

Academising Academia: Academics' Conceptions of their Labour in the Context of Managerialism at The University Of the Witwatersrand

Diksha Ram

Supervisor: Prof. Eric Worby



A research report submitted to the Faculty of Arts
University of the Witwatersrand
In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts in Anthropology
2015

Plagiarism declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

Diksha Ram

2 June 2015

Acknowledgements

The unseen – I have seen. Thank you.

Family – This is only possible because of you! I extend my deepest love and gratitude to you. Thank you.

Friends – thank you for convincing me that I could on the countless occasions that I believed I could not.

Prof. Eric Worby – I am most grateful to have had the opportunity to spend this time with you, and I am much richer for the experience. Your kindness, patience, flexibility, and deep understanding of human nature have taught me much. I stand in great admiration of your mastery of the spoken word. I feel as though I am a calmer and warmer person for having been in your calm and warm presence. I will carry the memory of the countless times I left your office feeling elevated and inspired after great conversation! Thank you.

Informants – what a wonderful experience you have given me! I knocked, hoping to catch a mere glimpse of you. But you opened the door, and invited me in for tea and cake! I am so grateful for your magnanimity, honesty, and kindness. Thank you.

Contents

Chapter 1:	Introduction
Chapter 2:	Literature Review
Chapter 3:	Methodology
Chapter 4:	Academics on Academia
Chapter 5:	Reflective Conclusion
Appendix 1:	Interview Schedule
Appendix 2:	Participant Information Sheet
Appendix 3:	Consent Form
Appendix 4:	Audio Consent Form

Chapter 1: Introduction

With the advent of neoliberalism, higher education began to appropriate quasi-market strategies from the business sector. In what Strathern (2000) has termed “audit culture”, universities began to implement managerialism – a corporate mechanism designed to enforce top-down management of academics with the ultimate goal of excelling in a globally competitive academic environment (Johnson, 2005; Strathern, 2000; Giri, 2000; Shore & Wright, 2000). The University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) began this journey of competitive behaviour in 1999 (Johnson, 2005), and in 2013, with the inauguration of new Vice-Chancellor Adam Habib, the pressure on academics to produce publications as the major token of merit has reorganised activities that hold value within the University management’s gaze. Among the many informal but desperate complaints relayed to me over the course of the year by academics about their burdensome workloads, I began to hypothesise about a deeper story behind the surface narrative of a top-down process that has been enforced upon them as a feature of the tide of global changes in academia that has swept over South Africa. This is story about how academic labour is conceptualised by academics at Wits within a contextually borne discourse of managerialism.

This chapter charts a history of the University of the Witwatersrand. This is followed by a chapter which reviews pertinent literature. The methodology chapter elaborates on the procedure of data collection in a reflective and reflexive way. A chapter drawing on Victor Turner’s (1969) interpretation of liminality is situated against managerialism and its practice in the University of the Witwatersrand. This chapter includes extended quotations from interview data. The concluding chapter offers my general reflections on the process of producing this research as well as suggestions for further research.

The Historical Context of Transformations at Wits

In his book *Wits the Early Years: A History of the University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg and its Precursors 1896-1939*, Bruce K. Murray, a historian at the University, describes Wits as a university that emerged as “a major centre for liberal thought and criticism in South Africa” (Murray, 1982, p. xi). It opened in 1922 as the fourth university in South Africa among the University of Cape Town, the University of Stellenbosch, and the

federal University of South Africa (Murray, 1982). In 1896 there were five students registered for Mining Technology at what was then the South African School of Mines in Kimberley (*History of Wits*). This figure increased to over 10 000 over a 75-year period at what became the University of the Witwatersrand (The Jubilee Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand, 1972). In 1951 Wits had awarded 10 433 qualifications, and by 1988 this figure had exponentialised to 73 411 (*History of Wits*). Wits filled a multitude of roles, including being a major contributor to the development of professionals for the country, a major port of research emission, and a nexus of racial and lingual management when blacks were admitted to the institution during the Apartheid era and also when conflicts arose between English and Afrikaans-speaking whites (Murray, 1982). Murray's book charts the trajectory of progression of Wits from its beginnings as a school of mines, through its establishment as a university over a period of two decades, leading up to World War Two (Murray, 1982).

Wits: The Open Years is Murray's (1997) second installation that documents the political and social life of the University between 1939 and 1959. In 1959, the government of South Africa instituted legislation that introduced apartheid onto the university system (Murray, 1997). Despite student protests for an open university, by 1965 the number of black students had fallen to 10 from 74 in 1959 (Murray, 1997). Many young liberal academics had left South Africa to pursue their university educations overseas under less prejudiced and conflictual conditions (Murray, 1997). The culmination of this period of political unrest saw the Prevention of Political Interference Act of 1968 phasing out the Liberal Party as the University's final anti-apartheid political organisation (Murray, 1997).

A documentary text emerging from Wits during the apartheid era is *The Golden Jubilee of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg 1972*. This is a book written by the University's Jubilee Committee to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Wits becoming a fully autonomous university. Beginning with a letter of acknowledgement from the Duke of Windsor, the book outlines a brief history of the University from 1896 to 1972. It also gives an account of the University's research and other intellectual accomplishments, with contributions made by the Chancellors, Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Chairman of Council, Presidents of Convocation, and Professors Emeriti. The then Vice-Chancellor and Principal G. R. Bozzoli wrote that "during... [its] growth... the small college in Kimberley

has become one of the world's most important universities" (Jubilee Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand, 1972, p. 7). Chapters like "Wits' contribution to Afrikaans literature" (Jubilee Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand, 1972, p. 87) remind one that the University is a place of rapid alteration where, departments like the Afrikaans Department cease to exist decades later (*SLM Current and Past*). Books like these present a record of the priorities that the University held as a function of politically hegemonic forces during various periods.

In her PhD thesis, Johnson (2005) describes three periods of restructuring at Wits. In the period from 1984 to 1994, the apartheid government was prevented from influencing university policy (Johnson, 2005). The period between 1990 and 1997 is characterised as the "intensification of contestation and crisis management" (Johnson, 2005, p. viii). The period from 1997 to 1999 saw the "emergence of a visionary approach in university management" (Johnson, 2005, p. viii). From 1999 to 2004 the changes at the University reflected a period of managerialism, which Johnson (2005, p. ii) calls "contrived collegial managerialism". This describes the effect of managerialism as a top-down process, which has affected the collegial relations of academic staff detrimentally (Johnson, 2005). Collegiality is proposed as a term that, unlike "managerialism", does not focus on the implementation of a corporate fad (Birnbaum, 2000), but rather turns the focus onto the implementation of a corporate structure that has noticeable effects on the broader university environment (Johnson, 2005). These effects include a severe constriction of "spontaneity, initiative and voluntary interaction associated with collegial practices from below" (Johnson, 2005, pp. 13-14). Wits 2001 was a plan for the implementation of contrived collegial managerialism.

The "Wits 2001" project is examined in Johnson's (2005, p. 11) thesis as a plan of "a new institutional identity underpinned by economic rationality, efficiency, performance and market relevance". Rather than being reduced, costs were shown to have increased during this strategic reorientation of the University toward the market (Johnson, 2005). During this time several administrative roles and responsibilities were created such as the Senior Executive Team (SET) (which secured power at the highest levels of the University), the position of Head of School and Dean (Johnson, 2005). Head of School was a position created to exert authority on academic staff (Johnson, 2005) which is characteristic of the monitoring and controlling function of audit culture (Strathern, 2000).

Similarly, an MA thesis was conducted by Nkoli, (2003) which analysed the restructuring of the University between 1999 and 2001 through documents such as *Shaping of the Future* (1999) which was a directive through which the University sought to sustain itself within a competitive economic environment (Nkoli, 2003). Nkoli (2003) concludes that Wits 2001 achieved restructuring without transformation, such that promotions of black academics to positions of professorship were not meaningful as they did not allow for much influence on University management and restructuring decisions.

More recently, on 1 June 2013 Adam Habib succeeded Professor Loyiso Nongxa who had served for 10 years as Vice-Chancellor of Wits (*Habib Takes the Top Spot at Wits*, 2013). Speaking on Vision 2022, Habib stated, “I am ready to engage robustly in the global war for the very best academic talent...If we are going to be the best, then we have to secure the best scholars and scientists on the planet. This also means that we need to look after those who are already on board and who are productive and leading the way in their respective areas” (*Habib Takes the Top Spot at Wits*, 2013). On the University’s website, he states that this “also means that we have to balance access with success, without becoming elitist” (*Time to Implement 2022 Strategy says Habib*). Since intellectual elitism is a central tenet of Vision 2022, this leaves students who are from lower income groupings and without demonstrable academic achievement in the lurch. Given that the majority of this category might be racially distinguishable given South Africa’s apartheid legacy which aligned wealth and race, might Vision 2022 be a capitulation to intellectual racism?

The *Vision 2022: Strategic Framework* document describes, over the course of 37 pages, the reasons for the implementation of this strategy. In a section entitled “What Wits will look like in 2022?” the University’s position in the top 100 universities in the world is securely attained through its high quality research output and its ability to attract high-performing students and researchers from abroad. It also aims to have 50 National Research Foundation A-rated scholars or ISI highly cited researchers, to have 50% of enrolments be by postgraduate students and for 30% of students to be from abroad. In a section entitled “Management Implications” the dossier (n.d., p. 15) states that

Universities are recognised as special kinds of businesses...Academic scholarship

and intellectual leadership skills are no longer the sole requirements for running higher education institutions. Efficient management, political networking and fundraising skills are equally, if not more important...Wits needs to position itself within this reality as a research-intensive university supported by sophisticated administrative and business systems

Clearly, the strategy is geared toward a business model, which Johnson (2005), in the company of other scholars, warns against, as it alters the university's framework at the peril of academic development and collegiality. The next chapter elaborates on these and other themes that inform important literature on the topic of university governance.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Research Aims

This research aims to explore academics at the University of the Witwatersrand's perceptions of their labour through semi-structured in-depth interviews. "Perceptions of their labour" is not quite narrow enough; rather, academics were asked to elaborate on their thoughts about managerialism and how, in their view, this particular style of leadership might be affecting their work, if indeed they perceived it to be doing so.

Research Rationale

This research allows academics of all ranks to offer detailed reflections on their labour. Its characteristic importance, thus, lies in the free-flow of narrative that emerges from the type of interview that holds questions as mere suggestions rather than as directive channels into which perceptions and conceptions must fit. It is my hope that the responses have answered what I consider an essential question in the process of the unveiling of the academic's world. That question is: What is important to you as an academic at Wits, and why? It is also my hope that this research will contribute to the general body of literature on academic labour a multitude of voices from the ground.

Literature Review

This section begins by describing the history of managerialism and discussing it as an ideology. Managerialism and its business-like features are discussed within the context of the university, after which audit culture and accountability are considered.

There is a large body of literature on the value of labour ranging from Marx's (1887) labour theory of value, to Durkheimian (1933) and Weberian (1963) theories on divisions of labour and how status can be accrued from labour. There is also a large extant body of anthropological literature written about value by scholars such as Malinowski (1922), Graeber (2001; 2013), Mauss (1954) and Sahlins (1972) that centres on patterns of the trade of specialised objects. Not as readily available, however, is an anthropological literature

focussing on the value of intellectual labour. One has had to be constructed for the purpose of this thesis, and draws upon literature from diverse fields such as sociology, anthropology and education.

Durkheim (1933) argued that the division of labour functions to create social solidarity, and rather than the true value of labour being in its economic function, labour is seen as a vector for social relations. Social solidarity is not directly measurable, but by looking at the laws operating in a society, one can deduct the types of social solidarity that exist. (Durkheim, 1933). The types of social solidarity can be understood by investigating the restitutory and repressive laws (Durkheim, 1933) and the enactment of power within the university space. An increase in the division of labour occurs as boundaries between social groups break down and new group combinations form (Durkheim, 1933). Does the creation of positions such as Head of School in the late 1990s (Johnson, 2005) (which fortify new boundaries under which academics can be monitored (Strathern, 2000)), reveal the breakdown of transnational boundaries and therefore the dissemination of global trends and modes of governance in academia? With a shift in governance, has come a shift in the structure of the university to that of a corporation.

A large body of literature exists on managerialism and audit cultures within universities that have emerged in the last two decades. Collegiality, managerialism, restructuring and audit cultures are prominent themes of discussion that are both scorned and welcomed by scholars from sociology and education, and less prolifically anthropology. Historical accounts of the origins of managerialism, as well as hypotheses regarding its future effects, are topics that inform many texts. The following section considers the contributions of selected authors who, collectively, present an overview of the debates within the literature.

Managerialism: The Backstory

What is managerialism? Managerialism is defined by Smeenk, Teelken, Eisinga, & Doorewaard (2009, p. 591) as “the trend of adopting organisational characteristics, such as organisational forms, technologies, management instruments and values that originate from the private sector organisations”. Deem, Hillyard, & Reed (2007, p. 6) define managerialism as “a general ideology or belief system that regards managing and management as being

functionally and technically indispensable to the achievement of economic progress, technological development, and social order within any modern political economy”.

Locke and Spender (2011) posit that even though by the middle of the twentieth century management had been incorporated into managerialism, the two are not necessarily the same thing. Managerialism is a structure in which managers perceive themselves to be a “professional caste” (Locke & Spender, 2011, p. x), whereas management refers to the governing of people within an organisation (Locke & Spender, 2011). Within the ideological perspective of managerialism, management is considered to be a superior form of leadership that offers a particular rationale for controlling the actions of people (Deem et al., 2007). Middlehurst offers a chapter in Schuller (1995) that is about changing leadership and its connection to the changing university context. Samier (2002) writes about ethics in leadership by drawing on Weberian thought.

Where did managerialism originate? In Strathern’s (2000) *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, Shore and Wright detail the historical context of managerialism, auditing, and the corporatisation of universities. According to Shore (2008), public scandals in the UK involving a bank, the medical profession, and the Catholic Church contributed to the public perception that professions could not regulate themselves and thus required administrative reform which included external auditing. Those who support managerialism reject this account and assert that citizens demanded the accountability that has resulted in managerialism (Shore, 2008). The Robbins Report, published in 1963 is cited in Schuller (1995) as a pivotal moment after which such changes were effected as an increase in student numbers and funding, the conversion of colleges into universities, and an increase in the number of new universities.

Scheutze writes in Schuller (1995) about the shift in Canada from a system of elite higher education to mass higher education. This shift occurred for two reasons: firstly to allow more people to become educated and therefore to allow for society to become more egalitarian and to ensure that talent was being utilised, and for economic benefit; and secondly, to satisfy the demand for higher education skills (Schuller, 1995). Their chapter discusses changes in Canadian universities in terms of funding (Schuller, 1995). Wagner’s chapter in Schuller (1995) charts and compares the changes occurring in universities in England during the 1960s

and 1990s. Miller (1998) focuses on an analysis of academic management and managerialism in Canada and the United Kingdom in the 1990s.

In the decade that followed, the financial crisis of 2008 affected higher education through funding cuts (Standing, 2011). The University of California saw then governor Arnold Schwarzenegger cutting US\$1 billion from its budget, with a fee increase of 20 per cent, support staff retrenchments and academics having to take unpaid leave (Standing, 2011). Similarities were found across the United States and the United Kingdom (Standing, 2011), with neoliberal ideology disseminating globally.

The way in which managerialism is expressed differs across regions (Smeenk et al., 2009). Differences can also be found within countries and also within a given institution itself (Smeenk et al., 2009). Smeenk et al. (2009) suggest that the variations within institutions and regions may be greater than those between them. Their study foregrounds the opinions of academics which they suggest influence their behaviour, and are responsible for the variation in the expressions of managerialism within institutions and countries (Smeenk et al., 2009).

Neoliberal ideology and its practices have gained hegemony outside of universities too, where they overwrite extant standards and practices of good governance (Shore & Wright, 1999). In other words, managerialism, as a type of leadership, occurs beyond the academic sphere (Strathern, 2000). It can be seen in the Structural Adjustment Policies of the IMF and World Bank, in recruitment and management procedures of corporations in North America, and in British council housing (Strathern, 2000). It is the process of neo-liberalisation that matters, and its effects differ according to context (Strathern, 2000). Strathern (2000) details three ways in which to predict the contextual particularities of managerialism (Strathern, 2000). Firstly, through the discourse that is generated (Strathern, 2000). Secondly, through the resulting norms or points of interest (Strathern, 2000). And thirdly, through the effect that the norms have on the way in which workers construct their work identities (Strathern, 2000). Audit technologies alter people's perceptions of themselves and their work; "they are used to transform professional, collegial and personal identities" (Strathern, 2000, p. 62). Is this transformative experience that is managerialism here to stay?

Management as an Ideology

Birnbaum (2000) describes managerialism as a management “fad” which is one of many theories developed in the business sector and adopted by universities. Citing Chaffee (1985), Birnbaum (2000) describes that fads adopted from business are initially highly regarded in academic literature where academics are enthusiastic to implement them; after this, case studies that offer praise for the fad appear, and finally the fad fades from the institution. The decline is precipitated by disappointment in its lack of perceived effectiveness (Birnbaum, 2000). These fads are not closely analysed in terms of their effectiveness in a higher education context, and are generally adopted once their efficacy in business has declined and they are in the process of becoming redundant (Birnbaum, 2000). Meyer (2002) posits that universities need to create their own models for times of change, rather than adopting business models which will not lead to successful changes. He suggests that management of universities will have to become as complex and sophisticated an endeavour as it is in top corporations and optimistically views changes in university management as exercises in organisational learning within a bureaucratic environment (Meyer, 2002).

As a top-down process (Johnson, 2005), it is questionable whether managerialism at Wits has spurred much enthusiasm among academic staff given the periodic protestation around such issues as salary increases. This begs the question: how flexible is Wits management to change? In my interviews with senior managers, it seemed as though they were not very flexible at all. The next chapter elaborates on the mutual disdain that members of the pro- and anti-managerialism camps have for the others’ ideological preferences.

The ability of universities to be flexible to change is an important consideration in Dearlove’s (1995) case study of managerialism and leadership in English universities. He states that “trusting leadership is not the same as controlling management” (Dearlove, 1995, p. 166) and advocates for the training of leaders who are open to change and yet who work within the managerial construct. While the readiness of managerialism to change its formations is in question, the process of “restructuring” toward managerialism is yet another term that has been adopted from economics and is one of the effects of globalisation on the education system, accompanied by an increase in emphasis on achievement (Daun, 1997). Accompanying this restructuring in Europe, were budget cuts and decentralisation which resulted in a decrease in educational resources (Daun, 1997). These effects can be seen

against the backdrop of neoliberalism (Daun, 1997).

Enteman (1993) describes Marx's belief that an ideology would come into power after the Communist revolution. This ideology would be "perfected" (Enteman, 1993, p. 154) and thus not in need of alteration or replacement. Considering whether managerialism could be just such an ideology, Enteman (1993) claims that managerialism is not a perfected and therefore a lasting ideology, and that attention should be paid to subsequent ideologies that might take hold.

While Bourdieu does not speak of managerialism specifically, he asserts more broadly:

I would argue that the *collective unconsciousness of intellectuals is the specific form that the complicity of intellectuals with the dominant sociopolitical forces takes*. I believe that the blindness of intellectuals to the social forces which rule the intellectual field, and therefore their practices, is what explains that, collectively, often under very radical airs, the intelligentsia almost always contribute to the perpetuation of dominant forces" (Bourdieu in Waquant, 1989, p. 18)

From this perspective, incisive and critical thought- the very substance of academic independent work- fails to challenge the status quo. This contention may not reflect the actuality of all academics' reactions to managerialism, as much of my fieldwork interview data suggests. However a complicity with managerialist practices has been noted by other scholars too. Shore (2010, p. 26) posits that academic freedom is constrained by academics' fear to oppose management within a "culture of compliance". A shift has occurred in which management is perceived as the university itself rather than as representing an aspect of the university (Shore, 2010).

Standing (2011) claims that the values of the Enlightenment (the idea that individuals have the ability to construct the world and themselves through learning) had been lost as power shifted from the education departments in universities to business departments in 2009. Lord Mandelson (the then business minister in the United Kingdom) is quoted as saying "I want the universities to focus more on commercialising the fruits of their endeavour... business has to be central" (Standing, 2011, p. 68). In a managerialist society, "influence is exercised

through organisations” (Enteman, 1993, p. 154) and the representation of interests is dependent upon whether or not those interests are aligned with those of the organisation (Enteman, 1993). In *The Future of the City of Intellect* (Brint, 2000), Chait discusses how faculty came to power in the university during the “Academic Revolution” (which was a term coined by Jencks and Riesman in their 1968 publication of the same name) (Brint, 2000). The Academic Revolution, which occurred in the 1960s in America, placed higher importance on research production than undergraduate study, and among other things, an “expansion of the faculty” occurred (Brint, 2000, p. 293; Jencks & Reisman, 1968). After decades of competition and contestation with “presidents, trustees, and legislators” (Brint, 2000, p. 293), academics had gained control over curricula, the hiring of senior administrators and academics, the admissions and graduation criteria, workloads, and research schedules (Brint, 2000; Jencks & Riesman, 1968). The control of faculty over these aspects is “rarely challenged” (Brint, 2002, p. 15) today. Brint (2000) describes the way in which the market has come to power and how this is the reason for conflicts of governance at the university now. The origins of managerialism provides some insight into the power dynamics that characterise the system. These power dynamics are frequently likened to those in the corporate world.

The Business of Universities

In *The Precariat: The Dangerous New Class*, Standing (2011) asserts that the education system’s image is that of an industry characterised by profits and earnings, performance indicators, and competitiveness. In this setting, administrators are in control, “imposing a ‘business model’ [that is] geared to the market [with] the idea... [of] process[ing] commodities, called ‘certificates’ and ‘graduates’” (Standing, 2011, p. 68). Standing (2011, p. 70) suggests that the “dumbing down” of the education system is a partial contributor to the precariat (that being the class of people who do not have job security). The standard of education has fallen, with non-academic courses such as a “BA Honours Degree in ‘outdoor adventure with philosophy’” (Standing, 2011, p. 70) helping to “maximise profits, by maximizing ‘throughput’” (Standing, 2011). The resulting “irrationality” (Standing, 2011, p. 70) is that the value of courses lies in their ability to create demand rather than in their inherent academic value (Standing, 2011).

Shore (2010) writes about the effects of managerialism on universities in New Zealand. There the neoliberalisation of universities has resulted in massification along with a decrease in government funding for students (Shore, 2010). Along with this, a transformation occurred in which universities are seen as transnational corporations within a “global knowledge economy” (Readings, 1996 as cited in Shore, 2010, p. 15). There are other effects of the corporatisation of universities on aspects such as teaching and research, and performance management.

Shore (2010, p. 28) asserts that neoliberal reform within the university has produced what he calls “schizophrenic academic subjects” who perceive the university as a “multiversity” to which a range of functions, some of which are contradictory, are ascribed. Shore (2010, p. 27) quoting Ball, describes the academic under managerialism: “the new ‘performative worker’...[the academic] is a ‘promiscuous self, an enterprising self, with a passion for excellence’”. In a Weberian reading, universities house several forms of rationality. Relationships between academics, and the work that they produce must shift from its centring on traditional values to focussing on economic values (Samier, 2002). According to Samier (2002), this is how a group of academics becomes a social class.

Citing the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education (1991), Schuetze describes the undervaluing of teaching in universities due to an increase in significance being placed on research in decisions for hiring, promotion, and tenure of staff (Schuller, 1995). Standing (2011) claims that low teaching hours means that academics can focus on research; with these low teaching demands, senior Ivy League academics can take sabbaticals every three years where previously it was every seven. A recommendation made by the Ontario Council of University Affairs’ Report (as cited in Schuller, 1995, pp. 172-173) is that “every faculty member, on hiring and at the start of each evaluation period, [should] be given the opportunity to decide... whether his/her evaluation will be based primarily on research (or some other form of scholarship) or teaching”. Research and teaching under managerialism has “produced a culture of performativity and an institutional obsession with research ratings and rankings” (Shore, 2010). University league tables affect funding, student applications, and the university’s image (Shore & Wright, 1999). For this reason, academics must concede to the influence that university ratings have (Shore & Wright, 1999). Shore & Wright (1999, pp. 570-571) call this “a powerful technology for inducing respect”. Shore

(2010, p. 26) quotes a New Zealand university lecturer who describes the shift in the university values: “[g]one is the old idea of the ‘impartial, disinterested pursuit of truth’; the new guiding institutional principle is the political-economic value-added vision”.

Performance outcomes have replaced the more traditional “culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate” (Smart, 2007, p. 313). These performance outcomes can be seen in strategic planning, performance benchmarks, audits, and quality assurance indicators that universities use (Smart, 2007). Over the last 20 years managerialism has taken a central role in academic policy (Deem et al., 2007). Managerialism has resulted in academics feeling like they have lost control over both their work and workplace culture (Deem et al., 2007). This is because universities have changed from “communities” into “workplaces” (Deem et al., 2007, p. 2). This will be elaborated upon in Chapter 4. Deem et al. (2007) describe the difficulties that many universities face due to the technological change, competition from other universities, an increase in state control over universities, and intellectual instability. Some scholars assert that business models such as managerialism do not lend themselves to the university structure which is not business-like.

Shore (2008) claims that universities are unlike companies except in the most superficial sense. The differentiation of subject matter within universities results in their complex character (Brint, 2002). “Who else would try to group folklore and biochemistry, philosophy and nursing, classics and mathematics, and pretend it is an organisation? Universities operate somewhere on the far side of loose coupling” (Brint, 2002, p. 339). A discussion of four university models (collegium, bureaucracy, corporation, and enterprise) informs McNay’s chapter in Schuller (1995). Clark writes in Brint (2002) that universities are led by their own internal dynamics rather than by external bodies and that business models don’t fit the university.

Business models perceive universities as primarily performing an economic function; this is a flaw of these models (Brint, 2002). Changes in the university then are effected through hierarchical accountability, annual assessments, and increased efficacy (Brint, 2002). A different model describes the value of the “autonomous university that uses a collegial form of entrepreneurial activity” (Brint, 340). This is thought to increase adaptability and thus help solve future problems that might arise (Brint, 2002). What is the effect of this business-like

approach on the social and professional milieu in which academics find themselves?

Audit Culture or Auditing Culture?

The term “audit culture” was created by anthropologists and sociologists and describes the culture that ensues from the dissemination of the rules of accountancy into non-financial worlds (Shore, 2008). This dissemination affects human behaviour, which in turn creates a culture or way of relating inter- and intra-personally (Shore, 2008). Drawing on Foucault, Shore (2008) proposes that these routines and practices are the way in which government exercises control over the population (Shore, 2008). Shore (2008) focuses his article on audit culture within British universities and society. Within this context, he investigates how audit technologies affect the environment and behaviour of academics, what managerialism might suggest about how power evolves over time in society, and why academics appear to be “complicit” (Shore, 2008, p. 278) in a system that they cannot change (Shore, 2008). Ethnographic examples from Shore’s (2008) article point to the damaging effect that auditing technologies have on individuals’ independence and sense of competence.

According to Webster and Mosoetsa (2001), who wrote a paper discussing the change in academia as it relates to managerialism, academics are pessimistic about the future of the profession and many are moving into private or public sector, managerial, or full-time research jobs as an “avoidance mechanism”. A small number of academics deal with the demands of managerialism in creative ways (Webster and Mosoetsa, 2001). As an attempt to solve the problems incurred through the demands of managerialism, one must “take seriously the views of academics and be sensitive to the specific features of their occupational culture” (Webster and Mosoetsa, 2001, p. 19).

The word “audit”, once associated with financial accounting, became associated with other professions during the 1980s and 1990s (Shore & Wright, 2000). In a book entitled *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy* (Strathern, 2000) Shore and Wright describe how Thatcherism and neoliberal ideology became entrenched in the university system in Britain through audit cultures – one of which is managerialism (Shore & Wright, 2000). Thus, as groups with ideas about nationhood (such as universities) try to incorporate state power (for example in securing state funding), so

states try to control nations' ideas and conceptions about nationhood (Appadurai, 1996). The movement of a word across professions occurs with the dissemination of discourse and ideology, such that audit culture found a new home in academia (Shore and Wright, 2000). Managerialism has become a technology through which individuals monitor and control their behaviour in accordance with audit governance (Shore & Wright, 2000). Shore and Wright (1999) trace the dissemination of audit culture from its origin in financial accounting into other areas such as higher education, as a government endorsed set of techniques and policies. From the standpoint of the authors, "[auditing] processes beckon a new form of coercive and authoritarian governmentality" (Shore & Wright, 1999, p. 557). Shore (2008) cautions that state power is enacted through audit and regulation, and diminishes civil freedom. Audits are necessitated by "concerns about 'quality assurance', 'operational risk', and the 'crisis of trust' (Shore, 2008, p. 280).

The process of auditing is not objective, but rather asserts criteria of quality and performance that auditees must conform to (Shore & Wright, 1999). Auditees must alter their form into that which is auditable (Shore & Wright, 1999). According to Shore and Wright (in Strathern 2000, p. 57), "audit technologies... are agents for the creation of new kinds of subjectivity: self-managing individuals who render themselves auditable". In other words, audit technologies produce and sustain the kinds of people who serve its perpetuation.

Shore and Wright (1999) assert that the form that accountability takes within managerialism is damaging for three reasons. Firstly, because it is associated with surveillance, secondly because professional relations are diminished to measureable outcomes, and thirdly because the "disciplinary mechanisms [that co-exist]... mark a new form of coercive neo-liberal governmentality" (Shore & Wright, 1999, p. 557). Sharing this contention, Shore (2008, p. 291) states that this "coercive and authoritarian [managerialism]... reduces professional relations to crude, quantifiable and inspectable templates" (Shore, 2008, p. 291). In higher education, accountability has taken the form of assessing teaching performance, research quality, and the university overall (Shore & Wright, 1999). Accountability is directed toward taxpayers and away from those who utilise taxpayers money (Shore & Wright, 1999). According to Amit (in Strathern, 2000, p. 217) who draws on Foucault, "...professors must constantly and frequently provide an account of how they spend their time... The university is being remade into a panopticon".

Giri (2000) in quoting Power explains that auditing is a tangible and calculable measure of accountability that has come to replace informal measures of trust. New managerial positions and new titles in universities are effectively positions through which auditing or monitoring of staff can be delegated (Shore & Wright, 2000). Many faculty members in management positions at Wits agree with this contention and during my interviews with them, expressed their disapproval of having their labour monitored and quantified into measurable outcomes. Shore and Wright (2000) claim that audit culture or the rise of measureable outcomes and their monitoring (Strathern, 2000) has been one of the most influential factors in altering the nature of thought and work in Britain since the Second World War. They write that “culture is constantly being invented and re-invented, nowhere is this becoming more evident than in the milieu in which most anthropologists themselves operate: the university sector” (Shore & Wright, 2000, p. 57). While audit culture is highly influential, authors (like Birnbaum (2000) argue that it is merely a passing phase.

Research Question

The central question which this research is hoped to have answered is: How do academics at the University of the Witwatersrand conceptualise the value of their labour within a context that is commonly referred to as “managerialist” and how can this information be situated within anthropological theory?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Social scientists are perhaps at their most misleading in describing how they do their work. They may be models of objectivity in reporting what they find and they will usually work within the canons of scientific method in trying to interpret what their data mean. But ask a social scientist how he found out, and you are likely to get an outrageous oversimplification (Mack, 1970, p. 38).

1. Demographic and general information.

I conducted 14 semi-structured interviews with 13 respondents. The interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 4.5 hours with an average of 1 hour and 20 minutes per interview for 13 interviews. One of the interviews was conducted via an emailed written response. All interviews were conducted in the offices of the lecturers at the University of the Witwatersrand.

The informants' ages ranged from 25 to 74 with an average age of 48 years. The informants belonged to three racial groups: 6 are White, 4 are Indian, and 3 are Black. While every attempt was made to interview equal numbers of academics from all five faculties, informants within the Faculty of Humanities responded most keenly. As a result 6 informants fall within this Faculty. Within Humanities, I conducted two interviews with one respondent who, in the first interview, discussed information about the Academic Staff Association of Wits University (ASAWU) informed by their membership in the union. The second interview focused on similar themes as those in the general interview schedule. The Faculties of Engineering and the Built Environment, Health Sciences, and Science all yielded one respondent each. The Faculty of Commerce, Law, and Management yielded two respondents.

6 informants occupied positions in senior management either during the time of interviewing or prior to that. With the exception of one informant who occupied such a position in the 1980s, these high-level positions had still been occupied within a year of the interview date. Senior positions include current or former Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Heads of Schools, and Heads of Department. To protect the identities of my informants, I cannot specify the numbers of each, nor can I specify whether these positions are currently or

formerly held. A member of the Strategic Planning Division and current Vice-Chancellor Adam Habib were interviewed. 3 informants were current or former members of ASAWU.

2. Foregrounding the informants: sensitive information and writing for an audience

One of the difficulties of this project has been the representation of sensitive information. Some of this information might, in the most extreme cases, jeopardize already precarious tenures. To honour my pledge of confidentiality, I have opted not to include Faculty or race in my descriptions where this information is not elucidative in its immediate function. I have not used gender consistently in my descriptions where this characteristic renders informants identifiable. I have also chosen to skew or omit certain narrative accounts. Murphy and Dingwall (2007, p. 341) express the effort and concern of generating anonymity most succinctly:

Ethnographers can do much to protect settings and participants by removing identifying information at the earliest possible opportunity, routinely using pseudonyms, and altering non-relevant details (Burgess, 1985; Tunnell, 1998). However, they are rarely able to give absolute guarantees that the identities of people and places will remain hidden... Even where anonymity is preserved beyond the setting, members are likely to recognize themselves and one another.

And recognize themselves they certainly might. Twelve of thirteen informants requested a copy of this thesis.

I have found difficulty in writing with this audience in mind. This puts me in a particularly interesting position as the observer of my own influences. Had this thesis not been requested by so many informants, I might have had greater surety in the objectivity of my presentation of the narrative accounts (this would have been a false sense of security). I now find myself striving to describe the people and their accounts as authentically as I can. I am constantly placing myself in the perspective of the informant as I re-read what I have written. I am keenly aware that when a point of interest is focused on, other points of interest are not. The nuances, words, gestures, tonalities, objects, and contextual influences that I have focused on represent but one gaze at one particular moment. They are but one observed and documented moment of an unknown number. I share this contention with Murphy and Dingwell (2005, p.

341) who, drawing on Josselson, write that

The experience of being written about may be a matter for concern in its own right: “I worry intensely about how people will feel about what I write about them. I worry about the experience of being “writ down”, fixed in print, formulated, summed up, encapsulated in language, reduced in some way to what the words contain. Language can never contain a whole person, so every act of writing a person’s life is inevitably a violation (Josselson, 1996b:62).

I do not purport to having spent enough time in the field with informants to differentiate between all the winks, twitches, and other gestures (Geertz, 1973). I do purport to having an awareness of my limited view and understanding of the thick details of the University and its academics. This compounds my concern for representation that is accepted by the informants as approximating an honest representation of them and their narratives. As a disclaimer of sorts, I quote Geertz (1973, p. 15) who writes that “anthropological writings are themselves interpretations... They are, thus, fictions; fictions in the sense that they are ‘something made’, “something fashioned”... not that they are false, unfactual, or merely ‘as if’ thought experiments.”

3. The Emic Perspective Evaluated

At the beginning stages of a study... structured interviews tend to shape responses to conform to the researcher’s conception of how the world works... [A] semi-structured interview is most valuable when the fieldworker comprehends the fundamentals of a community from the “insider’s” perspective. At this point, questions are more likely to conform to the native’s perception of reality than to the researcher’s (Fetterman, 2010, pp. 40-41).

It is difficult to establish to what extent I have achieved an emic perspective. I have been a student at Wits for the last 5 years, but students and staff do not usually interact outside of professional, academic boundaries. I cannot imagine that the slew of sexual harassment claims over the last two years has done much to encourage staff-student socializing. On entering this research project, my perspective was somewhat on the periphery between an

insider's and an outsider's. As the project progressed, my awareness of the goings-on among staff resulted from information given to me by informants during their interviews, and by my supervisor (who is an academic at Wits). My supervisor did not give me specific details where confidentiality was to be maintained, but I was made aware of some of the prominent issues, which I could then further investigate. At the close of this project, I am aware of personal and professional issues that staff members deal with, but having spoken to informants individually under the rule of confidentiality, I don't feel as though I have gained an insider's perspective into a group of academics; instead, I feel as though I have some insight into each informant, without any other informant being aware of this. In the short time for contact with informants and for data collection, an authentic emic perspective was probably not possible. My inability to participate as an academic might also have prevented the development of my own sense of having an insider's perspective. Perhaps I have established a type of secretive partial-insider's perspective as the insider who must be treated and perceived as an outsider by informants as they conceal their knowledge of my knowledge.

4. Interviews

Academics are well versed in oral and written communication. Interviews appeared to be a comfortable method of data collection for the informants. From the most junior to the most experienced academics, none of them appeared to be uncertain or apprehensive about the interview process. It follows that conversation and interview conventions such as turn taking, and listening carefully to questions were managed with no obvious problems. It is important to note that the informants were self-selected, and it is quite likely that there exist academics who are uncomfortable with the interview process and associated social cues, and who might have chosen to ignore my interview requests. Some informants did need to be coaxed into elaboration, but generally relaxed after about 20 minutes at which time their answers became more elaborative. In these cases, if I did not make a deliberate attempt to become calm and focused (which was difficult in the first two interviews during which I was nervous and my interviewing technique seemed mechanical and robotic), then the informants didn't seem to relax either.

My tactic was to allow the informants to talk openly without adhering too rigidly to an

interview schedule. My hope was that this would allow themes to develop organically rather than be shaped too closely by my thematic preconceptions. The issues that academics deal with cannot be gleaned through observation but rather through conversation. Participant-observation was not a possibility as I am not a lecturer and could not attend closed meetings. Because I was not observing and participating in the field site (thereby allowing the field itself to be a source of information), I kept the interviews as unstructured as possible. In many cases I allowed the interviews to veer off topic, and would then present, in a general form, anomalous information to subsequent interviewees for further elaboration, contestation, or corroboration. I encouraged informants to pursue issues that they wished to by asking elaborative questions, but allowed them to change topic or move onto another question if I sensed that they had said all they wanted to. I allowed for silences, which almost always resulted in the informants offering more information that might not have been explored had I quickly moved onto the next question. I was careful not to interrupt during interviews, with the result that some responses in the early interviews were unnecessarily long-winded, leaving important questions to the end of the interview with little time for in-depth exploration. Determining the extent to which I should pursue anomalous information while being aware of important questions that I might not have time to ask was not easy.

In some cases, informants made a concerted effort to give answers that they felt were relevant to what they understood my topic to be. This was especially the case in three interviews where informants were somewhat familiar with the body of information on managerialism. I had the impression that some informants made themselves familiar with the literature on managerialism prior to the interview. In both cases, the answers seemed derivative and less personal. Some informants were uncomfortable with their lack of knowledge about the topic. One informant said, “I don’t know if I’m going to be of help to you because I know nothing about this topic”. Of course, every informant provided a wealth of information deriving from their personal experience as an academic. When asked to elaborate on my topic (either through email, or at the start of the interview), I was careful not to provide too much information which could prompt their responses, and felt like the process of allowing information to develop organically was undermined by those who chose to research the topic. I have subsequently realized that my perspective should welcome the characteristic behavior of the people who inhabit the field site. Information may be, after all, the medium through which the academic makes sense of the world. Given the nature of their professional practice,

it only makes sense that some academics make meaning of their experiences of the management of their labor through scholarly study. It follows that some academics prepare for an interview by consulting academic literature on the topic.

Many of my formal interviews ended in informal conversation. Often, during these informal conversations, I was asked to turn the audio recorder off. These informal conversations were the sites where informants shared information about their personal as well as professional lives. While information emerging from these informal conversations was not always directly related to this thesis, it did help to provide a broader perspective of the person being interviewed. Since I hadn't done any "deep hanging out" (Geertz, 2000, p. 107) with my informants, and in the majority of cases met them for the first time at the interview, information emerging from informal conversations gives me some indication of the form that my portraits or characterisations of the informants should take.

Most of the informants were very welcoming and open to helping me as much as they could. There was a sense of busyness, and in some of the interviews I felt as though I was scheduled into a very busy day. One lecturer had a lunch meeting after the interview and a supervision meeting that ran slightly into the interview time. The interview took 40 of the 45 scheduled minutes, and the informant walked out of the building with me and continued to talk about the interview material. Not for one interview did I feel that time and effort were not graciously given even when an interview might have been inopportune. For example, I arrived at one of the interviews that I had scheduled with a female lecturer in her thirties. I walked into her office and after greeting her she said, "can I help you?" She had forgotten about the interview. After I reminded her she said, "Oh my goodness! I completely forgot about your interview! You're so lucky that I'm still in my office!" She later told me that she was feeling somewhat depressed and disorientated after having submitted a PhD only a month before. Still, she gave effortful concentration and honesty to her answers in the hour that we spent together. In another interview, a dean's personal assistant forgot to tell me that she had moved my appointment up by an hour. She had been on the phone when I arrived. When she hung up the phone 5 minutes later she began apologizing profusely. As I tried to assure her that it was ok, the dean, overhearing the conversation, came out of his office and, in a jovial manner, said, "Don't say it's okay! Tell her she's a bloody idiot!" He asked me if I could make the next appointment, and when I responded that it was too close to my research

submission date he said, “Too bad!” and rushed out of the room to his next meeting. His personal assistant asked if I could email the questions to the dean, who, she assured me, would send me his responses by the end of the week. I received them that Sunday morning before he left Joburg for a week.

4.1. Interview Sites

Most interviews were in quiet settings. Some interviews had a few interruptions. One lecturer had two supervisee students coming in and out of the office to sign forms requesting an extension for their MA research, with the result that the interview started 20 minutes late, but continued for well over an hour. Professor Habib’s interview was shorter than expected because a TV interview prior to mine had run 30 minutes over and the next reporter and cameraman began setting up after I had been in his office for 30 minutes. His personal assistant came in twice, once to remind him about an appointment, and once to find something in a cupboard. His teenage son came in to use the computer about 10 minutes into the interview and remained there for the duration. The phone rang once in almost every interview, and in the majority of instances, these were calls from family members. Before answering the calls they politely asked “do you mind if I take this call?” and then told the person on the other end “I’m in a meeting”. Some offices, particularly those positioned on the ground floors of buildings became quite noisy during tea or lunch breaks. A sessional lecturer shares an office with about four other lecturers, and we were alone for about 10 minutes of a 95 minute interview. During the first half of the interview, another lecturer was working at the adjacent desk and I did wonder if the interview might be disturbing him. Rather than ask the informant if we should take the interview elsewhere, I continued the interview hoping that the informant or the other lecturer would suggest a change of venue if needed. Other lecturers came into the room and people stopped by to say “Hi”. I realized that these disruptions were not really disruptive to the lecturers themselves, but maintained the social and informal environment in which young, male sessional lecturers and postgraduate students resided.

Lecturer’s offices were generally quite similar across the ranks. Most offices had a desk or two, two or three chairs (I sat on a few broken chairs during the interviews), and bookshelves. The main difference was the number of academic books, which ranged from about 90 to close to 1000 in some offices. Despite their occupants’ busy schedules, offices were quite

clean, neat and organized. I got the sense that regular effort was put into organization. If I was shown a book or document, informants knew exactly where to locate it. Apart from a foosball table in a communal office, there were no objects that were noticeably out of place. Very few offices had family pictures or personal memorabilia. Management offices in Senate House were a notch above the rest with tea services, and corporate-chic black furniture. There were certainly no broken chairs in these offices.

Professor Habib's office was by far the largest with three desks, pictures of his family adorning a bookshelf, and a view of the city that is expansive and industrial. This view is made possible by the office's elevated position (not just hierarchically, but also physically) as it is on the 11th floor of the Senate House building. By contrast, an emeritus professor with 40 years of service to the university had the least impressive office. It seemed like more of a storage room than a functioning office. This could be due to the fact that he doesn't spend much time at the office. When I mentioned this to another academic, his alternative perspective was: "I do know that many emeritus professors harbor resentment about what they feel to be a humiliating disregard for their contribution". Either way, it was not something that the professor himself had mentioned during the interview, despite it being an interview in which he openly expressed disdain for other aspects of the university system.

5. Age

I've noticed that Indian people retain a sense of community that stems from their apartheid community formations. My older relatives will often reminisce and say that there was a time when "everyone knew everyone". I've noticed a heightened sense of interest about other Indians, and have come to expect this when talking to Indians of my parents' generation (in their 50's or older). I am also aware of my need to demonstrate respect to elders in general. However, this takes a particularly acute form of heightened self-consciousness, or a moving outside of myself to check my own behavior, when I am interacting with older Indian people. Perhaps I have internalized the nostalgic sense of community as a surveillance mechanism in which my behavior is reflective of my family, which is known by an imagined "everyone".

Perhaps as a result, I found myself quite conscious of my behavior in the interviews with older informants, but it was amplified in an interview with an older Indian professor. I felt

overly stiff and cautious during this interview. At one point, he said, “I’ve taught my children that they must be respectful to adults. I tell them, ‘If you’re not respectful to adults, I’ll give you a good hiding!’” We both laughed and then, in a serious tone, he added, “*ja*, but you must be respectful to adults, that’s very important!” I wondered whether I had said something that he might have found disrespectful. After listening to the audio recording of that interview I was surprised to find that the interview went much better than I had imagined. It was interesting to note the real impact that context- or the interpretation of context - can have on one’s interpretation of communication. Thus, the importance of reflexivity.

Ever cautious to be sensitive and receptive to information that was given to me, with younger lecturers (under 50) the conversation took a more relaxed tone, and interviews easily turned into casual conversations. One particular conversation was so comfortable that the interview lasted more than four hours and I left the office as the sun was almost set. During this time, the informant said “I like your interview technique –I felt like we were chatting rather than interviewing”. Another lecturer ended the interview with, “Let me take you for a tour of the Anatomy museum!” I looked uncertain, having seen only the entrance to the morgue and no museum. She said “Come on! It will take 10 minutes!” When I asked if I could take a picture of a foetus that must have been about 5 cm and perfectly formed, she said, “Taking pictures is against the Human Tissues Act. When Oprah’s crew came here, they were like, ‘Who cares about the Human Tissues Act, we’re from Oprah!’” Another young lecturer had on a black t-shirt with a picture of a heavy metal band printed on it and a poster with another metal band on his wall. He said, “Sometimes I wonder when I’m going to realize that I’m too old to be wearing metal shirts to work”. Younger lecturers seemed more willing to share other parts of their lives with me. These interviews approximated the informality of “hanging out” more closely than many interviews with older staff members. While the atmosphere differed between older and younger staff members, this didn’t affect the candid and honest nature with which questions were answered.

Chapter 4: Academics on Academia

A note on “managerialism” and other words

When management adopts new goals it adopts strategies to attain those goals. These strategies alter the ethos and “culture” of the institution. I use inverted commas because culture is a concept that has been problematized by anthropologists as that which is bounded and described by the observer, rather than that which occurs organically (Geertz, 1973). In the words of Lila Abu-Lughod (1990, p. 470), “

Culture is the essential tool for making other. As a professional discourse that elaborates on the meaning of culture in order to account for, explain, and understand cultural difference, anthropology also helps construct, produce, and maintain it. Anthropological discourse gives cultural difference (and the separation between groups of people it implies) the air of the self-evident.

I am using the word “culture” to describe the change in social relations, language, and values of the University. The nature of relating socially has changed between academics, as will become evident during this chapter. Some attribute this to a newfound lack of time, others attribute it to union behavior that has increased the gap between management and academics, others attribute it to the individualistic nature of academic work that requires extended periods of solitary writing and reflection, and others question whether these changes are context-related at all or if they have just become increasingly introspective as they grow older.

Only one informant suggested that language has demonstrated the infiltration of changes into the university system. I had noticed in my interviews that the words “managerialism” and “collegiality” did not have one set of coherent assumptions or definitions. As one professor said, “you cannot bring in a system from business and expect it to work within academia”. And I wonder whether this perceived misfit is reflected in the usage of words which are themselves seen as problematic by academics, or which are ascribed definitions that reflect academics’ own perceptions of the context that they inhabit. I am not suggesting that the terms are problematized because they originate in another context, but rather that the words

reflect the infiltration of changes into the university system; the words become symbols (Derrida, 1978) through which a problematized context is represented and expressed. In this way, word-symbols allow individuals' thoughts, feelings, and conceptions of their context to be inscribed on them (Derrida, 1978). Words become tools of agency through conceptualized self-expression. In a similar fashion to my interviewees, I am appropriating, and perhaps misappropriating the word "managerialism" to describe broadly the leadership and management of the University at this time. My focus is not on the actual structure of managerial practice, but rather on academics' perception of their position within the University and their conceptions of their labour.

Within this spirit, this chapter evaluates managerialism against Victor Turner's (1963) writings on liminality and other academic sources and draws on excerpts from my interviews with academics. From the outset, I must emphasise that the concept of liminality is not a perfect fit for the position in which academics find themselves in. My intention is not to distort the data by imposing a pre-existing theory onto this complex fieldsite and the reflections of the academics within it. My contention is, rather, that liminality is a concept that provides, if nothing else, an interesting juxtaposition for the analysis of this moment in academia. It is also not the sole source of theory that has been drawn upon. As will become apparent, other theories have filled a supplemental role where necessary.

The point of departure for this section is an explanation of the concept of liminality. After this, change as a characteristic feature of liminality is compared to academics' perceptions of changes in collegiality in academia. This serves to evaluate to what extent the concept of liminality fits with the position academics find themselves in currently. The concept of liminal beings or neophytes as polluting is explored and related to academics, and this ties in with the section that follows which discusses alienation and isolation as a feature of academic labour. Finally, the importance of rank and status is discussed, and a brief section on the anthropological relevance of these ideas concludes this chapter.

Liminality

What is a liminal period? A liminal period is a phase within which information is generated which allows the individual a transformative experience. The liminal phase is transitory,

transformative, and isolated. It occurs within a system, and is prompted by a reaction to the system. One might postulate that the anti-system is birthed through the system itself, and in this way all systems are contained within themselves (Turner 1969). They are thus both self-generating, and since they awaken within their constituents the ability to critique the system, they are self-realising. In the words of Victor Turner (1963, p. 97-98):

Jakob Boehme, the German mystic whose obscure writings gave Hegel his celebrated dialectical “triad,” liked to say that “In Yea and Nay all things consist.” Liminality may perhaps be regarded as the Nay to all positive structural assertions, but as in some sense the source of them all, and, more than that, as a realm of pure possibility whence novel configurations of ideas and relations may arise... We are not dealing with structural contradictions when we discuss liminality but with the essentially unstructured (which is at once destructured and prestructured)

I am using “liminality” to describe systems because the university system is the environment within which academics are situated. By the “system” I am referring to the set of assumptions and rules that govern the labour of academic staff at Wits. The implications of such a system are broad and affect the political economy and socio-culture of the institution.

Preceding the liminal phase of change, is the separation phase which is characterized by the inability to integrate with the system (Turner 1969). One might then imagine that disconnection, discord, disillusionment, and dissatisfaction of the separation phase precedes the drive for creative idea generation which characterizes the liminal phase. If I may offer a creative musing and a summation of the concept of liminality thus far, the liminal phase is thus either a “lumen-al” phase of enlightenment and epistemic realization (where “lumen” refers to the amount of light emitted and is associated with illumination (Soanes, 2002)), or a “lumen-al” phase which presents a space for the development of new ideas (where “lumen” can refer to a cavity or space within the structures of the body (Dictionary of Medical Terms, 2004)).

One might, as I initially did, listen to academics complain about the discomforts of their jobs. Often, I felt as though I was sitting through a cathartic soliloquy-rant disguised as an

interview. “Why would people stay in jobs they so obviously hated in a situation that seemed so rigid and unamenable to alteration?” I wondered. This was a question that I kept asking myself, and even my informants as I navigated this oppressive managerialist territory. Their answers did not answer that question satisfactorily – they would say “I really like what I do”. It’s hard to be convinced that someone “really like[s]” what they do when they spend most of an interview complaining about how much they dislike what they do. Much of the academic literature laments managerialism. Written by academics, this body of literature echoes the disdain felt by academics that I interviewed at Wits. I have come to view their soliloquy-rants (both the style and the content) as the feelings of disconnection, discord, disillusionment, and dissatisfaction that precede, or are the impetus for, creative idea generation. I previously described academics as people who understand the world through information. Retaining this perspective, academics, whether through interviews, books or journal articles, accrete information about the system which, in this instance, is experienced as oppressive and agonistic to their perception of the academic endeavor. I have made the important realization that instead of drawing on such information as the sources through which an attack on managerialism is to be launched, I could distance myself from the one-sidedness of the information, and view the system as a neutral entity through which academics express themselves. Rather than a system being a completely restricting and oppressive entity, it brings to the fore the values and ideals which academics perceive as vital to their labour.

Are changes in academia characteristic of a rite of passage?

Turner (1963, p. 93-94) defines the “states” which are bridged through rites of passage or phases or liminality:

Such rites indicate and constitute transitions between states. By “state” I mean here “a relatively fixed or stable condition” and would include in its meaning such social constancies as legal status, profession, office or calling, rank or degree... [it] may also be applied to ecological conditions, or to the physical, mental or emotional condition in which a person or group may be found at a particular time... [it] refers to any type of stable or recurrent condition that is culturally recognized.

It stands to reason that academics who are in a transitional state – that between critiquing and

uncertainty about managerialism, and between ascribing to managerialism- are transitioning into a physical, mental and emotional space, and also a professional one that is different from their previous state. Subscribing to managerialism implies that one subscribes to the career advancement that occurs as part of the process of increased research output and other such benchmarks. It is important to distinguish between a transition and a state. The liminal or transitory phase “has different properties from those of a state” (Turner 1969, p. 94) which will become more apparent during the course of this argument.

Why is the change in academia a rite of passage? Turner (1963, p. 94) states that “*rites de passage* are not confined to culturally defined life-crises but may accompany any change from one state to another” further, “[the] condition [of neophytes or those in a phase of liminality] is one of ambiguity and paradox, a confusion of all the customary categories” (Turner 1969, p. 97). Something has indeed changed. During my interviews I felt a definite sense that academics were trying to reconcile traditions or behaviours of the past with the present, for example, the change in social relations between staff, and staff and students. A senior tutor who has worked at Wits for 23 years made note of what she perceived to be a change in the way students have lost their personhood. In our interview she said, “the courses are [now] called “units” and students have person numbers. Hello! They used to be students! (Laughing) ...if you look at the vocabulary you’ll see a mirror into our world.” Not only have students had their personhood diminished in the gaze of university administration, but relations between lecturers and senior management has changed in a similar fashion. She went on to say:

In the first 10 years [that I worked here – from 1990 to 2000] Wits was... an open university. The majority of faculty anyway were white European staff and it was very typical of the children of professors to be children of academic staff. Well it has to do about the culture of home and the fact that the country was closed, so it was a very family [oriented] university...and had a very family[like] ethos... I found that...that meant that the Dean knew me personally... and my experience was that they would phone and invite me to go for tea or out for breakfast maybe with a few other colleagues and [we would] tell them what we needed to do our job well. They knew who I was by name. I had a network of people with whom I was on first name terms. I could lift up the phone, the person would answer the phone, and I could get whatever

it was [that]I wanted [and it was] done there and then. All of that has vanished with systematisation,right? So there's been this radical change... over say the two ten year periods, between a very face-to-face, personalised working environment, and the exact opposite of that.

Worth quoting, is a comment from Frank Furedi, a sociologist at the University of Kent that is reveals the suppression of creativity that academic staff face under conditions of what Johnson (2005) has termed contrived collegial managerialism:

innovation has been stifled and professional autonomy eroded ... standardisation has encouraged formulaic teaching, conformity and superficial research. Many of us spend so much energy trying to respond to the demands of the research assessment exercise that we end up researching to order. Academics have responded to the bureaucratic pressure on their time by reducing contact with students (Times Higher Educational Supplement, 28th January 2000 as cited in Webster and Mosoetsa, 2001, p. 3)

An emeritus professor who has been at Wits for over 40 years also offered a glimpse into this change in collegiality:

When I started here at Wits there was a higher degree of collegiality in the department, and within the faculty, [so] that in the department every morning at tea we used to have a tea break. For a long time it was in my office. So we'd use it as an opportunity for an informal meeting to discuss things. Um, then there was a staff dining room in Central Block when I arrived here, uh, with long tables, you'd meet people from other departments [and] other faculties, [and]over lunch, chat together. Then that moved. It moved to University Corner, it still functioned as a staff meeting place, and was replaced in Central Block by a common room for tea for everybody in Central Block. So you'd meet a lot of people from different departments there for tea. It replaced our departmental tea with a much wider tea service, and that was great having that common room and tea now. But, you know, show me where the common room is today, show me where the staff canteen is today. These sorts of things don't exist... I was always keen on cricket. In the 1970s the cricket club would go and play

against staff from other universities around the place. We had an annual game against UNISA staff, King Edwards staff, against St. Peters, Rivonia staff and parents. And the team was recruited from all faculties and some non-academics, you know, guys who worked on the technical staff at Wits. So it was a great meeting place. Again, across faculty boundaries, [and] across departmental boundaries, you know, you met people in science, commerce, and what have you, and that promoted a nice sense of collegiality. There was also a staff tennis group that used to play down where the Wits Club is now, [at]the tennis courts there. We'd meet on a Thursday night, play tennis and then have supper together. And so there were all these points of collegiality which now just don't happen, [they] don't exist. We had, seemingly, the time for that kind of relationship in the old days. People are under too much pressure these days to even think about it.

Certainly it is evident that a shift in staff and staff-student relations has occurred, however the sociality was exclusionary for some, and so while collegiality is embraced by all the academics I interviewed, the shape that it took in previous years fit the context of a racially biased South Africa. A Professor who is of the Indian racial classification describes his experiences of the collegial past:

There was a time when Wits was collegial. You can sometimes lapse into a romantic past of the world of collegiality. Well the world of collegiality that they're talking about was only for whites and men. I built my entire research career not ever having taken a cent from the University Research Committee. Why? Because I didn't know I was allowed to. I was shocked to find that [the University Research Committee] was generating at that time R 30 million, and that the largest portion of it was going to senior researchers who happened to be friendly with the 11th floor. I thought it was going to junior people in philosophy and history who didn't have research funding.

No! Eighteen percent of it went to one department that produced two percent of the research output. Now those were the days of collegiality when decisions were taken in carparks and at peoples' dinner tables. If you want to go back to that world, you must count me as your enemy.

A white, American Professor related to me that when he arrived at Wits the assumption was that he would automatically become a part of what he described as the white group of academics. He said that this was quite a strange experience for him as he was not from South Africa but rather from a country in which racial segregation was not as overt and openly accepted. More recently, a young Indian lecturer related to me his experience of being part of the “out group” in her department which consisted of herself and black non-South African academics. She further described how it was very difficult to be treated as an equal in a department in which white academics seemed to be treated as more equal than those of other races (Orwell, 1945).

In sum, while the criterion of change as a characteristic of entering the liminal phase has been satisfied, namely in terms of the familial aspect and general opportunities for collegiality, racialism and its exclusionary practice within the collegial realm remains a stable factor within some pockets of the University. What is worth mentioning again is that all but one academic that I interviewed lamented the decline in spaces for socialization and collegial growth within the University whether or not they experienced it firsthand. Another characteristic of the liminal phase is the polluting effect that those within it are thought to have (Turner, 1969).

Pollution

While academics are in a state of liminality or indecision with regard to whether or not they will accept the managerialist structures of the University, there is an element of disapproval or disdain that accompanies the glance of those who are more accepting of managerialism toward those who are undecided or reject some of its constituent parts. I am not suggesting that one either accepts or rejects managerialism in its entirety or that this decision is made at a single moment in time. Rather, the liminal state is constituted by academics who are in a state of critical contemplation about the university space, its leadership and the structure of its management. Those in senior management positions display a black and white attitude of academics either being on-board with the managerialist benchmarks and structure, or being against it. There seems to be very little tolerance for those in a position of critical examination. The belief seems to be that managerialism provides the best possible way of managing the University at this time. Any anti-managerialist critique, such as that discussed

and formulated into official demands by the staff union ASAWU, can be polluting as its logic influences those who are as yet unformed in their critique. In sum, the type of “pollution” that academics display in their liminal position might be a kind of contagion that gathers momentum and incites social movement. Whether or not academics of the pro-managerialism camp avoid those from the anti-managerialism camp in a marked and observable social cleft is not clear from my fieldwork. What is clear, however, is that an awareness of differences of opinion regarding managerialism is heightened and frowned upon, with each side of the argument perceiving dire consequences that result from the perception of a lack of foresight and insight into the problem of university leadership and strategy. For example, an individual in senior management cited managerialism as the antidote and prophylactic for laziness and incompetence:

We can come to Wits and say nothing about research targets so that we're not seen as managerialist, [and] chances are [that] we're going to collapse [while other universities who subscribe to managerialism flourish]. You can quote this: I don't believe that an academic who is not graduating masters and PhD students on time, who has a high failure rate in their modules at [the] undergraduate [level], [and] who does not produce... at least one-and-a-half or two articles a year and publish those in renowned journals, (which, by the way, ... are the reasons to be employed in a university), I don't think those people should be left alone. So why do we have the university? Why do we have contracts with [academics]? Why do we pay [their] salaries? I don't believe [that]...we should let people sit and waste university resources because we are scared [of] challeng[ing] their performance and... be[ing] seen as harsh,... [or] racist,... or [against] transformation,... [or] arrogant,...[or] managerialist. [In that case] ... we must...open the cash tap for the public to come and take resources because [the University]... is throwing away resources. We need accountability. For every man and woman, in spite of race, colour and nationality, when you get paid in a university, you get paid for particular tasks and you need to perform... [at a] particular level. Unless you are high-handed and you are pushing people beyond the reasonable trends in higher education. If we were to say now that every academic must produce five articles a year when we know that, on average, people produce one-and-a-half to two articles a year in other universities, I think, then, we would be taking an extreme kind of a route. But managerialism, usually is in

the mind of a person who doesn't want to live up to the spirit, the letter, and the content of the contract that they signed.

The accountability of academics is mentioned as an essential component of good governance in the above excerpt. In the following extract from an interview with an academic, the lack of accountability that management has for the effects of managerialism is described. At times, this is a scathing critique of the Vice-Chancellor himself.

... for me [the management style] comes across as a little rushed and very aggressive and a little too managerialist... it hasn't been consultative and democratic at all, [it's about] getting Wits up there to be successful, 'cause its all about the ratings. I think that's insulting to the academics who are in the institution, people with good research records, or people starting out their careers like me. There's no sense of support for us. There's no sense of "well how can we support and nurture the existing talent in this university?" There's just a sense of "...let's get our research ratings out and we can look great to the whole world because being number one is the most important thing". It doesn't matter if your staff are unhappy and they don't feel valued and they feel disgruntled. That is overlooked completely. And when we had an open meeting around it, nearly everyone in the audience had something to say about it. You know, it's results at the expense of other things that they should be taking into account...

[Adam Habib] didn't take our concerns into account at all. They were systematically dismissed in a very aggressive way, and I just think if he continues this way he's going to alienate himself from academics. It's not just Adam Habib, it's the other VC's as well, but he's become this very high profile, visible person, but [he's] also a little bit [of a] megalomaniac. That's the impression I get of him. It's not about Wits, it's about him being number one at Wits, and everyone must just comply... there's no real room for other voices or dissent... He likes going through the motions [and] he likes saying he likes robust debate, but [instead] he bulldozes people. I've seen it myself. So my sense is that this whole notion of managerialism has been accelerated indeed as he's come in as the new Vice-Chancellor... I'm not very familiar with this Vision 2022 or whatever the hell it is, it seems to be completely unrealistic. I mean, statements such as "in the next ten years the postgrad numbers are going to be higher

than the undergrad” I mean that’s just not going to happen, I don’t know what planet they’re living on... that’s absurd.. They just want to ignore reality and force through things at any cost... This whole Vision sounds like a big PR pie in the sky exercise. I’m not saying that we shouldn’t have a vision and we shouldn’t focus on goals, but they don’t seem realizable. Every time people voiced concern over this whole... scheme Adam said “oh it wasn’t me, I’m just carrying it out”. So however you argue it, it feels like it’s being imposed. Whether it’s the vision of a single man or whether it’s a strategic thing, this thing feels like it’s being imposed on us and we don’t have any room to express how things could be improved or what role we could play... [The system] is stressful and it makes you feel very inadequate. And then, of course, you start comparing yourself to all of the other colleagues you have around you... There are so many individuals who are so prolific and they publish [and] you compare yourself to them and you think “am I in the wrong job? Because I’m not as successful as I should be”.

As previously mentioned, whether or how the cleft (that is illustrated by these two excerpts) becomes animated within the social context is not clear to me. Uncovering that would require longer term immersion into the social life of academia from which the intricacies of academics’ inter-relations can be understood.

Since neophytes are not only structurally “invisible” (though physically visible) and ritually polluting, they are very commonly secluded, partially or completely, from the realm of culturally defined and ordered states and statuses’ (Turner 1969, p. 98). Does “structurally invisible” and “ritually polluting” (Turner 1969, p. 98) suggest that the liminal space is somewhat undesirable? While the margins may provide a space of creative idea generation, the peripherality of its location suggests a separation and exclusion from the normativity of greater society, which in this instance is most apparent as a separation from management. (The assumption here is that the hegemonic ideology of managerialism is considered common sensical (Gramsci, 1971) and normative). Within this “ordered” (Turner 1969, p. 98) space, feelings of alienation arise. For example, one lecturer said:

I think that like many academics here, there’s a sense of alienation maybe from management. There’s a sense of certain things that we have to deal with as academics

on a daily basis that just seem to be overlooked or ignored. The pay issue [for example]- academia is not known for earning a lot of money- I knew that, but there's also certain managerial attitudes with regard to salary negotiation, other aspects of working life,[such as placing] tremendous pressure on research output. And also the daily frustrations of being at Wits, for example, parking, having to pay for parking, not having enough parking, and then when you complain about it, you're just ignored really.

What I found surprising was one informant's preference for her position within this no man's land. Her conscious attempt to remain disengaged as far as possible with the politics of the University and any socialization into an academic group, or even limiting her knowledge of the broader workings of the University gave her a sense of autonomy.

I've been very protected... I haven't really been on any committees, and I haven't really interacted with the wider Wits world out there. I haven't really interacted with the University management. I've always been the kind of person who gets in and then does my job and then I get out and do whatever I do outside. So I have been less involved in kind of what's been going on around the University ... Honestly...I just come and do my job, and leave. And I haven't actually put myself within the larger Wits community, and I haven't positioned myself in any way.

This sense of autonomy, rather than inducing a sense of loneliness and isolation, made her feel protected. Pollution can certainly be alienating and as the next section illustrates, for some, the consequences of social isolation can be dire.

Alienation expanded

Turner (1969, pp. 100-101) relates that,

...complete equality usually characterizes the relationship of neophyte to neophyte, where the rites are collective... The liminal group is a community or comity of comrades and not a structure of hierarchically arrayed positions...I have no need here to dwell on the lifelong ties that are held to bind in close friendship those

initiated into... the same fraternity or sorority on an American campus, or into the same class in a Naval or Military Academy in Western Europe.

In academia however, there is a sense of alienation. An academic who had just completed her PhD at the time of the interview related,

We don't have a staff room which is a pity. It would be so nice to go outside and have a bite with someone and have a chat. Basically my best buddy is next door and we go down for a cigarette and a chat and we buy a sandwich and we go back up and we go back down and we come back up. And it's mostly me and her, and that's it. And then I have a couple of other friends and we go down for smoke breaks as well. As I say it's this very narrow, isolated kind of workplace you know. It would be nice if we could just chill at a staffroom... it does feel superficial and it's a pity you know. And I also think that we're also our own worst enemies because we're so individualistic about the way that we are and [how we choose to spend] our time...that we can alienate ourselves as well.

Another academic mentioned that he has noticed that academics are highly resistant to collaborative publications:

People tend to think there is more value in the writing that is done by a single author...Joint-authored articles receive more citations than single-authored articles. And the reason is that there is joint thinking that has gone into that paper. So it is bound to be richer, it is bound to be a more coherent piece of work. And when people read it they can see that [the] quality... is probably that which goes beyond that which can be produced by a single individual.

Deem (1998, p. 47) states that universities were once “communities of scholars researching and teaching together in collegial ways” which in the current context of university management would have been deemed “heretical”.

If the vast majority of academics that I interviewed are a microcosm of the greater body of

academics at the University, and collegiality (in terms of social relations or academic collaboration) is deemed favourable, why does academia create an alienating and isolating environment instead of providing academics with conditions that are conducive to collegial sociality? Turner (1969, p. 101) states that

People can 'be themselves,' it is frequently said, when they are not acting institutionalized roles. Roles, too, carry responsibilities and in the liminal situation the main burden of responsibility is borne by the elders, leaving the neophytes free to develop interpersonal relationships as they will. They confront one another, as it were, integrally and not in compartmentalized fashion as actors of roles.

Academics as neophytes are not “free to develop interpersonal relationships as they will” (Turner 1969, p. 101). Rather, they are in positions of a high level of responsibility. Perhaps the responsibilities and institutionalized roles that academics fill circumscribe their social interactions. Perhaps this formulates a performativity that suppresses social bonds and emphasizes the formal and minimal interactions that result in feelings and perceptions of alienation. One of the responsibilities includes writing, which many academics agree is an isolating and lonely experience as one senior academic related:

[I'm] constantly working on staying buoyant in this context of alienation...the thing with doing research and writing is that it's a very lonely process... writing is such a hard process- I write very well- but it's a craft so it's...a difficult process. But that loneliness that's involved, it's difficult to deal with, especially if the context in which you're working now is no longer about ideas that are being valued, but money.

It seems as though the loneliness that characterises the academic milieu affects academics of all ranks. This excerpt of an interview that I conducted with a junior academic illustrates this point:

Diksha: if you had total control over your job, what would an ideal day look like?

Lecturer: I like coming in to work actually. I don't like staying home and doing research or being too isolated doing research. I find it lonely. I'd like to have maybe more interaction with my... colleagues about teaching and ways to improve teaching techniques in a more relaxed kind of way. And maybe talk about [job related] things because it seems like we're very isolated in our different departments and disciplines...

It would be nice to see more fora where people can brainstorm and express ideas, and speak about the challenges affecting them. Instead of us all soldiering on in our corners despite the fact that we actually share a lot in common with the challenges that we face.

However, later in the interview she said,

At the moment I don't mind the work encroaching into my personal space because I live alone, I don't really have a partner [or] kids, and to me it's fine. Maybe it's also a way of not being lonely. You know, sitting in the evening and doing emails, and getting involved in ASAWU things.

Herein lies a contradiction: the nature of academic labour is alienating and consuming to the extent that the work itself becomes the antidote to the generalized isolation that it has created. This is particularly the case where academics are too busy to remedy the isolation with other activities as one Professor explained:

I've seen constant battles around heads of schools trying to get people to come to tea once or twice a week. If there's more pressure to publish and so on, you're not going to be there having tea [and] talking, you're out there using whatever time you've got [on research].

What are consequences of this isolation? Academics have mentioned to me that there is a sense that they are united in their isolation, but during many of my interviews I became aware of the fact that for many of them the experience of being listened to during these interviews proved cathartic. I left too many interviews feeling worried about academics I had just

spoken to who seemed so vulnerable and so strained. This was especially the case with academics who returned to empty homes every evening. In some interviews I got the distinct impression that some academics were depressed, not just because of their generally low demeanour but because some said it explicitly: “I’m feeling demotivated and depressed” one young lecturer confided.

Unfortunately this is not a characteristic of an impermanent liminal period, but rather a feature of academics existing within a paradoxical position: that of being central to the operation of the University and therefore having heavy workloads, and yet feeling as though they are marginalized. Liminality does not offer an exact fit for this phase of managerial change at Wits. It is conflated with aspects of marginalization and isolation that do not satisfy the criterion of group coherence and community that Turner (1963) refers to. As previously mentioned, liminality does, however, provide an interesting theoretical comparison through which the managerial moment can be viewed. Here is one senior academic’s insight into the effects of this liminal, marginal, and isolating position:

I think we’re all very awkward people. The standing joke is that we’re all nutters. I think the biggest single expenditure is on psychology [for the Wits medical aid]. We are an odd bunch. Some of us are far too weird... Look I’m not going to tell you about the cases, there’s all sorts of people... there [are] lots of people with mental health issues. I’ve been overseeing disciplinary cases where, frankly, our member is out to lunch and they do need medication, they need to be boarded because they can no longer cope. So it happens. Whether suicide is a higher risk among academics, I don’t know. [It] probably is if they’re lonely, isn’t it? Loneliness is a very key factor. [That’s why] a lot of professors don’t retire. The university is their life. It’s not just Wits, it’s everywhere.

Constanti and Gibbs (2004) analyse the need for emotional labour within the managerial university in which academics are perceived as service providers and students as customers. They analyse whether emotional labour (or emotions that result in the best outcome for the student and profit management) is exploitative for the academic since this type of labour is not quantified (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004). Citing an article in the Times Higher Educational Supplement, Webster and Mosoetsa (2001) describe that increased stress levels among

academics are due to disharmony between home and work milieux, an increase in bureaucracy in the workplace, and a decrease in job security. They cite statistics which reveal that a majority of academics deal with stress which they claim affects their health and psychological well-being (Webster & Mosoetsa, 2001). During one interview, an academic, who prior to 2013 worked at a university in England, elaborated on the connection between work life and home life:

There are no two ways about it- if you don't sacrifice, you don't succeed in the academic world, but you also need a very supportive family for you to be able to do that. I've had colleagues, friends whose families have broken down because of the demands of the PhD, because of the demands of having to write and publish. I know quite a number of families that have broken down because of the pressures exerted around academic work. So if you don't have that supportive family, it can actually place [a] strain on your life in general. A necessary ingredient for the success of the academic is the supportive family.

Job dissatisfaction stemming from low salaries, employment insecurity due to increased labour flexibility within a globalised economy, and long hours and working after hours are variables which contribute toward increased stress (Webster & Mosoetsa, 2001). These factors are highlighted in an article that attempts to understand the difficulties facing academics and their responses to this difficulty (such as leaving for employment in the private or public sectors), while emphasising that universities cannot exist without academics. If isolation and alienation characterize the “complete equality” (Turner 1969, p. 100) between academics, what characterizes the relationship between academics and management? Turner (1963, p. 99-100) writes about the relationship between neophytes in the liminal phase and authorities:

“... the authority of the elders over the neophytes is not based on legal sanctions; it is in a sense the personification of the self-evident authority of tradition. The authority of the elders is absolute, because it represents the absolute, the axiomatic values of society in which are expressed the “common good” and the common interest”

Similarly in academia, meeting targets and goals is seen as serving the common good within

a broader vision for the liberation of Africa from its colonial legacy or heritage. In the words of Vice-Chancellor Adam Habib:

If [academics are] thinking about building third world institutions... then you want to be party to the colonial project. I'm sorry [but] that's not what we are here [for]. Then everything we fought for for the last 20 years was a mirage. It's got nothing to do with being free. And partly, being free means we must be intellectually free. And the question they should be asking is: "what is precisely required to achieve that project?" and "how do we achieve that project with the kinds of limited resources that we have?"...Don't say to me "we're tired, we don't want to be part of this project". So what do you want? [Do you want] to be a part of a sub-standard institution? Because that's not what our citizens deserve. And for me that's the real groundwork.

I do not agree that the “equality” between academics is “complete” (Turner 1969, p. 100). Certainly they share the experiences of alienation, burdensome workloads and other aspects of academic work, but considering that a competitive current underlies the directives from management and also seems to be a shared characteristic among many academics, it would seem logical that a hierarchy of sorts is likely to ensue.

Rank and status

“They have no status, property, insignia, secular clothing, rank, kinship, nothing to demarcate them structurally from their fellows” (Turner 1969, p. 98-99).

How important is rank and status in the University and what are the implications for the polluted and polluting? While an increase in research output and the resulting ascent in rank might be a valued outcome for the University in its managerialist context, do academics need to be in agreement with managerialism to aspire toward an ambitious rise in position? Or does ascending in rank imply that one is accepting of the competitive and outcomes-focussed character of managerialism? One senior academic mentioned to me that academics are by nature competitive people- the type of people who have always excelled academically and

who have a strong desire to be number one in everything that they do. Another senior academic shared this contention and added that:

There's a really unpleasant rule in academia which is that those that get ahead are those that are the bastards, because what you've got to do in a department or a school is cover everything: the weak students and the strong students, the mundane work and the high-flying work. If you want to get ahead, you've got to publish. So what you've got to do is you don't take on weaker students for supervision because they involve more work. If you're given a coordinating job- let's say coordinating first years- you do a terrible job. You neglect it, so now it gets taken off you and you never have to coordinate first years again. It means that you free up time.

Weber (1963) posits that striving toward positions of power is not necessarily incentivised by economic gain. Instead, power may itself be the driving force (Weber, 1963). Classes, status groups, and parties are indicative of power distributions within communities (Weber, 1963). And since “capital breeds capital” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 85) new positions are generated by those in power. Bourdieu (1988) argues that the timing of succession of academics in senior positions and the duration of their time in positions of prominence and power shapes, to a great extent, the structure of a university. Is the current academic leadership constituted by those who have a strong focus on winning, sometimes at any cost? It would stand to reason that in an environment in which the achievement of targeted outcomes is valorized, competitiveness and ambitiousness are nurtured. This allows a glimpse into the way in which value is defined within this particular context (Graeber, 2001), and as will become slightly more evident, this is dependent upon who is making the valuation.

Giri (2000) interrogates the values that academics might hold within the context of managerialism and calls for an approach of ethical mindfulness by academics toward their labour. She turns the anthropological lens back on university lecturers and asks whether, in a culture of auditing and accountability, lecturers prioritise money, fame, recognition and power over time and energy devoted to students (Giri, 2000). In quoting a passage written by Gandhi that explains the importance of considering the impact one's decisions have on the less fortunate other, Giri (2000) asks academics to reflect on whether the research they generate will benefit those the research is being conducted on – an especially important

consideration for anthropologists for whom much research focusses on the impoverished or marginalised. While the competitive nature of universities is exemplified through such actions as seeking out top researchers, students, and income within the “quasi-market” (Deem, 1998, p. 48) context of a broader (neoliberal) economic influence, scholars like Giri (2000) take a step back from audit culture and its premise of efficiency, and reflect on the ethical implications within a broader scheme of scholarship and humanity. The tension between the values of academics and management became apparent through the contestation that ensued during the proposal in 2014 by management for staff incentive bonuses, to which I now turn.

The Senate Report on Performance Management (2014) encapsulates the debate surrounding the incentivisation of academic productivity through staff salary bonuses that was proposed by management during 2014. The Report states that “the underperforming academics at Wits are by far in the minority. It is therefore unclear what problem the proposed new performance management system and bonus incentive scheme is intended to address”. This contention was shared by other academics who, in their interviews, stated that the monitoring of performance was necessitated by “lazy” academics who squandered their time on endeavours unrelated to their university work. Many academics felt that they are, as a group, driven by excellence and do not need to be managed or monitored to perform. The Report (2014, p. 2) goes on to say:

...in the case of public universities in particular, we have not found evidence to support a positive correlation between performance bonuses and improved performance... at most, they can create perverse incentives in universities with divisive and corrupting effects on academic behavior.

Consistent with my findings, “the academics who have indicated that they are in favour of implementation of additional performance management typically do so because they resent free-riders and they are unhappy with existing salaries” (Senate Report on Performance Management, 2014, p. 2). The Report concludes that staff members should be paid salaries that are comparable with academics in “top South African universities” (Senate Report on Performance Management, 2014, p. 4). It seems logical that instead of working toward targeted incentives, academics should be paid equitably. As an alternative, “investment in overcoming constraints on excellence (such as the high student to staff ratio) would be a

better use of resources than trying to motivate an already highly motivated but overburdened academic staff” (Senate Report on Performance Management, 2014, p. 4). A lecturer who has been working at the University for over 20 years explained,

Lecturer: So there's been a shift from the notion of collegiality with academia at the focal point of the enterprise to corporatisation of universities and with that... a shift to a corporate model and very much an instrumentalist and administratively driven "business"... So everything that academics now do is being quantified in monetary terms, and the key motivating factor is now money – the way in which salaries are being structured... that is just so foreign to one's understanding of what a university is and should be all about.

Diksha: What do you think a university should be all about?

Lecturer: I think it should be a place where new knowledge is generated, where, it's a very time-labour consuming profession, so the people should have a space to think, to generate knowledge and to teach that knowledge to young people. So I'm not averse to productivity in terms of qualifying South Africa's young people to make a contribution to their own society- I'm very committed to that. That's my idea of productivity. It's not that I would get x Rand more because I pushed a student to publish a chapter of their thesis.

Differing conceptions of the value of academic labour might be held between academic staff and staff of the Academic Information Systems Unit (AISU) (who quantify and value the various activities that academics perform in order to calculate salaries) at Wits within the context of managerialism.

Appadurai (1986, p. 21) defines tournaments of value as “complex periodic events that are removed in some culturally well-defined way from the routines of economic life... their forms and outcomes are always consequential for the more mundane realities of power and value in ordinary life”. With Wits’ increased impetus for research output (Habib Takes the Top Spot at Wits, 2013), could publications then be tournaments of value that take on particular characteristics revealing of the social conditions under which they are produced –

namely audit culture and managerialism? Technological devices represent the collective knowledge of all the labourers whose work has culminated in the eventual object (Sohn-Rethel, 1978). It stands to reason that managerial shifts and structural changes within academia alter the social conditions under which knowledge is created and therefore may affect the nature of the knowledge that is produced. Migration and mass-media also have a great effect on cultural subjectivities (Appadurai, 1996), and managerialism as an imported structure which encourages internationalisation through participation in global ranking systems (QS World University Rankings: Methodology, 2013), certainly contributes toward a cultural impetus for the production of knowledge goods. In this way knowledge as a commoditised good that brings prestige to those claiming ownership, is not only a tool of power, but is itself shaped by a history of power contestation.

In sum, managerialism seems to put academics into a state of liminality in which they perceive themselves to be not fully integrated into and compliant with the system. For reasons that I have discussed, the equality and social cohesion that characterise the liminal phase (Turner, 1969) eludes academics. I have come to view the disdain that academics have for their position in the University as the disillusionment that characterizes the liminal phase and as the impetus for creative idea generation. Academics are critiquing the University system, and are possibly moving into a stable state which is different to their prior state. The experience of a significant change is one characteristic that defines those in the liminal phase (Turner, 1969). An example of a change that has occurred is the decrease in staff-student collegiality which some academics have pointed to. What has remained constant is the presence of racism among the faculty. Pollution is another characteristic of those in the liminal phase (Turner, 1969). In the University this occurs possibly through the influence that anti- or pro-managerialist discourse has on those whose ideas are as yet unformed. The effects of this cleft between the anti- and pro-managerialism sentiments creates a sense of alienation between academics and management. Due to the nature of academic work, academics also feel alienated from one another. This is a point at which the model of liminality does not apply to the academic realm. Those in the liminal phase have a sense of togetherness (Turner, 1969). They are also seen as equals (Turner, 1969). Within academia a hierarchy of “institutionalized roles” (Turner, 1969, p. 101) exist which works against the social integration of academics.

Relevance to anthropologists

Turner (1963, p. 106) states that the liminal phase “paradoxically expose[s] the basic building blocks of culture just when we pass out of and before we re-enter the structural realm”. This is a phase of critical examination of the structures that exist; it is a “stage of reflection” (Turner 1969, p. 105). Many academics told me that they chose academia as a career because they love ideas. During these interviews I came to realise that managerialism is not merely an external structure against which academics shape their identities and conceptions of the work that they do, but rather it provides an environment that many academics perceive as richly imbued with data and ideas that are deconstructed and evaluated for their merit and validity within the university context. The evaluation asks: Does managerialism or this style of management make sense within the context of an academic environment in which the generation of novel data is the central task? Deeper still, the environment reveals academics to themselves. This seems to be a case of “we learn who we are by learning who we are not”. This phase or moment is revealing of a value system which constitutes something akin to academic “culture”. As explained previously, the inverted commas denote the problematization of the concept of culture as that which is inextricably connected to the person who defines its boundaries, and this act is in itself an exercise of power (Abu-Lughod, 1990; Geertz, 1973).

Chapter 5: Reflective Conclusion

As a fieldsite, the university presents a space that is enticing in its complexity. The neoliberal moment casts a sun-dappled shadow over this social field wherein certain of these complexities can be gleaned with the most superficial of observations (this is represented by the illuminated aspects in the metaphor), and where others are far less easily understood and interpreted (for they lie in the shadows). I have found that my attempts to make sense of an environment that is rich with contradictions and paradoxes has been both rewarding and also challenging. Even more difficult has been the task of trying to represent these complexities through the written word. I am not convinced that I have managed to illustrate the richness of the data that I have collected or the intricacy of the emotional and physical aspects of academic labour within a managerialist context satisfactorily. As I write this, I question whether liminality is a concept that contributes a valuable evaluation of the position in which academics find themselves, or if my attachment to the concept is bound within my own deep desire that academics will pass through this trying phase and reach a space of positive structural assertion. In other words, am I so troubled by the seeming haphazardness of the academic's position that I am asserting a time-limited quality to the chaos that is in fact permanent? Is academia by nature a space in which complexity, dissatisfaction, contradiction, and contestation find their home? I feel as though the haphazardness and awkwardness of fit that has characterised many of the academics in relation to their work environment has permeated my fieldwork, which is itself awkwardly positioned in relation to the literature I have selected. The field has certainly influenced me to a greater extent than I anticipated.

My goal has not been to focus on the structure of managerialism, but rather to grapple with that which is foremost in the minds of academics at this time and to evaluate it against a body of literature that is anthropologically significant. At best, I hope that this research prompts other scholars of anthropology to attempt to cast an anthropological view on the problem of academics and their labour in the neoliberal context, even if the awkwardness of academia permeates their work and their minds. Perhaps, to the smallest degree, this is what is meant by “going native” (Tresch, 2001).

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). Writing against culture. In R. Fox (ed.). *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (pp. 466-479). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Amit, V. (2000). The university as panopticon: Moral claims and attacks on academic freedom. In M. Strathern (Ed.). *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy*. London, England and New York: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1986). Chapter 1: Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective* (pp. 3-63). Cambridge, England: University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). The life cycle of academic management fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 1-16.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo economicus*. USA: Stanford University Press.
- Brint, S. (2002). *The city of intellect: The changing American university*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Constanti, P. and Gibbs, P. (2004). Higher education teachers and emotional labour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 243-249.
- Daun, H. (1997). National forces, Globalisation and Educational Restructuring: Some European Response Patterns. *Compare*, 27, 18-19.
- Dearlove, J. (1995). Collegiality, managerialism and leadership in English universities. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 1, 161-169.
- Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8, 61-70.

- Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: the case of “new managerialism” in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31, 217-235.
- Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Great Britain: TJ Internatinonal Ltd.
- Dictionary of medical terms. (2004). London, England: A & C Black.
- Durkheim, E. (1933). *The Division of labour in society*. USA: Free Press. (Halls, W. D. Trans.)
- Enteman, W. F. (1993). *Managerialism: The emergence of a new ideology*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2010). *Ethnography: Step-by-step*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays by Clifford Geertz*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (2000). *Available light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*. Princeton and Oxford, England: Princeton University Press.
- Giri, A. (2000). Chapter 6: Audited accountability and the /imperative of responsibility: beyond the primacy of the political. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy* (pp.173-195). London, England and New York: Routledge
- Graeber, D. (2001). *Toward an anthropological theory of value: The false coin of our own dreams*. New York: Palgrave.
- Graeber, D. (2013). It is value that brings universes into being. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 3, 219-243.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Habib takes the top spot at wits. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/98/94350.html>

History of Wits. (n.d.) Retrieved from

<http://www.wits.ac.za/aboutwits/archives/3171/universityarchives.html>

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc.

Johnson, B. J. (2005). *Towards post-managerialism in higher education: The case study of management change at the University of The Witwatersrand 1999-2004*. (Doctoral dissertation).

Mack, R. W. (n.d.). The study of man: Intellectual strategies and research tactics. *Trans-Action*, 38-39.

Malinowski, B. (1978). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*. London, England: Routledge.

Marx, K. (1887). *Capital: a critique of political economy, volume 1*. Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>

Mauss, M. (1954). *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. London, England: Routledge.

McNay, I. (1995). Chapter 9: From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University?* (pp. 105-115). USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Meyer, H. (2002). The New Managerialism in Education Management: Corporatisation or Organisational Learning? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 534-551.

Middlehurst, R. (1995). Chapter 7: Changing Leadership in Universities. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University?* (pp. 75-92). USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Miller, A. (2011). Managing academics in Canada and the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8, 2-24.

- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007) Chapter 23: The ethics of ethnography. In P. Atkinson, S. Delmont, A. Coffey, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland, (Eds.). *Handbook of Ethnography*. (pp. 339-351). London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Murray, B. (1982). *Wits the early years: A history of the University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg and its precursors 1896-1939*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Murray, B. (1997). *Wits the open years. A history of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg 1939 – 1959*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Nkoli, A. P. (2003). *A sociological analysis of restructuring at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits): 1999-2001*. (Master's dissertation). Available from the University of the Witwatersrand Electronic Thesis and Dissertation database.
- Orwell, G. (2001). 1984. Thorndike: G. K. Hall.
- QS World University Rankings: Methodology (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings-articles/world-university-rankings/qs-world-university-rankings-methodology>
- Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone age economics*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Samier, E. (2002). Managerial rationalisation and the ethical disenchantment of education: A Weberian perspective on moral theory in modern educational organisations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 589-603.
- Scheutze, H. (1995). Chapter 14: Funding, access and teaching: The Canadian experience of a mass system of higher education. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University?* (pp. 161-175). USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Schuller, T. (1995). Chapter 1: The Changing University? A Sketchmap with Coda. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University?* (pp. 1-14). USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

- Shore, C. (2008). Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory*, 8, 278-298.
- Shore, C. (2010). Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. *Social Anthropology*, 18, 15-29.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1999). Audit Culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 5, 557-575.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2000). Chapter 2: Coercive accountability: The rise of audit culture in higher education. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy* (pp.57-89). London and New York: Routledge.
- SLM Current and Past. (n.d.) Retrieved from
<http://www.wits.ac.za/academic/humanities/sllm/7680/about.html>
- Smart, C. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research: Volume XXII*. The Netherlands: Springer.
- Smeenk, S., Teelken, C., Eisinga, R., & Doorewaard, H. (2009). Managerialism, organisational commitment, and quality of job performances among European university employees. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 589-607.
- Soanes, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Pocket oxford English dictionary* (9th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Sohn-Rethel, A. (1978). *Intellectual labour and manual labour: A critique of epistemology*. Great Britain: Lowe and Brydone Printers.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The dangerous new class*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Strathern, M. (2000). Introduction: New accountabilities. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- The golden jubilee of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg 1972*. (1972). Johannesburg, South Africa: Witwatersrand University Press.

The Senate report on performance management. (2014).

Time to implement 2022 strategy says Habib. (n.d.) Retrieved from
<http://www.witsfoundation.co.za/newsArticle.asp?id=603>

Tresch, J. (2001). On going native: Thomas Kuhn and anthropological method. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 31, 302-322.

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. New York: Cornell University Press.

University of the Witwatersrand. (n.d.). *Vision 2022: Strategic framework* [Brochure]. Retrieved from
http://www.wits.ac.za/aboutwits/governance/3053/strategic_planning.html

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1989). For a socio-analysis of intellectuals: On "Homo Academicus". *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 1-29.

Wagner, L. (1995). Chapter 2: A thirty-year perspective: from the sixties to the nineties. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The changing university?* (pp. 1-14). USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Weber, M. (1963). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Webster, E. & Mosoetsa, S. (2001). At the chalkface: Managerialism and the changing academic workplace 1995-2001. *Transformation*, 48.

Appendix 1: Interview Schedule

- Personal history:
 - age
 - nationality
 - marital status
 - children
- Professional history:
 - briefly describe your journey to this point – being a lecturer here at Wits
 - length of time working as an academic- what proportion of this time was spent at Wits
 - reason for choosing this profession and field
 - reason for choosing Wits
 - highlights and lowlights of career
 - what do you value about the work that you do?
 - what don't you value about the work that you do?
 - describe the nature and extent of collegiality among your colleagues
 - what have you had to sacrifice in your journey to becoming an academic? (personally)
- Change in academic labour
 - describe the structural changes that Wits has undergone while you were at the University
 - when?
 - what changed?
 - how did you feel about the changes (agree/disagree and why)?
 - how did it affect the work that you do (workload/meetings/admin work/supervision/publications/study further)
 - how did it affect you personally and psychologically?
 - did it affect what you value about your work?
 - did it affect collegiality and in what ways?
 - what helps you get through tough times?
- 2013: Vision 2022 and the new Vice-Chancellor
 - how did you feel about the inauguration of the new Vice-Chancellor?

- what has changed since he was inaugurated? (collegiality/workload- specify about workload)
- if you had to describe the values that the University holds highest what would they be?
- do you agree with these and why?
- Compromise and sacrifice
 - what, if anything, have you had to sacrifice with the change in management and university structure?
 - what compromises have you had to make to your labour and personally?
 - if you had total control over the way you did your job – what would an ideal day look like?
 - what is important that you are just not finding the time to do at work or personally?
 - what would you like to say to Wits management/the VC that you think they/he need/s to hear?
 - do you feel as though you are being paid enough? if not, why do you think this is the case? why have you not looked for another job?
 - what would make you consider changing jobs or universities?
- is there anything you'd like to add before we conclude this interview?

Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet

Dear Participant

My name is Diksha Ram and I am a Masters student in Anthropology at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am conducting research that investigates the impact of managerialism on the labour of academics at Wits. I would like to invite you (an academic staff member at Wits) to be part of my study, which will involve conversation about managerialism at Wits and how this might impact the perceived value and nature of the work that academics do. I am particularly interested in how academic labour is valued by academics themselves; in other words – how academics understand the value of their own labour in comparison with the priorities set out by management. Interviews and life histories will be conducted in person and will require between about 60 minutes of your time. These will be voice recorded, during which time I will take summary notes, and will be transcribed at a later date. Please note that participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw from the study at any point with no consequence to your employment at Wits. Also note that no payment will be made to you at any point of the study. You may refuse to answer any questions and may withdraw from the study at any point with no consequence. Your anonymity will be guaranteed in the final research report, where no identifying characteristics will be mentioned, also note that your identity and identifying characteristics will not be revealed to my supervisor. Please be assured that I have thoroughly familiarised myself with the faculty members within each school and department, and that characteristics which might reveal your identity have been very carefully considered and noted. In sum, I can guarantee the maintenance of your anonymity during and beyond the conclusion of this research project. I am the only person who will be aware of your identity. You may use a pseudonym if you desire. The final research report will be available online as a Masters thesis from 2015; it may also be available in libraries at the University of the Witwatersrand. If you have any queries about this research please feel free to contact me at any time. If you would like a copy of the final research paper, or a summary thereof, I will gladly make one available to you.

Thank you for your time in reading this and considering my research.

Sincerely

Diksha Ram

Appendix 3: Consent form

I _____ give consent to Diksha Ram to include me in her research study of managerialism and how it affects academics' conceptions of their labour at the University of the Witwatersrand.

I confirm the following:

- My participation in the study is voluntary and I can leave the study at any point with no consequence to my employment at the University of the Witwatersrand
- No payment will be made to me at any point during the study
- I have the right to refuse to answer any questions I am not comfortable with, with no consequence to myself
- I have the right to stipulate the extent to which my identity is concealed both during the time of research and in the final research report
- The final report or a summary thereof will be made available to me if I request one from Diksha Ram
- The final research report will be available online from 2015, and in hard copy at libraries at the University of the Witwatersrand
- I can contact Diksha Ram with any queries I may have relating to the study
- I agree to being interviewed by Diksha Ram. I understand that these interviews will take the form of semi-structured depth interviews and life histories
- I understand that Diksha Ram will record the interviews with an audio recorder, and brief written notation

I understand that completion of this form is an agreement to participate in this research study

Signature of participant: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 4: Audio Recording Consent Form

I _____ give consent to Diksha Ram to include me in her research study of managerialism and how it affects academics' conceptions of their labour at the University of the Witwatersrand.

I confirm the following:

- The audio recordings and transcripts are for the purposes of this study
- Identifying characteristics will not be used in the transcript/s or the research report
- The audio recordings will be handled securely and destroyed five years after the completion of the research
- I have been briefed on the reasons for being audio recorded

Signature of participant: _____

Date: _____

Signature of Diksha Ram: _____

Date: _____