Third Way is a phrase made popular through the work of Giddens (2002, 2000). It became a useful concept for the responses to increasing civil unrest associated with economic management for President Clinton, Tony Blair and Helen Clark, but is also clearly articulated by Minister Steve Maharey:

> In the 1990s as a first term parliamentarian I began to look a lot harder for the kinds of policy prescriptions that represented a social democratic response to New Times.
>
> The answer, it seemed to me lay in the kinds of ideas debated by people around Bill Clinton, Tony Blair and a range of European social democratic parties. For convenience let's call these ideas the Third Way.
>
> These people were not united by a single version of the Third Way. What they had in common was an understanding that new times demand new answers from social democratic politicians. They could see that right wing neo-liberal politics had dominated the 80s and 90s by appearing to respond to social change and they wanted to "modernize" their own parties.
>
> During its period of renewal, New Zealand Labour did not consciously decide to become a Third Way party. However, there is a great deal of the Third Way in former Labour leader Mike Moore's approach and Helen Clark has talked of Labour being a Third Way party.
>
> After leading the political debate during the 1990s and the early part of this century, the Third Way has fallen on hard times. President Clinton completed two terms and watched his agenda swept aside by the new incumbent George W. Bush followed closely by a Republican control of both houses of Congress. Tony

> Blair is still in power but talks less of the Third Way. Meanwhile in Europe anti-immigration parties have defeated many social democratic governments.
>
> Despite these setbacks the ideas behind the Third Way label are, I would argue, still valid and relevant to New Zealand
>
> Perhaps the lesson we learn from Clinton is that Third Way politicians should be less cautious. They need to lead rather than seek to appease those on the political right. They need to map out a vision of what society can become and actively build support for change (Maharey, 2003).

While acknowledging the pain of the reforms, and promising a moderated Third Way approach to economic and social policy the free trade agenda has not gone off the boil in this country (Kelsey, 2003). The social effects of our policies on the most vulnerable of society are still intensifying (CPAG, 2006). Market wages do not meet voter aspirations. Middle New Zealand has been appeased to some extent by the instigation of the "Working for Families" package that

> will put more money in the pockets of New Zealand's low-and-middle income families with children, also enabling parents in receipt of government welfare to be able to afford to move back into low-paid employment. The total amount delivered by this package will build to $1.1 billion a year in 2007 (MSD, 2006).

Promoted by the government as a tax credit for a selected segment of the population, by some this package is viewed as a subsidy for employers. This example draws our attention to the significant struggle we have to run a "free market" economy that will deliver benefits to all and demonstrates a continued commitment to democratic aspirations.

The current labour market's appetite for employees is high. Women, older people, and people on various disability supports are under pressure to get a job. This in itself would be a fine thing if paid employment is available, adequately paid, rewarding and safe. However, if the pressure to take a job puts at risk already vulnerable networks of relationships or adds more pressure to a family than already exists, whose "well-being" has been enhanced? While perhaps solving in part

the employer's need for labour, the pressure for all to be in employment also is supporting the trend for families to accept that it now requires two incomes to maintain current standards of living. Greater support for the cost of childcare has been promised but has yet to be made workable for many families. Just as "tax credits" are seen by some to disguise the inadequacy of real wages, underwriting of childcare costs are seen as state subsidies for private day-care operators. Ironic? Practical. These less than subtle market interventions pacify both employer and employee while our Free Trade deals, achieved behind closed doors, continue to undermine the real wages and the position of trade in this country. While the redistribution of wealth remains an issue for all capitalist countries, to suggest that we can achieve this through adherence to ideology of "the free market" is to speak with a forked tongue.

Of equal concern about the surreptitious implantation of employer subsidies in disguise of tax credits, the need for employment flexibility for primary care-givers has facilitated a demand for and acceptance of more diverse conditions of service. Part-time, unsecured jobs have become commonplace. For many, the stringing together of several part-time jobs, usually without benefits and with the attendant cost of maintaining them exacerbates the stress of being poor. While such flexibility may suit a small group of people for a short period of their lives, many more people are required to accept these unsecured positions as the means to their livelihood. These are often the only conditions on offer (Dyer, 2003). For some, over-work, exhaustion, family stress, and domestic upheaval are the outcome that has an individual and social cost, but is a market opportunity for others. The increasingly unworkable conditions of the benefit system continue to press people either into accepting these diminished conditions of service (effectively lowering the cost of labour still further) – or they disappear from the statistics altogether by finding an equally tenuous livelihood in the underground economy or in crime.

Despite pockets of academic focus on the effects of neo-liberalism, we concur with the editors of this special issue of *New Zealand Sociology* who argue that in sociology departments, research and teaching on

work and organisation seems to be sparse, fragmented and difficult to locate. We would suggest that this is no accident. The period of neo-liberalism imposed from the mid 1980s in this country was not notable for its enthusiastic embrace of critics of what would become nearly two decades of apparently unassailable neo-liberal dogma informing our intellectual, economic, political and social landscape. Diligent researchers, documenting aspects of this imposition and their predictions of dire consequences were given scant professional or popular recognition. We include in this group the detailed documentary work of Jane Kelsey, the acerbic wit of Brian Easton, and the accessible narrative of Tim Hazeldine. In 1998, a number of excellent social thinkers were invited to staff the Royal Commission on Social Policy. These researchers made a significant contribution to our understanding of the social landscape at that time. Their task, however valuable, might also be read as a serious deflection of their own and community attention away from the concurrent wide-reaching economic redirection of this country that would provide the subsequent subjugation of the social to the economic. We use the phrase associated with the work of Jurgen Habermas (1990, 1984, 1973) to express this achievement as the "colonisation of the life world". This phrase suggests the imposition of limited and rational western liberal economic thinking on all aspects of the human endeavour. It is a phrase well suited to the intellectual and pragmatic organisational ethos of New Zealand since the early 1980s. The association of this work in the emerging CMS is discussed later in this paper.

Hope and faith; fear and compliance: The relentless intensification of global capitalism

Despite a flurry of interest in the Third Way, New Zealand has remained overtly committed to a Free Trade agenda. We continue to sign treaties through which we agree to prioritise the interest of investment capital over citizens' concerns. We continue to support this agenda in all major political parties. Some of us may balk at doing trade with a country whose economic development includes the hosting of organ tourism (BBC Hidden Cameras, 2006) and the purported harvesting of organs

from people convicted of crimes that attract death sentences in a seemingly sinister synchrony with market demands (Amnesty, 2006). This does not stop us purchasing the relatively cheap goods that flood our markets from this country. And before we express our outrage at the Chinese, we cannot ignore the deep connection between our insatiable need for oil and the wars we are willing to tolerate to satisfy our appetite for more things, cheaper services, and our comfort in general. A less obvious example of our complicity in the current world system may include our burgeoning appetite for coffee. We may have matured to select fair traded brands for our daily fix, but our (ethical) appetite still requires the draining of unprecedented quantities of water for our pleasure that this crop demands, water that might be better put to a different use. We are all implicated. We must also be responsible; response-able. And for that, we need an analysis. In most business programmes this analysis appears to be skewed in favour of systemic maintenance and intensification rather than transformation. Chomsky, Gramsci, and Durkheim would not be surprised.

As this predominant form of economic direction intensifies globally and locally, so too must the consequences. The situation in New Zealand is no different to the many situations in all countries where capitalist investment has free roaming rights. Recent job losses world-wide have displaced hundreds of thousands of workers. In the example below, Air New Zealand employees are facing outsourcing of their jobs. It is unlikely that the traditional source of their power, their own unions, will support their interests.

In the case of Air New Zealand, the unions long ago gave the green light for job cuts, beginning in the 1990s with a $40 million cost-cutting exercise. In 2001-2, following the collapse of the airline's Australian subsidiary Ansett, the unions endorsed a major assault on jobs as part of a $NZ1 billion bailout, involving the buy back of 80 percent of Air New Zealand shares by the Labour government. The current offensive began last October with an announcement that the Auckland wide-body engineering base was to close, shedding more than 600 jobs. Heavy maintenance work on long-haul aircraft and engines would go to cheaper servicing centres in Asia.

The unions made not the slightest pretence of defending jobs and conditions. Instead, given 58 days by management to come up with a counter-proposal, the EPMU hired business consultants Ferrier Hodgson who delivered a plan to "save" the Auckland base by sacrificing half the targeted jobs and imposing sweeping "labour changes" to recoup $48 million a year over five years. Faced with demands for "competitive pay rates and competitive costs for servicing aircraft", the unions simply asked: "How high do you want us to jump?" EPMU national secretary Andrew Little assured the company it had "a workforce that is supporting an agenda for change". Management initially remained non-committal, saying that only a "small fraction" of the required cuts had been found and that it wanted comprehensive concessions across the entire engineering sector, including the Christchurch operation.

The entire episode underlines once again the futility of relying on the trade unions. These organisations function as a direct arm of management in imposing the dictates of the global market on workers. The defence of jobs and conditions necessitates a turn to other workers around the world facing the exactly same onslaught and a joint struggle based on socialist principles against the imperious demands of global capital (Worldproutassembly, 2006).

The effects of the globalization of our economy are writ large in this example. The parties to the conversation are already so embedded in the discourse it is difficult to see where a transformative intervention might be made. In this case, as in all the others, we rarely notice what happens to these out-placed employees, unless it happens to us or our families.

What about the effects of free trade on the people of Asia and the Pacific? Some individuals in Asia and the Pacific may gain from the redeployment of our various jobs to other countries. We are now disciplined enough to tolerate, if not condone, such limited and limiting logic. And the same rhetoric that facilitates our agreement to export our jobs to Asia and the Pacific also facilitates the dumping of surplus milk products from the EU and US on the Indian market, jeopardizing the businesses that sustain millions of women, their families and their wider communities (Maketradefair, 2006). Where are these millions of

displaced people to find a livelihood? In already overcrowded cities where their farmlets, once sustaining large extended families, become integrated into "more efficient" agribusiness? Sweatshops, prostitution, and increased trafficking of vulnerable people are just some of the outcomes of intensification of capitalism the world over. Criminal networks that smuggle and traffic in human beings for financial gain increasingly control the flow of migrants across borders (Interpol, 2006). It is a system that creates desperate people who will resort to desperate means to survive. For those who feel they are winning, the winning may be short lived. And those who accepted the outcomes, are nonetheless vulnerable to this same system that secured their victory.

Whether their personal victory is of long or short duration, their winning always comes at a cost to someone. Nowhere is this tension more visible than in the growing Maori economy in New Zealand. In this segment of the community, successful Treaty Settlements and the "liberation" of "tribal resources" to global market opportunities and risks, have Maori, just as everyone else, competing to win in a game that may be described as a race to the bottom. Why is a re-view of Maori entry into the global scenario of particular interest?

Neo-liberalism promised economic enterprise free of state intervention. For Maori, this was heralded as a welcome step towards the sovereignty they never ceded but was taken from them. However, documented Maori economic success is not without its troublesome dynamics anymore than are the economic effects of all ventures when considered in the current global context. The Free Trade/State Intervention dynamic takes an interesting twist in this example. On 3 October 2006, for example, NZPA reported Maori Party opposition to a plan to raise wages by $2 per hour for workers on foreign fishing boats, following a report last year that found some foreign crew were being paid as little as $195 a month. At the time of writing, Cabinet was yet to make a decision on the plan which reportedly would raise pay rates for foreign crews to $12.75 an hour from $10.25 an hour over a three-year period, to be imposed through immigration permits. Alert to the government's inconsistent position, Tariana Turia, co-leader of the Maori party said:

> I'm not opposed to people being paid a fair and just wage but it seems to me that the Government's prepared to do this [impose a wage increase] to fishers and yet when it came to their own business interest in Air New Zealand [they were] more than happy to shunt it off to China to get a cheaper deal (NZMP, 2006).

Idealised versions or the aspirational statements of those promoting Te Ao Maori, however, led some Pakeha to believe that Maori were in a prime position to help regain a more holistic approach to human organisation. Many Pakeha critics, however critical of neo-liberalism, did not press their analysis into this arena. They might well have for our mutual benefit.

Critical theory in New Zealand universities: Two decades of starvation

The editors of this special issue suggest that the study and critique of work and organisation are central to issues of power, identity and social interaction. They urge authors to develop work specifically from an Aotearoa New Zealand perspective. We agree with this premise in general. We understand the need to tell the stories of our place and our times. We are not, however, convinced that the articulation of clear boundaries between activity in Aotearoa and the rest of the world is helpful for a robust analysis and a transformational agenda. New Zealand is a country that imposed neo-liberal economic dogma, apparently voluntarily, more quickly and more deeply than any other western country. We are a small but significant player in the rapid movement of western economies that serve the interests of elites cloaked in a rhetoric of individual freedom and opportunity, human rights and social justice. The disciplinary effects of the shift from a managed economy to a neo-liberal driven entity change the intensity but not the nature of the beast.

The acceptance of this intensification can be traced to the call to New Zealand citizens to respond to the purported economic crisis of the late 1970s by "tightening belts". Economic doom, international isolation and worse were predicted should every New Zealander not comply. The New Zealand Planning Council's 1976 document: *New Zealand at the turning point*, for example, argued that there would be "some pain" but

that restructuring would restore competitiveness, the "free market", and "greater" investor autonomy. Restructuring was discussed in abstract terms "independent of the social relationships of production found in firms, industries and communities" (Britton et al, 1992, p.4). Long-term efficiency and growth were offered as the prize for short-term pain. Unions were neutered (Humphries, 1998) and corporate support services took their place. When restructuring occurred, whether to single individuals in the small organisations nigh invisible to politicians, or to many in the high profile mass redundancies, the pain of individuals rippled through families and communities. This ruthless process has not been abandoned in this country. In fact, it is alive and well in our business school classrooms and management seminars. Many of the management students we educate, placed in experiential role plays, jump to the immediate conclusion that when stockholders require higher returns on investment, management's job is to cut costs. They interpret the demand as the requirement to eliminate jobs, or to cut wages. We have found this classroom experience is as true in the US and Europe as it is in New Zealand (Humphries & Dyer 2001, 2005).

Economic growth based on the twin icons of increased productivity and cost reduction has become common fare in university business curricula. Since the 1970s, management schools have grown exponentially while sociology and philosophy departments languished. In business schools, compulsory courses in other disciplines have been sacrificed for courses that provide technical, professional and discipline specific requirements of the business degree. Most of these subjects are underpinned with a rational, technical and instrumental ethos that goes unrecognised and unchallenged by faculty and students alike. Triple Bottom Line accounting systems, while perhaps a highly desirable step in the right direction, will not be robust enough if the architects of our categorization and their hierarchies have no social or environmental education. This creeping colonisation of our intellectual spectrum and our technical infatuation with a dogma associated with the mythical creature called "Free Trade", has diminished the conditions of service of many New Zealanders, and exacerbated the indicators of poverty for the most vulnerable. Short term pain has come to mean a life of

vulnerability for many. In the meantime, the wealthiest New Zealanders are far better off. It is a pattern that is seen the world over. It is here, from the pain of this unhappy story, that New Zealand, small as we are, has the opportunity to contribute to the transformation of this globalising zeitgeist. We have the evidence of our experience that, as human beings, we have been quickly able to change the prevailing ethos in our land. We did this in our move to embrace neo-liberalism. We can, with a vision and a will, bring into effect some other form of collective consciousness to inform our practice.

The value of the structural analysis of critical theorists is a powerful awakening of individual consciousness and consciences. It is a challenge to integrate this insight without becoming drawn into superficial structural solutions. Structural solutions, in our view, are a necessary but not sufficient condition for transformation towards a more dignified way of being. The structural changes we seek would be a reflection of the transformation of the zeitgeist, a move away from the instrumentalization of humanity and the earth that sustains us. We call for the intensification of a relational ethic, an ethic in which each human being is considered, not as a means to an end, but as a free being, entitled to the wherewithal to live a life of dignity and self respect. This notion of freedom is different from the liberty offered by the neo-liberals. We suggest a notion of liberty that facilitates freedom to work in collaborations by which communities unfold their potential, collaborations that are mutually beneficial, collaborations that are unavailable for harnessing to the interests of others. It requires the transformation of the subtle form of harnessing, better known by critical theorists as the effects of hegemonic control (Humphries 1998; Humphries & Dyer 2001).

Colonisation of the life world

At the conference that preceded this Special Edition, [Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) held in Wellington in February 2006] the works of Stanley Deetz and Matt Alvesson were readily identified as leading critical organisation theory internationally. We too have found their work invaluable in our research. Through their writings we have

found useful connections to the work of Jurgen Habermas and those who engage with his ideas in organisational studies. These authors draw our attention to the potential to move from analysis/diagnosis to transformational/emancipatory action. We have used the work of Habermas in a number of projects in both manufacturing and social service organisations as well as in our teaching. Common to all these various projects is an interest in transforming the "domesticating effects of the template", a transformation of the instrumental logic that is focused on the attainment of a limited notion of efficiency and a dangerous notion of economic growth. Examples of "templates" may be seen in the increasing "panoptic" processes engaged by corporations, governments, and community organisations in the form of compliance mechanisms (Paine & Humphries, 2006). Many of these are now "on-line" "pull down menus" – intensifying "managing from a distance" and amplifying control from the centre. In each of these projects, location and locality have significant implications. Meaning making is always contextualised. The possibilities and the boundaries of what can be said, known, or done is geographically, historically, culturally and politically inscribed. In our work with manufacturing and service delivery organisations, the lexicon of efficiency circumscribes all discussion. Maori and Pakeha might productively revisit such lexicons and the uptake or imposition of their associated supposedly neutral templates for action (quality assurance, risk management and so on). We might usefully review them as part of the gospel of neo-colonisation (Ellis, 2006).

In keeping with the analysis of critical theorists, we believe that imbalances of power provide opportunities for exploitation and injustice. In keeping with the transformational aspirations expressed in this form of scholarship and praxis we wish to contribute to a change in the way we now organise and experience our humanity. The very marginal movement of power/domination observed in our various projects invites us to consider that these apparent shifts are mere illusions. We can see that these minor shifts may be mere co-options of discourses of justice and environmental responsibility that serve to safeguard the larger

project of exploitation or colonisation. However, we also might seek more rigorously their transformational potential through increased exercise of communicative action.

Is this delusional? We hold the view that there is no better aspiration than to advocate for such processes of mutuality through which to address the many life-threatening and dignity-defiling conditions of human and environmental existence. We are interested in any theories that generate a desire not only to resist opportunities to harness and exploit others, but in theories that generate processes of mutuality and respect. To that extent, we support the formulation of a relational ethic and to facilitate an increasing interest in communicative action in all spheres of human endeavours. We hope for a world in which the ethical impulses that support the life world are the impulses that generate our economic as well as our social activity. In the line of reasoning that informs these projects, the advocated movement from instrumental to communicative action, even if not achievable in its ideal form, has transformational possibilities and is worthy of our serious attention.

Transformational education: Awakening the impulse to responsibility

It is said that with art comes voice and with voice comes responsibility. When we understand our work as academics as a form of creativity, a form of art rather than a form of functional training we might create quite different texts, different discourses, and different outcomes to the ones we see today. New Zealand academics are in an enviable place to make a contribution to the global discourse. We are mandated by the Education Act (1989) to act as a critic and conscience of society. Academics developing their careers in the schools of management or organisational studies are in a powerful position to affect the zeitgeist that currently consumes us. We would like to be part of such a community of thinkers – thinkers who are connecting to transformational endeavours. But this desire draws our attention to the vulnerability of our position. Many of us are indentured in professions that serve "the system". Our professional productivity is monitored at the gates by journal editors who do not see the world through this lens of critical

theories - a lens that itself is not coherent and thus offers far less tangible responses than functionalist calls for intensification of efficiency and a rationale that underpins it.

The current call to solve social challenges of this country by a commitment to a free market, (albeit disguised in a Third Way form of capitalism) allows for maintaining our commitment to Free Trade while harnessing the social sector to ameliorate the consequences of our continued investment of trust in this fable. Mothers of young children, whether single or married, are strongly encouraged to benefit from the liberation their mothers fought for by taking up jobs and placing their children in child care. Many find that by the time they have calculated the cost of this move into paid employment, they have barely covered the cost of their liberation. Many are saddened by the loss of providing the primary care for their babies. While pockets of social sciences, women's studies, policy courses and social geography are drawing attention to these issues from a critical perspective, only the most instrumental versions of these theories are finding their way into the organisational disciplines. Gender and diversity studies, for example, are largely about assimilating difference in order to harness the energies of diverse people to the overall project of growth and efficiency. The study of the relationships between managers and workers is usually about how to harness them into collaborating with the prevailing economic logic. What might be read as continued devastation to New Zealand jobs are re-interpreted as savvy management in the context of globalisation. The partial salvation of engineering jobs, initially prepared for export to Asia by Air New Zealand for example, become read as victories (AirNZ, 2006). The export of financial services jobs to the Pacific is reframed as an opportunity for Fijians. Unions will aid these transitions, even when this hurts some of their own members. Forces of resistance are dissipated. The underlying interests of capitalists have not been challenged. We adjust. We come to accept the apparently inevitable. We are relieved if the changes do not harm us or those we love. For those who could not move out of harm's way, we had, in our neo-liberal line of reasoning a palatable explanation. They, the "other," had made poor choices. Even deeply committed advocates of this theory, however,

have come to see its limitations. This Labour government, for example, while still a harbinger of the Free Trade agenda globally, has been required to intervene in its outcomes. In her speech to the Labour Party conference in October 2006, Helen Clark acknowledges that many New Zealanders were unfairly burdened and even hurt by this economic system. By the opening of Parliament in February 2007, she was willing to associate this burden with the fallacious attribution of market-delivered justice. Today her government and the population in general are being exhorted to bring redress and justice through a commitment to a sustainable future, where we will see an ongoing commitment to liberated markets, strong governments setting the conditions of trade and social responsibility for a sustainable future for all. As critical theorists, and as citizens generally, we could claim this speech to be appeasing rhetoric – or we could work with all those willing to articulate these concerns, to find ways of speaking this rhetoric into reality.

The ruthlessness of our policies that caused so much pain and distress among many of our citizens is a blight on our self-respect. Are we going to do better through the treaties we are signing abroad? Will the most vulnerable citizens of the countries we trade with be better off because we choose to engage with their governments and markets? Are the citizens of the countries we will make trade agreements, with no more or no less our responsibility than folks closer to home? Can we continue to think that we can take care of our own without ensuring the wellbeing of those seeming most distant? Can we even pretend that anything we agree to or tolerate in free trade treaties will not have profound reverberations at home and abroad? Can we move our reasoning from the instrumentalism that informs all capitalist economic activity to a theory for humanity in which social and moral thinking determines what economic activity is to be deemed ethical? We are a long way from achieving such a position in our formal theories and applied disciplines of management. We would like to participate with others in a transformation of this situation. We argue that sociologists and the people in the schools of organisational and management studies who are interested in such a transformation have every reason to believe such change is possible. To lose faith in such hope is to condemn our

future, not to the abstract workings of a free market, but to the interests of those controlling those markets. We can do better than that (George, 2002).

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the unsung contribution of our students who daily challenge us to articulate our critique into an understandable form and our teachers who did this for us. Among these, Professor David Bettison, Dr Betsan Martin, and John Kirton stand tall.

References

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research.* London: Sage.

Amnesty (2006). Amnesty. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi.

Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil.* New York: Viking Press.

BBC (2006). *BBC.* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://digg.com/videos_educational/BBC_hidden_cam_finds_China_selling_prisoners_organs.

Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J., & Walsh, P. (1996). *Public Management: The New Zealand Model.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Britton, S. Le Heron, R. & Pawson, E. (1992). *Changing Places in New Zealand: A Geography of Restructuring.* Christchurch: New Zealand Geographical Society.

Buber, M. (1996). *I and Thou.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Chatterjee, S. et al (1999). *The New Politics: A Third Way for New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Chomsky, N. (1996). Old wine in new bottles; a bitter taste. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organisation theory, 2(1).* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot

Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over People.* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Chomsky/NeoliberalismPOP_Chom.html

Clark, H. (2006). Address to Labour Party Conference, October. Retrieved March 12, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.labour.org.nz/news/hot_topics/HT-Conference_2006/CONF_06-HC/index.html

Clark, H. (2007).Opening of Parliament, February 13th. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.stuff.co.nz/3960719a6160.html

CMIG: Critical Management Studies Interest Group of the Academy of Management (2004). [USA]. Domain Statement. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://aom.pace.edu/cms/About/Domain.htm

CPAG: Child Poverty Action Group (2006). Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.cpag.org.nz

Dees, JIG. (2005). Current Issues in Comparative Education. Commentary: Social Entrepreneurs and Education. *Critical Issues in Education.* 8(1), 1-5.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life.* Albany: State University of New York.

Dyer, S. (2003). *Normalising global neo-liberalism and workplace change through career management and development discourse,* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Easton, B. (1997). *In Stormy Seas: The Post War New Zealand Economy.* Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Easton, B. (1999).*The whimpering of the State: Policy after MMP.* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Eichbaum, C. & Shaw, R. (2006). *Labour in government, social democracy, and the third way: The New Zealand Experience.* Paper for the British Political Studies Association Annual Conference.

Ellis, R. (2006). Ngaiterangi, Ngati Raukawa ki Waikato, *'Mauri Oho, Mauri Tu, Mauri Ora - Enhancing Maori Health and Wellbeing.* Ngati Tahu. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, http://www.mai.ac.nz/people/riri_ellis.html

Estes, R. (1994). *The Tyranny of the Bottom Line: Why Corporations Make Good People Do Bad Things.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Press.

Fitzgerald, T. (2001). *The Third Way: Searching for a State without enemies.* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.sociologyonline.co.uk/politics/Giddens_3way.shtml.

Fitzgibbons, D. (1992). A critical reexamination of employee absence: the impact of relational contracting, the negotiated order and the employment relationship. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management,* 10, 73-120.

Forester, J. (1985). *Critical theory and public life.* Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations,* 53(1), 7-32.

George, S. (2002). Another world is possible. *The Nation,* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.tni.org/george/articles/awip.htm

Giddens, A. (2000). *The Third Way and its Critics.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, A. (2002). *Runaway World: How Globalization is Shaping our Lives.* London: Profile Books.

Grosvenor, S. (1996). Globalisation and the economy. In R. Le Heron & E. Pawson (eds), *Changing Places- New Zealand in the Nineties* (pp.20-54). Auckland: Longman Paul Publishing.

Habermas, J. (1973) *Legitimation Crisis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1984) *Theory of Communicative Action.* Boston: Beacon Press

Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hazeldine, T. (1998). *Taking New Zealand Seriously: The Economics of Decency.* Auckland: HarperCollins.

Humphries, M. T. (1998). For the Common Good? New Zealanders Comply with Quality Standards. *Organisation Science.* 9(6), 737-749.

Humphries, M. T. and Dyer, S. (2001). Changing the nature and conditions of employment Stimulating critical reflection. *Journal of Management Education,* 25(3), 325-340.

Humphries, M. T. and Dyer, S. (2005). Transformation through critical management education. *Journal of Management Education.* 29(1), 169-195

Interpol (2006). Trafficking in human being. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: www.interpol.int/Public/THB/default.asp

James, C. (2000). Assessing the Issues. In Boston, J., Church, S., Stephen, L. Mcleay, E. and Roberts, N. (Eds) *Left Turn: The New Zealand General Election of 1999.* Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Jermier, J. (1985). When the sleeper wakes. A short story extending themes in radical organisation theory. *Journal of Management,* 11(2), 67-80.

Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Kasser, Tim (2002). *The high price of materialism.* Cambridge, Massachusetts & London: MIT Press

Kelsey, J. (1997). *The New Zealand Experiment. A World Model for Structural Adjustment* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Kelsey, J. (1999). *Reclaiming the Future: New Zealand and the Global Economy,* Wellington: Bridget Williams Press.

Kelsey, J. (2003). Recolonisation or decolonization? Where does our future lie? Bruce Jesson Memorial Lecture. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.brucejesson.com/lecture2003.html

King, M. (2003).*The Penguin History of New Zealand.* Albany: Penguin Books.

Le Heron, R. (1996). Globalisation and the economy. In R. Le Heron & E. Pawson (eds), *Changing Places- New Zealand in the Nineties* (pp. 20-54). Auckland: Longman Paul Publishing.

McNeil, I. (1981). *The New Social Contract,* London: Yale University Press.

Maharey, S. (2003). *The Third Way and how I got onto it.* Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.beehive.govt.nz/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentID=16977

Maketradefair (2006). *Trade Talking.* Retrieved Wednesday, 12 March, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.maketradefair.com/en/index.php?file=videos.htm

Miller, R. (2001). *New Zealand: Government and Politics.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Ministry of Social Development (2006). *Working for families.* Retrieved 30 October 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.msd.govt.nz/media-information/working-for-families/

New Zealand Maori Party. (2006). *Concerns of Maori Fishing Companies Shoved Aside.* [Press release] http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0610/S00130.htm

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen-Eighty-Four.* London: Secker & Warburg.

Paine, A., and Humphries, M. (2006). De-instrumentalising humanity: research that disrupts, educates, engages, inspires, demystifies and democratises. *Australia and New Zealand Third Sector Research, Eighth Biennial Conference: Navigating New Waters?* University of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia, 26 – 28 November.

Parker, M. (2000). The sociology of organizations and the organization of sociology: Some reflections on the making of a division of labour. The Sociological Review, 48(1), 124-146.

Perry, M. (1996). Globalisation and the economy. In R. Le Heron & E. Pawson (eds) *Changing Places- New Zealand in the Nineties* (pp.20-54). Auckland: Longman Paul Publishing.

Prichard, C., Jones, D., Stager Jacques, R. (Eds.) (2006). Organization, Identity and Locality (OIL) II: A one-day conference on Critical Management Studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand. [10 February, 2006, Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington]. Conference Proceedings. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Management, Massey University. Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: www.massey.ac.nz/~cprichar/Oil%20Conference%20Proceedings_revised.pdf

Roper, B. (2003). What is the "Third Way"? *Socialist Review: Aotearoa New Zealand*. 1(16). Retrieved Wednesday, 21 February, 2007 from the World Wide Web: www.iso.org.nz.

Rose, N. (2000). Community, citizenship and the third way. *The American Behavioural Scientist*, 43(9), 1395-1411.

Session, G. (1995). *Deep ecology for the 21st century: Readings on the philosophy and practice of the new environmentalism*. Boston: Shambala.

Shirley, I. (1990). *Social Policy*. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson, & Shirley, I. (Eds) *New Zealand Society*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Steingard, D.S. and Fitzgibbons, D. E. (1995). Challenging the juggernaut of globalization: A manifesto for academic praxis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 8(4), 30-54.

The Treasury (1984). *Economic management*. Wellington: Government Printer.

The Treasury (1987). *Government management: Volume I*. Wellington: Government Printer.

The Treasury (1987a). *Government management: volume II – education issues*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Turner, B.S. (1999). 'McCitizens: Risk, coolness and irony in contemporary politics.' Chapter 6 in Smart, B.(ed.) (1999). *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage.

Worldproutassembly (2006). *Unions collaborate in ongoing destruction of Air New Zealand jobs*. Retrieved Wednesday, 12 March , 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.worldproutassembly.org/archives/2006/03/unions_collabor.html

Maria Humphries completed her PhD in Sociology under the keen eye of Professor David Bettison. His relentless scrutiny of 'the-taken-for-granted' and his passion to urge a responsibility for that 'fictive entity' we call 'the economy' has reverberated through her work ever since. Maria is an Associate Professor at the Waikato Management School where her interests are in the applications of critical theories and actions research methods to the many phenomena 'taken-for-granted' in such an environment.

Dr Suzette Dyer completed her PhD under the keen eye of Maria Humphries. Suzette is a Senior Lecturer at the Waikato Management School. Her interests are to help students develop critical awareness of our every-day-life experiences.

Dr. Dale Fitzgibbons is Associate Professor in the College of Business at Illinois State University, and teaches in the areas of organizational behavior/theory, teams, leadership, and strategy.. His research interests include socially responsible business, corporate governance, management spirituality and ethics.

Assassins in Academia? New Zealand Academics as "Critic and Conscience of Society"

Todd Bridgman

Abstract

This paper uses literature on the positioning of intellectuals in society to consider the enactment of the "critic and conscience" role within New Zealand universities. The critic and conscience of society is a statutory obligation for universities but is seen to be threatened by a combination of market forces and challenges to the status of knowledge. Drawing on the work of Laclau and Mouffe, the identity of the "critical and engaged expert" is constituted, which recognises the vital role that New Zealand academics can play as a force for democratic social change.

Trade Me and the "Tall Poppy Assassin"

"Let's hear it for the Trade Me genius" sang the *New Zealand Herald* in March 2006, following the sale of New Zealand's largest internet auction business to Australian-owned Fairfax for NZ$700 million (Gaynor, 2006). The "genius" in the spotlight was Sam Morgan, who created the site as a 23-year-old in 1999 and sold it seven years later for a personal gain of NZ$227 million. It all began, as the legend goes, with Morgan's need for a second-hand heater to warm his draughty Wellington flat. Frustrated by his experience of buying it using the internet, he created Trade Me.

Trade Me is heralded by the New Zealand media as a fairytale success story – a young Kiwi entrepreneur drops out of university and with the aid of a PC takes on the global might of eBay to create a personal fortune and inspire a whole generation of budding e-entrepreneurs along the way. The sale gained blanket coverage in New Zealand as journalists searched for every angle on Morgan and the secret of his success – even his 93-year-old grandmother was asked for comment, having acquired something of a celebrity status at her Invercargill rest home (Levermore, 2006).

In the chorus of public approval that greeted the Trade Me sale, there was a lone voice of dissent. Craig Prichard, management lecturer at Massey University, issued a press release describing the sale as an "opportunity lost for New Zealand" (Prichard, 2006). Prichard acknowledged that Morgan and his fellow investors should realise a healthy return for their efforts, but argued that a concentration of wealth in such few hands was unreasonable, since Trade Me's value had been created by its customers' co-operative activity as well as their investment in internet-capable home computers. He suggested a number of options for dealing with the distribution of value from new economy firms such as Trade Me, including a preferential nominally priced block shareholding for staff and Trade Me traders as part of a public offering. Prichard also questioned whether it was really something to celebrate that yet another successful New Zealand enterprise had passed into Australian ownership, thereby leading us further down the road of economic dependence on our neighbour.

Despite the extent of the coverage on the Trade Me sale, most New Zealand media ignored Prichard's press release. Those who did not were scornful. The *National Business Review* described it as "an analysis that will leave most in management, let alone most economists, thunder struck" (Trade Me Sale Too Much Money for Too Few, 2006). Karl du Fresne, columnist for the *Dominion Post*, went further, labelling Prichard a "tall poppy assassin" who sits "safe and snug in his taxpayer-funded academic post" (2006, p. B4). Whereas Morgan had worked hard and made New Zealanders proud, Prichard "hasn't contributed a damn thing", he argued. Du Fresne was not much interested in engaging with the issues, but was puzzled by the background of this "previously unheard of management lecturer". Du Fresne found Prichard's university webpage and "stumbled into a morass of impenetrable academic mumbo-jumbo" littered with references to Michel Foucault and Karl Marx, who, he argued "have an alarming number of devotees in places of higher learning".

> I am not sure whether to be appalled that we pay academics to inculcate impressionable students with their madcap ideas, or grateful to Dr Prichard for coming forward and revealing himself. It's useful to know what's going on in the universities (Du Fresne, 2006, p. B4).

This case presents a useful reference point for thinking about New Zealand academics' responsibilities as critic and conscience of society - responsibilities which are laid out in the Education Act 1989. While it is usual to stress the teaching and research roles of universities, their unique status also rests on their provision of a range of public good responsibilities which are crucial to a vibrant, informed and participatory democracy. These responsibilities, in turn, rely on the protection of academic freedom, defined in the Education Act as

> the freedom of academic staff and students, within the law, to question and test received wisdom, to put forward new ideas and to state controversial or unpopular opinions (Education Act, 1989).

Aside from being a useful illustration of the critic and conscience role, Prichard's intervention over the Trade Me sale raises two other issues worthy of consideration: his location within a management school and his interest in social theory. The first prompts questioning about the positioning of management schools within the university and their relationship to established social science disciplines such as sociology. If the views of the *National Business Review* and the *Dominion Post* columnist are widely held, there is a presumption that management schools should be unquestioning supporters of the workings of the capitalist system, rather than critics of it.

For those working in New Zealand management schools, Prichard's comments should come as no surprise, since he is part of a strong and growing presence of critically inclined management academics. Critical management studies (CMS) is a branch of management theory critical of established social practices and institutional arrangements and challenges prevailing systems of domination. It has drawn together critical currents in the study of management that had been developing during the 1970s and 1980s and takes its name from Alvesson and

Willmott's edited collection published in 1992 (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992). The movement developed initially in UK and Scandinavian business schools but has now spread to many parts of the globe including the US, where there is a CMS interest group at the Academy of Management.

The second issue to emerge is Prichard's interest in social theory, which was used as the weapon to bludgeon his credibility as a commentator on the Trade Me sale. To take critique of work and organisation in capitalist society seriously, one must look for theoretical lenses that inform a critique of capitalism, with Marxism and Foucauldian analysis being obvious starting points. The latter does, however, raise questions about the epistemological commitments of those who adopt the critic and conscience position.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In the following section, I suggest that the literature on the role of intellectuals in society provides a useful lens to rethink the enactment of the critic and conscience role within New Zealand universities. I first review a number of contributions heavily influenced by the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. These approaches focus on the role of science in legitimating academics' knowledge but are challenged by contributions which claim that intellectuals have lost their authority as bearers of objective, scientific knowledge. I then suggest that the work of Laclau and Mouffe can contribute to a theorisation of the relationship between intellectuals and society in two ways. First, it provides a theoretical framework for rethinking positions which are grounded in grand narratives such as positivist science and Marx's historical materialism. Second, it provides a horizon on which a new position for intellectuals can be constructed. This position, the critical and engaged expert, can fulfil an important role in Laclau and Mouffe's ideal of a radical and plural democracy. Finally, I return to the Trade Me case to consider the challenges and opportunities for the critic and conscience in New Zealand universities.

Theorising the Critic and Conscience

This section examines a number of conceptions of the intellectual. To a greater or lesser extent, Weber (1949; 1989), Mills (1951; 1958; 1959) and Mannheim (1991) appeal to a belief in the individual as a sovereign

agent, a belief in reason, a belief in universal truths and values, and a belief in progressive emancipation through scientific knowledge. This constitutes the critical intellectual as a detached figure who stands above "the masses" and who claims superior access to objective, scientific knowledge. More recent contributors to the literature, such as Bauman (1987) and Foucault (1980), challenge this conception. I begin by examining Weber's position on value-freedom, which constructs a boundary between the spheres of science and politics.

For Weber (1989), specialisation is the only legitimate means of contributing to the life of the public sphere. Scientists contribute by providing factual, value–free knowledge that presents an alternative to prejudice and preconception and by recognising and respecting the limits of scientific knowledge with regard to its impotence on matters of moral choice. Weber argues the sphere of science is limited to answering "if", rather than "whether" questions, which belong in the sphere of politics. Academics, therefore, are urged by Weber to avoid engagement in politics. To do so risks confusing and compromising public confidence in science producing and disseminating unbiased, factual, value-free knowledge.

Like Weber, Mills believes in reason and emancipation through scientific knowledge. For Mills (1959), the academic is a political animal, since values guide the selection of problems for scientific study. However, in conducting scientific inquiry, these values should not determine the results or their moral or political implications. For Mills, the political role of the academic does not extend to an activist role, as this would indicate "a disbelief in the premise of social science and in the role of reason in human affairs" (p. 192). Completely objective social science is impossible, but this does not require the scientific paradigm to be abandoned.

The notion that the intellectual is somehow elevated or detached from the masses and is therefore able to study social life from the outside gives legitimacy to the position of the critical intellectual. This is achieved partly by an appeal to objectivity and the truthfulness of science, as articulated by Mills and Weber, but also by an assumption that intellectuals, unlike the masses, are able to transcend their

immediate situation. For Mills, the political task of the scientist is to educate the masses about the structural causes of their personal situations because "by their own private experience they can only know a small portion of the social world" (1958, p.173).

This theme also appears in Mannheim's conception of the "freely floating intellectual". Like Mills, Mannheim (1991) asserts there is no possibility of discovering a universal truth, since there are multiple competing worldviews on the political landscape. However, it is possible to produce a synthesis of these worldviews and that task belongs to a *relatively* classless stratum, the "socially unattached intelligentsia" (Mannheim, 1991, p.137, emphasis in original). Mannheim asserts that the intelligentsia share a common heritage of education, which, unlike those without education, enables them to keep an open mind rather than blindly accepting the ideology of a particular group. Education, therefore, is the source of autonomy and independence, enabling intellectuals to take a "broader point of view" to capture the "whole of the social and political structure" (1991, p.162). This external view allows intellectuals to reflect critically on what is widely taken for granted. Intellectuals can attach themselves to classes in situations where members of those classes are unable to theorise their own position, but this affiliation does not imply subservience.

Weber, Mills and Mannheim formulate different conceptions of the social role of intellectuals, but they share a belief that the critical intellectual is a sovereign agent who is guided by reason, the search for "truth" and the possibility of emancipation through scientific discovery. Other contributors to the literature, such as Bauman and Foucault have challenged these positions and it is to them that I now turn.

For Bauman (1987), intellectuals (or more specifically, public intellectuals) are a product of the Enlightenment, appealing to reason, standing outside partisan politics and rising above one's specialisation to address issues of broader public concern. Bauman argues there has been a shift from modern intellectuals as legislators of universal values to postmodern intellectuals as interpreters of social meanings. The modern strategy of intellectual work is the "legislator" role, which "consists of making authoritative statements which arbitrate in

controversies of opinions and selects those opinions which, having been selected, become correct and binding" (Bauman, 1987, p.4). For legislators, the authority of knowledge is grounded in the use of procedural rules, such as the scientific method, which assures the attainment of truth and moral judgement. Since their knowledge is universally valid, legislators have the right and duty to validate beliefs which are held in various sections of society. Bauman criticizes Mannheim's concept of the freely floating intellectual for trying to revive the idea of intellectuals as legislators. Mannheim gives the intellectuals the mission of adjudicating between ideologies, to reveal them as partial and prejudiced world-views and to disclose their lack of universal foundation. The intellectual therefore, assumes a privileged position of independence above all particularised social locations and stands above the political world as analyst and critic (Bauman, 1987).

The irony, suggests Bauman, is that the concept of intellectuals was constituted at a time when the unity of reason was already breaking down. According to Bauman, modernist discourses assume that there is nothing beyond modernity – that it is progressive, inevitable and the highest point of development. For Bauman, postmodernism has exposed this myth, viewing modernity as "an enclosed object, an essentially complete product, an episode of history, with an end as much as a beginning" (p. 117). The objectification of modernity questions the authority claims upon which it is grounded, creating a crisis of confidence in the intellectual community. The belief in universal truth and judgement has been replaced by recognition that the validity of the judgement depends on the site from where it has been made and the authority ascribed to that site. Bauman argues that since the authority of intellectuals in no longer taken for granted, intellectuals must adopt a new, postmodern role of interpreters, which "consists of translating statements, made within one communally based tradition, so that they can be understood within the system of knowledge based on another tradition" (Bauman, 1987, p.5). In the interpreter role, legislative ambitions are abandoned, given the plurality of world-views. In a world where consensus on values is unlikely, the interpreter becomes a mediator of communication between communities, a specialist in the "art of civilized

conversation" (p.143) whose aim is conveying understanding, rather than making judgements. Bauman's position has similarities with Habermas (1991), whose model of communicative action is also based on mutual understanding and shared knowledge. However, while Bauman believes that consensus is unlikely, Habermas has faith in reason and the possibility of a rational consensus.

Foucault's (1980) target of critique is the "universal intellectual", which closely resembles Bauman's legislator role. Foucault opposes Left intellectuals (such as Jean-Paul Sartre) who purport to represent universal values and who purport to speak on behalf of others, such as the proletariat. The universal intellectuals are represented spatially as being outside, a positioning which gains legitimacy from a sense of detachment, which supposedly permits an objectivity and a sense of being able to see things in their true form. Foucault rejects this positioning on both ontological and political grounds. Ontologically, he rejects the idea that academics can be outside the "truth", instead locating them within a regime of truth through their production, control and dissemination of knowledge. For Foucault, truth is not outside power. Politically, he argues that the universal intellectual is not connected in practice with political struggles and therefore has little influence on these struggles. In "Truth and Power" Foucault claims the universal intellectual has been replaced by the "specific intellectual", who operates "within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them (housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family and sexual relations)" (1980, p.126).

Foucault is concerned with politics, however it is a different form of politics from those influenced by the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. Foucault's specific intellectuals necessarily occupy a specific position and engage with real, material, everyday struggles. He believes they are a potentially revolutionary force, not because they represent the truth of the oppressed, but because they can problematise systems of power/knowledge domination from their own location (Foucault, 1980).

The issue of representation is problematic for both Bauman and Foucault and raises doubts about the viability of academics engaging in critical public work. For the legislator or universal intellectual, their

primary role is representation, justified on the grounds that intellectuals have an external perspective that the masses do not, or that their job is to formulate the ideology for the class with which they choose to affiliate. In contrast, Bauman's interpreter merely conveys understanding and facilitates communication, while Foucault is hostile towards any role for intellectuals in representing the masses, seeing that as part of the problem, rather than the solution (Radhakrishnan, 1990). This concern, together with claims that academics, as intellectuals, can no longer credibly stand as the bearer of universal values, questions the legitimacy of academics' critical engagement with the public. If academics problematise the nature of concepts such as justice, truth and human rights, how can they engage meaningfully in public debate?

Rethinking the Critic and Conscience

The discourse theory of Laclau and Mouffe is an emerging analytical framework within organisation studies, offering an alternative to established approaches such as Foucauldian analysis and critical discourse analysis (Bridgman & Willmott, 2006; Willmott, 2005). Laclau and Mouffe's theorising has generated considerable interest within New Zealand, following the establishment of a month-long summer school programme at Victoria University in 2003. Courses are taken by leading international discourse theorists and attract faculty and postgraduate students from across the disciplinary spectrum. Of relevance to this paper is not Laclau and Mouffe's theory of discourse *per se*, but their articulation of a political space within which intellectuals can work.

Laclau and Mouffe draw upon structuralist, poststructuralist and psychoanalytic traditions to elaborate an approach that highlights the contingency of identity, thereby questioning the Marxist assumption that identity is determined by the part played out in the relations of production. Laclau and Mouffe (1985), for example, argue that classical Marxism's privileging of a class identity cannot account for the emergence of new social movements, which do not appear to be organised around class-consciousness. This critique can also be deployed to rethink conceptions of the social role of intellectuals that privilege a structural location within the relations of production. Gramsci,

for instance, believed that every class "creates together with itself, organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function" (1971, p.5). The role of the intellectual is to secure hegemony for the dominant class, or any class that seeks to replace it. From the perspective of Laclau and Mouffe, Gramsci goes beyond the concept of class in developing a theory of hegemony, yet retains a foundationalist position by assuming that class remains a single unifying principle.

Mannheim is another who develops his position on intellectuals on a class foundation. Despite positing that intellectuals are a "relatively classless stratum" (1991, p.137) and therefore freely-floating, Mannheim observes that in history intellectuals have always attached themselves to one class or another, since people from these classes are not capable of theorising their own position. Konrad and Szelenyi (1979) and Gouldner (1979) also refer to a structural location, arguing that intellectuals have become a new class in themselves, pretending to carry out the historical mission of the working class, but instead establishing their own class domination over the working class. This is not to suggest that these theorists conceive of the role of intellectuals as being determined by their part in the relations of production. However, Laclau and Mouffe provide a way of thinking about the role of intellectuals that does not rely on the concept of class, by seeing the identity of the intellectual as the product of a hegemonic struggle between competing political projects.

Laclau and Mouffe also provide a means for interrogating the idea of the sovereign individual with preconstituted interests, which is evident in Weber's conception of the value-free expert. For Weber, the vocational mission of the scientist is limited to providing value-free technical expertise that enables people to make informed choices between alternative courses of action. Scientists are constituted as value-free experts, heroically pursuing a project of progressive knowledge production within a specialised field of inquiry, totally unresponsive to questions of values, or the commercial exploitation of their work. Weber sees agents as motivated by preconstituted interests, such as vocation. From the perspective of Laclau and Mouffe, the identity

of the value-free specialist is seen as a contingent identity thrown up by a (positivist) project of progressive knowledge production (Bridgman & Willmott, 2007). Does this mean however, that we can no longer advocate any positive role for intellectuals? Can Laclau and Mouffe's work form the basis of a progressive politics and if so, what is the role of intellectuals? In the remainder of this section I suggest that the insights of Laclau and Mouffe do not inevitably lead to political nihilism, by using the concept of radical and plural democracy to articulate a positive role for the intellectual.

Laclau and Mouffe are notable for articulating a new political direction for Left politics. Far from neglecting the difficult political questions, the impetus for Laclau and Mouffe was very much political – a desire to reformulate the Left project in a way that connects the struggle of the working class and the struggle of new social movements. The concept of a *radical and plural democracy* is the nodal point of their political theory and it can be used to construct a positive role for academics as engaged critics who extend the boundaries of public debate.

Laclau and Mouffe's project of a radical and plural democracy attempts to defend the political content of the Enlightenment, such as justice, equality and freedom, whilst abandoning its epistemological foundations of the sovereign individual and reason. Mouffe argues that while democracy is the distinctive feature of modernity, postmodern thinking has recognised "the impossibility of any foundation or final legitimation that is constitutive of the very advent of the democratic form of society and thus of modernity itself" (Mouffe, 1998, p.34). Despite rejecting the foundations of modernity, Laclau and Mouffe believe this does not lead to political nihilism. Universality is an impossibility – an empty place that competing political struggles attempt to fill with meaning. In this context, the Enlightenment is read as one hegemonic articulation that competes to represent the universality of the social order, a horizon that is constructed through political argument. Far from ending up in a "relativist gloom" (Geras, 1987, p.67), this asserts the importance of continued political struggle, to defend positions from competing articulations that seek to transform and undermine them.

A radical and plural democracy is, therefore, the site of struggle between competing hegemonic articulations, where each seeks to fill the empty place of the universal, yet ultimately fails to do so. Laclau and Mouffe's position is distinct from Habermas (1987), for whom communicative action is the basis of a model of the public sphere which is oriented towards mutual understanding and common action. Both Laclau and Mouffe and Habermas highlight the importance of taking multiple perspectives into account, but Laclau and Mouffe preclude the possibility of any rational consensus, as envisaged by Habermas, on the basis that in a rational consensus relations of power will have disappeared – an impossibility since relations of power are constitutive of the social. Mouffe (1998) argues that Habermas, by theorising the possibility of a rational consensus, inadvertently undermines the democratic pluralist process. In Western democratic societies, this is leading to a consensus model where political parties from the Left and Right are congregating in the centre of the political spectrum, which reduces the opportunity for people to identify with alternative positions and contributes to disinterest and passivity in politics. For Laclau and Mouffe, a vibrant democracy is characterised by a "real struggle against different positions" (1999, p.25).

The project of radical and plural democracy is therefore about multiplicity, conflict and participation. I suggest that we can use it to rethink the role of intellectuals in society, and more specifically, to rethink the role of New Zealand academics as critic and conscience. In a radical and plural democracy, the function of intellectuals is to articulate positions that challenge received wisdom and by doing so widen the scope of democratic debate. This process of articulation takes place through active engagement with social movements engaged in political struggle. Intellectuals in a radical and plural democracy appeal to values, but recognise these values as social constructs that are the result of political struggle, rather than essential entities whose form and meaning is fixed for all time.

It is tempting to construct a label for this conception of the intellectual, since almost everyone engaged in the debate about the role of intellectuals does so. While it can be argued that faculty perform the

function of intellectuals, the signifier intellectual has little resonance with my academic colleagues. The term I prefer is "critical and engaged expert" (Bridgman, forthcoming). "Critical" implies that academics recognise as one of their primary roles the articulation of positions that challenge conventional ideas and received wisdom. Along with Mills, I see value in academics being unconstructive, in that it assists in creating an environment where prevailing ideas and attitudes can be scrutinised. In this way, being unconstructive, through offering critique, becomes constructive for a healthy democracy. "Engaged" implies that academics interact not only with students and other academics, but with audiences outside the university, such as businesses, government, think-tanks, political parties and journalists.

Consistent with Foucault, I reject the notion of the universal intellectual who is spatially represented as outside, which supposedly permits objectivity and an ability to see things in their true form. However, I would not go as far as Foucault in suggesting that academics have no privileged position from which to participate in political life. I would also not go as far as Bauman, whose interpreter forgoes all legislative ambitions and becomes a mediator of communication. The critical and engaged expert is privileged in the sense of having the time and other resources to contemplate and scrutinise social life that others outside the university do not possess. However, it does not follow that the knowledge they produce is objective and value-free. The critical and engaged expert acknowledges that they speak from a particular value orientation and they do not claim to speak the "truth". Their role is a political one – to secure hegemony for values such as justice, freedom and equality that construct a horizon for social transformation.

Being the Critic and Conscience in New Zealand: Issues, challenges and opportunities

What then, of the challenges and opportunities for the performance of this activity in New Zealand? The prospects for the New Zealand critic and conscience has attracted considerable interest in recent years, following a symposium on the public intellectual held at University of Auckland in 2003 and the publication of a series of interviews with New

Zealand public intellectuals (Simmons, 2007). The term public intellectuals rests uncomfortably with me, as it does with many of those featuring in the book, largely because of what is regarded as the anti-intellectualism of New Zealanders.

Horrocks (2007) identifies numerous sources of New Zealand's anti-intellectualism, starting with our small population, isolation and ruralism. Prevailing colonial attitudes are blamed for the suppression of Maori intellectual activity while puritanism and egalitarianism have, argued Horrocks, created a fear of difference. Another significant factor is New Zealand's pioneer culture, which privileges Kiwi ingenuity and undervalues academic achievement (Horrocks, 2007; Roberts, 1999). Turner (2007, p.85) sums it up nicely when he states that "just talking about public intellectuals makes you...a wanker rather than a well-rounded bloke".

In addition to the challenge of confronting anti-intellectualism, the New Zealand critic and conscience is seen to be threatened by an "enterprise culture" (Du Gay, 1996) within our universities. Through an application of a revolutionary new-right agenda state intervention in society has been reduced in many areas and redefined in others, involving processes of corporatisation, privatisation, commercialisation and marketisation. The university has not been immune to this transformation, with managerialism seemingly taking an ever stronger hold (Larner & Le Heron, 2005). This shapes not just its teaching and research functions, but also prompts concern about academic freedom and the future of the critic and conscience in this environment (Roberts, 1999; Savage, 2000). With New Zealand universities increasingly reliant on external sponsors and concerned with their brand image in a competitive tertiary sector, the fear is that academics will hesitate to go public with controversial positions that might raise the ire of university management.

This pessimistic assessment was made before the introduction of the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF), which encourages New Zealand academics to write for other academics rather than the public, with career advancement largely based on publication in journals that are read only by fellow academics. In writing about the United States,

Jacoby (1987) identifies this professionalisation of academic labour as a key contributor to the decline of the public intellectual. Jacoby believes that "for many professors in many universities academic freedom meant nothing more than the freedom to be academic" (p. 118). It remains to be seen what the effect of the PBRF on critic and conscience activity in New Zealand will be.

It is worth noting that Simmons' collection of New Zealand public intellectuals includes no representatives from either management studies or sociology (2007). It has two from history and one each from economics, religious studies, law, public policy and Maori studies, as well as a journalist, protest activist and a poet. Perhaps we should not be surprised at this. Turner (2006) attributes the "modest achievements of British sociology" (p. 175) and the dearth of British sociologist public intellectuals in part to anti-intellectualism and individualism, both of which are influential in New Zealand. The phenomenon of management school academics as critic and conscience appears an even greater contradiction, given the primacy of concepts such as the knowledge economy and the role of management schools in it.

This makes the intervention by Prichard in the Trade Me debate interesting and unusual. It is also a useful illustration of the position of critical and engaged expert. Prichard is certainly critical, since he articulated a position that opposed the tide of positive feelings surrounding the Trade Me sale. Sadly, his challenge to the mainstream media's construction of the story did not receive adequate consideration, probably because it was considered to be outside the realm of acceptable political debate in New Zealand at this time. Instead of generating a lively discussion, all that resulted was a personal attack. Prichard was definitely engaged, taking it on himself to produce a press release. Finally, it is reasonable to conclude that Prichard was an expert in this area, given his academic background and positioning within a school of management. Crucially however, this notion of expertise is not wedded to any appeal to impartiality, objectivity or a claim to be speaking the "truth". It might have been informed by a Marxist critique of capitalist political economy, but the point is that such a foundation should not be viewed as essential to acting as the critic and conscience. Prichard's

intervention into the Trade Me debate was most definitely a political intervention based on a particular set of values and no apology need be made for this. Those who lauded the Trade Me sale also did so from a particular value position, but since these values are hegemonic within mainstream media discourse, they largely escape critical scrutiny. Prichard's actions were exactly the kind of critic and conscience work we should be engaging in.

Despite the feelings of pessimism that linger around the prospects for the New Zealand academic as critic and conscience, there is some cause for optimism. There is some hope of critic and conscience activity being valued as part of service and/or a contribution to the research environment in the PBRF. It is pleasing that a search of New Zealand university websites finds numerous references to the critic and conscience obligations of these institutions. University of Otago, for instance, actively promotes *Dare to be Wise*, a collection of columns in major daily newspapers written by its academics on issues of public concern. Initiatives such as this are useful ways of promoting the institution and they also satisfy demands from external stakeholders for relevance (Bridgman, forthcoming). Paradoxically then, there are also opportunities for the preservation of the critic and conscience in a competitive New Zealand tertiary sector, even if undertaken for partly or wholly instrumental reasons.

Finally, it is important to recognise the potential costs of sticking one's head above the parapet. Jane Kelsey, a staunch supporter of the critic and conscience position and herself an outspoken critic on a range of social and political issues, believes the role comes with "significant emotional, psychological risk, because it can get quite nasty and vicious" (Kelsey, 2007, p.147). Prichard's foray into the Trade Me issue took considerable courage and it would have been far easier to confine his views to his CMS colleagues, from whom he would most likely have received a sympathetic hearing. He, and others like him, deserve our active support.

Conclusion

Literature on the social role of intellectuals provides valuable insights into how a critical public role for New Zealand academics can be theorised. In reviewing seminal contributions from Weber to Foucault, I have identified constructions of intellectuals which draw on discourses of reason, science and universality, as well as conceptions which problematise these discourses. In the former, intellectuals stand apart from and above the masses on the basis of their superior knowledge. Alternative conceptions reject this identity in favour of a positioning of intellectual activity within a specific and local site. Taken to its extreme, these positions denounce any privileged role for academics.

Consistent with the philosophical premises of Laclau and Mouffe, the critical and engaged expert can be located somewhere between the positions of Weber and Mills and those of Bauman and Foucault. Bauman and Foucault's ideas are useful for rethinking the social role of intellectuals, but they go too far by abandoning the notion of a politicised role for university faculty connected to a coherent political project. Faculty can appeal to concepts such as justice, fairness and rights, but in the knowledge that these concepts are the product of political struggle, rather than essential, natural entities whose meaning is secure for all time. They can continue to legislate but without making claims to universality. The concept of radical and plural democracy is a horizon that can guide political activity by academics without an appeal to foundations. Far from breeding nihilism and anti-politics, the insights of Laclau and Mouffe demonstrate the primacy of politics and the vital role that New Zealand academics can play as a force for social change.

References

Alvesson, M & Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical management studies.* London: Sage.

Bauman, Z. (1987). *Legislators and interpreters: On modernity, post-modernity and intellectuals.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Bridgman, T. (forthcoming) .Reconstituting relevance: Exploring possibilities for management educators' critical engagement with the public. *Management Learning.*

Bridgman, T & Willmott, H. (2006). Institutions and technology: Frameworks for understanding organizational change – the case of a major IT outsourcing contract, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 42(1), 110-126.

Bridgman, T. & Willmott, H. (2007). Academics in the 'knowledge economy': From expert to intellectual? In C. Burtscher, A. Harding, S. Laske, & A. Scott (Eds.): *Bright satanic mills: Universities, regional development and the knowledge economy* (pp. 149-162). Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.

Du Fresne, K. (21 March, 2006). An assassin in academia. *Dominion Post*, B4.

Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.

Education Act (1989). Wellington: Government Printer.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and Power. In C. Gordon (Ed.):*Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-77* (pp.109-133.). New York: Pantheon.

Gaynor, B. (2006, March 11). Let's hear it for the Trade Me genius. *New Zealand Herald*, Retrieved 10 November, 2006 from Newztext database.

Geras, N. (1987). Post-marxism? *New Left Review*, 163(May-June), 40-82.

Gouldner, A. (1979). *The future of intellectuals and the rise of the new class*. London: Macmillan.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selection from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action*. Cambridge: Polity.

Habermas, J. (1991). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Cambridge: Polity

Horrocks, R. (2007). A short history of 'the New Zealand intellectual'. In L. Simmons (Ed.): *Speaking Truth to Power* (pp. 25-67). Auckland: Auckland University Press,

Jacoby, R. (1987). *The last intellectuals: American culture in the age of academe*. New York: Basic Books.

Kelsey, J. (2007). Jane Kelsey. In L. Simmons (Ed.): *Speaking Truth to Power* (pp. 141-162). Auckland: Auckland University Press,.

Konrad, G. & Szelenyi, I. (1979). *The intellectuals on the road to class power*. Brighton: Harvester.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1999). *An interview with Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau*. [Accessed February 25, 2007]. http://www.english.ilstu.edu/strickland/495/laclau2.html.

Larner, W. & Le Heron, R. (2005). Neo-liberalizing spaces and subjectivities: Reinventing New Zealand universities. *Organization*, 12(6), 843-862.

Levermore, E. (2006, 8 March). Sam's gran proud of his online success. *Southland Times*. Retrieved 10 November 2006 from Newztext database.

Mannheim, K. (1991). *Ideology and utopia*. London: Routledge.

Mills, C. W. (1951). *White collar: The American middle classes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. W. (1958). *The causes of World War Three*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mouffe, C. (1998). Radical democracy: Modern or postmodern? In Ross, A. (Ed.): *Universal abandon? The politics of postmodernism* (pp. 31-45). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Prichard, C. (2006). *Sale of Trade Me a Lost Opportunity*. Massey University Press Release http://masseynews.massey.ac.nz/2006/Press_Releases/03-15-05.html

Radhakrishnan, R. (1990). Toward an effective intellectual: Foucault or Gramsci? In Robbins, B. (Eds.): *Intellectuals: Aesthetics, politics, academics* (pp. 57-99). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Roberts, P. (1999). The future of the university: Reflections from New Zealand. *International Review of Education*, 45(1), 65-85.

Savage, D. C. (2000). Academic freedom and institutional autonomy in New Zealand universities. In R. Crozier (Ed.), *Troubled Times: Academic Freedom in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Simmons, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Speaking Truth to Power*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Trade Me Sale Too Much Money for Too Few, Says Massey Professor. (2006, March 15). *National Business Review*, Retrieved November 10, 2006 from

ttp://www.nbr.co.nz/home/column_article.asp?id=14652&cid=4&cname=

Turner, B. (2006). British sociology and public intellectuals: consumer society and imperial decline. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(2), 169-188.

Turner, S. (2007). The public intellectual is a dog. In L. Simmons (Ed.), *Speaking Truth to Power* (pp. 85-101). Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Weber, M. (1949). The meaning of "ethical neutrality" in sociology and economics. In Shils, E and Finch, H. (Eds.): *Max Weber on the methodology of the social sciences* (pp.1-47.). Illinois: Free Press.

Weber, M. (1989). Science as a vocation. In Lassman, P. and Velody, I. (Eds.): *Max Weber's 'science as a vocation'* (pp.3-31). London: Unwin Hyman.

Willmott, H. (2005). Theorizing contemporary control: Some post-structuralist responses to some critical realist questions, *Organization*, 12(5), 747-780.

Todd Bridgman is a lecturer in organisational behaviour at Victoria University of Wellington. He was previously a postdoctoral fellow at the Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, where he completed his PhD. His doctoral thesis, which was judged best doctoral thesis in Critical Management Studies at the Academy of Management 2005, investigates the commercialisation of the academic's public role. He is currently co-editing a *Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (Oxford University Press).

Young, Working, Studying: Labour Market Patterns and Education Sector Expansion

Catherine Casey and Kate Williamson

Abstract

Simultaneous participation in post-compulsory education and labour markets has emerged as a pattern consequent of both the liberalisation of employment relations and the expansion of post-compulsory education in the OECD countries over the past two decades. This article, based on an empirical study conducted in New Zealand in 2005 and 2006, discusses students combining study and employment. The article argues that although students seek to maximise the benefits associated with their employment, employers ultimately gain more in the short and long-term from a significant pool of low-cost, low-investment, highly flexible labour.

Introduction

Young people are engaging in post-secondary education in unprecedented numbers, and many of these young people are simultaneously active participants in the world of work. The development of a pattern of close interaction between post-compulsory education and labour market participation is occurring in the context of work practices that are emerging as New Zealand pursues official policies on developing a knowledge-based economy in the wake of the neo-liberal orthodoxies of the 1980s and 1990s. This article observes and analyses some of the young student-workers who, as a cohort, are generally expecting to participate in knowledge-intensive technical and professional work in a burgeoning technologically mediated knowledge-based economy and who are participating as core labour force in a range of low-skilled and contingent service sector jobs.

Much has been written about the changing patterns of employment relations under the liberalisation of the labour market since the 1980s, and this current study adds a further discussion of continuing effects

and trends of that neo-liberalisation trajectory. Are these young student-workers unfairly bearing the brunt of labour market policies that favour contingent and flexible employment relations? Is their labouring activity shaping and normalising 'non-standard' work practices and employment relations that may have longer-term consequences for power and control over work and in workplaces? This study draws on the theoretical orientation of both critical labour process traditions (e.g., Braverman, 1974; Casey, 1995; Knights and Willmott, 1990; Littler and Salaman, 1984; Thompson, 1983) and critical organisational studies (e.g., Alvesson, and Willmot, 1992; Casey, 2002; Fleetwood and Ackroyd, 2004; Grey and Willmott, 2005) but also, importantly, addresses the intersection of these work and organisational practices with current trends in tertiary education. The particular contribution of this study is its crucial linkage of labour market dynamics with the expansion of tertiary education in the OECD countries, and in New Zealand in particular.

The article delineates the contours of the current context in which student workers are located, with a particular focus on the socio-economic and political developments since the 1980s that have produced observable patterns in the labour market, in production organisations, and education. It offers an interpretive discussion of an empirical study that was conducted in New Zealand in 2005 and 2006.

Work, employment regulation, and education

Across Western countries a number of significant trends in labour markets, education systems and the economy more generally have shaped the current context within which young people enter the world of work and post-compulsory education and training. The intersection of these forces provides the context for paid employment amongst young secondary and tertiary students. Through the 1980s and 90s New Zealand underwent a much-documented and criticised period of liberalised deregulation and labour market reform. The remarkably rapid rise of shareholder grip on organisational intent fuelled a drive, not only for improved production efficiencies as was politically extolled at the

time of the 1980s reforms, but for heightened managerial strategic action for singular goals of profit maximization at the expense of other social imperatives linked to economic activity.

The emphasis on deregulation as a means of stimulating economic growth significantly included a deregulated and flexible labour market. At the forefront of the neo-liberal discourse was the revived notion of individual economic freedom that undermined the existing "social citizenship" model (Ladipo and Wilkinson, 2002). The Employment Contracts Act in 1991 devolved collective bargaining to the enterprise level and diminished restrictions on employers (Brosnan and Walsh, 1996; Honeybone, 1997; Morrison, 2003; Spoonley et al., 2004) which led to the individualisation of employment relations and strengthening of managerial prerogative, setting a new climate for employment practice in New Zealand. A decade later, the enactment of the Employment Relations Act in 2000 attempted to restore some balance in employment relations through revitalising the role of unions and collective bargaining. However despite these legislative changes the legacy of individualised employment relationships, and of deregulated employment practices, remains intact. The diminishment of collective action in shaping employment relations, the rise of individual employment contracts accommodating deregulated economic action and a labour market demand for higher skills stimulated an environment of heightened competitiveness and uncertainty. In place of the altered role of social citizenship and worker protection against the extremes of economic rationalities, arose – in policy rhetoric – a new and vigorous role for education.

The positive relationship between education and work and improved prosperity for individuals has long been evident, and immense development and expansion of schooling to near-universal levels of participation until age 15 in the developed societies has been followed by a generalised policy movement in the OECD countries toward the expansion of post-school education and training to a mass population. In April 2000 the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission (TEAC) was charged with developing the sector to aid development of a knowledge society. TEAC states that "the tertiary education system represents a

major investment in the development of the knowledge society that New Zealand aspires to" (2001, p.15) and that "a quality tertiary education system will be the key generator of the innovation, competencies, attributes, and knowledge that contribute to achieving the five national strategic goals" (TEAC, 2001, p.15). There is little argument in policy circles that the expansion of the tertiary sector is vital for the development of a knowledge-based economy. Critics, however, argue that these policies are double edged. They may promote participation in tertiary education but simultaneously exacerbate applications of neo-liberal theories of human capital that have directed the reorganisation of education systems across western countries (Casey, 2004; Peters, 2001; Wolf, 2002). Critics point out that the current emphasis on knowledge as the central economic resource has been prompted by international organisations such as the OECD, World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These international discourses on the knowledge society and knowledge economy demand employment oriented lifelong education and training to meet knowledge economy demands. Again critics point out that this economically driven conception and role of education now overshadows and diminishes the intrinsic benefits of learning and the role of education in creating a civil society (Brown et al., 2003; Wolf, 2002; Yorke 2003).

Alongside the rapid deregulation of employment relations, the tertiary education reform in New Zealand formulated new mechanisms for funding tertiary education that included vastly increased private funding and student fees. At the same time demands for greatly expanded participation in tertiary education to meet the economy's needs for more highly skilled workers were vigorously promulgated (Casey, 2006; Kelsey, 1997; New Zealand Department of Education, 1989; Peters, 1997; Vaughan and Boyd, 2005). A new era in the tertiary education sector, based on competitiveness and commercial focus, signalled a shift from highly state-funded tertiary education system to a mass, user-pays system.

The conditions sketched above have significantly shaped the experiences and expectations of young people negotiating education and employment in the early twenty-first century. Evidence indicates that up to two thirds of students combine education with employment (Maloney, 2004; NZVCC 1998). As the labour market has become more flexible and the economy has generated a diverse service sector a rise in non-standard jobs[1] has become evident. Young people, entering tertiary education for which they or their parents must pay, find themselves forging a new convergence of labour market interests with student interests. The deregulated and services-intensive labour market has generated more opportunity and demand for student employment with ensuing complexities of outcomes. Some sectors of the economy now rely heavily on the employment of students as a ready source of flexible, low-cost, and compliant workers. We now examine some of the experiential effects and outcomes of New Zealand's pursuit of a knowledge-based economy, altered work patterns, and emphatic expansion of tertiary education.

Working students

To date much of the New Zealand and international literature that examines student employment has focused on describing the extent of student employment and the effect of employment on educational outcomes, the financial position of students, and the benefits and disadvantages of term-time employment. Studies in the United Kingdom have described aspects of work and study and variables that affect participation levels (Canny, 2002; Curtis and Shani, 2002; Ford et al., 1995; Hodgson and Spours 2001; Lucas and Lammont 1998; Lucas and Ralston1997; Metcalf 2003). Overall the consensus amongst these studies is that the phenomenon of full-time students in term-time employment has become more widespread. Curtis and Lucas (2001, p.39) summarise: "it is no longer appropriate to assume that being a student is a full-time occupation, except for a privileged few from high-income families". Some

1 Non-standard work are those forms of employment that diverge from the standard model of working, typically characterised by permanent, open-ended, full-time employment that is governed by a formal contract (Felstead and Jewson, 1999).

studies have also highlighted the potential for learning experiences from employment to be incorporated into education (Harvey et al., 1998; Yorke, 2003).

In the United Kingdom studies have described the relationship between students and employers as a "coincidence of varying interests" (Lucas and Ralston, 1996 p.24) where an increase in the availability of part-time and temporary employment has converged with the willingness of students to take up positions that can be fitted around, or in some cases in place of, their educational commitments (Ford et al., 1995). Hodgson and Spours (2001) identify specific conditions that have facilitated student employment, including the availability of 24 hour service, weekend trading, the potential debt burden associated with further education and marketing of expensive consumer items targeted at young people. Elsewhere students have been described as flexible workers with the most flexibility (Lucas and Ralston, 1997) where employers can take advantage of students' willingness to work variable and unsociable hours, as well as their intelligence, level of education, communication abilities, discipline and willingness to learn (Curtis and Lucas, 2001; Lucas and Ralston, 1997). Predominantly studies have indicated that students are employed for financial reasons (Christie et al., 2001; Ford et al., 1995; ; Hodgson and Spours 2001; Lucas and Lammont 1998; Lucas and Ralston, 1997). However Hakim (1998, p.145) argues that "financial need has not been the sole, nor even the main driving force behind the rising trend in student jobs", noting that evidence from the United States and the United Kingdom shows that levels of participation are higher amongst students from more affluent backgrounds. In New Zealand research is emerging in this area. Manthei and Gilmore (2005, p.212) note the variety of student experience and challenge the idea of the "leisurely student life".

In 2005-2006 we conducted an empirical study of young university students' involvement in work and study. The study involved a survey of undergraduate students, followed by in-depth interviews with students who were working and studying simultaneously. The survey established general information about the extent and scale of student participation in employment. Data collection involved the distribution of 420 self-

administered survey questionnaires to students after lectures. Of the questionnaires that were distributed, 400 were returned and 384 of these were used in the analysis.[2] The survey comprised questions about students' educational activities, paid employment during semester time and their views of paid employment. Once the data had been collected the open-ended responses were coded into categories based on themes generated from the data. Descriptive statistics were produced from the survey data. The method of administering the survey favoured participants who were studying toward degrees in business/economics (85.5 percent, although some of these students were studying conjoint degrees: Arts, Law, Engineering) and were in their first year of study (58.4 percent).

Following the survey, 32 semi-structured interviews were conducted with students who were simultaneously engaging in full-time undergraduate studies and working part-time. Participants were recruited using a snowball sampling approach. The students represented a range of ethnic backgrounds and were aged between 18 and 26. Interview participants were studying toward degrees in Arts, Sciences and Commerce, Law, Planning, Engineering and Pharmacy. One fifth of interview participants were studying two degrees conjointly. Interviews lasted for approximately 45 minutes and were conducted by one of the authors.[3]

Findings

1. Types of work and contractual arrangements

Term-time employment was very prevalent with 55 percent of those surveyed engaging in paid employment simultaneously with full-time study. The survey and interview data show that student employment clustered into specific occupational groupings that have come to typify the sectors in which contingent organisational structures and flexible

2 Responses from people who were not undergraduate students, aged 25 years or younger, or studying a full-time course load were removed from the data set.

3 Questions explored the experiences, tensions, problems and rewards of managing the dual roles of employment and study. Interviews were audio taped and fully transcribed.

employment relations are more commonly practised: call centre work; general office, administrative and accounting; customer service, including retail sales, supermarket operatives, hospitality and catering work in hotels, cafés and restaurants; tutoring and teaching assistance; trades work, including landscaping, house painting and general maintenance; domestic and childcare work. Most of the jobs performed were of low skill and variety and often characterised as boring and unfulfilling. Typically students remained in the same job for between six months and one year, although the survey demonstrated that 17.4 percent of employed students had been in their job for at least two years.

The survey showed that 36 percent of all students reported working for at least 10 hours each week, however there was significant variation in the number of hours worked. Of employed students almost one third (28.1 percent) indicated that their paid work hours differed each week suggesting some degree of work hours flexibility. Interviewees' working hours ranged from four to thirty hours per week and the majority of jobs ordinarily involved a fixed number of hours per week although some allowed a degree of work flexibility, for better or worse. Some task based jobs enabled employees to have some discretion over when they did their work and students with fixed or rostered work had some flexibility in being able to re-negotiate their hours to fit their new class schedules. Two students had requested fixed rosters so that they had some certainty about their work time, and could therefore better manage their study commitments. The nature of some jobs allowed for very little work-time flexibility.

Students' attitudes and rationale toward participating in paid employment varied considerably: "it's purely financial based – yeah it's just a matter of earning money. I mean I don't enjoy particularly what I do for work, there's nothing stimulating or interesting about it" and: "I had to, it was that [work] or starve more than anything, I had no choice really, if I didn't do it I wouldn't eat". For one respondent: "it was about passion and loving the organisation, there was a gap in the organisation that needed to be filled and I was the person who was probably best

suited to the job at the time and really glad I did it". Another respondent who worked as a mentor of secondary school students reports that: "(the job) is fulfilling, that's cool, even though it's a lot of hard work".

The most frequently cited reason (85 percent of interviewees) for undertaking term-time employment was to earn money, although this could be framed positively. One student sums this up: "having to work's a pain, but I suppose that's half the interesting side of university". Another states: "in an ideal world I would like to not work at all, but yeah, I think probably one day a week would be my preference just because I would rather get As than Cs and just have more leisure time as well because I feel like I don't have any of that either". Many students made comments that indicated that work had become a normalised aspect of student life. As one of the participants stated: "I don't really respect people that don't work while studying, I think it's a luxury to not have to work". For another: "normally it was about just getting a job, you know, I was like, oh, get a job... I've been working since I was 15, so I have to get a job here and as a student it's just kind of a concept, you know as a student you have to have a part-time job". And another: "I've been working since I was 13, so I'm 21 now so it's kind of like it's just always been like that". In spite of the general acceptance of term-time employment there continues to exist a tension between time spent at work and the financial gains of working: "I didn't think I'd overly enjoy going to work 25 hours a week while I was studying but knew I, well I like having money, I like buying things".

For the most part however, the non-financial motivations for employment were centred on the benefits of having term-time employment, rather than the jobs themselves, especially for students in jobs that respondents described as "boring", "demoralising" or "unfulfilling". These were expressed as short term or immediate benefits, such as employment being a social activity, a non-academic challenge and providing what was seen as a "legitimate" break from studying. Some students, especially those living in the family home, also felt employment was a means of achieving freedom and independence. Working allowed space, as one respondent succinctly

expressed it, to: "have one day at work and to let yourself just not think about uni".

2. Benefits, costs, trade-offs

Almost all of the interviewees indicated that they had developed skills through their student employment. Half of these considered organisational and time management skills to be important in managing work and study, and the acquisition of these skills, along with communication skills, confidence and general life skills, were viewed as having long-term benefits. Other positive aspects of working and studying included learning about practical aspects of working, including general work habits or "work etiquette", and in a few cases having a practical application of knowledge acquired through their studies. General work experience was also considered to enhance future employment prospects.

Stress and tiredness associated with managing the dual roles of work and study was the most significant cost. For some people this was compounded further by the stressful nature of their work, and employment crowded out social and leisure activities. One third of interviewees explicitly identified that term-time work compromised their studies. One full-time student working 20 hours per week reported that working "definitely has an effect on overall grades". Another who worked a similar number of hours stated: "I initially got by by ditching the study, which wasn't the best thing to do and so my grades dropped from Bs down to Cs and so I picked them back up again", while another reported: "I think with the exception of probably one paper, I haven't done my best at all, in any of my time at uni".

In some cases, financial circumstances permitting, students had recognised the effect work had on their studies and had modified their work arrangements in response to this. Others were fitting their study requirements around their employment and their need to earn an adequate income. One student considered herself fortunate to be employed in a specialist field and therefore would not compromise her work hours for fear of having her job usurped by other students. She reports:

> I try not to mess with my hours just because I'm lucky to be able to work there, there's a lot of sort of competition from optometry students to work there, and so I kind of leave it alone as much as possible... I don't take any time off during the study break.

Some interviewees had found jobs that particularly suited students as they were able to study while working. One person described her work as an ideal place to study:

> I work right through exams because it forces me to sit in one place, whereas at home I'd get up late, lounge around, whereas there is nothing really to do [at work], there's nowhere to go... I can't leave and I've got a computer right there.

Many students also highlighted the social benefits of working, in particular developing friendships and having fun at work. An interviewee working in engineering reports: "there's a good kind of sense of comradeship, it's good out with the lads on the site". Similarly, one person working in retail reports: "having fun, the hours that I work... it's mostly students when I work and everyone's just laid back and just there for the money so we just have fun". For another: "my experience at work is closely paralleled to my relationship with the guys [I work with] and I look forward to going to work now".

In addition to these positive reports, personal costs of simultaneously working and studying were reported. Two of the interview participants reported having breakdowns and another had severely cut back both her work and study describing herself being "the closest to burn out that I've ever been". Another student outlined the physical costs of work and study:

> working makes an impact, especially when it means that a couple of days in a row you're working 12, 15 hours a day because you're going straight from university or work, or you do five days a week [at uni] and work two days a week, it really takes its toll... that's when you really start to notice it and you find you're getting quite ill, quite run down... that's when I started to sort of ease off on one thing or the other is when I start not feeling too good... [I ease off] bits of everything but the only thing I don't ease off on is work because I can't.

The majority of interviewees maintained a distinction between 'student' work and 'real' work. This view appeared to facilitate a trade-off between the necessity of their participation and its temporariness. One reports of her job:

> It's very repetitive, it's very you know, do the same kind of thing every day it gets you know, you kind of become frustrated with having the same day over and over again. Yeah, so I'd like to have you know in the future, I'd like to have a job where ... you get diverse work and .... interactions with people and .... do different sorts of things each day, not just automatically the same thing.

Another student working in a supermarket reports: "I suppose it's kind of frustrating working in a job like I do knowing that I could sort of do better than that but I know it's only a short term sort of means to an end".

3. *Self-management and relations with employers*

For most students achieving a balance between paid and unpaid work, study, finances, academic grades, social and personal life, family and a healthy lifestyle involves some trade-offs and in some cases these pressures had significant consequences. One student, quoting from a North American course catalogue, expressed his view: "at university there are three things, there is an academic life, there's a social life and there's sleep, you only have time for two. I think that that's actually pretty accurate really". While the normative expectations among North American college students of term-time may not include paid employment, for this interviewee the expression portrays the tensions in student life. However, this is not universal with two interview participants feeling that they had very little difficulty combining work and study.

The majority of interviewees suggested that their employers, and people generally, have an expectation that students should be able to successfully manage full-time study and part-time employment. This sometimes manifested itself in a lack of understanding about the demands of university life. One interviewee reports: "I think they [employers] still think, 'oh, when I went to university it was just drinking

and women' and things like this and I think they just have this real mentality of students don't do any work". Many respondents reported that employers regarded them as just an employee, without recognition of their other life as a student. One student reports:

> .... there's an attitude [among employers] that students don't do any work and 'they can just work for us instead', so that was always a bit of an issue trying to convince them that no, I'm doing engineering and it's a heck of a lot of work and it takes up quite a lot of time.

For the most part participants felt that they could adequately manage their work and study commitments, despite reporting some difficulties. One participant reported having rotating shift work in a call centre with shifts of variable lengths over seven days a week. Reconciling the effect of this was difficult: "the inconsistency and the planning and if it's routine, studying routine can be quite difficult in that environment where you're always changing", yet he also claimed that: "the lack of routine keeps you fresh". However, "what becomes flexible is your study time". Although students reported being able to negotiate their work and study relatively well they simultaneously reported tensions and difficulties in dealings with employers.

A few respondents reported that some employers were aware of the pressures of student life and allowed for, as one student described, "a mutual learning process" between employer and employee: "When I joined them they made it clear that they'd be flexible for ... exams so they're quite happy to fit in where I need them to. If I want extra hours or days off I can do that". Another says "there's been a few times where I've had an assignment due at 4 o'clock [that afternoon] and I've phoned up and said, you know, I'm going to be late".

Among students who did have some degree of flexibility in their employment, or felt that their employer made allowances for their studies, there was sometimes a sense of obligation to the employer and a view that this was a privilege being provided by their employer. One person who had worked at a hotel reports:

> the reason I worked there for three years was that I had such a great boss, he was so lenient and if I said I had university then he understood but when he said, 'look I know you've got university, I know you've got a class but it's really important' then it must have been really important and I was happy to come and help, but it was just a bit of flexibility.

Another reports:

> I think mainly because I've been there such a length of time they sort of know my situation and are sort of willing to accommodate and they know that when I'm not at university, like during the holidays, I am there and willing to work, and so sort of they don't pester me really during semesters.

A minority of interviewees expressed critical views of their employers' use of their flexible labour. One who worked 20 hours per week reported: "I didn't really like what they [XX Employer] had to offer. I guess a lot of what I saw at [XX Employer] was to me student exploitation". Another who had worked in a casual hospitality job for a year described his experience:

> You soon open your eyes up to that, I think because a lot of their employees were uni students and they [employer] had their stories which they used to get people to come along [to work] because they know we're all busy but they're not like an employer that when we graduate we'll be looking at working for and so they don't really care about when we graduate. They're not kind of worried about that because they're just going to lose employees when we all graduate and they're always kind of make the most out of us while we're still studying and I think from a business point of view it makes sense.

For another:

> the hotel industry loves students because it means lower pay and on their busy times, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, they know they've got their numbers there, I know through other hotels they've started to take on more and more students because they found the university students capable and they're in the city pretty much every day of the week and they're always looking for work.

One person also working in hospitality tried to resist employer-driven flexibility: "sometimes you get people calling you in, like they ask you, oh, can you come into work and sometimes, oh, I don't know ... I kind of find it hard to say no to people... I tend not to leave my cell phone number at work... if they can't find me, they can't find me".

Student work and labour market dynamics

1. Exploitation or opportunity?

The practice of students working and studying simultaneously raises an array of questions about the organisation of education and employment practices. From the vantage point of higher education concerns arise about the implications of this growing practice for the quality of higher education experience and the traditional norms of student participation in advanced study (Belfield, 2003; Wolf, 2002). These concerns and the questions that arise from them, although important, are not the focus of this paper. Here, regarding students as workers, concerns arise in regard to the use of student labour and of this sector of workers in relation to other workers in an uneven labour market. This interplay of questions to which we now turn illustrates the current intermeshing of work and education that our sample of student workers now experience as everyday life.

The highly influential policies pursuing a knowledge-based economy have immediate implications for students, through the expansion of tertiary education and the necessary policy implications of this, but also wider effects in the jobs that serve, and those that constitute the knowledge-based economy. Policies and strategies designed to reach knowledge-based economy measures include a much-expanded tertiary education sector and what the OECD has termed mass participation in post-compulsory education and training. These policies, notwithstanding their wider governmental appeal (Brown et al., 2003; Casey, 2006; Green, 2006), encounter emerging evidence that labour market returns to participants in tertiary education are variable. The general movement toward mass participation in tertiary education, with its many complexities and debates (Brown et al., 2001; Casey, 2006; Wolf, 2002), presents some immediately visible features: more students are

participating in tertiary education, they are responsible for much of its costs, they pay fees and incur debt, and work part-time throughout their degrees. Our data suggests that a majority of tertiary education students in New Zealand now miss out on the full immersion experience in university life. Their participation in these labour market and education practices constitutes an economic trajectory that seeks both an aggregation of higher skills for potential labour market utilisation, and an immediate labour market utilisation in lower skilled jobs. These latter jobs are both excluded from and serve the knowledge-based economy of official pursuit.

From the material above, it is evident that student workers experience and negotiate a complex set of arrangements and demands. As a population in the labour market, they are necessarily of mixed positioning: they are depicted simultaneously as both students and workers, and they uniformly self-identify as students who are secondarily working. A first analytical question that arises in respect to student workers pertains to their risk of exploitation. Are these young student-workers unfairly bearing the brunt of labour market policies that favour contingent and flexible employment relations? Is their higher education, for which they and their parents are paying, and for which government policies over the past decade are strongly advocating, being simultaneously undermined and compromised by students' labour market participation?

The reports from interviewees cited above indicate a high degree of student expectation to work, and confidence in their self-management of their dual roles. They indicate students' efforts to accommodate the demands of their jobs, including the low stimulation or boring aspects, into their lives through finding benefits in workplace sociality, humour, rudimentary forms of skill development, and useful self-disciplines. Some indicate at least self-reported abilities to negotiate with employers to achieve mutually acceptable hours of work (although none of the students reported participation in collective or trade union roles in wage bargaining). These benefits and compensatory accomplishments must not be discounted. However, the question of effects of term-time labour market work on students' lives cannot be assumed to be largely positive.

Even though, as our study revealed, a majority of full-time students are currently working too, the increasing normalisation of this practice warrants interrogation.

Only one of the respondents reported experiences that they explicitly construed as exploitative. A high majority reported their participation in labour market work, even in low-paid, low-skilled jobs, as driven by necessity, and therefore an immediate opportunity to satisfy immediate needs. In addition many endeavoured to find opportunity beyond income satisfaction in the meeting of other social goals and future development. This data does not present a case of a singular trajectory of student exploitation. A cursory view of the data at hand and of a general observation of the student-worker sector in the labour market may suggest an apparent convergence of employer and student interests, with the as yet unknown effects on higher education qualities a matter for industry adjustment.

A closer interrogation, however, reveals more critical concern. Employers are gaining the most short and long-term benefits from the availability of student labour. Student workers, as our data indicates, provide a ready source of low-cost, low-demand, low-investment labour. In exchange for low wages and some trade-off for examination schedules, employers for the most part provide contingent jobs with low commitment and no developmental opportunity. Students do not and cannot exploit the labour market in which they are employed in this capacity. At best they may manipulate some advantage through their self-styled trade-off of costs and benefits. At the same time, employers' use of this pool of low-demand, low-commitment student workers has effects on other workers in the sector of lower-skilled work for whom participation in tertiary education is an unavailable or exceedingly remote possibility. We return to this point momentarily.

2. Student labour, non-standard work, power and control

The jobs performed by the majority of student workers are jobs which economists regard as secondary labour market sector jobs. These are characterised by high degrees of employer-initiated contingency and flexibility in relation to organisational and labour market demand. The expansion of so-called secondary labour market jobs and higher

frequency of non-standard jobs in terms of tenure, hours of work, and workplace locations has attracted much analytical attention in the past decade (Borghans and de Grip, 2000; Szell, 2001). Much of this attention has focused on workers' diminished protection from market flux, employer and organisational contingency, and deregulated employment relations. In particular, the vulnerability of workers for whom so-called secondary labour market work is their primary occupational activity and source of income remains a major concern.

This necessarily draws our attention to the positioning of student workers pursuing their own sets of interests in regard to immediate and future work and the practices of employer-initiated contingent work. The student workers reported their use of flexible, non-standard work serves their immediate interests in supporting their studies. None of the sample reported that their studies and their work played an equal and complementary role in their lives. Their current paid jobs were not those to which they aspired and were an instrumental means to an imagined better end. This widely tolerated disposition toward sectors of work in the contemporary New Zealand economy poses further implications. We propose that the labour market participation of student workers on the basis reported in this study contributes to the configuration and normalisation of 'non-standard' work practices. This normalisation raises further concerns for relations of power and control over work and in workplaces. Students' casual and instrumental regard for their low skill and low socially valued jobs converges with the employer and managerial view of these jobs. This is problematic given that these jobs are not exclusively performed by students who expect to develop the necessary skills to acquire 'better' employment in the future.

The casual and dismissive attitude to low skilled jobs weakens the abilities of workers holding these jobs to raise demands for improved conditions and opportunities in these occupations and in their workplaces. An acceptance of managerial systems' control over the structure and content of jobs in this sector of work reduces work to a mere instrumental performance measured solely by economic utility. Scope for worker agency in shaping her or his job and the quality of the

time spent doing the job, and relations with other workers, is crudely truncated. Workers' power is conceded to abstract systems' power and seemingly inarguable economic authorities.

Conclusion

The growing occurrence of full-time tertiary students working during term-time may, at first glance, be regarded as a mutually beneficial arrangement between students' financial needs and employers' needs for contingent, low-commitment, low-cost labour. However, a closer examination of this labour practice reveals potentially significant social consequences. In the first instance, the complex demands placed on working students poses considerable risk to the quality of their tertiary education experience and their gaining optimum and enduring socio-cultural benefit from participation in higher education. Moreover, the aggregate effect of this cohort of workers in the lower-skilled service sector labour market poses additional threats to the quality of work and social position of this sector. While there remains a potential for student workers to contribute social and cultural competencies to non-student workers in their workplaces, none of the respondents in this study reported any evidence of that. On the contrary, a generally held casual regard for their part-time jobs appears to undermine any sensibility toward solidaristic relations with non-student co-workers in these sectors. In addition to the immediate implications for workplace relations among workers engaged in these jobs by long-term necessity and those intending to permanently reject them, more serious, and enduring socio-cultural risks are posed.

The clearly advantaged party in this labour market is the employer. Once again, there is potential for individual employers to take action to diminish wide power disparities, enhance shared gains, and harmonise workplace relations. However, the manifest trend toward a highly flexible and contingent service sector in which it is assumed that modestly skilled jobs are automatically of low commitment and readily disposable, undermines potential to develop participatory and congenial (beyond the rudimentary) workplaces. Employers are acting within a wider set of marketised social relations in which current production and

employment relations are distortedly regulated in favour of employers.

The greatest risk posed in the labour market relations we have described in this article is that of generalised exploitation by economic forces and labour market dynamics of populations of workers, most of whom are young, and nearly all of whom are low-skilled. For the student workers, in pursuit of higher skills and knowledge-based economy employability, the risks lie chiefly in compromising study and learning quality in term-time work. Their aggregate effect to the advantage of employers, risks simultaneously a deleterious effect on the conditions and power relations incumbent in low-skilled, contingent work and on the majority of workers performing these jobs.

References

Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical Management studies.* London : Sage

Belfield C.R. & Levin, H.M. (eds.) (2003). *The Economics of Higher Education.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Borghans, L. & de Grip, A., (eds.). (2000). *The Over-educated Worker?: the economics of skill utilization.* Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labour and Monopoly Capital.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Brosnan, P., & Walsh, P. (1996). *Plus ca change...: The Employment Contracts Act and non-standard employment in New Zealand 1991-1995.* Wellington: Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University of Wellington.

Brown, P. Green, A. Lauder, H. (2001). *High Skills: Globalization, Competitiveness and Skill Formation,* Oxford UK: Oxford.

Brown, P. Hesketh, A., Williams, S. (2003). "Employability in a Knowledge-Driven Economy. *Journal of Education and Work,* 16(2), 107-126.

Canny, A. (2002). Flexible Labour? The growth of student employment in the UK. *Journal of Education and Work, 15*(3), 277-301.

Casey, C. (1995). *Work, Self and Society: After Industrialism.* London and New York: Routledge.

Casey, C. (2002). *Critical Analysis of Organizations: Theory, Practice, Revitalisation,* London: Sage.

Casey, C. (2004). Knowledge-Based Economies, Organizations and the Socio-Cultural Regulation of Work. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 25*(4), 607-627.

Casey, C. (2006). A Knowledge Economy and a Learning Society: A Comparative Analysis of New Zealand and Australian Experiences. *Compare: The British Journal of Comparative Education, 36*(2). 343-357.

Christie, H., Munro, M., & Rettig, H. (2001). Making ends meet: student incomes and debt. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(363-83).

Curtis, S., & Lucas, R. (2001). A coincidence of needs? Employers and full-time students. *Employee Relations, 23*(1), 38.

Curtis, S., & Shani, N. (2002). The Effect of Taking Paid Employment During Term-time on Students' Academic Studies. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 26*(2).

Felstead, A., & Jewson, N. (1999). Flexible Labour and Non-Standard Employment: An Agenda of Issues. In A. Felstead & N. Jewson (Eds.), *Global Trends in Flexible Labour.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

Fleetwood, S. & Ackroyd, S. (2004). *Critical Realist Applications in Organisation and Management Studies.* London ; New York : Routledge,

Ford, J., Bosworth, D., & Wilson, R. (1995). Part-time work and full-time higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 20*(2), 187.

Green, A. (2006). Lifelong Learning and the 'knowledge society'. *Compare: The British Journal of Comparative Education, 36*(2), 307-325.

Grey, C. & Willmott, H. (eds.). (2005) *Critical Management Studies : A Reader.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hakim, C. (1998). *Social Change and Innovation in the Labour Market.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, L., Geall, V., Moon, S., Aston, J., Bowes, L., & Blackwell, A. (1998). *Work Experience: Expanding opportunities for undergraduates.* Birmingham: Centre for Research into Quality, The University of Central England.

Hodgson, A., & Spours, K. (2001). Part-time work and full-time education in the UK: the emergence of a curriculum and policy issue. *Journal of Education and Work, 14*(3), 373-388.

Honeybone, A. (1997). Introducing labour flexibility: The example of New Zealand. *International Labour Review, 136*(4), 493-507.

Kelsey, J. (1997). *The New Zealand Experiment: A World Model for Structural Adjustment?* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Knights, D. & Willmott, H. (eds.) (1990). *Labour process theory.* Basingstoke : Macmillan.

Ladipo, D., & Wilkinson, F. (2002). "More Pressure, Less Protection", in B. Burchell, D. Ladipo & F. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Job Insecurity and Work Intensification.* London: Routledge.

Littler, C.R. & Salaman, G. (1984). *Class at Work: the design, allocation and control of jobs,* London: Batsford Academic.

Lucas, R., & Lammont, N. (1998). Combining Work and Study: an empirical study of full time students in school, college and university. *Journal of Education and Work, 11*(1), 41.

Lucas, R., & Ralston, L. (1996). Part-time student labour: strategic choice or pragmatic response? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 8*(2), 21-24.

Lucas, R., & Ralston, L. (1997). Youth, gender and part-time employment: a preliminary appraisal of student employment. *Employee Relations, 19*(1).

Maloney, T. (2004). The *effects of in-school and in-tertiary employment on academic achievement and labour market transitions. Evidence from the CHDS.* Report to the Labour Market Policy Group. Wellington: Department of Labour.

Manthei, R. J., & Gilmore, A. (2005). The effect of paid employment on university students' lives. *Education and Training, 47*(3), 202-215.

Metcalf, H. (2005). Paying for university: the impact of increasing costs on student employment, debt and satisfaction. *National Institute Economic Review*(191), 106.

Morrison, P. (2003). Deregulation of the New Zealand Labour Market. *GeoJournal, 59*, 127-136.

New Zealand Department of Education. (1989). *Learning for life: Education and training beyond the age of fifteen*. Wellington: New Zealand Department for Education.

New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee. (1998). Student Employment Survey. Wellington: New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee.

Peters, M. (2001). National education policy constructions of the 'knowledge economy': towards a critique. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(1), 1-22.

Spoonley, P. Dupuis, A. & deBruin, A. (Eds.) (2004). *Work and Working in Twenty-first Century New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Széll, G. (2001). *European Labour Relations*, Aldershot UK: Gower/ Ashgate.

Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. (2001). *Shaping the System: Second Report*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.

Thompson, P. (1983). *The Nature of Work : an Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process*, London : Macmillan.

Vaughn, K., & Boyd, S. (2005). Pathways, Junctions, and Pitstops: Transition Policy in New Zealand. In N. Bagnall (Ed.), *Youth Transition in a Globalised Marketplace*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Wolf, A. (2002). *Does Education Matter? Myths about education and economic growth*. London: Penguin.

Yorke, M. (2003). Going with the Flow: First-Cycle Higher Education in a Lifelong Learning Context. *Tertiary Education and Management, 9*(2), 117.

Catherine Casey is Associate Professor in the Department of Management and Employment Relations, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Kate Williamson is formerly a tutor in the Department of Management and Employment Relations, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Linking Abortion and Mental Health: What Does a Difference Mean?

Mike Lloyd

Abstract

Recent research from the Christchurch Health and Development Study (Fergusson, Horwood and Ridder, 2006) suggests that "exposure to abortion" is associated with increased risks of mental health problems, independently of confounding factors. The authors do not make any recommendations on policy, concluding that "more research is needed", nevertheless the topic is one where the policy implications are never far from the surface. Certainly, there was a great deal of media attention surrounding the study and this had policy as a background issue. This paper offers a critical reflection on this research, considering the adequacy of the authors' epidemiological model as it is applied to the complex social phenomena of abortion and mental health, and how they might be linked. It is argued that while the study shows differences in mental health measures between women who had abortions and those who did not, how we are to understand these differences has not been clarified by this research.

Introduction

Early in 2006 there was a sustained period of media attention given to a study linking "abortion in young women and subsequent mental health" (the paper's title). This study by Fergusson, Horwood and Ridder (2006), published in the *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, came from the Christchurch Health and Development Study, an ongoing longitudinal study begun in 1977. This project reports its findings mainly in psychological and medical outlets, but it should also be well known to sociologists (e.g., see Du Plessis Novitz, 1990; Lloyd, 1991, 2006; McDonald, 1994), and those in the policy field (there has been a summary of policy-relevant findings recently published (Fergusson, 1998)). Certainly, the media commentators on this particular study were quick to speculate

on policy implications, even if this was not the direct aim of the authors themselves. For example, the principal investigator is quoted as saying,

> "They'll be cheering for our results on the pro-life side and denouncing us angrily on the pro-choice side," he said. "Neither of these positions is sound." He said the study was conducted to deal with the dearth of reliable evidence on the mental health effects of abortion. "The issue is not a trivial one". (Robotham, 2006)

Thus, the authors emphasise that they are trying to get the facts straight, to present good scientific research, rather than slant the policy debate in any particular direction.

Likewise, I would like to make clear my own reason for offering a critical discussion of this research (for the sake of brevity, hereafter the study is referred to by the authors' initials, FHR). I have never researched or published on the topic of abortion, nor do I have any personal involvement in pro- or anti-abortion interest groups. My interest stems mainly from having taught in the area of the sociology of health and illness for the last twelve years: I discussed FHR's research in my class, the students found this interesting, hence I decided to go one step further and put these thoughts to paper.[1] In offering a critical discussion I draw upon general sociological thinking, that is, the ability to place claims about social processes in relation to knowledge about how social life is structured and experienced. The gist of my criticism is not that FHR's study suffers from flawed statistical analysis or is poorly conducted, but that because of a certain distance from the social experience of abortion and mental illness, the actual meaning of the research remains unclear. Additionally, as an anonymous reviewer has pointed out, it is important to realize that any published research on abortion and mental health, irrespective of the author's disavowal of policy implications, has the

1 It should also be noted here that in 1989 I was employed as a junior research fellow in the then named Christchurch Child Development Study. I left the unit to pursue PhD study in sociology. There is nothing of an *ad hominem* nature to my critical comments; rather I would hope that this critique could be interpreted as a mark of respect. That is, in choosing to criticise research one is admitting that the research is valuable enough to merit detailed scrutiny, and I hope that this critique can be seen as a constructive activity.

potential to be taken up and used by policy makers. The paper begins with a brief summary of FHR, moves to critical commentary, then finishes with some general implications.

The Research

Ideally, readers should consult the original document being discussed here, however, it is not difficult to summarise the key aspects of the research as it is very clearly laid out. FHR begin by noting that they are not concerned with the ethical debates about abortion as a response to unwanted pregnancy, but wish to contribute to the empirical research literature presenting evidence on the possible adverse mental health effects of abortion. They note that the existing research evidence is relatively weak, however, where there is evidence of adverse effects, there are two clear explanations: first, the associations "reflect a cause and effect linkage in which exposure to abortion has adverse effects on subsequent mental health", or second, "the association arises because abortion is associated with third or confounding factors that are also related to mental health outcomes" (p. 16). Their literature review suggests that most studies have made a comparison between two groups: pregnant with no abortion, compared to pregnant with abortion. Whereas this is an obvious comparison to make, FHR point out that by adding those "women who were not (yet) pregnant" to the analysis, this can "provide a reference by which the direction of association may be determined" (p. 17). Thus, they set out the basis of their study: an analysis, using longitudinal data, of the linkages between abortion in young women aged 15-25 and subsequent mental health, comparing the "three pregnancy status groups: not pregnant by age 25; pregnant no abortion; pregnant abortion" (p. 17). They employ a standard epidemiological design: data are captured as quantitative variables, there is a search for significant bivariate associations, followed by multivariate analysis that attempts to control for confounding factors.

Before presenting their results, FHR provide a relatively lengthy account of the variables they use in the analysis. When doing this they make a cautionary point about their key variable: through questioning sample members at ages 15, 16, 18, 21 and 25, the reports showed 14.6%

of the cohort reported obtaining an abortion at least once (a total of 90 abortions). This rate was compared with officially recorded pregnancy and abortion statistics, suggesting that the cohort data might represent an underreporting of abortion.

The mental health variables are derived from two diagnostic interview schedules that the researchers claim allow them to "ascertain the proportion of young women who met DSM-IV criteria" (p. 17) for major depression, anxiety disorders, alcohol dependence, and illicit drug dependence. They also note that "in addition, measures of DSM-IV disorders were supplemented by measures of self-reported suicidal ideation and attempts" (p. 18). The measures that form covariate factors, such as family socio-demographic background, family functioning, childhood conduct problems, educational achievement, and so on, are then described, before moving to the statistical analysis and results.

Four tables are presented in the results section. These contain a great deal of information, and have been produced using complex statistical analysis, however, the general picture presented is very clear. FHR summarise the initial bivariate analysis as showing two key things: first, there were significant associations between pregnancy history and rates of mental health problems, with these being highest amongst those having abortions, and lowest amongst those who had not become pregnant, with those pregnant with no abortion intermediate between the two other groups; second, with one exception, the not pregnant, and pregnant with no abortion groups, did not differ to statistically significant levels. This finding remained after adjustment for covariate factors. In their concluding discussion, FHR summarise their study as follows:

> In general, these results are consistent with the view that exposure to abortion was associated with increased risks of mental health problems independently of confounding factors. The study estimates suggested that those who were not pregnant or those becoming pregnant but not having an abortion had overall rates of mental disorders that were between 58% and 67% of those becoming pregnant and having an abortion. (p. 22)

They conclude their discussion by claiming their study has some key strengths, but also note some cautionary points. That is, there is always the possibility that important variables have been omitted; comparison of their data with other sources suggest some underreporting in the cohort data, thus there is the possibility of distortion in the results; and finally, they do admit the unknown role of "contextual factors". As they put it, "It is possible, therefore, that the apparent associations between abortion and mental health found in this study may not reflect the traumatic effects of abortion *per se* but rather other factors which are associated with the process of seeking and obtaining an abortion" (p. 22). While FHR note this important point, they claim that their data could not be used to explore these complex processes, however, they intend to study the cohort again at age 30 and it may be possible to gather further contextual information at this stage. The final words are relatively cautious: whether or not abortion has harmful effects on mental health remains to be fully resolved; more research is needed (p. 23).

Mental Health Outcomes?

A first critical question can be made relatively quickly, but this should not be taken to indicate that it is not important – it forms the basis for a further point developed below. It concerns exactly what is meant by the term "outcomes", and more specifically whether this study can properly claim to be dealing with the *diagnosis* of mental health disorders. To see this, picture the research process not in epidemiological language, but in slightly more prosaic terms. There is a research unit in a medical school whose data is drawn from a birth cohort. This group providing the data never come into the medical school, hence the researchers have to rely on survey-type instruments to capture their data. At the same time, there are a number of institutions that employ health professionals who attempt to diagnose and treat what their profession calls mental illness. Many of these professionals use a document called the DSM in this work, and just like the longitudinal researchers' survey instruments, the DSM uses tick-box questionnaire-type forms. However, to diagnose a mental illness these professionals believe they need to

see and question the people who think they have mental health problems, or who have been referred to these professionals by others. It is only after a process involving both the use of DSM-like instruments, and face-to-face interaction, that a diagnosis of a mental illness may be arrived at.

In contrast, our researchers in the longitudinal research unit are not trained psychiatrists. They employ interviewers to ask questions derived from the selfsame DSM to gain data on mental illness within the cohort they study. The point should be clear: FHR conflate diagnosis and measurement. In one part of their article FHR say, "From this questioning it was possible to ascertain the proportion of young women *who met* DSM-IV criteria" (p. 17, emphasis added). The phrase "who met" is a significant one as it does not suggest replication of actual diagnosis, hence this would be a fair term to use. However, the far more dominant expression in the article is one of diagnosis: the tables are headed up as showing "rates of disorder", there are statements like "This information was used to construct DSM-III-R diagnoses" (p. 18), and one of the strengths of the research is said to be "assessment of mental disorders using standardised diagnostic criteria" (p. 22). But we need to ask who has made these diagnoses? Answer: the non-psychiatrist research team. How did they do this? Answer: they employed interviewers to take a questionnaire, based on DSM items, out to the cohort, record their answers, enter these into a computer database, and tally each individual's item responses to reach a "diagnosis" of DSM-type mental disorder. Has a trained mental health professional been involved in this process, actually talking to these women on a face-to-face basis as part of the diagnosis?[2] Unless these details have been omitted in the published paper, the answer is a definitive no.

Some people may have no qualms about this process, seeing the above point as a quibble over a technicality. Or they may argue that calling such research "diagnosis" is standard practice within

2 Note here that whole books have been devoted to the practicalities of carrying out a clinical interview using the DSM (eg. Othmer and Othmer 1994).

psychological research circles. Such responses are interesting, because it is very easy to take out any copy of the DSM and quite quickly find the following:

> *Cautionary Statement*
> The specified diagnostic criteria for each mental disorder are offered as guidelines for making diagnoses, because it has been demonstrated that the use of such criteria enhances agreement among clinicians and investigators. The *proper use of these criteria requires specialized clinical training* that provides both a body of knowledge and clinical skills. (American Psychiatric Association 1994, p. xxvii, emphasis added).

It is true that further on in this cautionary statement "investigators" are taken to be legitimate users of the DSM. However, there is no denying the intent of the above-quoted segment: "the proper use of these criteria requires specialized clinical training". Getting other people to employ tick-box questionnaires and tallying the results does not constitute diagnosis according to the makers of the DSM.

If you feel this criticism is overstated, then consider a corollary of accepting what FHR call diagnosis. Is the following situation acceptable? Could psychiatrists work solely from websites, sub-contract interviewers to go out with the DSM derived questionnaires to identified people, and email back their completed questionnaires to the psychiatrist's website for a diagnosis to be passed on to the people "interviewed"? Could it all be done without face-to-face contact with the acknowledged psychiatric expert? Would that be good mental health diagnosis, let alone a good beginning point for treatment? A further implication of this point is developed below.

The Complexity of Measurement

As noted above, there is a great deal of measurement of variables in FHR's approach, as befits a quantitative longitudinal study, but I want to suggest that we need to reframe issues of measurement in a way that better reflects the complexity of what is at stake. That is, abortion and mental health are both complex *social* phenomena. A good way to make this point is by considering a thought experiment.

Imagine that we take a random sample of humans aged fifty from the Christchurch urban area. We execute every member of this sample, then perform an autopsy, specifically with the aim of listing the medical conditions found in the bodies of the sample. We would expect to find each body displaying the signs and symptoms of several diseases; if we had let these fifty year olds live, one or more of these conditions may well have caused their natural death. Obviously, this is hypothetical, but it serves a useful point in getting us to consider the language we use for understanding health and illness phenomena. For example, it is sensible to say "medical conditions found within the bodies", but it is *not* sensible to say "the medical conditions that they know they suffer from", as it is likely that the persons autopsied will be unaware of many of their diseases. "Suffering" is a word from the realm of social action, the world of reflective and sentient embodied persons interacting with others. In the situation where conditions are found within these bodies that are not hitherto known by the persons occupying these bodies, then we do not sensibly say they "suffer" from these conditions. Suffering requires some form of awareness. This is not to say that our process of autopsy and disease identification is subjective or inaccurate, just that, in this case, it bears an unknown relationship to what we call suffering.

Now consider the link between abortion and mental health reported by FHR.[3] Is it not the case that a woman who has had an abortion may live her whole post-abortion life without making contact with a single health professional for a single mental health issue? By chance, she is part of the cohort of the Christchurch Health and Development Study. She reports truthfully that she has had an abortion, and then answers the interviewer's questions, derived from the DSM, in an equally truthful manner. The way her answers coalesce finds her "diagnosed" by the researchers, who are not mental health professionals and who never talk to her directly, as depressive. Her case becomes

3 Note here that it is nowhere stated in FHR's article that they passed on to the women in the cohort their "diagnoses" of mental illness. There are obviously good ethical reasons for this, nevertheless this just serves to highlight the differences between the research and actual mental health identification and treatment processes.

part of the analysis showing abortion leads to higher rates of mental illness, such as major depression. Is she not in a situation comparable to our autopsied random sample? That is, someone claims to have measured her level of mental illness, objectively fitting her into a category, but she herself may never have made any contact with mental health professionals. Thus, it is not sensible to say she *suffers* from a mental illness. There is a possible, and I would argue, likely, disjuncture between measurement and experience. Regardless, some would like to say that on the basis of these objective measures she should be counted as depressed. They will argue that the DSM is a tried and trusted instrument backed by the American Psychiatric Association who have submitted their manual to much critical scrutiny and testing. However, there is no denying that FHR do not report measures of *contact* with mental health professionals for mental health problems, nor levels of admission to mental health facilities. It is quite possible that any individual woman will have no actual contact with any health professional for what FHR suggest is a mental health outcome. This is not to say that the differences in the comparison groups on the DSM derived measures do not exist; it is to say that we do not know what they mean in terms of the actual lives of the women in this cohort. The "diagnoses" are not made for the reasons, nor in the manner, a mental health professional would make them, for example, because of a concern from an individual or their family that they are unwell. Nor are these "diagnoses" made as a beginning point in the progression to treatment.

There is a fairly obvious counter-response to this line of argument. If it is admitted that these differences in the comparison groups are real, then these differences would also flow through in actual consultation and admission rates for mental health problems. That is, the data is a good enough proxy for the "real thing". The trouble is, whatever your stance on the "anti-psychiatry" debates, there is now a substantial literature (e.g., Fee 2000; Kirk and Kutchins 1992, 1997; Lewis 2006) that shows massive variability in how the DSM is used to "objectively" diagnose mental disorders, not to mention variability in forms of treatment that then follow (eg. Guise's (2006)

research on dealing with depression suggests that there are a variety of ways that people successfully "live through" depression without making recourse to mental health expertise or pharmaceutical treatment). Simply, there is no standard relationship between the use of DSM items and the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorder. Consequently, it is unknown whether FHR's measurement of mental health outcomes are a good proxy for the actual rates and experiences of mental illness of the women in their cohort.

Persist with the thought experiment a moment longer. In the executed sample, we find several cases of advanced heart disease, which in the natural history of this person would have been fatal, but we also find these same people have early stages of skin cancer. As members of contemporary New Zealand society these people will have been surrounded by copious discourse[4] regarding how we should minimize the risk of skin cancer. It is almost impossible to avoid this discourse; as a result of its pervasiveness we do indeed take precautions: we wear sunhats, we put on sunscreen, we avoid over-exposure to the sun, and so on. But, at the same time, we do something else - we *worry* about our risks of contracting skin cancer. We remember that distant aunt who had a melanoma, and when we read media reports of the latest scientific research on the growing ozone hole, we agree that the sun is indeed fiercer these days. This worrying, this form of awareness, is individualized, but the discourse within which it is embedded is thoroughly social: it depends on the circulation of types of knowledge, and it reproduces commonsense ways of understanding our risks and how we might react to them. Exactly similar to the discourse on the risk of sun-exposure, our society is full of discourse related to abortion (witness the media interest in FHR's research). This is because it is part of a larger discussion on what it means to take a life. As such, it is a very powerful and thoroughly morally-imbued discourse. I would venture it to say that every woman who has an abortion, or even contemplates one, is touched by this discourse and knows how to operate

4 By "discourse" I simply mean organised ways of talking, akin to an interpretive repertoire.

within it. That is, we know what questions to ask of ourselves, we know what kinds of emotions to feel in these circumstances. In short, we expect a woman who has an abortion to *worry* about what she has done.

FHR's research and its process of controlling for confounding is like trying to make sure we do *not* say "skin cancer would have killed that person" when actually it was another variable – heart disease – that would have caused death. This makes sense, and FHR have been very careful to avoid reporting spurious correlations. But the point is, the *worry* about skin cancer was still real and present – this is because it is a social force. It is partly because it is socially normal to worry about abortion, that when FHR ask whether having an abortion leads to mental illness, they are addressing a legitimate research question that most of us can understand (and we also have to wonder if this natural worrying is implicated in the under-reporting of abortion noted in their data). However, again, their terminology betrays inappropriate models of how people do things.

FHR state that one of the causal interpretations they are testing is that "exposure to abortion leads to an increased susceptibility to subsequent mental health problems" (p. 17). But, is it useful to speak of *exposure* to abortion? This biomedical language is *entirely appropriate* to our skin cancer example above: on the basis of current medical knowledge, most people accept that exposure to the sun can cause skin cancer. That selfsame medical knowledge will feature debates about the complexities of the risk factors and the best way to minimize harm. Within this discourse the language of exposure is appropriate, and it is reasonable to say that the people we autopsied *should* have known about their risks of skin cancer and *should* have taken simple preventative measures. The important point here is that, in contrast, the language of exposure is entirely inappropriate to the topic of abortion. Why? Because it is a *decision* and not an exposure. By all accounts, we expect it to be a fraught and difficult decision, after all it is a form of taking a life. This is not a simple matter of semantic preference. The words "exposure" or "decision" are derived from, and reproduce, particular models of social action. Talk of exposure belongs to a biomedical model where the key issue is determining causation. Talk of decision belongs to the world of

lay understandings of how people live their lives: we live by our decisions, we regret our decisions, we labour over our decisions, we consult others about how to decide, and so on. We are not exposed to the decision to terminate a pregnancy; women *make* that decision over time and in a social environment, and it then becomes part of the ongoing course of their life. Thus, there is no single event – the exposure – but a flexible, changing experience. If this is accepted, this admits the possibility that one woman can have multiple reactions to having an abortion. This includes positive reactions, a point elaborated below.

Positive Effects?

What is strangely lacking in FHR's analysis is any mention of positive effects of an abortion, despite it being readily understandable at a lay level. For example, we do not take it to be strange that a woman could say, "at the time, having an abortion was the best choice to make, and my life improved after it". What we take to be a qualitative improvement in a life is a contingent and complex issue.

Again, I would like to present a hypothetical scenario, but I hope this can be seen as reasonable.[5] FHR measure suicidal ideation as well as their DSM derived measures of mental illness. They do this at different time periods, being careful in their analysis that the variables are entered into the equation to fit the before-and-after logic of causation (ie. if the abortion is reported at the 16 years interview, the measures of mental health are made at subsequent interview ages). The trouble is, as FHR seem to partly realize in their final cautionary note, it may not be abortion that we should be measuring as the causal variable. How do you begin delineating where your independent variable takes effect, or how do you even know it is the right variable? Imagine the situation where a young woman – say 15 – becomes pregnant, and for a variety of easily inferred reasons, this is a deeply troubling event in her life, consequently

5 There is of course a point in any quantitative analysis, like FHR's, where the exact process whereby dependent and independent variables are connected has to be inferred. As both Popper and Wittgenstein made so clear some time ago, one cannot simply point to data and then expect the causal process to speak for itself.

in her life, consequently she experiences "suicidal ideation". However, she does not commit suicide, instead opts to have an abortion. If after the abortion she is questioned using a DSM-type questionnaire, she meets the criteria for major depression, and indeed in her everyday conversations she says she feels depressed. Surely, this would be understandable, but how should we interpret such a chain of events? Did the unwanted pregnancy *cause* her suicidal ideation? Did the abortion *cause* her depression? By introducing the prior event in the "exposure chain" – the unwanted pregnancy – then is it not just as sensible to say that the abortion is related to an *improvement* in her life situation? In FHR's study, being suicidal and being depressed are both found to be significant effects of abortion, but if "suicidal ideation" occurred pre-abortion, then it does not seem to have been entered into the analysis, hence cannot be related to the post-abortion depression.[6] Commonsensically, if such a relation existed it would be taken to be a positive effect of having an abortion. Such analytical decisions have to be made, but there are good reasons to believe that they can be very limiting in terms of interpreting the results. As I am suggesting, it is not unreasonable to see such a scenario as a qualitative improvement in a woman's life, where it could well be stated that the abortion is the most significant factor in this improvement.[7]

My guess is that FHR"s response to this would be that they could actually examine this claim with reference to their data, albeit with some difficulty. Actually, I do not think they should try; we need a realization that the independent-dependent-confounding variable approach can only do so many things. It is not well suited to tackling the issue of how people make real judgements about the quality of their lives, and how they actually weigh up what is a good decision to make.

6 It should be noted here that there is a 1, 2, 3 or 4 year gap in the ages at which women were interviewed to collect the study data. Thus it is possible that a woman in this cohort could become pregnant, have an abortion and then be interviewed (using the DSM type checklist) from 1 to 3 years later. The consequences of such a temporal sequence for FHR's quantitative analysis are unknown, but deserve further attention.

7 As an anonymous referee pointed out, it is also puzzling that FHR do not discuss the mental health impacts for women who carry a pregnancy that was unwanted and the long term outcomes for children who are born but not wanted. The use of the three comparison groups points to this possibility but would require further data on the women's experience of becoming pregnant and having a child.

Furthermore, we need more subtlety in the way we understand the operation of human memory in recalling effects of life events. As Jedlowski puts it, memory

> Is a complex network of activities, the sudy of which indicates that the past never remains "one and the same", but is constantly selected, filtered and restructured in terms set by the questions and necessities of the present, at both the individual and the social levels. (2001, p. 30)

The model of "exposure to abortion" is not well placed to incorporate such complexity; it invokes an image of something external imposing itself on an organism. Logically, a method that should be tried here is to actually talk to the women about their experience of choosing an abortion. The trouble is, if FHR plan to revisit this topic to adequately deal with the issue of the unknown role of "contextual factors", then in some cases the women would be remembering events that occurred fifteen years ago.

Perhaps it will be up to other researchers to pursue this line of inquiry, to change registers and work with a model of decision, placing the individual in a social context where people are taken to be reflective beings voicing, explaining, and discussing what they may or may not do, always in interaction with others. Within this latter model, there is little doubt that an abortion can be sensibly spoken of as having positive effects. It is an issue of practical relativities, not absolutes. The standardized nature of DSM derived measures is certainly useful for large scale quantitative research, but sometimes convenience comes at a large cost. Part of this cost with this research is a remarkable silence on the possibility of positive effects for the people directly experiencing becoming pregnant and opting for an abortion.

Conclusion

FHR's study is certainly clear, on an important topic, and does present food for thought. FHR have produced figures that show a difference across three comparison groups, but it may be a difference that does not matter *experientially*. In a sense, the science, good or bad, remains

too distant: we do not know how to connect the results of this study to the women who had abortions, and the varied ways this experience, as a social event, affected their lives. Unstructured interviews as a research method have their problems, but did the researchers ever think to ask women about their experience of having an abortion?

Is it good science to talk of "diagnosis" when, in the sense that mental health professionals use the term, there has not been any? Do we actually know if the women in this study who had abortions, *suffered* from it, in the way that any lay person would use that term? What do we know about the role of the socially normal tendency to *worry* about terminating a pregnancy in this whole scenario (including the measurement of depression)? What do we actually know about who women talk to, and what they say, when they *decide* to have an abortion? How much consideration has there been given to how abortion can be experienced as having *positive* outcomes? Unfortunately, FHR's reliance on the "exposure" model, has relegated such questions to the basket called "more research is needed". Yes indeed, but such research has to better reflect the social complexities of the experience of terminating a pregnancy. If this cohort is restudied at age 30, how will the researchers measure mental health outcomes? How will they attempt to fill in the contextual factors surrounding the decision to have an abortion? How will they take into account the possibility of positive effects of deciding to have an abortion? Without some attention to these questions we will never know what the differences between women who have abortions, and those who do not, actually mean.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Kent Smith and to the referees who made some useful comments on an earlier version of this article.

References

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.), Washington: American Psychiatric Association.

Du Plessis Novitz, R. (1990). Barriers and role choices. *New Zealand Population Review, 16*(2): 57-62.

Fee, D. (2000). *Pathology and the postmodern: Mental illness as discourse and experience*. London: Sage.

Fergusson, D.M. (1998) The Christchurch Health and Development Study: An overview and some key findings. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 10*: 154-176.

Fergusson, D.M., Horwood, L.J., & Ridder, E.M. (2006). Abortion in young women and subsequent mental health. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47*(1):16-24.

Guise, V. (2006). *"I Did Sink But I Didn't Drown": Acceptance, meaning and identity in narratives of depression*. Unpublished MA thesis, Sociology, Victoria University of Wellington.

Jedlowski, P. (2001). Memory and sociology. *Time and Society, 10*(1): 29-44.

Kirk, S.A., & Kutchins, H. (1992). *The selling of the DSM: The rhetoric of science in psychiatry*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter,.

Kutchins, H., & Kirk, S.A. (1997). *Making us crazy: DSM: The psychiatric bible and the creation of mental disorders*. New York: Free Press.

Lewis, B. (2006). *Moving beyond prozac: DSM, and the new psychiatry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lloyd, M. (1991). Troubles with team research. *New Zealand Sociology, 6*(2): 177-190.

Lloyd, M. (2006) Opening up pathways: A critical engagement with longitudinal health research. *Health Sociology Review, 15*(1): 48-58.

McDonald, G. (1994). A comment on 'teacher evaluations of the performance of boys and girls'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(1): 89-91.

Othmer, E. & Othmer, S.C. (1994). *The clinical interview using the DSM-IV*. Washington: American Psychiatric Press.

Robotham, J. (2006, January 4). Abortion linked to mental problems. *The Dominion Post*.

Mike Lloyd is a senior lecturer in sociology at Victoria University of Wellington.

New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations
Liu, J.H., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T. & Teaiwa, T. (eds.) (2005). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Reviewed by Avril Bell

As the title suggests, identity is both a departure point and a destination for the editors of this collection, although the former is emphasized over the latter. In the introductory chapter they talk of their deepening "appreciation of identity as a question rather than a statement, a point of departure rather than a destination" (16). This description is somewhat at odds with the frequent description of identity in terms of "roots and routes", a description that attempts to validate the significance of "origins" for identities, while insisting on their shifting, changing nature. I doubt the editors would have any problem with the "roots" and "routes" couplet. There is little emphasis given to "roots" in this volume, but much attention paid to the dynamism and constructed nature of identities. The emphasis on the point of departure is not to be read as an emphasis on the importance of origins, but as an expression of the editors' desire for identity to remain an open question, the beginning of a conversation and exploration, rather than the aim or endpoint.

But what would be the endpoint they might seek? It's not made explicit here, but my guess would be "community" or "solidarity", in the best sense that seeks unity in diversity. The address of this collection is national. The authors write to "us" as New Zealanders, as members of the nation. And in that sense they never escape the terrain of identity. National identity remains their destination as well as their point of departure. What each author in the collection champions, despite differences in emphasis and opinion, is a future, open and inclusive "New Zealand".

Structurally, the editors have produced a volume that reflects their interpretation of identity in terms of departures and destinations. Following the Introduction, the collection is made up of fourteen essays, one "screenplay" and a brief afterword by Joris de Bres (Race Relations Commissioner). Each chapter analyses a substantive point of departure

in the New Zealand present, with the "screenplay" projecting us into the future. The "screenplay" (Frame, Molisa, Taylor, Toia and Shueng), sets out possible "destinations" for the nation. It takes the form of a conversation between a "young person" and an "elderly relative" fifty years into the future. The "elderly relative" describes four scenarios developed back in 2005 to postulate possible futures for New Zealand. This creative format allows the authors to reflect on the limitations of their scenario building as they describe and discuss the pros and cons of each. It's a good read, interspersed with evocative images from the 1950s to enhance the sense of change through time, and a great means to flesh out the scenarios, which were clearly arrived out by a serious research process.

Two of the essays address issues of Maori identity (McIntosh and Borrell). Both in different ways problematise common perceptions of Maori identity. McIntosh takes account of both material and symbolic dimensions in her outline of three Maori identities - "traditional", fluid and forced (materially deprived), all of which she argues are marginal within New Zealand society. Her argument about the pros and cons of the dominant "traditional" identity is carefully nuanced and well-balanced. Borrell reports on interviews with young Maori in South Auckland, a group commonly subject to negative stereotyping. She illustrates how they internalise these stereotypes, but also how they negotiate them and retain their pride in being Maori.

Five chapters address some aspect of Maori/Pakeha relations or biculturalism (McCreanor, Liu, Byrnes, Levine, Barclay). McCreanor makes use of historic (1979) and more recent examples of Pakeha discourse on Maori to outline the common themes of a Pakeha "standard story" about Maori that he argues can be "tailored" to suit the occasion (56). Liu uses survey data to illustrate his argument that there are two competing narratives of New Zealand history - one emphasizing biculturalism, the other emphasizing liberal democracy. He sets out to show the points of conflict and points of connection between them. There is enough interest here for me to want to seek out more of his writing making use of the same or related data and I enjoyed and appreciated his "advice from the heart" (83-85). One point I remain unclear about in

this chapter is what Liu wants to say about the difference he notes between Pakeha acceptance of "symbolic biculturalism" and resistance to "resourced biculturalism", or what could more bluntly be described as tokenism versus power-sharing. Byrnes argues that there have been shifts in the rhetoric of the Waitangi Tribunal reports on the nation, with periodic oscillations between a view of a bicultural nation and emphasis on Maori autonomy. While I don't doubt there have been shifts in emphasis from time to time, the evidence provided here seemed rather slight. Levine focuses on the Waitangi Tribunal and the cultural safety issue to illustrate the reductionist dangers inherent in identity politics and to argue for a focus on politics and power, rather than culture, in rights debates. While I sympathise with his points on the problems of cultural identity claims, the argument we might be able to debate collective rights without them begs the question of what other basis appeals to collectivity might be based. Barclay's paper on "Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism" was the one I found the most theoretically sophisticated and interesting. Using Laclau and Mouffe, Barclay problematises the notion of inclusion and argues for a relational conception of democracy as forever unfinished. The notion that there can be no final answers or settlement, no utopian solutions to cross-cultural engagement, seems both right and politically useful. I also particularly enjoyed his argument that the ambiguity of the Treaty of Waitangi/*Tiriti o Waitangi* be taken as a positive, keeping its interpretation and use open.

Two of the remaining half of the essays focus on other cultural groups that make up New Zealand society - the Chinese (Ip and Pang) and Pacific peoples (Teaiwa and Mallon). Ip and Pang argue there have been three phases of Chinese history in New Zealand - as sojourners, a model minority and finally multiple identities. The chapter would be a useful introductory reading on the topic for undergraduates. Teaiwa and Mellon offer an interesting view of the place of Pacific peoples in New Zealand as one of "ambivalent kinship", both kin to Maori (for many at least) and "kin" to the colonisers/settlers via a range of historical colonial connections.

The rest of the chapters deal with issues of policy - citizenship

(Pearson) and immigration (Zodgekar) - and national identity more broadly - migrant acculturation (Ward and Lin), the role of nationalism in foreign policy (Capie and McGhie) and our "spiritual identity" (Morris). Pearson's chapter provides a measured and concise history of New Zealand citizenship to show that it "has always reflected plural forms of state membership" (35), obliquely refuting Don Brash's ideal of "one law for all". Zodgekar provides a useful overview of the shifts in immigration policy since the points system was introduced in 1986 and argues for the need for more effort to be put into an accompanying settlement policy, refreshingly reminding us also that "adaptation" and "integration" are two-way (or relational) processes. Ward and Lin present a typology of acculturation that would be useful for undergraduate discussion, but the chapter is light theoretically and politically. They report on some of the findings of a survey conducted with young people, specifically on the ambivalence demonstrated by young Pakeha regarding ethnicity and on young people's comfort with combining biculturalism and multiculturalism, but neither of these significant issues is analysed in any detail. Capie and McGhie outline how integral national identity is to the workings of international relations, while Morris argues for a national "spirit", which he insists is distinct from state-sponsored nationalism. There is much of interest and substance in his paper, although I am not completely convinced by the argument. Rather than dub this sentiment beyond state versions as "spirituality", I think we need to remember that nationalism is not only a state project. It is also a popular project. Morris's New Zealand spirituality seems to me to perfectly canvass the thematics of cultural nationalism, itself frequently dubbed a secular religion.

Edited collections are always uneven and this one is no exception, although overall I would say the contributions reflect solid conceptualising and inquiry and report on substantial bodies of research. There is much useful teaching material here. At the same time I am vaguely disappointed that the sum of this collection is not greater than its parts. The introductory chapter tells us that the collection arose out of a weekend at Waikanae, during which the contributors presented papers and discussed their ideas together. It sounds like a great weekend.

This explanation of the book's own departure point talks of generating dialogue, of a "powerful quality of listening" (8), of "voices speaking to one another and not past each other" (9). In the event, the contributions to this collection just sit within the same covers. There is no dialogue between the arguments made in the various chapters and no evidence of what gains were made over the weekend in Waikanae. In that sense the collection doesn't take us as far along the road to their nationalist destination as it might.

The man with no arms & other stories
Busch, G. & Johnsen, H. (2007). Lyttelton: Dinard Press.

Reviewed by Mike Lloyd

"The man with no arms" graces the front cover of this gem of a book. His name is Steve Roome and he is shown smoking a cigarette held between the big and second toes of his left foot. As we read the first chapter we see six other photographs of Steve, the most startling of which shows him sitting cross-legged on the floor wearing jeans with suspenders, but shirtless: it looks as if a scythe has neatly cut off both his arms. The photo gives no clues as to what happened to his arms - its front-on perspective means that nothing is glimpsed of the space on the torso where the arms should be. The intriguing (and clever) thing about the narrative accompanying the photos is that no explanation is ever given as to what happened to Steve's arms. Instead of offering the reader an explanatory 'category' – 'he was born without arms because of X' – we are left to engage with Steve's tale of his life. Again, instead of following the traditional 'this-then-that' narrative style, the story begins in midstream – "It does get tiresome. That's the truth of it; I'd be flat out bullshitting you if I said different" – and then simply offers Steve's account of his everyday life as an armless person. His disability is not dwelled on in every sentence, but because we simultaneously see the photos of Steve, we read the stories with this as a key characteristic of his life; it is after all fairly rare to have both arms missing. In this subtle way, we learn firsthand about his everyday life: his schooling, his troubles in late adolescence, his attempts and eventual success at finding a job, how he falls in love, gets married and has children, how he loses his job and marriage, and so on. It is compelling reading.

There are eight other stories, all equally engrossing as Steve's. In the order of presentation these introduce: Greg and Sally, the parents of Alex who has cerebral palsy; Anastasia who has an unspecified disability but who moves about in a wheelchair; Carole, who also needs a wheelchair, and her partner Maurice; Marilyn who walks with crutches due to a spinal tumour; Peter, who is the only one to start his story by

naming his condition – metatropic dysplasia; Leigh who has cerebral palsy; Pip the solo mother of Ben who has Down's syndrome; and Karen, paralysed below the waist due to an accident. Each of these stories are accompanied by Hanne Johnsen's wonderful photographs of the subjects. All photographs "frame" what they portray, and some of Johnsen's are more obviously artfully framed than others, but by and large the photographs capture the subjects as they go about their everyday lives: having a smoke while reading the newspaper; preparing a meal in the kitchen; at work; going for a walk (in a wheelchair), watching television, preparing to play wheelchair tennis, and so on.

It is only in the final "acknowledgements" that we garner any knowledge of how this book based on these stories and photographs eventuated. It is the result of a collaboration between CCS Canterbury/ West Coast, an organisation that provides support and services for people with disabilities, and the A Place in Time Project associated with the School of Fine Arts at the University of Canterbury. Glenn Busch is a senior lecturer in the latter, and in this final section he very briefly notes that the stories were selections from many hours of taped interviews. He provides no comment on how he made these selections, nor the extent to which he edited the interview transcripts. Methodologically, this is obviously something of interest to sociologists, but there is an important point here. It is this: it would be a mistake to approach this book with traditional methodological and sociological concerns, perhaps as the basis of some kind of critique. The point is, the book does not set out to be an exercise in the sociology of disablement, backed up by a traditional discussion of methodology. The book offers no formal analytic sociology, nonetheless, it has a wealth of relevance for sociologists. In abundance, it offers, to use an overworked phrase, the "lived experience" of disability. Sociologists teaching and researching in the areas of disability, embodiment, and even everyday life, will find this a useful resource. But more to the point, the book is simply wonderfully readable. The key thing I took from it was not how much I learnt about living with a disability, but the way in which ordinary, everyday concerns filled the life stories of these "disabled" people. The nature of the disabilities themselves takes up very little space in

these stories; instead it is getting through the this-and-that of life, just as able-bodied people do, that forms the main content of the stories. As Karen, the subject of the final story says: "I guess that's why I want to tell my story. I don't want to feel embarrassed or uncomfortable about my life, I just want to live it" (p. 267).

Instructions for Contributors

Submission of manuscripts: All manuscripts submitted will be considered for publication, on the understanding that they are original material and are not being considered for publication elsewhere. Please submit only finished manuscripts.

Manuscripts should not exceed 8,000 words, and files should be submitted to the managing editor, Mike Lloyd (mike.lloyd@vuw.ac.nz) as an attachment, preferably in Microsoft Word rich text format. If you are unable to attach a file to an e-mail message, please contact the managing editor to find another means of transmission.

The author's name(s), departmental or institutional affiliations, snail-mail and e-mail addresses, and a short biography of each author should appear on the first page of the paper. A short (100 word) abstract of the paper should be included.

Specifications for manuscripts: Authors should consult articles in current issues of *New Zealand Sociology* on general matters of editorial style, e.g. titles and headings, indentation of paragraphs, form of referencing, etc. Do **not** underline any words in the text. Please ensure that your text conforms to UK spelling rather than American.

Graphics: Type each table on a separate sheet with as few lines as possible, and indicate the placing of the table in the text. Use wide spacing in tables. Tables should be numbered in Arabic figures with a clear legend to identify the table. Drawings (graphs, figures, etc.) should be on good quality white paper and on separate sheets.

Footnotes and references: Footnotes are to be reserved for substantive commentary. Number them from 1 upwards. The location of each footnote in the text must be indicated by the appropriate superscript numeral. Footnotes will appear at the foot of the page where they are located.

Citations: These must conform to the style set out in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 1994, (4th Ed.). Citations in the text should be indicated in parentheses, e.g., "It has been argued (Smith, 1995, p. 47) that..."; It has been argued by Smith (1995, p. 47) that...

References. A reference list consisting only of those references cited in the text should be arranged alphabetically using the following American Psychological Association style:

Book: Roper, B. (2005). *Prosperity for all? Economic, social and political change in New Zealand since 1935.* Melbourne: Thompson/Dunmore Press.

Edited Collection: Goode, L., & Nabeel, Z. (Eds.). (2004). *Media studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Auckland: Pearson.

Book Chapter: Perry, N. (2003). On forging identities. In V. Grace, H. Worth, & L. Simmons (Eds.), *Baudrillard west of the dateline* (pp 102-115). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Journal Article: Rosenberg, B. (2002). News media ownership: How New Zealand is foreign dominated. *Pacific Journalism Review, 8*(1), 59-95.

Conference Paper: Wood, B. (2004). The cloning of hybridity and the imperial significance of the United States in New Zealand television. Paper presented at the Cultural Studies Association (USA) annual conference, 6 May, Northeastern University, Boston, USA.

Internet reference: Tanczos, N. (2000, February 10). Maiden speech to parliament. Retrieved June 24, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.greens.org.nz/docs/speeches/000210nt-maiden.htm

Thesis: McMillan, K.A. (2001). *Citizenship under neo-liberalism: Immigrant minorities in New Zealand 1990-1999.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Auckland.

Refereeing: *New Zealand Sociology* is a fully refereed journal. Following editorial review, manuscripts will be sent to referees for blind review. To facilitate this process, after the first page with author's details, the title only should appear on the manuscript.

Manuscripts will be acknowledged by the Editors upon receipt. Authors can expect to hear from the editors upon completion of the reviewing process.

Preliminary consultation with the editors about the suitability of an article does not necessarily guarantee its publication. The editors reserve the right to make minor editorial alterations or deletions to articles without consulting the author(s), so long as such changes do not affect the substance of the article. Authors will receive a copy of the issue in which their article appears.

Proofs will be sent to authors and they should be corrected and returned to the managing editor within three days. Major alterations to the text cannot be accepted at this stage.