UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

PAULINE LYNSAY FERGUSON

BECOMING 'EXPERT': AN EXPLORATION INTO THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS AND EFFECTS OF SUBJECTIVITY FORMATION WITHIN THE MARKETING ACADEMY.

SUBMITTED FOR FULFILMENT OF THE DEGREE OF PHD

FEBRUARY 8TH 2008

For Mum, Dad, Granny, Jacqueline and Dave
For Granda too

Table of Contents **Page**

Chapter One
Introduction

Chapter Two
Literature Review

PART TWO: Contextualising and Theorising Interest in the Marketing 'Subject'

Chapter Four
Findings Chapter

Chapter Five
Analysis and Discussions of Findings

Chapter Six   5
Conclusions, Contributions and Reflections

Acknowledgements

Doing a PhD is a strange thing. Helping me along the way have been a number of great people whom I really want to thank.

Firstly my family to whom this thesis is dedicated. Your support, patience and belief has been incredible and I'll never be able to thank you enough.

Next, Douglas Brownlie and Paul Hewer. Thank you for sharing with me some of the interesting ways you think about the world, and for seeing this through with me.

To Dr (!) Tim Stone too. What a great office mate and friend to have throughout. You beside so many others at the Department of Marketing within the University of Stirling (past and present) deserve huge thanks for all of the support and encouragement offered to me.

Gratitude also, to my research participants. Your help with the project was greatly appreciated. Although, of course, you shall remain unnamed here, I really hope you stand well represented.

Lastly to *all* of the wonderful friends who have taken me through; both those I know from university, and from beyond. Of you, special thanks must go to Esme for your initial wisdom on paragraphs, and utter dedication to my cause. Jim for your incredible (some would say journalistic?!) listening and structuring abilities, and Ally for being so excited about learning with me. Caroline your cups of tea have been a godsend and Clair, Rowan and Angela, your support, help and inspiration always so welcome. Especially to Jules too, truly I cannot say enough for all you have done. Each one of you is so very special and I'll be forever grateful.

'It would be foolish for us to imagine that we're anything other than creatures of our discipline and creatures of our time' (Law, 1994: 8)

Abstract

The marketing academy arguably holds an influential position within society, yet culturally speaking, very little is known about it; its people, processes or knowledge. Regardless of its privileged situation, we remain reflexively impoverished in terms of disciplinary self-understanding. This study, in some small way, hopes to change that. Indeed espousing and pursuing import around its scholarly intervention, this research instigates questions of a reflective nature, around marketing academia. More specifically, taking an anti-foundational perspective, it seeks to explore processes of knowledge production within the discipline.

Having reviewed current approaches to the evaluation of knowledge production from within marketing and beyond, this study comes to suggest a disciplinary lacking with regard to reflexive understandings, through marketing's; (1) lack of consideration around knowledge as practice and (2) unsatisfactory consideration of the academic 'subject' therein.

With this in mind, it located a more precise interest around 'the marketing academic' and specifically, subjectivity formation, within a doctoral process of a major UK University. It was believed that this focus would provide a potentially revelatory means for generating new and responsible understandings into the conditions and effects of our disciplinary (re)production.

To this end, having theorised and analysed subjectivity formation through a Foucauldian lens ('subjectification', 1983) this study came to produce five main conclusions. These included suggestions that (1) 'the self' was constituted, not inherent (despite dominant evaluatory positions to the contrary), (2) subjective reproduction within the site included 'independence' and 'knowledgability' (3) the rhetoric of independence served to obscure power relations and everyday interactions within the doctoral process (4) problematic power relations, in part, defined the supervisory relationship, and that (5) effects of training were both positively and negatively experienced by informants.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Summary

This opening chapter serves to outline and contextualise the focus of this thesis. To this end section 1.2 opens by providing background into its primary concern, that of reflection into knowledge production within the marketing academic sphere. After doing so with reference to (a) the potential influence the marketing academy has culturally and (b) inter-disciplinary works which provide inspiring theoretic/empirical frames for disciplinary reflection, the section also introduces a distinct 'evaluatory' lack with regard to marketing's outputs currently. From this, section 1.3 goes on to reveal the site of its enquiry and section 1.4, the aims and objectives. Sections 1.5 and 1.6 close the chapter with, respectively, an outline of the structure of the thesis and the specific contributions it hopes to make.

1.2 An Interest in Disciplinary Reflexivity: Context and Specifics

The marketing academy is a growing cultural phenomenon within the UK. Indeed, with significant growth in the number of university places, graduates, publications and staff, it can be suggested to play an increasingly prevalent part not only within academic culture, but in producing and intervening somehow in this phenomenon we call 'marketing' (Morgan, 1992; Brownlie and Saren, 1997; Brownlie et al. 1999; Hackley, 2001). Despite this, very little is known about the marketing academy culturally speaking, its people, processes or knowledges. Regardless of its privileged and potentially influential position, we remain reflexively impoverished in terms of disciplinary self-understanding. This study, in some small way, hopes to change that. Indeed, espousing and pursuing import around its scholarly intervention, this research instigates questions of a reflective nature around marketing academia. More

specifically, taking an anti-foundational perspective, it seeks to explore processes of knowledge production within the discipline.

(Inter-) Disciplinary Inspirations

For some time now, value and pertinence around the idea of socio/cultural exploration into academic knowledge production has been emphasised. Providing key inspiration within this research was a number of works that have long since demonstrated and endorsed works of this kind. These included the considerations of sociologists on 'hard' science (Kuhn, 1967; Latour and Woolgar, 1979; Knorr-Cetina, 1981, 1983; Law, 1994), French intellectuals on French intellectuals (Bourdieu, 1988; 1992), and marketers on marketing (Morgan, 1992; Brownlie and Saren, 1997).

Although individually very different, these works *most critically* provided the possibility for us (both here, and within the social sciences) to move beyond staid and typically essentialist conceptions of academic production, as well as the ways we consider them. Indeed, from a position of knowledge as practice, they suggest that academic knowledge has, for too long, been 'protected' from meaningful examination through the 'truths' of objectivism, and the assumptions of orthodox dualisms (separating knowledge from the social or the subject from the object).

The impact of this was significant. First of all, their constitutive view of knowledge provided a picture of academic reality and truths as being 'made up' socially, and hence, made them *available* for our comprehension in such terms. No longer bracketed and 'black-boxed' (Law, 1994) as real and impenetrable, scholarly orders (for example scientific 'facts', academic dispositions, authorial positions and

marketing theory) became very much available for intellectual scrutiny. This constitutive view also created and reflected the importance of such evaluation. Seen as worked up socially, academic reality is presented in a way which identified that it could, and should, no longer be unproblematically accepted as taken-for-granted. Indeed, on one level these works imply that to do so would be to overlook understanding of the partialised and contingent nature of such realities; and hence to turn away from 'seeing' any 'troublesome' aspects to their make up. On another, they demonstrate that to do so would be to deny the possibility of new ways of thinking academically. With regard to the latter more specifically, these works highlight the potential of such theorisation and mode of reflection to reside not only in understanding the way things are constructed, but in opening up the possibility that knowledge production could be a worthy site of research in itself.

Despite the importance and potential for scholarly enquiry represented through these works, as implied earlier, 'knowledge production' has not received much adequate attention in marketing. Indeed, as Chapter Two of this study will reveal, although evaluations of knowledge production are widespread within marketing, their abundance is characterised typically through Cartesian *modus operandi* and under-socialised means. This, it is argued, is particularly disappointing and disarming as it limits the possibilities of self-revelation and self-understanding, especially when set within a relatively young, and therefore potentially flexible, discipline such as marketing.

1.3 The (Formation of the) Doctoral 'Subject'

From this theoretical background and cultural position the thesis turns to a study of practice and a consideration of the marketing 'subject' to open up questions of reflexive understanding and subjectivity formation within the marketing domain. Primarily aligning to a constitutive conceptualisation of reality, and acknowledging that a critical lack is partially defined in such terms, such a 'site' is considered to hold real scholarly value for the discipline. This is so in the sense that academics may be conceived not only as mediators of this discourse, but as mediated through it. Indeed seen as 'the makers' and 'the made', academics - as a 'site' - are considered to offer a unique and interesting angle through which we can evaluate the conditions and effects of disciplinary productions. Not least this is through the potential they engender for accounting for 'human productions' as part of our exploratory scope.

Furthermore towards its interest in exploring the situated marketing academic, this study conceives potential profundity for critical intervention around a site of more traditionally conceived disciplinary socialisation: that of training and the doctoral process. As a location for empirical study it was thought potentially enriching, not only given the managerialist dominance in terms of its understanding so far, but also as a further means through which to explore how our everyday processes may play a part in colouring marketing's disciplinary possibilities. That is, the study benefits through what may be ascertained about the discipline, its conditions, effects and potential, through an examination of its pedagogical context.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

With this in mind the central aim of this thesis is *to provide insight into the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy, looking specifically at one site of such, the doctoral process.* Towards this, the specific research objectives are as follows:

- To explore the doctoral process, as a site of social interaction and reproduction, through the conceptual lens of Foucault's concepts, technologies of power and technologies of the self.

- To locate processes of subjectivity formation through investigating the lived experience of participants within a doctoral programme of a UK University.

- To consider the potential power effects working through this process, and their possible implications.

Towards the satisfaction of these, a research study was designed and executed with its key focus being the generation of insights into the relational contexts around the marketing doctorate. Interviews were conducted with a number of informants presently working within a major UK University setting, both supervisors and supervisees.

1.5 Contribution to Marketing Knowledge

In light of these aims and objectives, and considering the outcome of this research design and execution, this thesis hopes to make the following four contributions.

To Broaden Disciplinary Reflexivity

As outlined in the literature review, marketing, as a discipline, still lacks critical depth in relation to understanding the effects of its discursive forms. With this in mind, this study hopes to broaden existing understandings and open disciplinary possibility through theorisation of knowledge as practice.

To Reflect on the Situated Marketing Academic

Part of this critical lacking involves serious inadequacy with regard to understanding the marketing academics themselves. As such, this study wishes to know better the conditions and effects of, and on, those 'making up' the discipline.

To Critically Consider Training

In a context of managerial dominance around the area of training within marketing, this study hopes to provide rejuvenated insight. Alongside this desired critical illumination, it is hoped that the study will be helpful to those who are undertaking a PhD within the marketing discipline, or indeed those who are still considering such a journey. Unlike the rather 'rationalised' representations of the PhD elsewhere available to the marketing neophyte, this study aims to be more exploratory and critical of the experience itself.

To Exploit Foucault in the Context of Marketing

Foucault's works have long provided an insightful basis for many studies throughout the social sciences. Within marketing however, his usage is scant. Therefore, this thesis hopes to make a valuable contribution to the theoretical development of marketing, particularly through further application of his work.

1.6 Structure of the Thesis

Having worked up a legitimate space for the existence of this study and addressed the proposal of its contributions, Chapter Two will introduce in more detail its construction. It does this by outlining in significant detail the theoretical background within which its form partially took shape. Towards this, it will review in some detail previous attempts to evaluate the production of knowledge within the marketing academic sphere, including most particularly, those from epistemologically, functionally and socially centred perspectives. From there (having found strong inadequacies within such work) the chapter will continue by outlining and justifying an area and perspective through which inspection of disciplinary production may perhaps more usefully be set. Making strong recommendations for anti-foundational thought within the context of disciplinary reflection, and building on examples set elsewhere within the social sciences most particularly, it argues for the value and contribution of specific research around the construction of the situated academic. Moreover, owing to its reflexive intentions the work of Foucault will be presented as a theoretical lens. Chapter Three will outline and justify the translation between the theoretical chapters and the construction and execution of a working research design. It will do this by locating a specific empirical setting, interpretative parameters and

research participants as well as by outlining research methods and discussing interpretative intervention. Chapter Four will present the main findings of the research. Having identified a key aspect of Foucault's theorisation to exist around an analysis of power, it explores the experiences, relationships and knowledges around the doctoral process. Chapter Five offers detailed commentary, analysis and discussion of the findings. Most particularly, it illuminates material found in the empirical site through Foucauldian readings and relates these to literature previously outlined in Chapter Two. Chapter Six then closes the thesis. After summarising its main empirical findings and revealing its contributions, discussion is offered around its limitations and directions for future research.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Summary

The primary objective of this chapter is to achieve two things. Firstly, to review existing 'evaluatory' accounts of knowledge production within the disciplinary field of marketing; and, secondly, to theorise further investigation of this sort, drawing on appropriate literature from the wider social sciences. Towards the achievement of the former, the chapter begins (2.3) by critically discussing relevant work within marketing on the basis of focus, methodology and critical perspective. It concludes from this that knowledge production within the disciplinary field of marketing is undermined by methodological biases, under-socialisation of the processes of knowledge production and validation, non-critical prescriptivism and under-scrutinisation. The section also suggests that reflexive accounting, for and around the 'marketing academic', is seriously lacking. Arguing that a study of the situated marketing academic has the potential to open up new disciplinary territory and understanding, 2.4 then departs from the marketing literature. The argument then moves through a range of appropriate work that explores 'subjectivity' and its construction within a variety of empirical situations. It provides useful theoretical resources to develop an argument for the selection of parameters by means of which to think of the 'empirical' site of this study of disciplinary reproduction. It also further contextualises this study. Having worked up the 'need' for intervention around the 'subject', section 2.5 introduces the work of social theorist Michel Foucault. His work and in particular his notion of 'subjectification' (1983) is presented as providing the conceptual basis through which the study shall be theorised. The justification for this choice is also outlined. 2.6 will bring the chapter to a close, through reiterating its main achievements.

2.2 Introduction

Investigating the *production of knowledge within the disciplinary field of marketing –* the general topic of interest here – has for some time been a focus of scholarly attention within marketing's literature, although limited to debates about rules of evidence and other matters of epistemology. The following material reviews this work by way of putting in place the early building blocks of the contextualisation of the present study.

It becomes immediately apparent that an interest in work, which takes as *its* interest, the evaluation of marketing knowledge needs to be clearly framed from the outset; for example, how can we understand work which takes as its subject the evaluation of marketing knowledge? Given the technical requirements of peer-reviewed knowledge products, one could include within the topic area much of the work whose contribution is characterised by the terms 'theoretical development' and 'critical appraisal' within marketing. Unconvinced by the appropriateness of such a task to this study, critical interest is turned onto a body of published work within the marketing academy, which will be described here as 'inspectoral'. This work has in common a *substantive* interest in scholarly contest and analysis of knowledge types produced within the academy. This remains no small task, particularly given the ever increasing importance granted to disciplinary reflection (Morgan, 1992).

Part one reviews previous studies of the character of marketing knowledge production. It draws its structure from the work of Bettany (2002) which offers taxonomy by means of which to categorise knowledge products in marketing on the basis of their treatment of disciplinary reflectivity. Drawing on insights found within the education literature, this study develops those categories, offering those that follow as the basis for analysing the extant marketing literature.

'Abstracted' concerns: includes studies that pursue critique on the basis of epistemological adequacy and compliance with specified rules governing the acceptable conduct of science.

'Organisational' interests: includes work that employs means-end approaches to framing studies of academic practice such that outcomes take the form of guidelines or implications for research practice and for developing it through directed training.

'Socio-cultural' interests: includes studies which are anti-foundational and critical in nature, set in opposition to means-end approaches to organisational practices.

As noted, these add, adapt and tailorise an earlier piece by Bettany (2002) who, for different purposes, found interest in disciplinary reflections. It begins with an outline of epistemological/methodological battles that have in some respects defined marketing's academic history.

PART ONE

(Towards) Disciplinary Reflection: A Review of 'Inspectoral[ii]' Approaches to Knowledge-Making within the Marketing Academy

2.3 Abstracted Concern and Debates

'Abstracted Concerns' are used here to describe the range of efforts evident within the marketing literature, which have sought to evaluate the disciplines premise, scope and possibility in relation to/through abstract and philosophical argument. 'Abstracted' accounts, in other words, can be understood to regard those who find central concern with the making of knowledge via their understanding and discussion of ontological, epistemological or methodological worth.

Examples of such disciplinary reflection are many within marketing, with the discipline having mulled over a significant range of scholarly positions within its time;

> To be sure, the rhythms of methodological and meta-methodological debate have throbbed through the marketing and consumer research jungle for many a long year now (Hackley, 2001:38)

In this regard, widely disseminated and long running suggestions and debates over matters philosophical have become disciplinary commonplace with academics wishing to champion their own particular brand of how marketing knowledge should be approached [ii] (Kavanagh, 1994; Brown 1995; Stern, 1998; Wallendorf and Brooks, 1993; Gummesson, 2001). One can, for example, draw attention to a number of debates and contentions within the discipline, including those around modernism/postmodernism (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1992; Brown 1993;

Featherstone, 1988; Firat, 1990; Firat and Venkatesh, 1995; Firat, Sherry and Venkatesh 1993/1994)[iii], functionalism (Alderson, 1957; Hunt and Goolsby, 1998), qualitativism (Hunt, 1994; Spiggle, 1994), quantitativism (Hooley and Hussey, 1994), deconstructionism (Stern, 1996) critical theory, (Murray and Ozanne, 1991), or indeed social constructionism (Hackley, 1999b).

This section shall firstly present one of these debates from the marketing discipline, the purpose of which shall be to exemplify the abstracted approach to knowledge making within the discipline. Given that this is to provide a basis through which to consider 'abstraction' as a means to evaluate knowledge making, the relative values of the philosophical positions espoused in the case, is not of primary interest here. Additionally, however, as the substantive interest of some of these debates has influenced possible approaches to knowledge making within the discipline, comment where felt appropriate will be offered.

One of the most prominent cases of abstracted 'inspection' within the marketing academy is the debate that played out between Hunt and Anderson (1983). As one of the most contentious and long running instances of this kind within the academy's history, this clash of interests exploded, most particularly, around issues regarding the methodological usefulness and applicability of realist and relativist positions (Anderson, 1986; Cooper, 1987; Hunt, 1944; Siegel, 1988). The first instalment of this grapple appeared in the pages of the *Journal of Marketing* in 1983, and built steady momentum, until as Brown duly notes *'an uneasy truce descended on the battlefield'* (1995: 143) thereafter. This was essentially a philosophical conflict, central to which was how each side conceptualised the nature of reality. Their

arguments, crucially concerned with how marketing could or should approach its knowledge production, centred on what each thought their philosophical stance could achieve for disciplinary enquiry. Playing out this debacle, Hunt (1984; 1990; 1992; 1994), argued for what was already a long standing realism within marketing as the best and most progressive basis through which to forward thinking within the discipline, a position which stemmed from (and can be seen as further providing a basis for the legitimisation of) his strong allegiance to the marketing academy offering practitioner-led research. Anderson (1983; 1986), on the other hand, reflecting on the philosophical basis of knowledge making within marketing, demonstrated bemusement over the maintenance of the realism central to the discipline's economic roots. Beginning his 1983 offering with arguable frustration at earlier disciplinary scrutiny which had, over four decades of discussion, shed *'little light'* (Anderson, 1983:18), over marketing's scientific credentials, he went on to espouse critical relativism as his preferred philosophical position. An extract, underlining Anderson's earliest ontological challenge is provided below:

> The decline of positivism has left us with a number of competing perspectives in the philosophy and sociology of science…This suggests that it is inappropriate to seek a single best method for the evaluation of marketing theory… Thus a relativistic stance appears to be the only viable solution to the problem of scientific method… Finally, the lack of consensus on the issue of scientific method means that there is also no agreement on the question of demarcation between science and non-science. Thus, Hunt's (1976) assertion that 'intersubjective certifiability' can serve to distinguish science from non-science is unsupportable (Anderson, 1983:25-26).

Having considered the knowledge making methods possible under Hunt's realism, Anderson claimed that relativism would, therefore, provide the radical methodological rethinking marketing needed in order to counter what he perceived to be the 'captured nature' of current thinking. This standpoint of Anderson's was

arguably fuelled in its very nature by Hunt's defensive and perpetual claims that such work would lead *'to nihilism, irrationalism, incoherence, and irrelevance'* (Brown, 1995; Brownlie et al, 1999:44) within the marketing project. Indeed, posing the question *'Should Marketing Adopt Relativism'* Hunt makes his philosophical distaste for relativism clear:

> Neither individuals, nor academic disciplines, nor societies in general can make progress (in any meaningful sense of the word) by abjuring the importance of truth and its earnest pursuit. For marketing science to turn towards relativism in the year 1984 would be Orwellian irony incarnate (Hunt, 1984:34).

His attempt to avoid such disciplinary fate saw Hunt like the others of the time construct their relative positions through philosophical 'nit-picking' (Kavanagh, 1994). An example in 1991 saw Hunt provide six denominations of realism alone, and in 1992, a twenty-five point continuum of truth (ibid).

Essentially this stand off centred on issues that were not philosophically new. Indeed, as Kavanagh notes, the realist-relativist debate can be traced back to Sophist-Plato times (1994). For marketing however, the work of Anderson, (alongside what many have seen to be the self-defeating work of Hunt (Brown, 1995) was significant in the sense that through alternate methodological and epistemological weaponry**,** he was able to break from traditional and normalised ways of validating knowledge claims within the discipline. In this sense, he was able to alter approaches to knowledge making, in ways significant to the discipline.

2.3.1 Evaluatory Assumptions

This abstracted example, alongside the various others that have come to define the marketing academic landscape, are understood here to constitute similar approaches to the evaluatory enquiry of marketing knowledge making, in the sense that their assessments centre on the ontological and epistemological positions of marketing knowledge. Following, albeit indirectly[iv], the suggestion of Burrell and Morgan (1979)[v], such a 'collective' do so with an understanding that such means provide a suitable and beneficiary basis for enlivening and challenging the often dominant, orthodox knowledge making capabilities within the discipline. This assumption, although also surmountable through the extracts provided above[vi], is encapsulated through the following quote from Arndt (1985) wherein he champions – in this case - pluralism and more particularly 'liberating paradigms' on the basis that their incorporation could challenge directly research output within marketing;

> By limiting itself to the empiricist orientation and logical empiricist paradigms such as instrumental man, marketing has remained essentially a one-dimensional science concerned with technology and problem solving. The subjective world and liberating paradigms challenge the assumptions of empiricism by generating questions resulting in quite different research questions (Arndt, 1985:21-22)

2.3.2 Comments and Critique

Broadly speaking, it is the assertion that such 'episto-babble' (Brown, 1995) has been an evaluatory approach of some use for the marketing academy. As Burrell and Morgan's mantra (1979) may have suggested, such work has been successful in two ways. Firstly, by opening up an understanding within marketing knowledge/research that its associated possibilities operate through particular sets of underlying

assumptions (which can be challenged), and, secondly, by importing a range of research approaches to the discipline which have played some part in broadening disciplinary possibility. Indeed in these ways, it can be considered to have gone some way to providing levels of deconstruction and criticism elsewhere called for within the discipline (see Firat et al, 1987 below) and to have (in some respects) furthered a climate of *challenge* with regard to the knowledge making of the marketing academy;

> Marketing needs a thorough deconstruction. Through a process of criticism and self-criticism, it is possible to move a novel reconstruction based on philosophical and analytical investigations into the...proclaimed truths that we have taken for granted for so long (Firat et al, 1987:xvii)

However, such works are more predominantly considered here to be an inadequate means through which to solely assimilate disciplinary scrutiny within marketing. Although agreeing with Kavanagh's (1994) assertion that such internal wrangling and debates can be taken to be illogical and unnecessary extremes in ways which become counter-productive for the discipline[vii], the main source of disgruntlement here surrounds their containment as reflections (and as emacipatory agents in terms of knowledge production for the disciplinary field of marketing) *within* the limits of epistemological boundaries.

Characterised by what is considered methodological bias and under-socialisation, it is argued that perpetual scrutiny through these means shadows marketing, and its ability to self-understand, from exciting and now well-established advancements in ways to consider the production of knowledge rehearsed elsewhere in the social sciences.

2.3.2.1 (Not) Acknowledging Kuhn

Reference in this regard (although it potentially could be made to a variety of works) is attributed most predominantly to the work of Kuhn (1962)[viii], and specifically his ideas within the seminal offering *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962; 1970). Within this work – which some maintain to be one of the *'most exciting…developments in…modern philosophy'* (Potter, 1996:24) - Kuhn radically, alters the possibilities for how knowledge and its making can be considered. Specifically he makes the suggestion that rather than existing in some essentialised and detached manner, as is seemingly the case within those under-socialised episto-centric accounts above[ix], scientific knowledge and dominant thoughts of the time can be seen as fundamentally linked to the communities within which they are a part. This idea is demonstrable through his notion of the paradigm;

> [Paradigms] I take to be universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners (Kuhn, 1962: 17)

Here, through such a notion, and the notion of normal science which is usually used in tandem with this idea, Kuhn underlines science and scientific knowledge at any one time as held together by a shared and changeable set of assumptions and beliefs – very much tied to the nature of the social realm[x]. Opposing the certitude, objectivity, a-political and 'out-there' reality of scientific knowledge, where ideas are assumed to arrive from reality and great moments of intellectual genius, Kuhn instead considers ideas to be the product of social relations – tied, among other things, to the embodied institutionalised practices and knowledges of people *in situ*[xi]. People who themselves

of course are the products through their ideas of social relations (Potter, 1996). Kuhn, in other words, through such work most crucially suggests a situation wherein scientific truth (and academic thought) can both be conceived and *considered* as *historically* and *socially* relative – not possible of appearing through anything other than the workings of their situation.

With this in mind and as Potter (1996) indicates within the following extracts, scientific knowledge through such work can be thought of sociologically;

> this work shows how an abstracted epistemological concern with the relation between an observation statement and some part of reality has turned into a psychological and sociological concern with the role of expectations, machineries and communal practices (Potter, 1996:25).

> The new philosophy of science was an invitation to open the box and grapple with the specifics of scientific knowledge (Potter, 1996:25)

To this end, the work of Kuhn (1962) has long since provided an argument and ability for those in marketing to go beyond a real view of knowledge (for example epistemology) and to have significantly broadened their understandings beyond short-sighted essentialised confines of 'episto-babble'. Indeed, contesting the essentially limited ways in which this methodological work treats epistemology as a set of static choices, and strips our understanding of knowledge production from any social context, this work sets up the possibility for marketing knowledge production to be considered and evaluated as practice. This is an approach which, through its incorporation would provide the opportunity for understanding previously unconsidered aspects. Indeed it is with acknowledgement that these include

potentially revelatory and intriguing aspects such as the role of the social context (see Morgan, 1992[xii]) the impact and influenced nature of agency (beyond what would appear to be the assumption of the lone scholar here), and the potential role of politics within knowledge production, that huge opportunity is suggested to exist outwith such philosophical doggedness as a means to emacipatory understanding within marketing.

2.3.2.2 Towards the Social

Importantly, the Kuhnian inspired 'revolution', in terms of how (scientific) knowledge may be considered, has not eluded the marketing discipline and its reflections. Indeed, outwith the theoretical approaches just outlined, there have been sparse, but significant attempts at 'socialised' reflection on the knowledge making practices of the discipline. As shall be outlined within the third of the approaches to be discussed, this has in some ways filtered the discipline in ways that usefully develop the early premise and promise of Kuhnian-led ideas.

In addition to this, however, socialised inspection of another sort is understood here to define marketing's inspectoral output, and is therefore of interest here. To this end, reference is made to evaluative reflections, which take as their main source of consideration social and organisational practices of the discipline, as they are understood to relate to the making of marketing knowledge. The next section sets out to review such accounts.

2.4 The Marketing 'of Error': 'Organisational' Inspections of Disciplinary Knowledge Production Practice

> Many of us have learned we want to cleave an order. This is a modernist dream. In one way or another, we are attached to the idea that if our lives, our organizations, our social theories or our societies, were 'properly ordered' then all would be well. And we take it that such ordering is possible, at least some of the time. So when we encounter complexity we tend to treat it as distraction. We treat it as a sign of the limits to order. Or we think of it as evidence of failure (Law, 1994:5)

Evaluative reflections which take as their main source of consideration social and organisational practices of the discipline (as related to the production of knowledge within the discipline) are understood here to be widespread and, as shall be eluded to within their discussion here, can be conceived to cover a variety of substantive topics. Although not exhaustive[xiii], these are discussed in the following sections under the groupings; 'artefactual' and 'educational'.

2.4.1 Artefactual

Those referred to as artefactual describe a large number of texts within the marketing discourse currently, which find scholarly concern around various processes linked to (written) disciplinary outputs. Here, reflections around publication and research construction practices are discussed briefly as examples.

Research Construction Practices

With regard to the latter firstly, work such as that of Day, 1996; Perry, 1999, 1990; Baker, 2000a, 2000b, 2001a, 2000b place evaluatory attention around some of the

more functional aspects/practices of research, such as the actual process of writing and structuring of substantive content within research. Typically, it should be noted that such evaluations find expression within texts espousing prescriptive outcomes, such as '*How To'* rhetoric and style wherein such work provides advice and guidance to the academic audience regarding 'best practice'.

As a good example of such work, Baker, within his *Skills and Professional Practice* series (2000a, b; 2001a, b) outlines key elements and suggestions regarding the conventions of conducting good and successful research within marketing (Tynan, 2001). These are related to a number of key processes - including writing a literature review, research proposal, selecting a research methodology and getting published within marketing. (Extracts of these are provided within the table below). Here, towards offering 'suggestions' regarding the best ways such practices should be conducted (including, for example, the characteristic type and competencies of research students, as well as the content and structure of written work as examples Baker exercises value judgements. These judgements in the form they take, although substantiated at times with the use of supportive literature (others who have made similar attempts to convey best research practice), are primarily justified, if at all, seemingly through the 'strength' of *conventions*.

Publication

Additionally, attention surrounds those who situate assessment within and around those practices related to publication and artefactual output. In this regard, for example, work includes Varadarajan (1996); Diamantopolous (1996); and Day (1996), who assess knowledge related to the act of publication, in order to have an

evaluative basis through which to provide functional advice on best academic practice within such realms.

2.4.2 Educational

Significantly (as it relates to this work) in contrast to those aforementioned works lies another set of works set around an evaluation of knowledge production within marketing, which is definable as evaluatory. These works located specifically within the discourse of training, are understood as such to the extent that they consider knowledge making as relative to the *processes* and *outcomes* of the educational sphere[xiv].

Table 2A - Representative Evaluatory Texts Concerning Marketing Education Practices*

Area	Authors/Contributors
Teaching Practice	Desai, Damewood and Jones, 2001; Bridges, 1999; Ferrell, 1995; November, 2002; McNeilly et al, 1995; Chonko and Roberts, 1996; Cost et al, 1992; Kennedy et al, 2001; Conant et al, 1989; Henke, et al 1988
Training Practices (including most predominantly those around the doctorate)**	AMA Task Force, 1988; Woodruff and Cravens, 1990 Griffith, 1997; Motes, 1989 and Roach, Johnston and Hair, 1994, Ponder and Lueg, 2004, Ponder, Beatty and Foxx, 2004, Perry, 1999, Lusch (1982), Berry (1989), Lindgreen, Vallaster and Vanhamme, 2001) and Conant, Smart and Redkar, 1998; Smart and Conant, 1990; Trocchia and Berowitz, 1999

* omitted from such a list, for demarcation reasons, are other works concerning organisational policy more widely which may, under the employment of different definition here, be considered broadly evaluatory with regards knowledge production.
** Note – for fuller breakdown of work that focuses on the doctoral process within the marketing discipline, see table 3A within Chapter Three.

These works, as an embodiment of increasing reassessment within the discipline in regard to marketing education (Roach, Johnston and Hair, 1994; see also proliferation of *Journal of Marketing Education, Marketing Education Review, Marketing Educator and the Marketing Educators Journal*) find particular and growing interest around training and teaching. More particularly, like those works above, the pursuit of best practice therein. For example, Trocchia and Berowitz (1999) within the first of three exemplars provided below find focus around the PhD process particularly. When questioning the requirements for successful completion in this case, such evaluation (mirroring those assessments within previous sections) was set up towards the provision of managerial suggestions; both for marketing professors wishing to improve the quality of his/her marketing programme and students wishing to undertake the doctoral programme.

Table 2B - Representative Evaluatory Texts Concerning Marketing Education Practices - Content Insight

---

Exemplar One

Author(s): Trocchia and Berowitz (1999)
Means of Evaluation: Empirical Qualitative Interviews
Evaluatory Focus: Requirements for successful candidature within US doctoral programmes
Overview *Towards managerial suggestions for marketing professors wishing to improve the quality of his/her marketing programme and students wishing to undertake doctoral programme, this work considers the socialisation process, of doctoral students. Most particularly towards the possibility of modelling the socialisation process the focus of this work is to make assessments regarding the individual characteristics and environmental determinants of scholarly productivity within the US system of doctoral training.*

Exemplar Two
Author(s): Griffith (1997)
Means of Evaluation: Empirical Quantitative Questionnaire Survey
Evaluatory Focus: Doctoral Programme Content
Overview *This work set out to ask doctoral students about their experiences of their doctoral programmes and most particularly whether legislative calls for improved teaching were characteristic of academic training programmes through formal educator training. It was suggested that better levels of integration with regard to educator training were required and, offered up were ways in which this may be achieved.*
Exemplar Three
Author(s): Roach, Johnston and Hair (1994)
Means of Evaluation: Empirical Quantitative Questionnaire Survey
Evaluatory Focus: Curriculum Relevance
Overview *As part of a wider empirical study which also considers training of academics, this work sets out with an empirical aim of exploring the relevance of education programmes for the students undertaking them. On the basis of faculty and undergraduates viewpoints it concluded, towards an adequate satisfaction of its constituents, that marketing academic teaching practice ought to be more industry/practitioner focused.*

2.4.3 Comments and Critique

Although acknowledging the idiosyncratic nature of this research, it is argued that these works find commonality around a shared inadequacy when it comes to providing reflection on the production of knowledge, within the disciplinary field of marketing.

Despite acknowledging the institutionalised nature of knowledge production within marketing, such a charge *again*[xv] (with reference to scholarly agenda and theoretical underpinnings particularly) from recognition of contextual developments elsewhere, theoretical and otherwise. Therein, broader evaluatory scope is demonstrated.

Evaluatory Agenda and Assumptions

Primarily, disgruntlement surrounds what is considered here to be the means-end and prescriptive nature of such work, or more descriptively, the understanding that such works base their assessment of the production of knowledge (including finding and tailoring their concerns, solutions, judgements and guidance) on the basis of *achieving* and then *promoting* some seemingly pre-fixed notions of what and how marketing should be. In other words, critique forms around the perception that such work operates and exists *within* and *towards* the achievement or attainment of some assumed idealised picture of the discipline, and its outcomes.

An example of means end and prescriptive interest

Baker's work (outlined earlier) for instance as an example of that reflection on knowledge production (and indeed the suggestions made through such reflection) marked out a range of suggestions and opinions all working towards an 'improved' or 'optimum' picture of marketing practice, as defined by some ('non-stated') assumptions or logics underpinning the discipline. In this case one *may* speculate (1) an appreciation for the system of publication, or indeed (2) unequivocality regarding the status of 'writing' *per se* as the ultimate academic tool of communication, as examples of such logics.

More specifically, and in many ways learning from arguments already well developed in the discipline[xvi] (which more specifically dealt with means-end scholarship in the form of marketing's traditional market-led role Belk, 1984; Hirschman, 1986; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Levy, 1981; Olson, 1983), it is argued that such evaluations are **limited** in three ways. They;

1. are potentially exclusionary in terms of scholarly research.

2. overlook, reproduce and uncritically promote particular (and potentially problematic) logics held within the discipline (i.e. unreflexive situated knowledges).

3. ignore theoretical and empirical advancements elsewhere within the social sciences, which more positively define evaluatory potential.

Each of these is expanded on, in turn.

(1) Exclusionary in terms of scholarly research

> The purpose of [scholarly] endeavour is not to inform some interest groups… such purpose is more in line with the goals of the intelligence and police apparatus (Firat et al. (1987: xv)

In recent years a revolutionary band of consumer researchers (Belk, 1984; Hirschman, 1986; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Levy, 1981; Olson, 1983) have argued for a broader, more holistic approach to the way consumer and marketing research is approached.

> Consumer behaviour scholars, specifically an emerging vanguard of socially conscious ones, are seeking ways, conceptual and methodological, to generate knowledge that pertains to the consumption experience of individuals, households, and communities, regardless of the direct consequences of such experiences for market exchange or buying-selling processes. They are questioning the validity of research done solely for consulting purposes for the marketing organisations (Firat, 1987: xv)

Countering a long historical legacy wherein managerial intent and commercial interest has been the organising framework through which the 'consumer'[xvii] has been understood, such works have particularly argued two things. Firstly, that *academic research ought to be usable by all segments of society'* (Firat, 1987:xv) and secondly, that consumer research has failed accordingly. Indeed regarding the latter, they argue

that consumer research has been guilty, not only of representing the interests of a few, but of reducing the possible sites wherein scholarly interest may be located.

As a means of assessment, these 'organisational' texts within marketing are understood here to be similarly limited. Working undoubtedly towards some pre-understood understanding of marketing 'profitability' or 'betterment' within the organisation of their texts, it is argued that such works may be considered as operating instrumentally towards the interests of a few. This being the case, they may also be considered as unwriting a number of important evaluatory possibilities and questions around the sites within which they enquire. For example, what may evaluative works say if conducted from a less 'interested' perspective? What may come from an investigation into the tales academics tell beyond a context of justification for the system that sustains them? What could be said about the effects of the 'production of knowledge' and such 'practices of correction' on their lives? Would some, beyond the rhetoric of such texts, stand disempowered? Overlooking such, it is suggested, risks both new reflexive understandings and academic responsibility.

(2) Lack of critical engagement in logics shaping the field/promotion of such logics.

> The work of an intellectual is…to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions and starting from this reproblematization (where he occupies his specific profession as an intellectual) to participate in the formation of a political will (Foucault, 1989: 30).

As noted, another of the limitations of such evaluatory texts is that they are understood here to be characterised by lack of critical/evaluatory engagement around

the guiding logics or 'rules of evidence' which guide them. In other words, they operate as texts within particular sets of understandings – they themselves never open to reflexive scrutiny. Understood to be operating within a knowledge-social divide and Mertonian-like corrective agenda (which theoretically and epistemologically limits by considering some aspects of marketing knowledge 'real') they deny potential and can easily be critiqued as limiting and troublesome.

Robert Merton and his 'Sociology of Error'

Robert Merton viewed and described by many as the founding father of the sociology of science' (Kavanagh, 1994; Ashmore, 1988; Shapin, 1995) was interested fundamentally in understanding how science was socially organised, in such a way that it could continually maintain (its claims, regarding) the discovery of objective knowledge. Defined by his self-explanatory concept 'the sociology of error' therefore, the inspectoral work of Merton (1973) was defined by two main premises; firstly that scientific facts were real and objective, and secondly that sociological factors were worth exploration only in the sense that they could bring error to the process of finding such facts (Potter, 1996:18). To this end (and building on the motion within history and the sociology of science from the 1930's and beyond wherein scholars 'took the dualistic juxtaposition of 'social' versus 'rational', 'intellectual' and 'evidential' for granted' (Shapin, 1992)) the Mertonian project was one defined by an epistemological asymmetry wherein scientific knowledge is treated as essentially real, a universal given and unquestionable truth (Collins, 1983d). Social and organisational life on the contrary was considered interesting in that it could be seen as creating falsities, creating a situation overall where the sociological inspection of scientific knowledge never extended into scrutiny of the content of such knowledge, yet merely remained on its periphery.

On the first level therefore, in considering 'marketing' as real in some respects, this work writes out, not only the potential to view such 'logics' and 'taken-for granted knowledges' as potentially politically-fuelled and non-neutral in nature, but also the possibility of understanding/challenging them as such. On the second, through their general promotory intent[xviii], such ideas (regardless of any political aspect) are not only removed from critical examination but are unproblematically reproduced. Finally on the third, such work writes out the person as operating part of what makes

marketing and its morals. Indeed, crucially such work detrimentally omits 'agency' from its evaluatory remit, and with it, any possibility of working up understanding around marketing academia's people, and more importantly how they may be mediated and meditative of marketing academic reality. In other words, like those works of abstracted concern, they exclude the possibility of understanding the constitutive 'human effects' of marketing academic reality.

(3) Overlooking Theoretical (and Empirical) Advancements Elsewhere

Providing a strong basis for challenging the wholly adequate sense of this, are a number of works which themselves have approached institutionalised knowledge production from a less essentialist, and more openly anti-foundational/critical perspective. Here, specifically marking the agenda and interest of such work as tired and anachronistic, are works from within the study of science, and more particularly in this case from within SSK (previously SSS; now STS).

Following early works within the social studies of science which introduced the value and possibility (post-Kuhn) of destabilising conventional notions of *"truth and falsity, rationality and irrationality"[xix]* (Bloor, 1976:4-5) SSK offered up a more constitutive view of science and the possible evaluation of its knowledge production, through a socially constructionist perspective in their reflection on science as their object of study.

> Rather than considering scientific products as somehow capturing what is, we will consider them as selectively carved out, transformed and constructed from whatever is. And, rather than examine the external relations between science and the 'nature' we are told it describes, we will look at those internal affairs of scientific enterprise which we take to be *constructive* (Knorr-Cetina, 1981:1 emphasis in original. Cf. Potter, 1996:35)

To this end, through an updated view of representation and beyond the (silently operative and limited) subject/object, knowledge/social divide colouring these works within marketing, such works suggest there to be no inherently reality within disciplinary knowledge. No assumptions are deserving of evasion from critical scrutiny on the basis of some inherent essentialism and, therefore, all knowledge should be openly available for critique.

> While traditional sociology of knowledge asked how, and to what extent 'social factors' might influence the products of the mind, SSK sought to show that knowledge was constitutively social and in so doing, it raised fundamental questions about taken-for-granted divisions between 'social versus cognitive, or natural factors' (Shapin, 1995:289)

Crucially moving away from questions (like those of Merton) which concentrated on how the social impinged non-constitutively on knowledge production, works such as that of Latour and Woolgar (1988), Knorr-Cetina (1981) and Law (1994) offered up a broader scope for evaluation – one wherein the content and processes of knowledge within science were the focus. Indeed, through a range of ethnographically-inspired works within the empirical setting of laboratories, these works argued the basis for a wider set, more emancipatory and responsible scholarship.

To this end, through a myriad of findings and the adoption of updated social theory, such works pointed not only to the socially contextual nature of knowledge and to the importance of critical engagement within systems of thought, but to the danger of

work which leaves habitual ways of working and thinking as normal. Traweek (1988), as an example of work within this vein, points to the politically fused (gendered) nature of training and development within the field of physics – and in doing so illuminates particularly important sites for understanding left untouched and reproduced within current evaluations (such as those training ones within marketing).

2.4.4 Summary of Section

Having introduced and reviewed a number of works, which find broad concern with processes/outcomes of knowledge manufacture around organisational practices in marketing, this section concludes that they *further* embody impoverishment with regard to disciplinary self-understandings. With reference to both artefactual and educational inspections, this charge primarily relates to the means-end/prescriptive/uncritical nature of such work, which houses implications such as omission of 'agency' and exclusion of non-managerial interest. These 'incites' were made largely in acknowledgement of both anti-managerial 'progressions' within the discipline already, and a number of works elsewhere within the social sciences (particularly those in the sociology of scientific knowledge). These both champion and demonstrate more emacipatory, responsible, and overall adequate means through which evaluation may be devised.

2.5 (Towards) Reflexive Inspection within the Marketing Discipline

> Marketing's self-understanding is illusory; it brackets off its wider social responsibility and presents itself as neutral, whereas in fact it is centrally involved in constituting this particular type of society. It is crucial to find ways to dig into that self-understanding, to undermine it, to provoke it, to resist it. (Morgan, 1992:144)

As noted earlier, the (post) Kuhnian inspired 'revolution', in terms of how (scientific) knowledge may be considered, has not eluded the marketing discipline and its reflections. Although few in number, there exists a growing body of work who have found value in building upon the social, anti-epistemological and anti-performative potential brought about within the social sciences. Providing new opportunities for reflexive understanding (Ferguson, 2002), as well as means to move beyond the limiting, self-preserving nature of those evaluations just outlined, such offerings are understood to open up an exciting basis for reflection in marketing.

2.5.1 'Reflexive' Initiations

The introduction of such enlightened focus within (and towards) marketing thought was brought about by key contributors such as Morgan (1992), Brownlie and Saren (1996), Brownlie et al, (1999) and latterly Hackley (2002). These reflect the *'growing interest'* observed by Alvesson (1994) who notes in greater detail;

There seems to be a growing interest among scholars concerned with many of the sub-disciplines of management studies. This is springing partly from a feeling that management is simply too important an activity or field of enquiry to be left to the mainstream thinking of management departments and business schools, which uncritically adopt 'managerialist' perspectives and interests (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992, 1994). As with other forms of dominating discourse and practice, it is vital to subject it to critical examination (Alvesson, 1994).

In this regard, these authors (particularly following influential steps already taken within the discipline to legitimise the consideration of knowledge as practice[xx] and anti-foundational thought[xxi]) like many before them, particularly argued and acknowledged the relevance, applicability, and importance of '*rethinking*' marketing in the sense that its academic realms (and knowledges) should be scrutinised in more theoretically adequate ways. To them such discourse should not evade cultural critique. Justified by a number of factors - but perhaps most predominantly an acknowledgement of the potentially influential and constitutive (meditative) role marketing academic discourse may play in 'writing' an ever expanding and more widely scrutinisable marketing discourse (Morgan, 1992[xxii]; Brownlie and Saren, 1997) - this work particularly introduced the consideration of marketing academic knowledge from a constructionist perspective. As a result of doing so they firstly presented the suggestion within marketing that its academic discourse should not be considered as real but rather the effects of particularised sets of language and discourse within which they are embedded[xxiii]. As Brownlie and Saren would have it, marketing needs to '*address the problems of language and discourse*' (1997:150). Secondly, towards some semblance of emancipation, disciplinary understanding and meaningful scholarly ends (as an articulation of evaluation) were that we should locate our concerns *critically* around understanding its nature and conditions of such discourse. In other words to '*articulate its conditions of possibility*' (Morgan, 1992);

In order to enrich the current discourse we should seek to expand the existing repertoire of accounts of the social processes and practices that define the conditions of possibility of marketing management (Brownlie and Saren, 1997:148)

I feel that in pushing the social constructionist ontological position to the foreground can assist in a deconstruction of marketing thought which, while avowedly critical in tone and substance, amounts to a useful and constructive contribution to the academy's efforts (Hackley, 2001:3)

To this end, such authors note that understanding how marketing academic reality is made up through discourse and language allows for re-imagination (through our changed practices) around what our reality is and how it could be. Hackley (2001:6), for instance, considers mainstream thought and writing within marketing through social constructionist means, *'in order to textually subvert these in a re-imaginary expose'*. In addition, Alvesson and Willmott (1997) allude to the possibility of responsible scholarship through such perspective. Indeed, as they note, an anti-foundational consideration of sorts means that a consideration of marketing;

can bring fresh insights and provide a more penetrating appreciation of its ethical and social significance (Alvesson and Willmott, 1997:128; cf Brownlie et al. 1999)

In this regard, it is suggested that such evaluations may aid motion beyond potentially problematic reproductions; such as those arguably going unquestioned within 'Organisational' evaluations outlined earlier.

2.5.2 Under-exploitation

Overall, in the sense that they provided an introduction within marketing for us to think beyond under-socialised and managerial approaches to knowledge production, and to pursue anti-foundational research in relation to academic practice, these works are considered hugely valuable. Unfortunately, they only went so far in their provision, never really offering reflexive understandings themselves nor accounting for their own position in their writing. Additionally, in terms of promoting further empirical endeavour around academic 'practice as knowledge', their effect, unfortunately, has been minimal. In this respect, it is suggested that only the (forthcoming) work of Bettany provides an example of where these ideas have been acted on[xxiv].

With this in mind, marketing academia stands equipped yet under-exploited*, in all ways, as an evaluative*[xxv] resource. Indeed, it is with this in mind that this study notes its wish to contribute in such regard, and to aim to further reflexive development within the discipline.

2.6   Summary of Part One and Proposed Direction

Having concerned itself with the exploration of perspectives and approaches defining intervention and evaluation of 'knowledge' productions within the disciplinary field of marketing currently, the literature review has addressed a number of key bodies of work which have helped generate a number of key arguments. Substantiating further

the interests of this work as laid out within the introduction, three points particularly resonate from such as particularly pertinent.

The marketing academy can be understood as severely impoverished currently, in terms of its potential for self-understanding and hence (re) thinking, emancipation, and critical scholarly responsibility.

Having focused (within section 2.3) its attention on marketing's variant approaches; namely abstracted organisationally and socially centred works *and* on a range of now long established offerings from throughout the social sciences, it was suggested that, methodological bias, under-socialised treatment of knowledge production, essentialism, non-critical prescriptivism and under-exploitation prevailed. These readings rendered such works inadequate.

Such impoverishment may in part be defined through an insufficient consideration of 'the academic' within 'knowledge production'.

A close reading of marketing's inspections underlined a key commonality, to be poor consideration of 'the academic'. To this end, through (1) the maintenance of the subject/object divide - and therefore essentialised ideas of the detached and lone scholar, and (2), a largely 'unreflexive' social/cultural movement, it is postulated that understandings of the academic are fundamentally lacking; 'written-out', or poorly represented, within evaluations.

That scholarly value may prevail in overcoming such lacking.

Having made the suggestion that further reflexive pursuit would be of value within discipline, it is suggested *more particularly* that further evaluatory value may exist around better understanding of 'the academic'. Given the lack of theoretical adequacy, or empirical attention thus far (despite anti-foundational tools within the discipline which allow us to understand the academic as constituted socially and meditative of marketing potential in such terms) it is suggested that such may be a reflexive project of real worth.

PART TWO: Contextualising and Theorising Interest in the Marketing 'Subject'

Having raised an anti-foundational study of the marketing academic as a potentially useful arena for reflexive furtherment, the remainder of this chapter seeks to contextualise and theorise such. It does so firstly by reviewing other work that has demonstrated value in the consideration of the (academic) 'subject'.

2.7 Contextualising Interest in the Marketing 'Subject'

> As the engine of a huge system of signification (Brownlie, et al, 1999) marketing provides much material for the construction of identity and subjectivity (Hackley, 2001:30)

2.7.1 Historical Interest in the Subject

Finding interest around the 'subject' is not something new. Indeed, seeking to further contextualise this study, acknowledgement is made of a broad historical interest in the area - theoretical and empirical. As well as providing context, this body of work also serves to validate developing concerns with the marketing 'subject' here.

2.7.1.1 Theoretical

Theoretic contributions to '*personhood'* have played a hugely significant part of modern scholarship (Du Gay et al, 1997). Indeed, since *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899) by Freud initiated what some now refer to as the 'psychodynamic' school of thinking, and George Herbert Mead's *Mind, Self and Society* (1934) gave birth to the sociological school, a hugely diverse body of work has grown. Importantly these

works are founded on and provide self-justification around one key commonality; that the Cartesian notion of the person *'as an individual subject…understood as a given entity'* (Du Gay et al, 1997:2) is profoundly limited and requiring some form of exploration. Together both major schools underline and create interest in looking at the subject.

The Sociological Approach

Of particular validation and relevance here are sociological interests. These have proliferated in a number of ways. Since Mead, the consideration of 'the subject' as it relates to society/culture, has been voiced, for example, by Goffman (1959) and Berger (1966), (through their developing ideas of symbolic interactionism) and by Saussure (1949), through his structural assertion that rules of language form the subject.

Both providing for, and underlining, the importance of a study such as this however have been a number of works whose interests have been more 'anti-foundational' in nature, for example, Giddens, (1991); Bourdieu, (1977), and Foucault, (1977, 1981, 1985). These, beyond the person *'as a given entity'* (Du Gay et al, 1997:2), provide a view of the subject which renders it both constitutive of, and constituted within, 'social structures'. Bourdieu, for example, within his broad theoretical oeuvre (including most predominantly works such as *'Outline of a Theory of Practice'),* took as his primary interest the dialectic between the subject and social structures, and thus underlined the possibility of 'locating' the person (through habitus) culturally. Likewise, Foucault (building on much earlier thoughts of Nietzsche[xxvi]) pointed to

such possibility through his variety of works on subjectification (1977c, 1981, and 1985);

> We should try to discover how it is that *subjects* are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts, etc. (Foucault, 1980a:97)

Although they will be discussed at greater length later (particularly Foucault), at this stage it is enough to say that these works provide the context wherein a consideration of the 'marketing academic subject' is worthwhile. In providing a constitutive view they suggest possibly not only of understanding subjectivity formation but also, through such, of understanding the conditions of our discipline. In other words, they heavily suggest the validity of considering 'the subject' as a site of evaluation within the discipline.

2.7.1.2 Empirical

From this broad theoretic validation there comes acknowledgement of a plethora of works which have considered 'the subject' more locally and empirically. Emphasis particularly focuses on those that have contributed within 'relevant' fields including, marketing and education. Together these have demonstrated not only the possibility for this sort of study, but the possible usefulness of it too.

'Within' Marketing

Work within marketing has long considered its discourses as potentially influential in terms of personal reality, and hence worthy of study in this regard (Morgan, 1992; Brownlie et al, 1999; Hackley, 2001). Brownlie et al, for instance, note that;

> marketing can be located within processes through which individual identity is constructed (Brownlie et al, 1999:8)

Likewise Hackley notes that;

> marketing provides much material for the construction of identity and subjectivity (Hackley, 2001:30)

Reflecting this is an increasing body of work, which has come to consider the effects of marketing discourse in relation to personhood. Indigenous to the marketing academy itself, for example, are works such as that of Belk (1991), Thompson (2003), Elliot and Wattanasuwan (1998), and Lamont and Molnar (2001). In addition to these are non-native examples such as those of Appadurai, 1986; Bourdieu, 1984; Douglas, 1992; Douglas and Isherwood, 1979; du Gay et al., 1997; and Miller, 1987; 1995; 1997; Hodgson, 2002; Knights and Sturdy, (1997). All point to the constructive effects of marketing discourse on people and the value of considering such. Furthermore, although primary emphasis within the empirical works surrounded an understanding of the consumer, all lend support to the potential value of considering identity and subjectivity within *other* marketing discourses, and hence to a study like this wishing to explore the academic arena.

Within Education: Interest in the Academic Subject

Most relevantly however, there are a number of (empirical) works within the social sciences (and particularly within educational research) which have already come to place specific reflexive interest around personhood *within academia*[xxvii] - in other words around the construction of the academic.

Bourdieu and the 'Sociology of Sociology'

In this regard, Bourdieu must be cited as the dominant contributor through offerings such as *Academic Discourse* (1992), *Homo Academicus* (1988), *The State Nobility* (1996) *Practical Reason* (1998) and *Pascalian Mediations* (2000), which are set among the higher education system of France.

Bourdieu, as a sociologist, profoundly rejected ignorance surrounding academics and academic life, a notion expressed most clearly through his distrust and subsequent theorisation around the 'gap' between theory and practice (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). For Bourdieu, it was wrong that academics held 'authority' via their representations of subjects from a perspective wherein theory and practice were separate, and little recourse was made to their '*dispositions*' (Stabile and Morooka, 2003: 327). Indeed, as part of his invitation for us to participate in 'reflexive' sociology (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) Bourdieu considered academics like anyone else to be the '*effects of social mechanisms*' (Mahar, et al. 1990:2). As Duncan (1990) noted, Bourdieu held a:

> conviction about the position of the sociologist as being…'culturally mediated', i.e. historically situated, in particular, in the world of prestigious universities (Duncan, 1994:181)

And, as Stabile and Morooka (2003) underline, citing Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:251);

> In *Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Bourdieu submits that the practice and teaching of social science help equip one with a '"new gaze"', 'a sociological eye' (Stabile and Morooka, 2003:334).

More particularly, defining such 'reflexivity', he noted *and called for* an understanding of such a mediated position to be a key part of *'any rigorous sociological practice'* (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 68). Within his work, therefore, this motion towards 'reflexivity' was of paramount importance. In considering academic reality or the academic view to be made up in some way through the academic 'field', Bourdieu claimed that reflection around such would provide the basis for emancipatory and responsible understandings;

> Science, especially sociology, is [to be] used against, just as much as following, its own formation. Only history can extricate us from history. Therefore the social history of social science, in so far as it is seen as science of unconscious acts, in the great tradition of epistemological history with figures such as… Michel Foucault, is one of the most powerful tools for breaking out of history, from the hold of the past surviving into the present, or from the present which, like intellectual fashions, is already past the moment it appears. (Duncan, 1990: 181)

Importantly, Bourdieu pursued such reflexivity within his own work in two ways; firstly through the consideration of academic settings, and secondly through a sociological exploration of his *own* cultural production. Relating to the first, Duncan notes that;

> Fundamental to this task of knowing the subject of knowledge, is the sociology of the education system and of the intellectual world… Bourdieu reaffirms this as the most direct approach to uncovering those categories of thought lying below the level of conscious thought, and which evoke the whole world of assumptions and presumptions, the biases education makes us accept and the gaps it makes us ignore (Duncan, 1990:180)

With this in mind, towards the achievement of new 'self' and 'disciplinary' understanding, the work of Bourdieu points strongly to the importance of a 'sociology of marketing'. Crucially, his work also underlines that a consideration of the subject should be at the heart of this.

Supplementing the work and claims of Bourdieu are other works that have come to consider the production of the academic in anti-foundational ways. Included within these are thoughts of Foucault for one, who within *Intellectuals and Power: A Conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze* (1977a), he notes;

> [the intellectual should] no longer place himself 'somewhat ahead or to the side' in order to express the stifled truth of the collectivity; rather…struggle against the forms of power that transform him into its object and instrument in that sphere of knowledge, truth, consciousness and discourse (Foucault, 1977a:107-8)

Herein, Foucault, like Bourdieu, points to the situated nature of the academic and to the reflexive emacipatory importance of accounting somehow for that situ. In addition is another grouping of applied empirical works; some of which are outlined below;

Table 2C - Examples of Anti-Foundational Considerations of the Production of the Academic

Particular Research Site	Author(s)
Research Process/Development	Wray-Bliss (2003); Roth and Bowen, 2001 Devos 2004
Doctoral Training	Traweek, 1988; Lee and Williams, 1999, Delamont et al, 1997; Parry et al, 1994; Trotter, 2003;
Professional Change	Beck and Young, 2005; McLaughlin and Tierney, 1993; McWilliam, 2004; McLaren, 1993;
Teaching	Barkhuizen, 2002; Abbas and McLean, 2001; Atkinson and Delamont, 1985

These, too, point to the constructed nature of the academic and further underline the importance of their reflexive consideration, within a study such as this.

Particularly, through their consideration of academic subjectivities in relation to a number of academic sites, these works suggest the reproduction of academic reality as worked up through a number of organisational and pedagogic sites. Wray-Bliss (2003), for example, through his consideration of the interviewing process in *Critical Management Studies* points to its mediative role. Likewise, Lee and Williams (1999) point to the doctoral process within Australian Universities, which provides conditions for further academic reproduction through the specific pedagogically centred constitution of academics at the training level. As such, they raise questions over marketing academic reality, and particularly to what extent we may be able to evaluate (and locate) the possibilities of our cultural productions within everyday sites of our organisation. In what ways may we be understood as limited by our pedagogic/institutional arrangements for example?

In addition to the possibility of exploring questions such as those, these works also point to the importance around 'the subject' to reside in its ability to facilitate exploration around the effects of 'production' in human terms. In other words, they serve to broaden evaluatory potential through an understanding of the personal effects of 'academic constitution'. Suggestive of this indirectly, are a number of works; including again Lee and Williams (1999), Traweek (1988) and Wray-Bliss (2003), each of which point to a darker side of academic production. In the case of the first two, the findings offered were indicative of negatively experienced emotions as 'productive' outcomes for students around the doctoral process (Lee and Williams, 1999; Traweek, 1988). With regard to Wray-Bliss (2003), marginalisation and disempowerment were underlined as the seeming reproductions among participants within typical academic interview situations. As such, these works pinpoint particular reflexive potential, and import to reside at the site of 'subjective' consideration.

Indeed aligning to thoughts shared by Alvesson and Willmott, (1994) that marketing should give voice to; *'social groups such as subordinates, customers, clients, men and women…whose lives are more or less directly affected by the activities and ideologies of management'* (1994:296), it is suggested that such an approach provides marketing with the potential to further reflexive endeavour in responsible ways.

Although in no way reflecting the extent to which theorisation or empirical work has come to exist around such a 'topic' (see Du Gay et al 2000)[xxviii], these works do, to a certain degree, demonstrate variance. They do this in both the ways in which we can come to conceive and conceptualise the 'subject' in relation to particular sets of discourses, and ask questions of it. Most importantly, having marked a desire to

explore the constructed nature of the academic subject within the disciplinary field of marketing, they help reiterate the importance of drawing such boundaries within this study alongside Alvesson and Skoldberg, (2000). The following section addresses such.

2.8 Theorising 'Academic' Production: Towards Foucault

As eluded to above, when faced with the theorisation of a study concerned with the production of *'personhood'* or *'subjectivity',* a variety of conceptual options become available for use. Each of these provide their own limiting/enabling frame.

In thinking through how the relationship between 'subject' and 'discourse' would be conceived in this study, theories were considered on the basis of two primary reasons. The first of these was that they provided challenge to traditionally 'applied' notions of identity/subjectivity working through modernist discourse[xxix]; that of the *'individual subject, understood as a given entity, the author of its own acts and centred in a unitary, reflexive and directive consciousness'* (Du Gay et al, 2000:2). The second, (aligning to the wishes of this study) was that they found;

> concern with the social relations, techniques, and forms of training and practice through which individuals have acquired definite capacities and attributes for social existence as a particular sort of person'…[and in doing so focused on] 'an historical understanding of the limited and specific forms of 'personhood' that individuals acquire in their passage through social institutions (Du Gay, 2000:279-280).

From this, a number of pertinent factors pointed to the ideas of philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) as particularly attractive here. These, in some detail, are now outlined below.

2.8.1   Critical Marketing and Foucault

The first of these related to the context work within marketing itself, and more particularly: an acknowledgement of long articulated calls from some in the discipline for the use of Foucault, scant existing application of his ideas within marketing, and the demonstrated value of use therein.

For a long time there have existed calls to bring Foucauldian frameworks of theorisation and analysis to marketing. Morgan, for example, in 1992, postulated that a *'proper genealogy of marketing'* would hold *'considerable potential as a tool of critique'* (1992:153) and that *genealogy* [would] *allow us to understand more clearly how particular institution arrangements* [are] *set up and empowered such that they now appear normal* (Morgan, 1992: 153). Further, he claimed that *'Foucault* [could] *contribute strongly to [a] critique of marketing'* (ibid. 154) and wondered;

> What is it that marketing as a discourse actually does to the way in which people live their lives?   How are its power effects as a discourse constructed? (ibid: 152)

His valid questions, however, have received little reply. Indeed, Foucauldian work *within* the marketing discipline extends only to Thompson (2003), Hackley, (2002); McLaughlin (1998), Skalen and Fougere (2004), being only bolstered slightly by works external to marketing which find (through Foucault) concern around 'marketing related' discourses (Hodgson, 2002; Knights and Sturdy, 1997).

Despite such scant application, these works provide (empirically-led) justification to both Morgan's foresight, and, the interest in extending Foucault's application to marketing here. As just one example of this, Hodgson (2002) underlines the potential value of Foucault in relation to marketing discourse. Through his study of marketing in the financial sector, he illustrates how taken-for-granted realities, such as that of the 'consuming subject', may, through Foucault, not only be considered as related to marketing discourse, but be problematised in hugely useful ways. To this end, within his work, Hodgson is able, through Foucault, to underline how consumer realities may be seen as worked up through the particular effects of power.

2.8.2 'Related' Fields and Foucault

Beyond 'marketing' justification for the selection of Foucault comes from a variety of other works conducted within external fields, and concerned with subjectivity formation. Included within these, were a number of works that point to the value of Foucauldian-led thinking in the context of education (Popkewitz, 1991; Baker and Heyning, 2004; Shore and Roberts, 1993).

Table 2D - Contextualising Texts: Foucauldian Inspired Works

Workplace and Subjectivity	Covaleski et al, 1998; Rose, 1989; Knights and Willmott, 1989; Knights and Morgan, 1994; Willmott, 1994; Alvesson and Deetz, 1996; Garsten and Grey, 1997; Clegg, 1998; McKinley and Starkey, 1998; O'Doherty and Willmott, 2001; Alferoff and Knights, 2002; Townley, 1993; Kerfoot and Knights, 1992 and Fox, 1989, alongside professional socialisation (Grey, 1994).
Education	Dwyer, 1995; Ball, 1990a; Meadmore, 1993, Grant, 1997, Marshall, 1997; Blades, 1997, Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, Cherryholmes, 1987; Popkewitz, 1991; Baker and Heyning, 2004; Marshall, 2004; Lather, 2004; Harwood and Rasmussen, 2004; Adams St.Pierre, 2004; Hammerberg, 2004; Toll and Crumpler, 2004; Baker, 2001; Cavanagh, 2002; Davis, 1995; Fendler, 1998; Franklin, 1994; Gray-Rosendale, 1999; Hunter, 1994; Kirk, 1998, 2004; Middleton, 1998; Willis, 2002; Davies, 1995; Drummond, 2000; Gore, 1994; Jones and Ball, 1995; Marshall, 1996; Stone, 2002; Tamboukou, 1999; Shore and Roberts, 1993.
Broader institutionalised settings	Brownlie, 1999; Chapman, 1997.

Likewise the *value* for reflexive accounting through Foucault is reflected in the *Organisational Studies* and *Sociology of Work*. Knights and Willmott (1989) provided early vocalisation in this regard, championing Foucault for Labour Process Theory as response to perceived inadequacy around matters of subjectivity and power within such realm. Critically too, calls for greater attention have defined this grouping. Starkey and McKinley (1998), as one example, outline the consideration of subjectivity through Foucault to be potentially critical as a path to reflexive enlightenment; both disciplinary and subjectively;

A critical ontology of ourselves (a la Foucault) should be a major focus of organization analysis, aiming to examine both the limits of organization but also organization's potentially liberating qualities. Organizations bring individual selves into contact with others and allow, if we are willing, new definitions of the self and therefore, of organization itself (Starkey and McKinley, 1998:238)

Perhaps most notable, are Starkey and Hatchuel (2002) who underline impoverishment when it comes to understanding organisational life through Foucault's *later* works specifically. For them, more attention to Foucault's 'History of Sexuality' phase would provide valuable grounds for rethinking organisation. Through such, they indicate potential for doing so within this work.

2.8.3   The 'Limits' of Others

The move towards Foucault was lastly founded on its 'value' in comparison to alternate theoretical approaches. Two of the main theoretical contenders sidelined were Giddens and Bourdieu. Giddens, firstly, offered hope through his seemingly commensurable[xxx] anti-dualistic perspectives on the self (Giddens, 1991). However, on closer inspection, when compared to Foucault, his offering was considered limited in respect to the developing interest of this study. Most particularly, such a judgement related to what was considered his non-avoidance of essentialism at times around 'the subject', and particularly his residing theorising of 'ontological security'. As Newton supportively underlines;

> at the core of Gidden's theorizing is the notion of 'ontological security', the deep rooted concerns that he supposes we all have with maintaining a sense of continuity and order in our lives (Giddens 1991) Ultimately, human feelings of anxiety and existential loneliness derive from this essential need for ontological security, the desire for which appears as an almost inevitable part of childhood development (Newton, 1998:3).

Indeed, aligning here to a point expressed by Newton (1993) and supported further by Burkitt (1992), Giddens limits the possibility of his consideration of subjectivity, mainly through its recourse to a reality which prevents its relation between structures and discourse. In other words the theoretical possibility of exploring the situated nature of the academic, as is the hope of this study. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Bourdieu too, offered an 'alternate' means through which the theorisation of this work was considered. In light of much of his research interest outlined earlier (section 2.7.1.2), it would perhaps have been unusual for this not to be the case. Crucially, his most notable works; *Outline of a Theory of Practice (1977), Homo Academicus (1988)* and *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (1977)* conceive and develop what have become prolific non-dualistic and reflexive ideas of the relation between 'structure' and 'agent'. Most particularly, worked up around key conceptual tools such as 'habitus'[xxxi], Bourdieu set out to facilitate understanding around *'the genesis of social structures and of the dispositions of the habitus of the agents who live within these structures'* (Harker, et al. 1990: 4) In other words, to explore *'the processes whereby societies and/or specific forms of social practice were reproduced'* (Crossley, 2003:43). With this in mind, his work was in no way dismissed here. However it was deemed less attractive than Foucault mainly through an acknowledgement of one frequent criticism of his work; that it is perhaps too determinist at times (Noble and Watkins, 2003) for a work of social constructionist intentions.

2.8.4   Foucault: An Introduction

> [the intellectual should] no longer place himself 'somewhat ahead or to the side' in order to express the stifled truth of the collectivity; rather…struggle against the forms of power that transform him into its object and instrument in that sphere of knowledge, truth, consciousness and discourse (Foucault, 1977a:107-8)

Foucault, sociologist and historian of knowledge (Potter, 1996), a most celebrated of 'modern' social theorists, has contributed widely and prolifically to the context of social science, both through the theoretical shifts defining his work and the different subjects he has considered. Finding interest around psychiatry (1977b), the human sciences (1973), medicine (1975), the penal system (1977c), and sexuality (1979a, 1986, 1988d) for example, he has not only considered hugely varied institutions, but done so in ways wherein his thoughts have progressed in form from what can be considered structuralist to more post-structuralist ideas (Smart, 1985; Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000). Consistency and continuity however are centrally descriptors of Foucault's offering, particularly through theme and agenda. In this regard, core concepts of subjectivity, power, knowledge, discourse, and history (Smart, 1985) are perpetuates, as was his overarching interest in the subversion of self-evidences (Potter, 1996). With regard to the latter, Foucault aimed to demonstrate many taken-for-granted aspects of everyday life to be fabrications - particular effects within moments of history.

It is one of my targets to show people that a lot of things that are part of their landscape – that people think are universal – are the result of some very precise historical changes. All my analysis is against the idea of universal necessities in human existence. They show freedom we can still enjoy and how many changes can still be made (Foucault, 1988a: 11)

The role of an intellectual is… to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions (Foucault, 1989: 30)

…it wasn't as a matter of course that made people came to be regarded as mentally ill; it wasn't self evident that the only thing to be done with a criminal was to lock him up; it wasn't self evident that the causes of illness were to be sought through the individual examination of bodies; and so on (Foucault, 1991:76)

Foucault does historical research to extend our sense of possibility and one of his fundamental purposes in doing so is to examine the limits of individual historical possibilities (Starkey and Hatchuel, 2002:643)

The work of Foucault[xxxii], therefore, aims to bracket epistemological concerns. He places ultimate importance not on skirmishes towards truth (as has demonstrably defined much of marketing's current introspections), but on the production of knowledge, and more importantly how that plays out within contextual *situs*. Here, with interest in theorising marketing academics as well as how we may be understood to become, it is to his later work that this thesis turns.

2.8.5   Foucault and the Subject

Fundamentally Foucault's work provides challenge to traditionally 'applied' notions of identity/subjectivity working through modernist discourse; that of the

individual subject, understood as a given entity, the author of its own acts and centred in a unitary, reflexive and directive consciousness (Du Gay et al, 2000:2).

With this in mind, Foucault primarily rejects essentialism with regard to the human subject (McNay, 1992). Indeed, from his post-structualist perspective he claims that far from being a universally held or fixed thing 'the subject' is made up within its own historical context; the constitutive effect of various elements. (Bloom, 1998; Ellis and Flaherty, 1992; Flax, 1993; Foucault, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1988b; Weedon, 1997) Further, he argues that rather than having a fixed core or essence, subjectivity is constructed through language and is, therefore, an open-ended, contradictory, non-singular, *'non-unitary and culturally specific amalgam of different subject positions'* (McNay, 1992: 2).

> The distinctiveness of Foucault's (1977c) perspective on subjectivity resides in its appreciation of the subject as the constitutive product of a plurality of disciplinary mechanisms… His work mounts a direct challenge to those who continue to perceive subjectivity as that creative autonomy or personal space not yet captured by political economy. Indeed his professed aim is to rid discourse of the 'transcendental subject', which he regards as a legacy from classical philosophy (Knights and Willmott, 1989: 549)

> Foucault showed how we could no longer assume the existence of a pre-given unitary and sovereign subject. From a Foucauldian perspective, the dualism between the subject and 'objective' structures is misplaced, since the subject herself is not some independent, bounded and fixed unity (Newton, 1998:416)

> Rather than perceive the individual as reducible to an internal core of meaning, from a Foucauldian perspective, the human subject is not 'given' but produced…that is, constituted through correlative elements (Townley, 1993:521)

By extension/implication Foucault asks that those engaged in social research consider the subject as a site of social formation. More accurately he asks that adequate

analysis of the subject should assess those contextual elements which go to make it up.

2.8.5.1 Theorising Constitution – Towards (an outline of) Subjectification

Keen to follow Foucault's request, the remainder of the chapter provides greater insight into his understanding and theorisation of such 'constitutive elements'. In other words, it seeks to explore what a consideration of the subject in Foucauldian terms would involve.

Asserting Positionality

Setting about such a task meaningfully first requires definite alignment to a position within the non-continuity that is Foucault's work. As Rajchman (1992) notes, *'There is no one Foucault'* (1992:215).

As implied earlier, Foucault's interest in the subject was continual; most notably, as Smart (1985) observes, through *'historical analyses of the various modes through which in Western culture human beings have been constituted as subjects and objects'* (1985:19). However, his understandings of the subject, and how it is constituted, developed significantly and varied greatly. Here, moving away *solely*[xxxiii] from his earlier/middle works[xxxiv], interest formulates the latter, and particularly around his notion of subjectification (1983). Forming a main part of his conceptualisation within later works this was, for Foucault, a process that resulted in;

the constitution of the subject, or more exactly, of a subjectivity which is obviously only one of the given possibilities of organising a consciousness of the self (Foucault, 1996:472)

Central to its definition as a form of power, he notes that, as a concept,

subjectification;

> applies itself [as a *regime du saviour*] to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognise and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power, which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word subject; subject to someone ELSE by CONTROL and DEPENDENCE and tied to his own identity and conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power, which subjugates and makes subject to (Foucault, 1983: 212 original emphasis).

Perhaps the most significant aspect of such is that 'subjectification' includes the involvement of the active agent. Indeed, as his means to adequately answer the questions of his doubters[xxxv] the concept asks that we think beyond notions of the self in relation to notions of domination. Underlining this, Rail and Harvey (1995) noted his term *subjectification* to be the expression of his increasing interest *'in the process by which individuals are led to think about themselves, act for themselves, and transform themselves'* (1995:167). They go on to define such a period as that wherein Foucault noted that a true analysis of a subject only to be possible *'with an examination of the forms and modalities of relating to oneself '…. 'forms and modalities [through which] individuals constitute themselves and recognise themselves as subjects'* (1995:167). This is encapsulated below, within the following quote, wherein Foucault notes the requirements of an adequate analysis to surround insight into technologies of power and technologies of the self.

> If one wants to analyse the genealogy of subject in Western civilisation, one has to take into account not only techniques of the domination, but also techniques of self. One has to show the interaction between these two types of the self. When I was studying asylums, prisons, and so on, I perhaps insisted too much on the techniques of domination. What we call discipline is something really important in this kind of institution. But it is only one aspect of the art of governing people in our societies. Having studied the field of power relations taking domination techniques as a point of departure, I should like, in the years to come, to study power relations, especially in the field of sexuality, starting from the techniques of the self (Foucault, 1986:367 – cf McNay, 1992:49)

Although bracketing 'technologies' for the moment, subjectification is understood to be made up of two parts. To this end, asking that elements of theorisation be taken from two stages of his work (that of *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977c) and *The History of Sexuality: Volumes One, Two and Three* (1980e, 1986, 1988d)) he proposes that subjectivity be seen as the (potential) result/effect of domination and/or the result of an individuals own 'work'. This idea is central to the theorisation of this study and, as such although inextricably linked, each of these stages will be considered in turn[xxxvi].

2.8.5.1.1 'Domination'

> The individual…is I believe one of power's prime effects (Foucault, 1980a: 98 cf Townley, 1993:521)[xxxvii]

> Foucault's perspective on subjectivity resides [partly] in its appreciation of the subject as the constitutive product of a plurality of disciplinary mechanisms, techniques of surveillance and power-knowledge strategies (Knights and Willmott, 1989: 549, author's interjection)

Facilitating Foucault's self confessed over-emphasis on techniques of domination are two works particularly; *Discipline and Punish* (1977c) and *The History of Sexuality:*

Volume One (1980e). These works constitute the genealogical phase[xxxviii] of his work concentrating specifically on revised interests in and around a 'history of the present'.

Although their foci are markedly different, both, in analytic ways, point to a concern with power and its 'disciplinary' operation within society. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (*1977c) more specifically concerns itself with a consideration of penal institutions – although in doing so it intended to provide a broader metaphoric platform through which to consider the workings of broader modern institutionalised *situs*. The book opens with recourse to two forms of domination; 'Traditional' and 'Disciplinary'; both of which Foucault feels have characterised the West[xxxix], (McKinley and Starkey, 1998:18). 'Traditional' punishment for Foucault is corporeal, found historically in sites such as public executions; with 'Disciplinary' being subtler - operationalised through what may initially be considered less 'damaging'[xl] technologies. He describes and accounts for both in turn, firstly through a documentation of the execution of the regicide Damiens in 1757, and secondly through description of ordered regimes of activity, such as that of the timetable. An example of the latter is provided below;

> At half past seven in summer, half past eight in winter, the prisoners must be back in their cells after the washing of hands and the inspection of clothes in the courtyard; at the first drum-roll they must undress and at the second get into bed (Foucault, 1977c: 7)

This juxtaposition of penal styles marked the beginning of an historical analysis into how such transformations could have been possible. What, he asked, were the conditions which led to an alteration from the traditional to the disciplinary?

Crucially[xli], Foucault underlined disciplinary power to be more effective than the traditional, noting it to;

> …punish better, to punish with an attenuated severity perhaps, but in order to punish more universality and necessity; to insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body (Foucault, 1985:82)

Indeed, (in some ways emphasising the reading of 'domination' ascribed to such it), Discipline and Punish largely explores the various ways in which, during the seventeenth century, the human body became an object; manipulated and controlled through the creation of institutions such as hospitals, asylums, prisons, factories and schools. What Foucault calls a new set of 'disciplinary technologies' – or techniques for organising new configurations of knowledge and power – came together around the objectification of the human subject. In this respect, he underlined disciplinary power as particularly effective through its operation on the soul or psyche as opposed to solely the body, and additionally through its operation within mundane activities.

> It is his belief that our own contemporary society is not maintained by a visible state apparatus of national guards and state police, less still by shared value systems, but by the hidden techniques of discipline always at work in 'carceral' institutions (McKinley and Starkey, 1998:18).

Further, rendering *domination*, the outcomes of which he understood to be the production of what he described as the *docile body*; *a…body that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved*' (Foucault, 1977c: cf Rabinow, 1985: 17).

70

Regimes of truth

> People engage in self-regulating activities stimulated by the regimes of truth that they are embedded in (Foucault, 2000)

As noted earlier within this section, Foucault's *raison d'etre* was to disrupt particular assumptions and evidences existing within society – taken for granted ideas, and realities;

> The role of an intellectual is… to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions (Foucault, 1983:30)

Within his work such 'evidences and assumptions' are referred to as truths or, in their collective, regimes of truth (epistemes). In relation to the production of subjectivity, regimes of truth are important in the sense that they provide (at least part of[xlii] [xliii]) the means or framework through which subjective docility/productivity (as outlined above) are formed.

Although, of course, such regimes are not real and are considered arbitrary to the extent that they are a set of interpretations and beliefs (the effects of power) relating to particular historical, cultural and social *situs* - such truths, provide the particular means through which to think and do things. Indeed, as McKinley and Starkey note (of the conception of disciplinary power within Foucault's work) *'truth and knowledge, form the Foucauldian perspective, are weapons by which a society manages itself' (1998:1).* Ultimately, therefore, they are hugely influential in the

sense that they limit what can be understood and achieved within a particular field; to how people '*behave, think and act*' (Foucault, 1988b).

The Political nature of Regimes

Crucially the docility/productivity, to which Foucault refers, should not be considered neutral. He underlines that such regimes are politically charged. To this extent, outwith the inevitability that they provide just one set of rationality (among a host of possibilities), it is Foucault's contention that regimes tend to represent the interests of a few. Those people, Foucault further contends, are often likely to be those in positions of authority. As Potter notes, '*Truth...is likely to be hierarchical...[and] potentially oppressive*' (Potter, 1996:27). Likewise, whereas they serve some they can be seen to disservice others. Here, within a study of women's rowing, Chapman (1997) identifies the reproduction of particular cultural truths through the practice of making weight.

These, although they serve in the production of an institutionalised sporting context, are at the same time understood to disempower the women who take part within;

> By taking on the practices of the body…women learn to gaze upon their own bodies with a critical eye and invests considerable time, energy and money in the ongoing production of appropriately feminine bodies. An ultimate effect of the technology of weight control is women's disempowerment (Chapman, 1997:297)

Considering marketing practice through notions of disciplinary power, what particular regimes can be noted as operating? To what political effect? Are there, for example, 'evidences' of disempowerment running through the texts and stories of peoples

becoming, and whose interests are served in a production of a (docile) marketing subject?

Technologies of Power

Building on the statement made earlier surrounding Foucault's middle works, discursive practices are understood to be the means through which ideas are reproduced and enacted at the site of the person. In other words 'technologies of power' are understood to be the mechanism/means through which the person-as-docile becomes marked in the particular ways they do (through particular regimes of truth). These, of course, in light of the impending analysis of this work, need greater explanation.

Reflecting the 'effectiveness of disciplinary power as represented within *Discipline and Punish*, Shore and Roberts note the aims of such technologies to be;

> to achieve the exercise of power at minimal cost or effort; to extend the effects of social power to their maximum intensity and as discretely as possible; and third, to increase the docility and utility of all the elements of the system. In short, the aim of the disciplinary technologies was to forge, in the most economic and rational way possible, a docile body that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved (Shore and Roberts, 1993:4)

Crucially, at the heart of such is a very particular understanding of power. In a radical personal shift from others who conceive power as working to shape particular realities within the social sciences[xliv] (Knights and Willmott, 1989), Foucault, through his middle works, sets out a conception radically affecting the 'locales' through which technologies can be assumed to be operating.

To these ends, rejecting power's traditional conception as centralised, uni-directional and possessed/imposed by one dominant individual/group/(super) structure, Foucault proposes power[xlv] to be made manifest at the level of everyday practice. In other words he suggests power to be brought into effect by the activities of those people to whom it is said to effect.

Through daily enactment of our lives within relations of power *we* reproduce such relations and inscribe them upon our sense of self. To maintain this valued sense of self we are tied into normalising and reproducing these power relations. Rather than being dominated by power, we enact power, value it and are 'made' through it (Wray-Bliss, 2003:308.

> In thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am thinking rather of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives (Foucault: 1980a:39)

With this in mind, Foucault makes clear that rather than being governed and oppressed directly by power, we, as human actors, equally enact, perform such power in ultimately being 'made' through it[xlvi] (Wray-Bliss, 2003). In these ways the understandings of the workings of power can be understood to be everywhere and nowhere. He regards power as open arrangements of practices or open structures that are imposed in a multitude of forms and on a range of different social fields. In Foucault, there is no theory of power which delimits this analytic field; no theoretical order which sets the borders within which 'power' would 'be'.

> Power does not exist, but the practices in and through which power exists, these are potentially everywhere (Beronius, 1986: 32)

With this in mind, it should also be noted that Foucault presents further understandings around 'disciplining' or 'governance', which help contextualise these ideas. These understandings relate to the mechanisms through which they may be seen to work, and include firstly, individuals within such a conception who are understood *to 'self-monitor and self–govern themselves in accord with the normalizing specifications required by the broader socioeconomic system'* (Thompson 2003; 102, paraphrasing Foucault, 1979b: 102). This stems from Foucault's metaphoric conception of the panoptican[xlvii] as one way in which we can think of the operating of modern institutional life (such as that within the marketing academy), wherein individuals are understood to work through practices of self-surveillance built upon an internalisation of truths and expectations, as well as the constant awareness of institutional observation (1977c). Secondly, and tying to the same themes, is the understanding of want. Far from consciously being cajoled into any requirements of the field it is the understanding of Foucault that within a disciplinary society practices fulfilling (required) power effects of the field should be to the mutual benefit of authority and practitioner. As illuminated further by Knights and Willmott (1989) on such a theme; *'who and what we are (ie our social identity) is confirmed and sustained through our positioning in practices which reflect and reproduce prevailing social relation'* (1989:550).

The ideas found within such work have overall proved hugely enlightening, particularly within studies of the workplace and organisations. Savage (1998), Townley (1998) and Barker (1993) provide good examples of this with their works on

careers, management teams, and human resource management settings respectively. Despite new forms of understanding brought about through such genealogical ideas however, Foucault's middle works, and even their analytic applications have been heavily criticised. Despite his actual theorisation to the contrary[xlviii] - and therefore slightly heavy-handed nature of such - predominant in such troubling have been two aspects; firstly the perception that his work on disciplinary power offers up a hugely negative portrayal of power and its effects (Habermas, 1986; Jameson, 1991; Giddens, 1993 and McNay, 1992), and secondly, the lack of concern it is understood to place around the notion of agency (Starkey and McKinley, 1998). Pinpointing such concerns around individual passivity particularly, McNay (1992) notes;

> in terms of identity in general, the reduction of individuals to passive bodies permits no explanation of how individuals may act in an autonomous and creative fashion despite overarching social constraints (McNay, 1992:11)

2.8.5.1.2 'Technologies of the Self': Shifting towards the Self-Creating Self

Reacting to these perceived limitations, Foucault contributed what were to be his last intellectual offerings; *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Uses of Pleasure (1986) and, The History of Sexuality Volume 3: The Care of the Self (1988d).* Indeed it was these works, through their positive and less benign spin on reality, which doused the (1) negative/repressed readings of power and (2) ideas of the subject as docile and passive, which surrounded his earlier work.

Central to these was a clearer and altered position on the subject. Particularly, they espoused a revision of his term 'subjectification' and constituted a rethinking of how

the person was 'made up'. To this end, he cast aside the idea of 'subjection'

characterising his earlier definition and conceived of a more active self; a self who

was centrally involved in their own script and invention. Subjectification became

about the self acting upon the self. Although rhetorically a touch strong in their

representation of Foucault's earlier intentions[xlix], Starkey and McKinley make this

shift clear;

> in *Discipline and Punish*, the emphasis is upon the creation of docile bodies,
> individuals constrained against their will by discipline embodied in
> technologies of domination… In the later work his concern is with ways in
> which individuals create their own selves and realize their desires… The
> major focus is not how individuals are disciplined by others –that it is, what
> others do to subjects, - but how subjects (individuals/communities) create their
> own selves (McKinley and Starkey, 1998:231)

And Foucault himself notes:

> Perhaps I've insisted too much on the technology of domination and power. I
> am more and more interested in the interaction between oneself and others and
> in the technologies of individual domination, the history of how an individual
> acts upon himself in technologies of the self (Foucault, 1988a: 19)

'Transformation' through Desire

Additionally, for Foucault, this altered vision of *'how an individual acts upon himself'*

saw him reworking what he perceived to be a circumspect aspect of his previous

theorisation - desire. Troubled initially over what he considered an inadequate

explanation into why subjects would 'willingly' participate in activities seemingly not

serving their best interests (Starkey and McKinley, 1998), Foucault considers 'desire'

within his revision as paramount; playing a central part in the positioning and

motivations of individuals.

Introducing 'Technologies'

All of this is organised theoretically around the *aforementioned 'technologies of the self'*. For Foucault these are the conceptual means through which the 'invention of the self' and the realisation/constitution of 'desires' is made possible. By extension they are the means through which any analytic endeavour towards understanding the production of self/desire would operate. Crucially, he described such technologies as discursive practices;

> which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality (Foucault, 1988a:18)

Supporting and further illustrative of, this Foucault notes such technologies to be considered as *'matrices of practical reason through which human beings organize and develop knowledge about themselves'* (1988a: 18). Hutton (1988) too helps make this clear by noting them to be *'techniques that enhance our capacity to assert power over our own behaviour of self-management and of how truth is created through self management'* (Hutton, 1988:132).

Beyond Dystopia?

Providing opportunity beyond any 'iron cage[1]' interpretations of his earlier phases, some commentators quite rightly point to the possibility of freedom emanated through Foucault's later revamp. Note Starkey and Hatchuel below;

> These technologies… allow individuals to create new modes of being, distinct from those imposed by the workings of power regimes. In essence technologies of the self raise the prospect of a freedom (Starkey and Hatchuel, 2002:642)

Foucault himself noted of his later work that his agenda was to show people that *'they are freer than they feel'* (Foucault, 1988c). However, although more accommodating of its very possibility[li], any ease through which agency or indeed resistance may be imagined at the level of self-transformation should be at the very least cautionary. For, in the spirit of Foucault's earlier work *'technologies of the self'/'matrices of reason'* are in no way inherent or freely available. They are learnt *'functions of being'* (Hammerberg, 2004:361), and as such they are situated. They do not work outwith the realms of power, are neither apolitical, nor 'inherent' vantages through which one can come to 'be, think or act' within the world. Indeed they are only possible to people as part of a discursive structure within which they may have access. With such in mind, the idea around technologies of the self was that people could be understood as being made up – in contingent ways – through such means, and that any analysis should seek to understand such as situated practices.

> the main point is not to accept this knowledge at face value but to analyze these so-called sciences as very specific 'truth games' related to specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves (Foucault, 1988a:18)

The cultural (im)possibility of selfhood through technologies of the self is supported within the following quotes:

> self-understanding is, as always, constructed in a matrix of social and discursive practices (Hoy, 1896:18).

> the way(s) in which the subject constitutes himself in an active fashion, by the practices of the self, these practices are nevertheless not something that the individual invents by himself. They are patterns he finds in his culture and which are proposed, suggested and imposed on him by his culture, his society and his social group (Foucault 1988a: 11)

> …technology of the self does not mean such practices are unconnected to relations of power. Although Foucault (1996) described practices of the self in terms of freedom and the subject's active constitution of itself, he also stated that wherever there is freedom there are relations of power and that practices of freedom are always based on the models made available by one's culture or society (Chapman, 1997:218)

With attention particularly drawn to the last, it is argued that Foucault's intention with 'technologies of the self' and his new dawn of subjectification was to facilitate notions of self-involvement and resistant possibility, but also to continue with his interest in discipline. To this end, heavily underscoring the cultural location of 'technologies of the self' Foucault leads us to understand desire as disciplinary agent.

Summarising Positionality

Within her work on 'Foucault and Feminism' McNay (1992) implies that this latter thinking postulated by Foucault is supportive of a feminist agenda, at the very least to the extent it allows for the possibility of emacipatory change. Here, it is in regard to this emacipatory possibility – made stronger in his later phases - that this study finds use in what Foucault's work has to offer. After all, to work within a theoretic model, which did not accommodate reflexive development, would have been contradictory to the very purpose and hope of this study.

Although widely considered a welcome shift in his thinking (McNay, 1992; McKinley and Starkey, 1998; Starkey and Hatchuel, 2002), Foucault's later work has found less applied empirical interest than those of his earlier ideas. Despite this a number of works within a variety of fields including; education (Hammerberg, 2004), organisation (Knights, 2002; Starkey and Hatchuel, 2002), marketing/consumer discourse (Thompson, 2003) and others (Chapman, 1997; Amaya, 2004; Johns and

Johns, 2000; Rimke, 2000; Markula, 2003 Wesely, 2001) more than provide support needed for the perceived validity of its usefulness here. To reiterate a point well developed above, it is with both technologies of power and technologies of the self in mind, that this study goes forward.

2.9 Chapter Conclusion

This study set out with an interest in the production of knowledge and more particularly a view that this may be an important and valuable site wherein to locate further scholarly endeavour. As such this chapter found it valuable to review approaches to knowledge production existing within marketing currently, as well as to consider offerings around this 'area' from within the broader remit of the social sciences.

Having done so, it has achieved a number of things. Primarily, towards an assertion of firm belief around the value of this sort of work, it has come to underline severe problems with marketing's existing inspections. With the help of constitutive views on social reality provided for by a number of anti-foundational approaches to knowledge-production - including works which had considered science, academia and marketing - it has suggested, not only that these offerings are limited by way of their essentialist frameworks and methodological bias but, crucially, also in the ways they treat the 'knowledge maker'.

Helping towards this overall view that; 1) marketing academic knowledge remains crudely under-explored from a social or cultural position, and that 2) part of this

impoverishment is defined by 'accounts' of the academic which theorise them as real or detached socially, was the work of Michel Foucault. His theorisation of the relation between subject and discourse more particularly provided the view that academic 'lived experience' is 'mediated', and as such may be considered a valuable site through which reflexive work may be located.

With this in mind, the chapter also presents, through Foucault, a re-conceptualised basis through which a pursuit of reflexive evaluation may be set. In particular his concept of 'subjectification' (1983) was presented as of key conceptual value here. This, it was suggested provided more than an adequate theoretical means through which to meaningfully transcend current reflexive impoverishment within the marketing, and to furnish the discipline with new sets of self-understanding via the 'subject'.

[i] The term 'inspectoral' is used within this study to describe those studies within the marketing literature which have taken as their interest an evaluation of knowledge production within the academic field of marketing. The term 'evaluatory' is also used.

[ii] In pursuing a consideration of knowledge through discussion of methods and theories, marketing, as a discipline, is of course not unique. Indeed in doing so it mirrors a general academic project of recent times stemming historically from the initial work of philosophers over modernist times.

[iii] For an historical review of debates into the possible methods within marketing Saren (1999) also provides a good account.

[iv] It should be noted here that there is no clear or referenced linearity between such inspectoral works within marketing and contributions such as that of Burrell and Morgan (1979)

[v] Who initially introduced two things to the managerial disciplines through *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*; firstly that social research was grounded in particular assumptions about the nature of the world, and secondly that *reconsideration* of such research assumptions could radically alter the possibilities of our knowledge and understandings of the world.

[vi] Alongside the demonstrated assumptions of Hunt and Anderson, Firat and Venkatesh (1995) describe consumer research's incorporation of postmodernist debates as *'stimulating period of self-study, debate, and rejuvenation'* for the discipline (1995:239).

[vii] Here particularly, in reference to the Hunt and Anderson skirmish but more broadly analogous here, Kavanagh (1994) suggests that the usefulness of such (a) debate(s), through their repetitive nature, are defined to some extent as *'primarily symbolic, providing the token philosophical discussion necessary for academic legitimacy and self esteem within the social sciences'* (Kavanagh, 1994:28). In doing so he infers that debates around marketing knowledge production ought to go elsewhere (ibid, 1994)

[viii] It is hugely important to note that although concentrating on the work of Kuhn (1962) there were other key scholars hugely influential in socialising accounts of knowledge and its production. Particularly mentionable in this regard are key contributors such as Lakatos, 1970; Popper, 1959 and Feyerabend, 1993. Additionally, as shall be introduced as the chapter continues, there are those works whom in continuing and developing the work of Kuhn (1962) also play an important role in providing articulation of limitations around such methodologically inspired evaluations as presented here. These are represented most specifically in the form of contributors to The Sociology of Scientific Knowledge.

[ix] Through their sole concern with the evaluation of knowledge production on the basis of ontology/epistemology, through ontological/epistemological means (with no recognition of the social), those abstracted approaches above are understood to assume (1) epistemological knowledge be essential and real and (2) the social context (including knowledge makers themselves) to be fundamentally separate from such abstracted content. Indeed such an assertion of marketing approaches follows a dualistic reading provided by Woolgar (1988) in his problematisation of early scientific representation; 'Social Context-Human Thought/Knowledge' (1988: 22)

[x] Paradigms for Kuhn (as suggested above) do not remain stagnant and unchanged. On the contrary, moving beyond 'normal science' – those periods, according to Kuhn, wherein people (and research) are organised and held together by the established framework of theories, ideas and exemplars central to the paradigm - disciplines undergo what Kuhn describes (rather grandiosely) as revolutions in their established ways of viewing the world. Such revolutions, according to Kuhn no less than re-set the philosophical scene for the development and possibility of thought.

[xi] As Potter notes of the implication of such work *'the lone contemplative scientist and the world ready for inspection is compromised by observations blurring into theories, by theories being interconnected and by the recognition of how this is dependent on a community of scientists and their actions'* (Potter, 1996:24)

xii Morgan (1992) although more particularly in relation to Burrell and Morgan's epistemological schema underlines here (a la Kuhn - but with no direct reference to his work) the importance *for marketing* in considering social context within disciplinary reflection and more importantly its role towards generating emancipatory insight. With the following extract for example it is clear he understands it to be a centrally important mechanism for '*potential critique*' (Morgan, 1992:146). The full extract goes as follows; *The theories are abstracted from their social and historical context, thus undermining any potential critique...there is no historical perspective on the construction of theories* (Morgan, 1992:146)

xiii As was the case within 2.3, this section aims to provide a brief indication and overview of the types of inspections of marketing knowledge production existing within marketing currently. In no way is the review meant to be exhaustive in its presentation or discussion of each text.

xiv It is important to note that within *this* study work considering educational and training practices is seen as inspectoral or evaluative in sense that such practices are understood as related to the production of knowledge, both cognitive and 'artefactual'.

xv Adding to those epistemological works of earlier.

xviAs well as other areas within the social sciences, including organisation studies, where such managerialist practice has come under enormous criticism as the sole basis for scholarly enquiry (Clegg and Dunkerley, 1977; Deetz and Mumby, 1990 and Alvesson and Willmott, 1996).

xvii More accurately the 'buyer' within the perspective of such work (Firat, 1987)

xviii Such evaluations are understood as promotory here to the extent that they provide guidance to marketing academics regarding best practice. In this way they act towards the sustainment of particular disciplinary logics underpinning and legitimising such value judgements.

xix Which had previously within social studies of science served as real conditions of interest (Potter, 1996).

xx Here reference is attributed largely to the various contributions of the interpretivist group within marketing. Growing from (and indeed embodying) those works which found a positivist and managerialist orthodoxy in marketing work problematic, this body (primarily consumer research) of work can be considered key in the sense that they explored the possibility and presented the value of pursuing marketing research from a perspective which assumed consumer realities to be a locally produced, meaning based phenomena (building on Weberian notions), and not some inherent, external truth. Manifesting in a range of offerings (with many more complex and sophisticated), the early work of '*The Consumer Behaviour Odyssey*' provide a good example of work which espoused and promoted the worth of such a perspective. With the broad aim of seeking '*fresh way[s] [to] acquir[e] knowledge about consumers and [to pursue] fresh perspectives about the domain and nature of consumer behaviour*' (Belk, 1991:1) this 'Odyssey' (which saw a group of researchers travelling around the United States in 1986) rejected the previous disciplinary penchant for explanation, realism and managerialism within marketing research, instead opting to '*seek the consumer in situ in order to develop a more grounded understanding of what consumption means to people*' (Belk, 1991:6). Influential in a variety of ways, such work allowed for a broader base of understanding than had previously been facilitated within managerialist approaches and in ways which opened the discipline for the first time to consider (and allowed for the further consideration of) 'knowledge-making' in an altogether different realm from those aforementioned within the inspectoral approaches already outlined.

xxi Facilitating a move beyond the heavy assumptions of structuralism pervading much of its early cultural work (including that of the Odyssey group) (Hackley, 2001), the interpretavist movement within marketing has found itself increasingly intrigued, influenced and characterised by advanced cultural perspectives in social theory. In this regard, work within the discipline has increasingly come to consider a range of theoretical outlooks in their interpretavist conceptions of culture, including, for example, postmodernism (Brown, 1994a, 1995a; Firat and Venkatesh, 1995; Firat et al., 1995), feminism (Hogg et al., 2000; Bettany, 2002, 2004) and post-structuralism (Elliot and Ritson, 1997). In

doing so, the discipline brought to its own conditions of possibility to the possibilities central to such perspectives - a motion, it is argued here, allowing the marketing discourse to become more sophisticated in terms of its pursuit of cultural understandings (and hence knowledge making), research interests and priorities.

[xxii] *'Marketing is not a neutral way of looking at the world; it has distinctive power effects for organizations, managers, consumers and society as a whole'* (Morgan, 1992:137).

[xxiii] To this end, recognising the Heideggerian (1962) notion of 'Dasein', such work assumes that there is no inherent truth 'out there' within the world (such as, for example, the 'gap' in marketing between theory or practice, or idealised logics to which marketing academics must adhere). Rather, it is the belief that only *notions* of truth exist. Central to such premise therefore lies the view that 'reality' exists not as an inherently real entity, but through the *sense* and *meanings* we come to attribute to the world. In other words, such a perspective understands '*objects'* in the world not to '*exist'*, outwith our (shared) perceptions of them. Critically, the assumption is also, that such meanings (and therefore 'objects') are not fixed, but are the effect, and effecting of, its localised context of production though various processes and practices of representation.

[xxiv] Unpublished extract from draft of Bettany's doctoral thesis accessed on the internet 23/11/04. Web address: http://www.bettany.biz/Thesis/whole%20thesis%20jan%202004.htm

[xxv] Reference here to the term 'evaluative' here is in part inspired by Woolgar, who within his work *'Science: The Very Idea'* (1988) asked that we consider science as an 'evaluatory source', not a definitive entity (1988: 13). In this way he asked that we move beyond considering disciplines such as marketing and their knowledges as real, and rather towards them as constructions which could reap interesting insights when considered from socialised perspectives.

[xxvi] Within his earlier assessment of modern culture Nietzsche presented a radical challenge to previously dominant identity centric thought. As Seale notes, rather than consider the subject as a discrete he sought to show that identity was a product of modern values, and that it served to order, police and deny the creativity and potential of life, where life is conceived as a 'monster of energy', or a continuous process of change, disruption and becoming (Seale, 1998).

[xxviii] Where it is noted that there have been there are a number of works which have in their own way challenged the most traditionally 'applied' notion of identity/subjectivity working through modernist discourse that of the *'individual subject, understood as a given entity, the author of its own acts and centred in a unitary, reflexive and directive consciousness'* (Du Gay, 2000:2)

[xxix] Such, as it is suggested, those which were brought 'unsaid' to forms of evaluation related to marketing production, as outlined within the earlier part of this chapter.

[xxx] Commensurable to the developing interests of this study, which are largely founded on a dualistic theorisation of 'the subject'.

[xxxi] *'The habitus is a system of durable, transposable dispositions which functions as the generative basis of structured, objectively unified practices'* (Harker, et al. 1990: 10)

[xxxii] In ways aligning to, and undoubtedly constitutive of, reflexive movements within marketing.

[xxxiii] But in no way removing them from the analytic basis of this enquiry.

[xxxiv] As noted by Starkey and Hatchuel (2002) there are three distinct phases underpinning the (development of) the work of Foucault; *'the deconstruction of various forms of order, which led to his archaeologies of knowledge; discipline and punishment as panoptic practices, which led to his searching, genealogical analysis of modern power/knowledge formations; and in the later work, the concern with technologies of self'* (ibid: 642).

xxxv Particularly those who wanted further explanation around the possible willingness of subjects to enter into domination against their own best interests – as was the presumption of *Discipline and Punish* (Starkey and McKinley, 1998)

xxxvi It should be noted that, alongside McNay (1992), this work holds that Foucault's later work constitutes a continuation, not refutation, of his earlier lines of thinking. In this regard, an adequate account of subjectification here, through a dual exploration of both domination and agency, is a necessary contextual act of this review.

xxxvii An example of the application of such an idea exists within work conducted in marketing, already mentioned within this review. In this sense reference is made to the work of Hodgson (2002), who within his Foucauldian inspired study of the financial services industry pointed to the consumer as power effect; *'This paper...illustrate[s] the important role marketing technologies play in contemporary neo-liberal policies which aim to effect social control over a populace through the shaping of the desire and freedom of individuals'* (ibid, 2002:318)

xxxviii A clearer understanding of Foucault's oeuvre within both phases of his work is provided below. Such a comparative tool, it is hoped, shall provide the reader with the clearest picture of intent laid out specifically within the genealogical developments within Foucault's work. Both of these are taken from McKinlay and Starkey (1998:22)
Archaeological Method
- Uncover those rules which regulate and govern social practices, and which are unknown to the actors involved
- It is possible to achieve some partial distancing from these institutional bonds by a bracketing of 'accepted truth'
- Act as an 'excavator', revealing depth and interiority

Genealogical Method
- Record the singularity of surface events, looking at the meaning of small details, minor shifts and subtle contours.
- There are no fixed essences or underlying laws. There is discontinuity and arbitrariness. Since the world is as it appears, one seeks out the 'superficial secrets'
- Act as a recorder of accidents, chance and lies. Oppose the search for depth and interiority

xxxix Both formally and latterly in its history.

xl This juxtaposition reveals a move towards the soul for Foucault. Importantly however it does not remove 'the body' from his considerations. As Smart notes, *the transformation represented for Foucault a shift from the body to the soul or psyche as the primary target of punishment. But although the body no longer constituted the directly immediate object of punitive practices it was still subject to the penal process – confined in prison, forced to labour, subjected to sexual deprivation and to a series of other controls and regulations* (Smart, 1985:74)

xli Suggesting monopolistic power to have been altered in time through the rise of capitalist regimes - its demands rendering anachronistic and dysfunctional the performance of sovereign or state control (Foucault, 1977c)

xlii As part of Foucault's overall notion of discourse, which he talks of as *'taken for granted truths or practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak'* (Foucault, 1972). As Alvesson and Skoldberg also note also of the Foucauldian reading; *'Discourse is...a framework and a logic of reasoning'* (2000:224)

xliii Foucault's work, through his understanding of discourse as constituted through a range of practices and beliefs, demonstrated a radical departure from social constructionist thinking elsewhere within the social sciences. For example, although arguably heavily influenced by the 'turn to language' within understandings of representation, his conception profoundly departed from works such as that of Barthes and Saussure, who elsewhere defined the constructionist approach to representation through language (in the sign and significatory sense), and concentration purely on the making of meaning (Hall, 1997). In the following extract, building on his idea that such practice based discourse is the effect of power Foucault articulates his movement away from 'purely' language, Here; *I believe one's point of reference should not be to the great model of language (langue) and signs, but to that of war*

and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of a language: relations of power not relations of meaning' (Foucault, 1980d: 114-115).

[xliv] As Knights and Willmott note*; 'whereas Marxists concentrate on the exploitation of labour through capital's appropriation of surplus value, and feminists are concerned with the domination of women through patriarchal legacies, Foucault's analysis complements and qualifies these perspectives by focusing upon power-infused processes of subjectification'* (Knights and Willmott, 1989:550)

[xlv] *Table: Summary of Foucault's theory of Power (based on Foucault, 1979a:93/4) Adapted from Desmond (2002)*

• Power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, it cannot be held.
• Power is closely related to knowledge
• Relations of power are not outside other relations. The identities that comprise A and B are themselves artefacts of power. Thus Foucault cannot stand outside the system of power which he was describing
• Power comes from below; it is not something, which is exerted by A who is 'above' B.
• Power is intentional and rational to the extent that it has an aim and objective, but it should not be thought of as the creation of an individual agent, nor of a grouping such as the state.
• Where there is power there is resistance, but resistance is not outside power.

[xlvi] A point further underlined within his *'five methodological precautions';* a framework given within the second of his two lectures given in 1976 wherein he offered guidance on how power should be treated in its analysis.

[xlvii] The aim of the panoptican is, *'to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assumes the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tent to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that is architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it' in short that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers...Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so'* (Foucault, 1977c:201)

[xlviii] Despite the strength of ideas to the contrary, Foucault, within his earlier work, did allow for resistant practices. As one advocate of this, Smart (1985), for example, refutes the very idea that Foucault failed to account in any way beyond passive docility; *Not withstanding a degree of ambiguity in the formulation and a subsequent admission by Foucault that perhaps too much emphasis has been placed on techniques of domination in the studies of asylum and prisons, such an interpretation cannot be accepted. The concept of the disciplinary society refers not to the realization of a programme for a disciplined and orderly society but to the diffusion of disciplinary mechanisms throughout the social body, to the process by which the disciplines eventually constituted a general formula of domination. There is no assumption in Foucault's work that a formula of domination may achieve or realize a programmed end; to the contrary it is argued that struggles and forms of resistance necessarily accompany the exercise of power and further that analyses of programmes of social action or forms of social intervention invariably reveal a non-correspondence between intended effects and outcomes. A prominent example of the latter to be found in Foucault's work concerns the failure of the practice of imprisonment to reduce crime* (Smart, 1985:91). Likewise McCarthy vouching for the possibility of agency being theorised in earlier accounts notes; *'rules do not define their own application, rule following is always to some degree discretionary, elaborative, ad hoc'* (1994:257).

xlix Particularly through an overstatement around his intent to portray complete domination.

l Weber (1930)

li Critically on this level, it should be acknowledged that they allow for valuable questions to be asked and insights to be gained around the possible means through which normalised assumptions within discourse are potentially countered, and the frameworks for new thinking facilitated. Chapman (1997), as an example of this, was able, to identify particular practices wherein women where able to challenge orthodox positions limiting them previously within society. Likewise too within her work on breast cancer, Amaya (2004) underlined how an engagement with photography and art as a particular technology of the self allowed her to reposition herself from 'victim', 'damaged in terms of sexuality', and 'deformed'.

Chapter Three

Research Design

3.1 Summary

The primary purpose of this chapter is to underline how those questions and concerns raised within the literature were translated into a potentially insightful empirical study. After reminding the reader of its aims in 3.2, the chapter sets out in 3.3 to appropriately locate the research, in terms of its specific empirical setting, interpretative parameters and research participants. The research methods used throughout are thereafter presented in 3.4. 3.5 then brings the chapter to a close by discussing interpretative intervention; this time in respect to the process or strategy used in generating particular readings of the data.

> every particular case of inquiry without exception, is the managed accomplishment of organized settings of practical actions (Garfinkel, 1967:32)

3.2 Introduction

The review of literature offered up two main propositions. (1) That existing evaluations of marketing knowledge production can be considered wholly inadequate and (2) that reform of sorts may usefully be located around a consideration of the 'constructed academic subject', as theorised in Foucauldian terms. Wishing to pursue such reflexive 'betterment' here, the following broad aim was set for the study.

Aim:

To provide insight into the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy.

Towards an adequate exploration of this aim, the following chapter presents and justifies its empirically tailored research design. In doing so, it seeks not to offer up a linear, non-recursive and culturally detached account of such a phase[li], but rather seeks to demonstrate more fully *'some of the complexities of doing research'* (Brownlie, 1999:99).

3.3 Locating the Research Study

Having justified exploration into the situated nature of the marketing academic it becomes necessary to further detail the project, empirically speaking. Primarily, in order that more specified research *objectives* can be set, further particularisation is required with regard to the research site.

3.3.1 An Empirical Setting: Towards an exploration of the Doctoral Process

Noting possibility and opportunity to surround a number of under-explored areas of marketing's disciplinary processes and practices as sites of research (Brownlie et al, 1999), this work chose specifically to locate its interest around the doctoral process. As well as acknowledging this to be perhaps one of the more explicitly thought-of sites of academic reproduction[li] (Grant, 1997), this decision was considered and justified from a number of different perspectives. These are outlined below in broader theoretical, disciplinary and empirical terms.

3.3.1.1 An interest from 'the field'

Given its inherently exploratory definition, the early phases of this research were characterised by preliminary fieldwork. In this regard, before and toward settling on a research design, much time was spent looking (as a novice or even outsider) at the workings of the marketing academy, asking questions all the time as to *where* and *how* a study of subjectivity formation may be usefully located. Time spent on preliminary research was varied, with many possibilities presenting themselves as sites for reflexive enquiry. For example, departmental meetings, documentary evidence and scholarly presentations for example were all considered potential arenas.

It was a result of this phase and more particularly an experience at a major UK marketing conference, wherein final interest around the doctoral process was set. More specifically, it was during time spent at a doctoral colloquium. Critically, this training site shone light on the doctoral pedagogic process, not only as a site wherein an active attempt was made to shape people in particular ways, but where guidance seemingly surrounding ideas regarding 'best practice' and a persuasive relationship existed between 'experts' and 'novice'. Considering these last two points, comparisons were made with the 'means-ends' evaluations of section 2.4 (and more particularly the unreflective and promotory treatments of knowledge provided for therein) and questions were ultimately raised about the outcomes for marketing and marketing's subjective landscape through such activity. More pertinently, it stimulated questions of the doctorate beyond the colloquium and in particular how some other relationships and organisational contexts may help to construct marketing's neophytes. In fact it was at least on some level the author's interest in

these questions which marked the doctoral process as the area of interest beyond some of the others mentioned.

3.3.1.2 Supported by the Literature

Supporting the validity provided by empirical intrigue came acknowledgement of existing literature around the doctoral process – both from within and outwith marketing.

Disciplinary Lacking

Firstly, it should be noted again that broad interest around the people, processes and practices of training and the doctorate, is not new within existing marketing literature. As already indicated within section 2.4.1, there does exist a number of works within the discipline which pursue these substantive foci. These are summarised below;

Table 3A - Examples of work within the marketing field relating to the doctoral process.

Area of Enquiry	Author(s)
Adequacy of (formal) training	Griffith, 1997, and Ponder and Lueg, 2004; Woodruff and Cravens, 1990; Roach, Johnston and Hair, 1994.
Examinations	Ponder, Beatty and Foxx, 2004
Student Socialisation	Trocchia and Berowitz, 1999
Writing practice	Perry, 1999
Reflections and Advice on Successful Candidature	Smart and Conant, 1990; Lindgreen, Vallaster and Vanhamme, 2001; AMA Task Force, 1988; Berry, 1989; Lusch 1982; Motes, 1989; Conant, Smart and Redkar, 1998

Despite such interest however, the focus within such is solely functional. Indeed, although doctoral training is an increasingly prevalent characteristic aspect of the marketing academy no work exists which *critically* examines the PhD process. Although there are people working everyday within 'marketing discourse', no work moves beyond the system-sustaining rhetoric regarding best practice and attainment of managerial outcomes.

Unfortunately, included within such disappointment is the work of Trocchia and Berkowitz, (1999), around whose work this study placed initial hope. Constituting work elsewhere within the marketing academy which expressed interest in marketing academic socialisation, this work raised the possibility of new-found disciplinary understanding by posing some exciting, important and interesting questions;

> How are doctoral students socialised into the academic world…? What factors contribute most heavily toward the professional success of a doctoral student? (ibid: 747)

Despite such promise however, their agenda remained prescriptive[li] and relations between academic reality and doctoral programmes under explored.

Inter-disciplinary Promise

Helping to underline the (lost) opportunity around such questions, and render this sole managerialism inadequate, was an acknowledgement of inter-disciplinary works which critically considered the doctoral process (Lyon, 1995; Traweek, 1988; Hockey, 1996; Lee and Williams (1999); Johnson et al, 2000; Green and Lee, 1999; Parry et al, 1994, 1997; Pole, 2000; Burgess, 1994; Delamont et al, 1992; Delamont

and Eggleston, 1983; Parry, 1998). In particular, works such as Traweek (1988) and Lee and Williams (1999) were considered particularly influential in validating and placing value on critical rethought with regard to the PhD *and* marketing.   Interested in the nature of training within the physics community and the effects of the doctoral process within the social sciences more generally, these works - in ways not dissimilar to that of Trocchia and Berkowitz (1999) - understood and demonstrated the PhD and training process to be a formative site, wherein the requirements of successful undertaking (i.e. towards becoming a successful academic) leads to the particularised production of socialised beings[li]. Unlike Trocchia and Berkowitz (ibid.) however, these studies approached the PhD from a perspective of cultural contingency[li], understanding along the way the importance of questioning and problematising the nature and outcomes of such a process.

Within her work *Beamtimes and Lifetimes: The World of High Energy Physics (1988)*, Traweek considers the practices central to becoming a physicist within the US, and renders these reproductive not only of partialised subjectivities and conditions of knowledge, but of *gendered* knowledge and socialised beings[li]. Likewise, in ways equally rendering political production, are the findings of Lee and Williams (1999). Considering the doctorate more widely[li] they too noted such practices to be reproductive of gendered realities. Furthermore, aligning to an additional observation of Traweek's that, 'lack of emotionality' marked a journey of transition within the culture of physics, Lee and Williams indicated trauma to be a constitutive cultural condition and effect of doctoral participation within their 'site'.

In postulating therefore; firstly, (disciplinary) doctoral processes to be constitutive of subjective reality[li] and, secondly, the often problematic nature of how such journeys may be marked, these works provided what were considered invaluable contributions. Rather than working within the rhetorics of the doctorate and hence helping to support them they (1) to pass comment on them and (2) provide voice to the lives and experiences of those participating within them.

Most importantly therefore such work pointed to the possibility, and potential value, of similar work being done within marketing. To this end they;

Demonstrate the value of the doctorate being considered at disciplinary level.

Although concentration in many of these critically centred 'PhD works' focus on the process in non-disciplinary specific terms, two works particularly suggest value of exploration purely at the *marketing* level. These are: Traweek (1988) and her demonstration of insight into physics through training, and, Parry et al (1994) who considered academic identities to be formed around the specific doctoral processes of different disciplinary settings.

Indicate potentially important questions, which may be asked at marketing via findings hitherto unobtainable within the current paradigmatic limits of marketing's 'doctoral consideration'.

Underlining the politicised nature of the doctoral process and some of its more personal stories and effects, for example, these works raised intrigue and emphasised import around a number of issues. For instance, what does it mean to experience

academia within the contemporary academic environment in the UK currently? What are the requirements of the marketing academy towards becoming a successful academic in this situ? What are the conditions of such practice? What are its effects? What 'occurs' in the name of the successful doctorate? What is being done in terms of the capacity for ourselves and our scholarly capacity within marketing under the performative guise of training, and what does the process mean for the disciplinary production of artefactual knowledge?

3.3.1.3 (Aims and) Objectives

With certainty around the decision to pursue empirical work around the doctoral process, more particular objectives for the research study were set. These married some of the interests expressed above to Foucault's later theorisation around the 'subject'. Towards the overall aim, which is to *provide insight into the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy,* individually these aims are;

- To explore the doctoral process, as a site of social interaction and reproduction, through the conceptual lens of Foucault's concepts, technologies of power and technolgies the self.

- To locate processes of subjectivity formation through investigating the lived experience of participants within a doctoral programme of a UK University.

- To consider the potential power effects working through this process, and their possible implications.

3.3.2 Interpretative Parameters

Although going on later to discuss research methods and the specifics of interpretative intervention, presentation of this study's research design and its construction begins with an account of its 'paradigmatic' location. Talk of paradigms and epistemological assumptions has already played a part in this thesis, particularly through a discussion of Burrell and Morgan's (1979) assertions (section 2.3.1). Here, however, rather than critique such work[li], the following section reflects the significant implication of this work and particularly the importance it places on marking out methodological *situ,* for reflexive purposes.

3.3.2.1 Acknowledging *an* interpretavist perspective

As Burrell and Morgan (1979) proffered, there are a number of choices one faces when considering a research topic. Indeed, they underline variance in epistemological and methodological positions to provide alternatives for the researcher, in terms of both the nature of study they can engender, as well as the types of data which they can help to generate.

> Our proposition is that social theory can usefully be conceived in terms of … paradigms based upon different sets of metatheoretical assumptions about the nature of social science and the nature of society. The…paradigms are founded upon mutually exclusive views of the social world. Each stands in its own right and generates its own distinctive analyses of social life. With regard to the study of organisations, for example, each paradigm generates theories and perspectives which are in fundamental opposition to those generated in other paradigms (Burrell and Morgan, 1979:iii)

Contemplating this, it is unsurprising that an interpretavist perspective was selected as the means through which to facilitate this investigation. Interested in exploring 'marketing subjectivities' based on their conception as culturally constitutive effects, this decision was understood to both honour the theoretical assumptions regarding marketing knowledge(s) production already outlined within this thesis, and provide relevant means of 'accessing' social reality.

With regard to the latter most specifically, it is understood that interpretivism allows, through both its concern with *Verstehen* (or *understanding*) and generation of *'culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world'* (Crotty, 1998:67), the appropriate generative leverage towards seeing representations of the world, as contextual, processual and relational phenomena. Fostering such a perspective derived mainly from works that were understood to have generated valuable cultural insights, and proposals, through the adoption of such a stance. Influence in this regard most particularly stemmed from the methodological designs and requests of key works concerned with cultural knowledge (re) production within academic settings, both marketing and 'non' (Brownlie et al, 1997; Hackley, 2002; Traweek, 1988; Law, 1994; Bourdieu, 1988).

3.3.2.2 A definition of task

Before moving on to more fully consider the specifics of this research design, it remains important to provide an ample definition of the task and scope of interpretavist research, as perceived within this study. As acknowledged by many

scholars after (Latour and Woolgar, 1979; Atkinson and Hammersley, 1994), there is much variance as to the limits and principal characteristics of such a stance.

Non-Emic

In the first instance therefore, it should be stated that this research profoundly rejects, as a suitable basis for its enquiry, the historically rooted (and anthropologically traditional) presumption within interpretavist work that researchers *should* and *could* seek to pursue a completely *emic* perspective. To this end, although maintaining the broad proposition that interpretivism should (and can) seek cultural understanding through various *insights* and *interpretations* provided of the phenomenon by those constitutive of its discourse, this work dismisses the value and indeed possibility of being able to access that culture unproblematically, *through the eyes of the people being studied'* (Bryman, 1988: 61-66) Although rendered troublesome for a variety of reasons, it is thought that to work from this position would be to betray the idea of the situated academic; the conceptual basis upon which this thesis is built. Worked up within the theoretical chapters, the 'situated academic' not only eludes to the inescapably co-constitutive and embedded reality of cultural actors within the academic world, but also the implication of myself as the author of this research (and training academic) within the same conceptual position. As such, like those cultural actors whose situations and realities I wish to understand better, I, the researcher, understand myself as written into the practices, systems of thought, or *'webs of significance'* (Geertz, 1973: 5) which sustain me. From such a situation therefore, attempting or claiming to understand reality from the native's point of view would be paradoxical, in the sense that it would assume a possible detachment of my researcher (interpreting) self from my own cultural viewpoint. By extension it would assume

that my constructed perspective played no part in the interpretations and representations of such 'natives'.

Constitutive

Contrary to this, this research finds purpose in methodologically denying traditionalist subject/object divides within interpretavist definition. In so doing it aligns with Bourdieu in his stipulation that the sociologists point of view is; '*to be a point of view on a point of view*' (1996:34). In other words, it adopts a stance which seeks to acknowledge (where possible) the constitutive role of the researcher and the researched within the construction of this research[li] (Wray-Bliss, 2003).

Alongside Bourdieu (1996:34), inspiration is drawn from a number of works constituting what is now a well established backlash against methodological realism across the social sciences (Ashmore, 1988; Woolgar, 1988; Law, 1994; Marcus, 1998). Central to such is the understanding that the act of research or interpretation is far from a neutral act. Capturing such an idea effectively is the work of Law (1994). Indeed the following extract points to his rejection of realism within ethnographic practice, and more particularly to his belief that any practice of research is a co-constituted affair.

> As I describe the laboratory, I do not always want to make myself invisible. Thus I could talk about research methods as if they were clear-cut, fixed and impersonal. I could pretend that there was no interaction between what I observed and myself as the observer. But, as I've indicated, I believe this would be wrong because ethnography is also a story of research – and in some measure a tale about the conduct of the ethnographer as well. And, although perhaps in a smaller way, it is also about the way in which the ethnographer acts upon the subject-matter (Law, 1994: 4)

Although always modest in his assertions and justifications, for Law (1994) any *'social ordering'* (1994:2) such as research, is powerfully and politically infused (Wray-Bliss, 2003; Smith, 1990a). Stressed perhaps more vehemently elsewhere, it is in reaction to the importance of such sentiment that this research - through a few modestly reflexive acts - hopes to reveal itself and the partiality of its position, as a necessary step pertaining to the emacipatory rhetoric of itself. In fact the provision of this very section is one step towards doing that, as are the hermeneutic approaches to research underpinning the latter stages of this chapter.

It should also be noted however, that (pertaining to the logic of this work) the level through which this text can (articulate) know(ing) itself are always limited. Indeed like the constitutive conditions of the study's informants, some of the authors may remain unnoticed. Regardless of this however, it is the hope that engagement and reflection within various discourses of the marketing academy, shall at least pertain to, or suggest, the cultural production of a research piece such as this.

3.3.3 Research Participants

As already mentioned, the specifics of any research design constitute a hugely influential piece of any research, not least in the sense that they play a conditional part in the possibilities for interpretative scope, and potential understanding of the phenomena (Creswell, 1994). Perhaps most critical are the research participants selected. The following section outlines details of the 'chosen'[li] research participants and provides reasons for their participation.

Firstly, and most significantly, the *primary* source of data within this study surrounds the experiences and expressions of two main sets of participants within the doctoral process: supervisees and supervisors. As already stated it is of main concern to centre on the experiences of students within this study.   However, partly in light of Foucault's key conception raised by Gordon (1991) that *'government as an activity could concern...private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or guidance'* (Gordon, 1991:2-3), it was thought the contributions of supervisors to be important as well.   Indeed, in light of Gordon's extract such were considered potentially rich as constitutive (power) relational viewpoints. These supervisors were the supervisors of the students in question.   Additionally, the experiences of supervisors were understood to hold potential by way of retrospective accounts – perspectives, which in line with Foucauldian thinking may help to contextualise discursive events in the empirical setting.

Negotiating Access

In terms of recruitment, this study went through a variety of stages. Firstly, propelled by an interest in the contextual experiences of those involved around the performative site of the doctoring process (within the UK academic environment currently), the earliest phase involved identifying candidates who would make suitable respondents.

Identifying Candidates

Firstly a web-based search was conducted to reveal suitable candidates for the study. Doing so revealed a number of potential informants and university settings within the UK which would be suitable. It should be noted here too that a key decision within this research was to locate the study within one academic institution within the UK.

This was the intention from the outset, although was confirmed as possible in reality through the identification of a number of institutions which housed supervisors and supervisees in significant numbers. A number of reasons were influential in making this particular research choice. These included ease of access and recruitment advantages. Most significantly however, it was the strong belief that a comparative study – which would have stemmed from research conducted across a number of different institutions – would have been profoundly counterintuitive to Foucault's ideas which were so central in the development of this research and its questions. With this in mind, it was thought that to have entered into a comparison of different institutional mechanisms or 'modes', would have been to ascribe them some sort of social detachment from each other – or indeed a unilateral status, in terms of power. This of course would have been to counter Foucault's actual intention around his notion of power and to have therefore negated the possibility which this conception offered.

With this in mind then, having done this preliminary search one particular university was selected as most suitable. In addition to being a rich source of potential participants, this institution was selected as an empirical site through evidence of it's;

- Full range of courses: undergraduate, MBA, as well as PhD level degrees

- High rating in terms of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)

- History of conference hosting

These, along with its status as one of the largest and most successful marketing departments within the UK, provided reassurance that its academics *may* be typical

and characteristic – in terms of their day-to-day practices – of UK marketing academics.

Contacting Potential Participants

Having selected an institution, contact was made. Towards enrolling the help of participants a letter was firstly written to the Head of Department within the university asking further permission to contact *members of staff and PhD students* in relation to this study. It was felt at this stage a courteous approach given potential implications on department time. Alongside this letter was also a brief (page long) description of the proposed research project, and its aims. The purpose of this was to contextualise the overall request for staff involvement and to promote its support.

The response received was positive. General encouragement was offered regarding the study more generally and permission granted for me to contact staff members. A list of all current supervisors was even provided. Although no reasons were articulated at the time, the response (although seemingly happy for PhD students within the department to be contacted) also stipulated that individual supervisor's permission should be sought before contact with students was made. Such stipulation, again on the basis of courtesy, was accepted as reasonable.

Following this letters (and research agendas) were sent to those involved in roles of supervision outlining a desire for, and requesting their participation in in-depth interviews. What participation would entail, of course, was also included. Again the response was positive, with 50% of those contacted agreeing to participate.

Within the following month, PhD students were recruited. Based on the request of the Head of Department that permission should be sought from supervisors regarding PhD participation, names of potential doctoral informants were generated from those at supervisory level already recruited for the project. 100% of the PhD students who were contacted participated. For reference purposes appropriate details of them and supervisory participants (under pseudonyms) are listed in the table below.

Table 3B - Details of Informants*

Pseudonym	Position	Years in M**	Gender
SG: Claire	Professor/supervisor	18	F
SG: Brian	Professor/supervisor	20	M
SG: Alan	Professor/supervisor	18	M
SD: Elizabeth	PhD Student	2	F
SD: Fiona	PhD Student	2	F
SD: Hilary	PhD Student	2	F
SD: Gillian	PhD Student	3	F
SD: Donald	PhD Student	1	M
SD: Ingrid	PhD Student/Lecturer	4	F

*   The level of detail provided here on informants is done so with issues of anonymity in mind.

M** refers to the disciplinary field of marketing

3.4 Research Methods

This section moves the chapter on from broad methodological considerations and issues of accessing a suitable 'site' within marketing, to a more specific account and justification of its primary research method. Beginning with a general introduction, the section goes on to outline the precise details of its execution.

3.4.1 Interviewing

Following the lead of other works who have approached explorations of subjectivity formation in the same way (for example, Trethewey, 1999; Chapman, 1997; Anderson-Gough et al, 1998 and Gumport, 1993) this work selected *interviewing,* and particularly semi-structured/in-depth interviewing, as its primary method of data generation.

'Table' 3C - A Guide to semi-structured Interviews

Unlike the more structurally guided approaches which, as Cicourel points out, *'provide a solution to the problem of meaning by simply avoiding it'* (1964:108) semi-structured approaches place central importance on gaining insights into the interviewee's interpretation of a particular phenomena. As opposed to the extremities of its (more often positivistically inspired) structural 'box ticking' cousin therefore semi-structured interviewing as understood here embodies (as its intentions would suggest) an open ended approach. In this regard although themes and questions may loosely formulate discussion (and the theoretical and personal presence of the interviewer will always be there) the intention is to allow as much free talk as possible. Given the exploratory nature of this study, its intention is not only to facilitate insight into cultural phenomenon, as participants understand it, but also to be led and surprised.

Alongside its proven usefulness within works such as those noted above, the 'decision' to pursue interviewing *per se* was one based around a combination of factors. These are discussed below.

Facilitating Suitable Data

The first of these factors most importantly related to the perceived adequacy of this method as a means of providing textual and contextual data suitable to the task of the study. In other words suitable to the task of exploring the social conditions and effects of subjectivity formation, as defined through their Foucauldian conception within this study (see section 2.7.1.1).

With this in mind interviewing was widely judged to be justifiable (Chapman, 1997; Trethewey; 1999). Indeed, in line with the requirements here Trethewey (1999) underlines that;

> interviewing should be understood as an opportunity to fully explore the contours of a particular discourse. [Its value] lies precisely in its ability to capture participants' articulations of their (always discursively constituted) realities (Trethewey, 1999:429).

In this respect the ability of interviewing to 'capture' the necessary socio-political, relational and contextual aspects of participatory experience is highlighted.

Towards (necessary) Distinction

Although affording suitability to 'data capture' in this way, the selection of interviewing over other potential methods (observation, for example) was based

around two elements of distinction it was understood to bring to *this* research context. These relate to 'access' issues and are encapsulated within the two sections below;

Accessing Perspectives

As Seale (1998) has noted, interviews can often act as '*eyes and ears*' (1998:202) for the researcher, in the sense that they can elicit a potentially wide range of situations and events through the informant, allowing inferences to be built with regard to discursive practices and contexts which may otherwise remain unknown. Firstly based on experiences gained during time conducting preliminary fieldwork this quality was deemed requisite here. In this regard, early empirical phases indicated 'access' to a variety of marketing sites may be particularly problematic in this study, with non-approval for data generation received in relation to a number of sites. Indeed rejection from 'making observations' within arenas ranging from informal gatherings to more formal and structured meetings (departmental and supervisory[li]) provided cause to consider the 'contextualising' value of interviews. Likewise recourse to the enlightening potential of retrospective accounts provides validation around interviews. More specifically, they are understood to be a more than adequate means to generate historical contextualisation, which may for instance, derive from supervisor accounts for instance.

 3.4.2 Interview Details

Having introduced and justified the primary role of interviews within this research it remains important to outline details as to how the method was executed.

Interviews were conducted between March and May 2003. As partially indicated earlier these were pre-arranged using a variety of communications, including letters, phone calls and e-mails, and all without exception were carried out in the venue of people's choice – in order to maximise their levels of ease. To this end the majority were carried out on site (within the university setting) with only two being at the homes of participants.

Before each of the interviews it was checked with the respondent whether the tape recording of discussions[li] would be acceptable. In all cases this was. Also, each of the respondents was informed, via letter or e-mail as to the precise nature of the study. On a couple of occasions, at the beginning of interviews this was repeated on request. Where it was not requested the precise nature of the study was repeated, both as a reminder of intent and as a means to open conversation.

Interviews generally took around 90 minutes to complete, and were faithful to the semi-structured approach to interviewing favoured within this research (as outlined above). Respondents were allowed, as much as possible, to convey *their* experiences, feelings, stories and memories regarding their time within the marketing academy. Although reference at times was made to a broad guide of themes and questions[li] (intended very loosely to guide and stimulate discussion), definitive structure was never imposed[li]. If for example, the interview pursued a particular angle, such 'direction' was followed with interest until discussion on the issue ran dry. As such, participants were accommodated to 'free talk' in the sense that discussions followed whatever directions *they* felt were suitable (Oakley 1981). That the conversation

facilitated as much information from the participant as possible was important, particularly given the exploratory nature of my work[li].

3.5 Interpreting the Data

So far this chapter has concerned itself with the introduction and justification of the empirical design underpinning this thesis, including its 'setting', interpretative parameters, research participants and methods. It comes to a close now with insight into the interpretative intervention of this work. In other words, the means through which data came to be read and conceived within this study.

Acknowledging fully the process of interpretation is, of course, an important reflexive act. As many have noted (Clifford, 1986; Smith, 1990; Banks and Banks, 1998; Law, 1994)**,** this aspect of research not only transforms data into newly (re)presented forms, but in doing so generates an inevitable partial picture on 'reality'. Towards an adequate exposition of such here, both the conceptual approach and the actual 'stages' defining the interpretative phase of this study are outlined.

3.5.1 Conceptual Approach

Linking to its aims and objectives the interpretative interest here was immediately concerned with finding an approach, which would adequately facilitate investigation into the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation. More specifically, also, to an approach which would support suitable exposition into Foucault's notions of technologies of power and technologies of the self, within the empirical site. Towards

this, a Foucauldian-inspired discourse analysis was deemed to provide the most suitable framework.

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Based on a variety of ways in which 'discourse' has come to be defined, discourse analysis (DA) incorporates a variety of alternate approaches (Tonkiss, 2004). Centrally however, its common concern surrounds its understanding and interest in language and texts as topics for inquiry;

> Discourse analysis involves a perspective on language that sees this not as reflecting reality in a transparent or straightforward way, but as constructing and organizing the terms in which we understand that social reality. Discourse analysts are interested in language and texts as sites in which social meanings are formed and reproduced, social identities are shaped, and social facts are secured (Tonkiss, 2004: 373)

To the extent that this reflects the interests of this study, DA was deemed broadly suitable.

A Foucauldian-inspired usage however, more particularly pertains to a *social* approach to textual analysis. Not affiliated to the more traditional 'linguistic' camp, this, of course, reflects Foucault's conception of discourse in broader terms than *'a group of signs or a stretch of text'* (Mills, 1997:17) but as *'practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak'* (Foucault, 1972:49). More particularly a Foucauldian DA focuses on *'how social categories, knowledges and relations are shaped by discourse'* (Tonkiss, 2004:373) and it is in this way that it was deemed worthy of facilitating the sort of examination required within this study.

Additionally, it should be noted that a genealogical focus was mainly favoured within the interpretative frame of this work. This was commensurable to the theoretical focus around Foucault's later work, through its facilitation of thinking about power in relation to discourse, and, the ongoing nature of discourse (Kendall and Wickman, 1999). This however, it should be stressed that this study aligns with the view that Foucault's ideas are largely intertwined (Kendall and Wickman, 1999 and McKinley and Starkey, 1998) and that, as such, archaeological notions may and will inevitably filtrate analysis of genealogical nature.

3.5.2 'Stages' of Interpretation

With this conceptual frame in mind, the actual process of interpretation began. This is now discussed with recourse to a number of 'stages'. As a brief note, the reader is urged to apply caution with regard to this 'linear' representation of events. As espoused by many, interpretation, like many other aspects of conducting research, is not typically a straight and ordered process (Brownlie, 1999). Here, with the inevitability of any research, the activity of working ideas up between, and through, myself the author, conceptual tools and most importantly the data, was something highly recursive and 'messy'. These 'stages', therefore, represent the best attempt to communicate what was ultimately an iterative process.

Stage One

In mind of this interpretative complexity, identifying a 'stage one' is simplistic. However, the beginning of the analytic phase proper is attributed to the process of transcription. Through this process (which involved translating the interview tapes into the written word) it was note-taking in particular which represented the beginning

of interpretation. In this regard, notes were made in the margins of transcribed texts that in some way reflected aspects of informants' experiences, relationships, knowledges, ideas and feelings. These constituted, what were understood to be, early indicators as to possible Foucauldian 'modes' through which the person may be formed (Foucault, 1980). Importantly these notes also provided initial sketches around possible instances of power relations working through respondents' accounts.

These jottings corresponded to the use of 'coding and categorisation' within this research. Coding and categorisation is an analytical approach to data that brings a wide set of procedures from grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As Lindlof notes, it describes a;

> process in which the researcher creatively scans and samples data-texts, looks for commonalities and differences and begins to formulate categories of interest (Lindlof, 1995:224).

In other words its aim is to aid the researcher through the detection of patterns in the data. Herein, constituting the earliest phase of such analytic work, the intention related most closely to the achievement of what Lindlof (1995) further suggested to be 'first order' concepts. These he described as *'the descriptive practices of cultural membership'* (Lindlof, 1995:224).

Stage Two

Beyond transcription, the making of these notes continued into the next stage. Indeed, for some time after the interviews were translated into the written word, reflection centred on further generating these 'first-order' ideas. This process went on for a

period of time and involved reading the full texts several times. Importantly, making this stage distinct from stage one, was the effort to group these initial jottings which characterised participants talk. This firstly involved the use of post-it notes. More particularly these were inscribed with 'first order' concepts and then physically grouped. This helped provide the basis for themes to emerge. From there, before 'stage three', these assemblages were transferred to the computer.

Stage Three

Stages one and two, although dealing specifically with descriptive aspects from the data, inevitably involved further interpretative work. This work can perhaps best be described as 'second order'. Again utilising Lindlof's (1995) wisdom, second order concepts can be defined in his terms as, *concepts of the researcher's own invention or constructs existing in the literature* (Lindlof, 1995:225). With this in mind, these interpretations involved the generation of key themes that were understood to account in new ways for participants' utterances. Stage three was fully focused on a continuation of this thematic work.

In working up such themes, researchers may pursue a variety of methods for organising material (Such as the computer packages; NUD*IST (Richards and Richards, 1991), WINMAX, THE ETHNOGRAPH, QualPro, and Word Match TAP for example[li]). Here the decision was taken to devise a chart of personalised design. Set up in Excel, this 'chart' not only documented themes which had been collated as the output of initial readings, but at the same time kept note of the formative linkage constitutive of them. These included, for example, emergent notions of subjectivity

and notions of selfhood from interview material, along with what were understood to be the dynamics of modern disciplinary power/practice through which they may be constituted. The allowance of this to substantiate second order categories with recourse to inductively derived materials of the previous stages, and was done with genealogy in mind. In other words, toward the hope of adequately 'locat[ing] traces of the present' (Foucault, 1979, cf Burrell, 1998: 18). Keeping all emergent and ideas together in this chart also provided a highly useful facility through which to make comparisons between emergent ideas, and generate yet more readings. Indeed it provided a malleable basis through which to read in a different light what some the (unintended) effects of historical practice within the doctoral process may be.

3.6 Conclusion to the Research Design

To summarise therefore this section has concerned itself with the introduction and justification of research 'choices' used to underpin the empirical study of subjectivity formation within this research. In doing so it has specifically outlined its position in relation to location (in terms of its empirical setting, methodological perspective and research participants) method, and strategies of interpretative intervention. Moving onwards, the next chapter documents the outcomes of such empirical work.

li As is the case within many methodological texts. Considering this, Julie Brownlie (1999) refers to the work of Aldridge (1993), who in turn refers to a general tendency within the research process to present written work in re-ordered forms – forms within which the 'hand of science' (if not truth) appear to have been the unquestionable force behind the projects.

li 'Reproductive' here is used in its simplest sense, i.e. that the doctoral process literally constitutes an activity constitutive of the non-biological reproduction of the marketing academy.

li The following extract from Trocchia and Berkowitz (1999) underlines what was identified to be the strongly presciptivist flavour of their work; *'We believe that this exploratory research study serves as an important first step in identifying individual characteristics and environmental determinants of scholarly productivity among marketing academicians.... the study can be viewed as a resource for not only the individual contemplating a career as a marketing academician but also the marketing professor who wants to improve the quality of his or her marketing doctoral program'* (Trocchia and Berkowitz 1999:758).

li The understanding demonstrated by the Traweek (1988) and Lee and Williams (1999), it should also be mentioned, reflects a well made articulation elsewhere in this 'doctoral' literature. Green and Lee (1999) more specifically point out that what is *'at stake in doctoral work and postgraduate supervision....is precisely the (re)production of an intelligible academic identity – a certain kind of licensed personage'* (Green and Lee, 1999:219).

li Wherein, most specifically the understanding exists that social reality is not real, but rather is derivative from culture. Removed from Trocchia and Berkowitz, therefore, within these works is the understanding that cultural reality is bound within cultural processes and practices.

li The extract below demonstrates her understanding of how practices of success mark the cycle of development within physics as more particularly male; *I am not suggesting that only biological males can participate in the cycle [of development]. I am claiming that in this cycle a certain cluster of characteristics is associated with success, a cluster that is part of our culture's social construction of male gender* (1988:104-105)

li The work of Lee and Williams differs from the work of Traweek in many ways; important to mention here is that wherein Traweek drew *disciplinary* insights from her exploration, Lee and Williams (1999) concentrate on offering up conclusions regarding PhD pedagogy on a wider basis, most particularly as related to the lives and experiences of those across the 'humanities and the social sciences'.

li Whilst simultaneously underlining such *situ* as linked to the foreclosure of reality/ideas in academic realms.

li On the basis of its adequacy as an inspectoral framework 'replicated' within marketing.

li There is no intention to privilege purely 'research' here (in the output or artefactual sense) as an effect. Additionally, it should be noted that within this work alongside that of Wray-Bliss (2003) these 'interactions' in research acknowledge not only the potential influence of the researcher on the researched, but also that of the researched on the researcher.

li The very possibilities for research design are not considered voluntaristic in the purest agentic sense, rather relationally bound.

li After preliminary fieldwork had pointed to the consideration of the doctoral process as a location through which to situate interest in subjectivity formation, the initial intention was to facilitate such through a combination of interviews and observations of PhD supervisory meetings (as one possible location). This *in situ* meeting, it was thought, may provide an intriguing additional perspective around which formative conditions could additionally be considered. However, the pilot studies set up to test the workability of such an idea failed, with all potential contributors citing issues of sensitivity, intrusion and potential disruption to the process as particular reasons for non-participation.

li Acknowledging that the main source of data within this study was the spoken word the decision to tape record (as conveyed here) is perhaps unsurprising. Unlike the other options available, for example

note taking and video recording, this form of recording was understood to provide, accuracy, a means of recollection, access to the minutiae of conversations as they unfolded, full details of researcher participation and lack of any real intrusion.

[li] The questions asked within the study as mentioned were very much intended to facilitate a Foucauldian analysis and as such hoped to elicit open discussion around the central contexts, relationships, practices and knowledges defining the lives and experiences of those within the doctoral process. Towards this end, the broad themes of questioning included the roles people were, and had been involved in at different 'career' stages (including supervision), motivations, best and worst moments, and aspirations and values.

[li] In this way this work aligned to Seale's (1998) proposition that good interviewer technique in unstructured interviews should; *monitor what is emerging, perhaps gently guiding the speaker on to certain topics that seem promising, or asking for clarification when points made by the speaker seem unclear....[and] allowing the speaker to say how they see things, in their own words, rather than making them follow the researcher's agenda'* (1998: 206-207)

[li] Of course, placing importance within this research on allowing the interviewee to speak is in no way to deny the involvement of myself, the researcher, within the interview process itself. On the contrary, as an extension of the point made within section 3.3.3.1 it is fully acknowledged here that within interviews the interviewer is not detached from the situation, and in particular is not detached from shaping its representative outcomes (Smith, 1990; Wray-Bliss, 2003). As Holstein and Gubrium make clear; *'Respondents answers and comments are not viewed as reality reports delivered from a fixed repository. Instead, they are considered for the ways that they construct aspects of reality, in collaboration with the interviewer'.* (1997:127). In this sense therefore the interview is seen here as an 'active' site (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997) enabling the subjective creation of particular versions of reality.

[li] Such packages have been developed to allow the researcher to form on the basis of word recognition and patterning some sort of building in terms of a theory. The use of such software allows in what is arguably a more user friendly way an opportunity to code the data.

Chapter Four

Findings

4.1 Summary

The main objective of this research study, as outlined previously, surrounds an exploration into the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy. More particularly it is interested in illuminating the situated nature of those involved around marketing's doctoral process. Having talked to a range of informants within a marketing department within a major UK university, this chapter introduces the main findings of this study. In particular, towards a Foucauldian analysis of marketing reality in the next, this chapter includes insights around what were considered to be the central contexts, relationships, practices and knowledges defining the lives and experiences of those 'within' the site. To this end, after the introduction in 4.2, 4.3 introduces the everyday practices of doctoral students, much of which are underlined as highly individualised. 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 then go on to consider the PhD community, supervision and institutional bodies respectively, as key relations around which pedagogic practice was understood to be framed. 4.7 then brings the chapter to a close.

4.2 Introduction

As supported and eluded to within these two introductory quotes, a Foucauldian

analysis of the subject (and power) should involve its exploration around a variety of

domains;

> *Government as an activity could concern the relation between the self and the self, private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or guidance, relations within social institutions and communities and, finally, relations concerned with the exercise of political sovereignty. (Gordon, 1991:2-3)*

> *We should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts, etc. (Foucault, 1980a: 97)*

Leading towards such an analysis in chapter five, this findings chapter broadly outlines some of the 'domains' understood as working within the empirical site of primary interest here. In other words, as an analytic basis, it demonstrates what were considered to be some of the 'key' experiences, understandings, activities and relationships of, and around, those doing a doctorate. Based on the stories told by students and supervisors, it begins by representing some of the everyday practices students are engaged in during this pedagogic process. This will be immediately followed by greater insight into some of the interpersonal relations characterising the lives of those in the field.

4.3 Everyday Practices of Doctoral Students

Individual Activity

As well as engaging in a variety of peripheral, supportive and aligning activities including lecturing, conference attendance and research projects, all of the informants (SD)[li] within this research were involved in the construction (sole authorship) of a doctoral thesis within marketing. This operated as the primary manifestation towards full participation within the academic field. In the main, this section outlines some aspects of what typifies the engagement in and around such practice for those involved; including for example, personal routines and conducts, feelings, desires, hopes, motivations and understandings. Additionally, it also provides an indication of what initial hopes and justifications were involved in making the decision to pursue such doctoral work.

A number of key practices seemed to define and surround the time producing the thesis[li] for most of those talked to. Mostly, reflecting the production of a solo project, it seemed that these activities were mostly and highly individual in nature. This was something well understood, and represented clearly by the informants (SD) themselves. Indeed towards the pursuit of this individual project the informants (SD) made a point of painting their day-to-day existences as being 'their own', to organise, schedule and arrange as they saw fit. As was made evident some long running and highly routine like actions went to making up informants' (SD) days. As was the case with most of the informants' (SD) talked to, these actions included: making certain decisions about how the day would be structured; deciding on whether to going to the office; deciding on what hours to keep in the day; writing e-mails; going to the library to find material; searching new and appropriate material; reading material; considering and reflecting on material; conceptual development; writing and re-writing; creating literature reviews; making and implementing methodological choices; generating data; analysing data and presenting ideas in various ways and forms (including speech making) and writing for publication.

As implied, these activities largely describe a situation wherein the informants (SD) were largely working on their own during the days. Somewhat countering this however is an acknowledgement that part of this day-to-day individual (research) conduct and 'self-organised' activity includes the arrangement of some level of interaction with others. Informants (SD) typically talked of seeking people out for guidance, chats, and supervision in the departmental setting; whether it be with peers or those having completed doctoral study. Coffee breaks and 'catch-ups' were

common occurrences. Additionally key activities within student life at doctoral level included participation in supervisory meetings and formalised doctoral group practices. These were an aspect of the entire period of candidature and will be described in further detail in the sections to follow.

Motivations

Filtering through the stories of individual practice was evidence of a variety of motivations for spending time in this way and on the project. Primarily, all of those who were informants (SD) in this study appeared to be driven towards successful accomplishment of the thesis and their doctoral participation. There were different reasons and justifications given for this – outlining various perceptions of reward around the doctorate. One respondent (SD) talked of using her qualification to generate work outside of academia, and how gaining the experience of a doctorate would help her in the field; *[when] I entered the marketing discipline it wasn't that I …wanted a whole change in career, but more that I wanted to be able to give something different when I go back* (SD Gillian 130-132[li]) Others, however, for the most part quoted a career in academia as their primary *raison d'etre* and motivation, often citing distaste for the '*real world*' of commerce as an alternative.

Tales of desire and passion around the academic project and being an academic were central to the tales which the informants told, and depicted a sense of pleasure around their participation within this particular field. Indeed desire and passion seemed to characterise decisions which were taken to enter into the doctorate and to continue working within the academic environment.

Elizabeth explains firstly about the love she had for her undergraduate dissertation, and that her decision to do a doctorate came from a desire to continue that enjoyment;

> *I got really into my [undergraduate dissertation]. I loved doing it... and I kind of had an idea that I wanted to go on and do a PhD* (SD Elizabeth 18-20)

Following on from this Hilary points to similar feelings;

> *...the topic that I have chosen to work with. I mean you have to be passionate about what you are working on. You have to be passionate about what you are doing and why you are here today and I feel [that] about my research topic... quite simply that's what drives me* (SD Hilary: 125-127)

Here, having been asked about what motivates her in doing the doctorate, Hilary also emphasises a similar notion of personal passion, again most particularly around her research topic. This, she implies is something which justifies her continuation and '*why [she is] here today*'. Moreover in stating 'that is what drives me' Hilary makes clear that the achievement of work around her topic is the ultimate reward for her; the ultimate motivation within the process of the doctorate.

Ingrid too points to being able to research as being central to her early enthusiasm and motivation to start her doctorate;

> *I was fascinated with the fact that I was given a chance to generate ideas and this whole creative process...finding ways to come up with a new topic I found fascinating and I thought my expectation for myself would be to allow myself to investigate those wonderful questions I was coming up with...* (SD Ingrid: 48:53)

This extract nicely demonstrates her desire as surrounding a personal fascination with the ability to pursue her intrigue as a researcher, and a real pleasure at being able to have some sort of control and autonomy around the sorts of work she would be doing as well as the questions which she would be allowed to investigate. She considered the doctorate as a fairly free process which allowed her to pursue personal creativity. This idea of personal freedom as linked to research was something fairly apparent throughout the interview texts.

Alan reflects the passion of Ingrid in the desire he feels as an academic to pursue an exploration of ideas and questions;

> *you do tend to be driven by that [getting the PhD] but, curiosity – intellectual curiosity. You get hooked on questions... That's what drives you, what drives you...you get driven into research to try and find a satisfactory answer* (SG Alan: 74-82)

In this quote Alan notes the centrality of this idea of personal curiosity as a main driver in what he does: *'curiosity – intellectual curiosity'*. In ways going beyond those outlined above, Alan's tale is also particularly interesting in that it suggests in ways, almost beyond 'passion', that entry and continued participation within academia stems from an inherent intrigue and curiosity that some people have; a curiosity that they *have* to pursue. His comment *'you get driven into research'* suggests that to pursue research as a career path was almost an involuntary motion for some people like him - almost like a calling.

In balance to this however, this quote also indicates a significant level of importance around gaining the doctorate as a qualification. Alan notes that in addition to

intellectual curiosity that he also 'tends to be driven' by getting the PhD. This motivation for the official achievement and reward of the 'PhD' is also presented in the following quote from Gillian;

> *The pressure is whether it's good enough for you to then get that doctorate. From the beginning until that viva you are driven by your supervisors input saying yes this is fine that is fine. …you are not just doing it for the sake of the research you are doing it for a degree…*(SD Gillian: 701-704)

Here she implies that her involvement in the process is for the sake of research, but like Alan, that it is also about getting 'a degree'.

Overall, through the various stories told therefore the idea of pursuing personal ideas and enjoying free thought was a strong theme which emerged. It appeared as such to be a definite reason for joining and enjoying continued participation within academic practice. Interestingly, these ideas of pursuing personal ideas and enjoying free thought somewhat mirror (in their expectations and understanding of academic work within marketing) some residing thoughts and assumptions of academic practice elsewhere expressed by informants in the texts (SG). To this end at a number of points through these interview transcripts notions of academic freedom and independent practice were alluded to. Some talked of the doctoral process being about *'learning to fly solo'* (SG Brian: 430), others of the *'lone academic'* (SG Alan: 184). Towards this, in addition informants (SG) also expressed that that academia is about academics being able to generate their own ideas, and that academic freedom ought to be protected (SG Claire).

Experiencing the everyday

So far it is clear that characterising the lived experience for those in the field were not only highly individualist practices defining the everyday, but also strong desires to work towards successfully achieving the doctorate and pursuing a passion for autonomous intellectual curiosity.

Interestingly, as much as the accounts of personal motivations seemed to depict passion and enjoyment to a certain extent, it was also apparent that the doctorate was an experience which was represented as personally hard. Pleasure and pain seemed to exist hand in hand. Indeed, even though the doctoral process was thought of and depicted (above) as an escape from the 'real world', and an opportunity to explore research interests, evidently it did not exclude hard times. Herein ideas of sacrifice and personal investment seemed to pervade accounts and colour representations of doctoral experience for those talked to and to suggest hardship for those involved in terms of time spent and emotions felt.

To this end, stories around the doctoral process involved huge amounts of constant and continual commitment, dedication, hard work, self-discipline as well as continual self-judgement. Both the gruelling nature of the task, as well as levels of personal sacrifice are nicely demonstrated within the following quotes:

> *… you have piles and piles of, metres high of reading lists, and journal articles to go through. You need to sacrifice some time somewhere, otherwise you would have gone to a movie or clubbing with your friends or something and you say no you can't do it because you have to sit and read 20 journal articles* (SD Hilary: 631-634)

It is very difficult for my friends to understand. Why do I sacrifice myself? Because that's how they see it. Sacrifice your time and my energy, and you know, the best years of my life for a project that doesn't mean anything to anyone apart from myself and I'm still trying to answer that myself so its difficult. (SD Ingrid: 497:500)

everybody knows that [the PhD] is a very lonely, long, laborious process (SD Ingrid: 66-68)

These quotes demonstrate the presentation of the idea of self-sacrifice and the depiction of a doctoral process, wherein there appears to be a requirement for such personal forfeit. With this in mind it was evident that students gave up a number of things for the sheer scope and volume of work required. Social activities here seemed to be a central part of what students talked of giving up, however Ingrid eludes that she herself and 'the best years of her life' having been parted with for the process. These stories then depict a characterisation of a field wherein successful operation in the doctorate requires these particular forms of investment. Interestingly also they characterise a situation where such investment is a necessary and willing 'price' for the personal pursuit of research ambitions and the sorts of 'passion and desire' which were outlined above. Supporting this, in saying that she has given up 'the best years for her life for a project that *'doesn't mean anything to anyone apart from myself'* Ingrid helps to locate the rationale and justification for making the sorts of sacrifices that she feels she has.

That said however, although acknowledged to be part of the doctorate and, to certain extent necessary, these tales do not depict a picture of entire personal ease. Indeed as much as gaining the ability to pursue research, informants did depict a feeling of loss, and even doubt around their decisions.   However, it sacrifice was something chosen

and continued to be chosen by these students, and also was something not entirely unexpected from the outset of their candidature. Indeed the levels of investment, particularly in terms of hard work and isolation were, as Ingrid noted, something that *'everybody knows'*. Regardless of that however, it does not negate a characterisation here that those doing the doctorate were involved in difficulty around the processes required.

Supporting these ideas of hard work and sacrifice were other expressions of self-discipline. To this end informants (SD) strongly implied that a requirement of the doctorate was keeping themselves on track with some key activities. Particularly, in the context of self-organisation as outlined earlier, informants (SD) understood the imperative nature of this sort of action.

> *It is a constant everyday struggle. Do you let the work get on top of you, or do you stay on top of the work...you know? Because at the end of the day, you motivate yourself to work. You know if you don't want to get up in the morning and do anything, nobody is going to ask you at the end of the day; 'what have you done today?'* (SD Hilary: 91-93)

Here, alongside a continuation of the theme of hardship above Hilary emphasises in her own way the necessary requirements which come with doing a doctorate in the empirical site and, in particular, the need to self-enforce progress and development to some extent; *'it is a constant everyday struggle'*. Informants (SD) alluded to the importance of being self-critical within the process and to having to have strong levels of self-motivation. For example, they continually evaluate their own activity when it came down to research, judging their actions and ability all of the time. Some talked of using time-lines rigidly to follow research plans, and to achieve successful completion;

> *I would say that timelines are something that are absolutely critical I have a personal timeline. That is what I am trying to stick to. There is life beyond the PhD. So I don't want to let this be something that will go on forever but who knows what is going to happen...* (SD Hilary: 120-123)

Here Hilary points to a timeline as being utilised as her self-disciplining tool to ensure '*life beyond the PhD'*, although interestingly she also makes evident that sticking to it does not remove a sense of uncertainty and doubt around the project and how it will go.

Elsewhere underlining this context of hard work and its importance in the management of her day-to-day life is Elizabeth;

> **PF:** *do you ever feel guilty [doing your PhD]*
> **SD Elizabeth***: Yes! All the time! I do, for example this weekend - although it is a long weekend - I would ideally like to work 1 or 2 days of that, but I can't because I have my mum and dads 25th wedding anniversary... and I am already thinking 'oh oh, I am not going to do any work'. I am just feeling really guilty about it, and that is when I think well maybe I am not cut out for this because I am not prepared to….or I mean I am prepared to but just the situation will dictate that I can't do work, do you know what I mean?* (SD Elizabeth: 547 – 560)

Interestingly in the case of this quote, Elizabeth provides a demonstration of hard work - a key element pervading students lives. Her story therefore, through relaying necessary levels of time and effort required, helps to provide further characterisation to the idea of sacrifice pervading the field in this sense. In fact in noting '*maybe I am just not cut out for this'* she demonstrates unequivocally that participation in the doctorate requires a person who is willing and able to make the sort of investments that were troubling her in this quote.

Additionally this extract also points to another key aspects of informants tales, that of constant self-monitoring. Here Elizabeth underlines a lived reality for her which includes continual self-judgement not only around the activities that she is taking part in, but about her ability in the process of conducting those necessary activities. Additionally, in ways that pertained to an idea underpinning other stories told, it emphasises emotional hardship as playing a part in the doctoral process. In this quote she underlines how her time is riddled with constant feelings of guilt about doing work, moreover implying that work needs to be done all the time in order to ensure progress and good feeling. To this end, outwith the 'visible' aids of timelines and comparisons, self-induced 'guilt' and 'anxiety' appear to act through the process. These ideas of both hard work, and emotion are outlined in another fashion within another extract below. Here particularly it is anxiety that appears to be the result of the doctoral process;

> *…I worry that he thinks that I don't work hard enough on my PhD. And I worry sometimes that I think he thinks that I am not up to it sometimes. I don't know why I think that, but I do…constantly feel that I want to prove myself to him, if you know what I mean? Like I want him to read this and think, that is really good rather than this is a shoddy 2-minute job… I worry that he doesn't think that I work as hard as maybe other PhD students* (SD Elizabeth: 731-737)

Firstly, it can be suggested that this quote again helps to characterise the doctoral situation as one wherein self-monitoring plays a continual part. Here, more specifically however in demonstrating self-reflection Elizabeth not only conveys the idea of worry as being central to her experiences of the doctorate, but also talks of the need to prove something to her supervisor; *'I constantly feel that I want to prove myself to him, if you know what I mean?'*. This is interesting in the sense that self-

monitoring can perhaps be seen alongside or as linked to a perceived monitoring by others. To this end, beyond emotion, this quote talks of the importance of impression making - something which was apparent elsewhere within the accounts of students in the field. Indeed it helps underline an understanding that she felt aware of the importance of another's opinion. Specifically, she demonstrates a self-reflection and worry borne of her consideration of the *impression* she feels that she makes to her doctoral supervisor in the process of candidature. In this particular example, such an impression is linked to the perceived quality of work she produces and ideas her supervisor may have about her in relation to how hard she is working.

This extract is also interesting in that it points again to an awareness which students seemed to have for their relation to other students in the field. Elizabeth projects, for example, how any perceived personal evaluation by her supervisor of her would be conducted in the manner of comparing her performance to that of other doctoral students.

As noted, to this the earlier of Elizabeth's extracts points to an evaluation and doubt around her personal ability to do the job; '*well maybe I am not cut out for this*'. Raising questions around personal attributes, development and ability to do the job (as is also apparent within the quote directly above), was commonplace and characteristic for those with whom discussions centred. Informants (SD) for example continually appeared to self-assess whether they were on the 'right tracks' and judge themselves accordingly. Additionally they continually questioned what stage of the work (written) they were at with ideas of where they thought they should be (even using comparisons with other students to gauge self-understanding). Also they judged

current performance on the basis of whether they were on 'the right path' of things or not, and marked times when bad performance in these regards had defined their self understandings.

Such judgements seemed to reflect ideas of how students understood, or thought things *should be* within the context of the empirical site. To this end for example students demonstrated norms around aspects of practice such as research. Most, within a context wherein they understood publication to be important, reflected ideas espoused by Donald who noted that research should be; '*current, interesting, applicable and original'* (SD Donald: 376-377) for example.

Developing this theme of self-monitoring and personal evaluation Elizabeth notes that the doctoral experience requires her to prove herself all of the time;

> *you are constantly trying to prove that you are good enough to be here* (SD
> Elizabeth: 588-589)

On one level, this quote again, provides evidence of the tales of self-struggle and desire which seemingly surround the discourse. In noting that she was '*constantly trying to prove…',* Elizabeth for example can be read as wanting to 'be there' as much as continually making the effort to be so. Additionally however, it helps to represent the idea that the self-assessment of students was not only something which was perpetually ongoing but which was somehow something that was required of and by students themselves or by the field. An implication certainly resides that somehow Elizabeth believes that she might not be there if she were not to prove herself. Furthermore, this quote again further demonstrates the idea of doubt which was

operating and which seemed to pervade accounts of those in the field – both in respect to whether there would be continuation of candidature, and around personal ability (being 'good enough' to be there). Additionally, and perhaps linked the last point the quote also points to an expression of competition within the environment. In this case the need to be 'good enough' can be read as an awareness that students had of others and henceforth of the need to be 'productive' therein.

4.4 Fellow Doctoral Students

Despite much talk surrounding the doctoral process surrounding a depiction of an involvement in individual action day-to-day the doctoral process was not something that was conducted in isolation. All of those talked to played a constitutive part in making up what they termed '*a community*' (SD Ingrid: 139), within the empirical field of interest and this shaped their lived experience of the process. Through a variety of activities they contributed to wider disciplinary and academic communities also.

Part of this community involvement surrounded their participation with fellow doctoral students in the empirical site. Involvement of this sort was the result of coercion and informality. Indeed students spoke of regularly chatting to one another around the department (although less so out with work hours it seemed) as well as being involved in more formal arrangements. With regard to the latter, mandatory participation within training and 'PhD groups'[li] was mentioned. These 'arrangements' it seemed were fairly influential for those involved.

Across all domains for example, ideas were seemingly transferred between people, both formally and informally. Demonstrating such, are extracts from Hilary, Ingrid and Fiona. In the first example, Hilary describes learning and knowledge transfer occurring in a day to day context within the department, among doctoral students.

> *…the last year has been a very steep curve in terms of understanding the PhD process you know and how does one go about it…..you learn from your own personal experiences [and] from other peoples. There could be people who are just finishing up on their PhDs and you kind of have a chat with them. And they can tell you the difficulties that they faced, or things that worked well and things that didn't work so well. And they tell you, look this is what didn't work out right for me, but you better watch out for this* (SD Hilary: 68-74)

More particularly she refers to ideas being passed between students generally, and depicts a common practice which sees ideas being shared between more practised 'students' and novices within the field around ways to 'go about it'. In this sense it is clear that the ideas which are being shared relate to the successful construct of the thesis and doctoral candidature more generally. Similar thoughts are shared by Fiona;

> *I was enrolled in the doctoral programme here… [in which] I participated in lots of discussion about, not only particular topics, but also how they were managing processes…also stuff like peoples experiences and how people were getting on. People were in the throes of doing a PhD - a lot of them were doing their literature reviews and developing methodologies…when people talk of their experiences it is like; when I come to do that… you know you can learn from what they are telling you and that sort of thing. I mean a lot of them spoke about time pressures and that sort of thing…*(SD Fiona: 295 – 305)

Noting, '*not only particular topics, but also how they were managing processes*' Fiona demonstrates here again that research ideas, and the day-to-day management of being a doctoral student is the sort of knowledge which is being shared. Like Hilary

and other students, these learning experiences were communicated positively, and were depicted as something which was a good and helpful part of the process.

Hilary too, in the next quote still depicts the sharing of knowledge between students, this time however it is through her watching others operate in the field and learning from them, rather than direct verbal communication.

> *I have witnessed some people who have had... It is not that they have been slack, or they have not worked but just circumstances have kind of bogged them down time wise and then they get to the forth year stage and then things start to take on monstrous proportions, and so that is something that I am really, really scared of I would say* (SD Hilary: 95-100).

Interestingly, all of these quotes characterise a situation within this empirical site where it can be seen that doctoral students not only teach and guide others with regards to the requirements of the doctoral process, but that they also seek out, watch and listen to their peers (usually it seems, to those who are more advanced and further through their candidature) in the pursuit of gaining such knowledge. In doing so some of their tales relay *'what to watch out for'*, *'difficulties'* which they may face, and how to *'manage processes'*. All of this was part, it seems, of the processes of doctoral learning for those involved within the site.

In addition to this, another aspect of this relationship between doctoral students seemed to denote a comparison between students and other students in the department. The quote below is presented as an example of this;

> *We talk amongst ourselves…We find that somebody might be ahead of somebody else in a particular area* (SD Hilary: 596-598)

In particular, it outlines students talking to other students as a means of them ascertaining whether sufficient personal progress had been made on their research project. Interestingly also, it reflects what was understood to be a common feeling of division or difference within the site - an understanding that there were different sets of people making up the academic community. *Here 'we talk among ourselves'* helps mark out the doctoral students here as understanding themselves as distinct from 'unstated' others.

Ingrid also introduces thoughts around the nature of the group of doctoral students in the department.

> *There was a strong community that developed among the students. There was a bunch of us here, a community...there were also systems here, which facilitated interactions between PhD students, like training for teaching...[and] [PhD Groups] that were for presenting the progress of their research for [states a particular time period], where people can ask questions and interact...This I found was to my advantage because it helped me focus...*(SD Ingrid: 138-145)

Here particularly she characterises the students as forming '*a community'*; somewhat of an organic relationship 'that developed among the students'. This, she describes as 'strong'. Additionally however, she talks of the more formal setting of the 'PhD groups' as a situation of knowledge development and transfer. Below, and in ways supporting the positively relayed stories of learning and shared knowledges from the extracts above - she more specifically points to the nature of the influence of such meetings and community on the progression of her work.

In particular, she made clear the ways in which participation with fellow doctoral students within such an organisational setting allowed her to develop, but also

transgress. As substantiated further in the next quote, such transgression included, for her, the understanding that she was learning, what the *'right path'* was.

> *I started attending more and more conferences. I was more sure about the arguments I was developing…I was feeling a bit more, you know, certain that I was at least on the right path of things*…(SD Ingrid: 166-169)

Interestingly with regard to the community of doctoral students and the making of the thesis more generally, Ingrid implies that participation within the doctoral group, with its interactions and questions between others, helped her to go on, branch out and be participatory within yet more community driven sites within academic circles. Interestingly also it provides another possible reading of the notion of doubt which can be understood to characterise the experiences of the process. To this end, as much as the process of the doctoral community had an effect on the way she viewed herself within the community (*'It affected my morale, it boosted my morale'* (SD Ingrid: 170) and her sense of certainty, there is still hesitation around the extent to which there full belief around herself and her position as a candidate. To this extent; *'certain that I was at least on the right path of things...'* points to a residing notion of uncertainty and self-doubt which remained.

4.5 Supervision

Supervision, of course, was central to the lives of those interviewed; either by being supervised, supervising or having been supervised. Indeed it was the key relationship discussed around the process of becoming a marketing academic. This section aims

to provide thorough indication into such a relationship, as well as some of the wider acts that seemingly sustained and defined it.

Considered a mandatory aspect of doctoral research, entry into PhD candidature[li] would not be facilitated without 'appropriate' allocation of supervisor(s), as well as satisfaction of a number of other criteria. These, as noted within the rules and regulations of the empirical field, are outlined within the table below;

Table 4A - Expectations of both Students and Supervisors within the Supervisory Relationship

Expectations, relating to/of Supervisors:

- The department provides two adequate supervisors.
- The proposed primary supervisor has expertise in the area of research selected.
- The secondary supervisor will have similarly appropriated expertise.
- Supervisor allocation lies ultimately with the university and not the student.
- The proposed (primary) supervisor should have conducted successful supervisions beforehand.
- Enough time is allocated to supervision.
- Students are introduced to relevant research communities.
- Guidance is provided on the expectations leading to successful completion.
- 'Appropriate' expertise is provided around the topic area.
- Students will be encouraged to teach.
- Continual assessments/ 'examinations' will be 'hosted'.

Expectations, relating to/of Students:

- Supervision is received, and appropriate contact time made with supervisors.
- Students participate in allotted processes of evaluation.
- Students to be present around faculty regularly/as much as possible.
- Students attend and participate in particular events as stipulated by supervisors – including conferences and making presentations.
- Students conduct corrections suggested by supervisor following assessment.

Adapted from: Rules and Regulations of the Empirical Site

As implied above for the informants, the supervisory relationship was one that would last for the entire length of candidature. The assumption residing around such a relationship is that after candidature is over the individual student will be prepared to work independently. Brian, one of the supervisors described the process of supervision as one wherein students needed to '*learn to fly solo*' (SD Brian: 430). Practices within such collaboration differed for each informant, although to a certain extent there was some parity. In this regard, all were involved in working alongside busy professorial figures (as supervisors), each of whom evidently had demanding roles, impacting on the amount of possible time which could be spent with doctoral students. Regarding the latter particularly, students all reported spending relatively little time with their respective supervisors[li]. This matched with earlier descriptions of self-organisation largely defining the day-to-day process of conducting a doctorate, and also their pre-understood ideas of doctoral practice wherein they anticipated that work would largely be done alone; everybody knows that [the PhD] is a very lonely, long process (SD Ingrid: 66-68).

4.5.1 Agreement over Research Proposal/Topic

The rules and regulations of the empirical site state that agreement must be met with prospective students and supervisors over the topic for study. To this end, all of those informants (SD) interviewed worked on some level with supervisors on constructing and agreeing on a proposal for their study from the outset. Describing this process explicitly were Donald and Elizabeth. Donald firstly notes;

> *…I think completing my PhD proposal was a good success and a milestone for me. I think going over my PhD topic with [name of supervisor], we have changed it around a bit since my initial and I understand his reasoning. It was going down loyalty and that wasn't really cool, so we will go this way, and I said absolutely…* (SD Donald: 577-581)

In his discussion, although indicating autonomous decision making with regard to his topic earlier in his interview[li], Donald describes supervisory intervention around the pursuit of his initial proposal.

Particularly he notes the nature of the intervention to reside around his supervisors assertion that 'loyalty' [his original choice of topic], was not the best choice of topic. As Donald relays about his topic and supervisory discussion *'It was going down loyalty and that wasn't really cool, so we will go this way, and I said absolutely…'* (SD Donald: 577-581). Although this was a decision which Donald presented as something which he which was happy to go with, nonetheless it demonstrates that that there was a certain relinquishment on his part to the thoughts of the supervisor. This suggested influence of the supervisory relationship over the construction of the thesis is evident elsewhere throughout the interviews and appeared to be fairly characteristic of experiences.

In another example relating to topic development, Elizabeth responds to being asked about whether the research she was actually pursuing within her doctorate, married with the interests she had originally proposed to pursue from the outset of her candidature. Noting a major difference she states;

SD Elizabeth: *Yeah, because basically my dissertation was on [topic stated[li]] …whereas - and I think this is where I slightly naïve to a certain extent - when I first came in that was exactly what I wanted to do, and I was quite clear with where I wanted to go with it. But…[supervisor] was quite keen for it to move along in a slightly different direction, and I think it is quite easy to look back and think well maybe I shouldn't have done that but, basically, now it is on [different topic stated]…Sometimes I sit back and think 'wait a minute…how did I get…' although I… you can see the link… it is a massive difference in terms of what I was actually researching… So I would say that [the topic] definitely that has changed quite a lot, but I would not say necessarily that that is for the worst, you know I think you know in terms of funding… it is a lot more fundable than what I was originally planning, and I think that is why it has changed…you know it is difficult because you are with someone who has been in the game for so long, they are a professor and you are this little researcher who has one idea…but at the time it is difficult because at the time, they make so much more sense than you if you know what I mean.*
PF: *Now do you still think it is…a valid research topic?*
SD Elizabeth: Yeah definitely I do think it is…(SD Elizabeth: 674-697)

Although similarly discussing the process of topic development as involving her supervisor, Elizabeth appears less comfortable with the situation. To this end, there were signs of regret over what is seen essentially as the loss of a topic, which she states at the end, she believes was valid in its own right; *'I think it is quite easy to look back and think well maybe I shouldn't have done that'.* (SD Elizabeth: 661-662) Earlier, the notion of sacrifice was raised as one of the key elements which was represented among the stories of informants. Here the idea is expressed again, this time in relation to the manner in which particular choices which had to be made around the doctorate. Although expressed in different ways, both of these candidates provide examples of having to sacrifice particular ideas which they had from the outset of their doctoral candidature. Moreover they both represented an idea of yielding or giving way not only to their supervisors but to particularly held ideas of how research is and should be. This may be considered deference of sorts. Overall this helps to raise interesting questions about the workings of power within the site for

doctoral students, particularly in light of their earlier stated desires and motivations to pursue their own research questions as a motivation to enter the academy.

Here, particularly in relation to the tale of Elizabeth the story told relates to what she gave up in the name of both funding and 'sense'. The latter of these particularly points again to an acknowledgement in the site of the theme of difference around people who make up the academic community. Beyond the earlier example of doctoral students at different stages, Elizabeth demonstrates a perception of particular expertise being located at the site of 'professorship'.

In addition, Elizabeth's extract points to her understanding that a personal transformation has defined her time within the doctorate. Depicting a loss of 'naivety' in particular this change is particularly characterised by new sets of understandings relating to the realities of research culture. In this regard it is clear that students in some way move on from notions which they had held around what research entailed when they first entered the discipline.

4.5.2 'The Meeting'

Central to the practice of this relationship, is the supervisory meeting; the official purpose of which is to provide adequate student support (see rules and regulations of supervision). Both informants (SD and SG) described playing a role in the (seemingly informal) organisation of meetings – although it appears that in reality, informants (SD) very much have to operate around supervisory schedules. Additionally, informants (SG) indicated that they orchestrated fairly directly what the

course of action should be in terms of meetings. Typically, informants (SD) described going to supervisory meetings with a) material prepared and b) a clear agenda as to what they wanted to achieve in the meeting. For example Elizabeth said;

> *…it tends to be me that initiates [agenda in meetings]. Like I will say right, ok, I have done x, y or z, or here is chapter 2. Here it is, can you have a look over it? These are the concerns that I have got, or these are areas that I particularly want to chat about…*(SD Elizabeth: 709-712)

Again, although contradictory to the supervisory direction normally described as the outcome of such meetings, this would appear to depict another level of 'self-organisation' on the part of the student.

Most met with their primary supervisor alone, but one of the informants (SD) talked about her supervisory meetings being conducted with both her primary and secondary supervisors being present. This was something which was viewed positively; *at least once a month we would meet all together…the meetings where we were both together worked better - you could sort of watch the discussion between them* (SD Gillian: 545-548)

From there, all described supervisory meetings as comprising of discussions around various topics, including teaching and presentation making, but mainly about their ongoing doctoral research and its development.

4.5.2.1 Exchange of Ideas

Both informants (SD and SG) talked about meetings being centred primarily on research, and the various practices involved with such. Both discussed aspects of the students literature review including uses of concepts within, and how literature should perhaps be ordered. These meetings were also sites where methodological decisions were taken, questions over data analysis were aired, and advice over data collection was given. Additionally, it can be noted that practices of 'considering and exchanging' ideas were mediated by activities such as drawing. One informant (SG) particularly talked of using whiteboards and diagrams within the context of the meeting:

> *I try to have …these white board sessions with them, or I book a room somewhere and we just sit and talk about ideas, and we sit and we draw patterns and circles, and we do much more of that… talking about the ideas of something and we see where it goes from there* (SG Claire: 495-498)

Indeed in this case, Claire implied the benefit of such to surround its usefulness in facilitating of the help of the student in ordering collected material, shaping the formation of ideas and developing the ongoing content of the thesis.

Within this context of the *exchange of ideas* there is particular evidence within the transcripts that supervisors may enforce particular decisions on the students. An extract from Claire is revealing in this regard when talking about her relation her students research;

I am…keen really having quite a big say over their methodology… so if they have chosen something that is going to take forever then I am going to say no.. In the past I always erred on the side of 'well it is their work…they should be able to choose that' but sometimes you don't win those battles if they are battles (SG Claire: 498-505)

Here she states that she often intervenes around aspects of research such as the methodology, something which she attributes here around the idea of time; '*if they have chosen something that is going to take forever then I am going to say no*'. Importantly though this quote, as much as demonstrating enforcement, also points out a desire on the part of Claire not to enforce on the basis that '*they should be able to choose*'. Interestingly this seems to demonstrate, once more, not only a relationship where control maybe understood to be playing a part, but one wherein a value around personal autonomy and academic freedom within the site of research and the doctoral process.

The idea enforcement, or direct guidance on the part of the supervisor around what was produced in terms of research, was something evident elsewhere within the texts. Elizabeth implied to this end, within the following extract;

I would say that I have become more confident in meetings with [supervisor] because I think that at the start I was like I don't know if this is right, and although it was my PhD I don't think I had that much ownership over it… (SD Elizabeth: 695-698)

Now, I am a lot more like; 'right ok… I know what I am doing, this is what I am doing, I know the route that I want to go down now …and this is what I have got'. So I would say that I can challenge him… I can stand up to the research. I would say that that is definitely something that has changed, because at the start I was definitely something that I was like; 'well… I don't know…' (SD Elizabeth: 700-703)

Crucially, in these quotes there is a distinct feeling communicated that at some point in Elizabeth's candidature wherein the research that she was doing was perhaps not steered by her. This reflected her talk of earlier with regards to the selection of a research topic. As well as indicative of the supervisory relationship being one of either control and/or guidance the quotes also point to personal transformation wherein relationships with supervisors and research alters. Central to such was the claim that the student was able to take 'ownership' of the research, and make more forceful decisions regarding its direction. Change in this example therefore pointed to confidence, knowledge, authority and certainty.

Finally this exchange may be seen in broader ways; wherein the supervisor learns from the student. To this end reflecting the supervisory relationship and meeting as being a site wherein new ideas were generated for and between the two parties, Alan notes in responds positively when asked if his ideas are challenged through students;

> **PF:** *Do you get new understandings through your PhD students, are your ideas challenged?*
> **SG Alan:** *yeah definitely...they bring me things* [ideas] (SG Alan: 277-278)

4.5.2.2 Judgement and Monitoring

As implied above, it was understood that a key role of the supervisor within such meetings was to evaluate and judge the (work of the) students. This was evidently in order that some indication of 'progress' could be ascertained on their part. Judgement and monitoring took a variety of forms within meetings, but was perhaps most commonly evident through the practices of marking.

Marking involved 'directions' being offered to students with regards to their written material, and with supervisors imparting their value judgements on such. Writing, in terms of both content and style was an important part of the practice of being a student. Claire talks about this process;

> *the other thing that I do is that I make them write…I make them write… you see after that first 4 month period where …they are going to be left alone I say right I want regular writing, because I need to check up on their writing skills if you like… because you can have students who are very good at articulating abstract concepts…they can even draw lots of these circles saying that this is an issue, and demonstrate it with an arrow and saying how that links to that. And then you ask them to write a paragraph on that and it is gobble-de-goop. At the end of the day they have to be able to express themselves in the written medium because that is what will be examined.… So those are things that have become much more.., I don't want to say controlling, I hope I am not controlling, but I make them do things to time…(SG Claire: 512-522)*

Here Claire demonstrates the attention she gives as a supervisor to writing style. Additionally however it points to a broader characterisation which was evident through discussion with supervisors which depicted the role as involving the broader management of students. Claire for instance reveals through her statement about 'that first 4 month period' that she plays a part in the organisation of student's time.   In

addition to this, the quote also characterises processes of supervisory 'self-reflection' which where characteristic. In this case particularly not only writing, but; ideas of 'not being too controlling', giving the student a certain space for thinking, and examinations, all come into her reasoning around certain interventions.

Supervisory discussions therefore also seemingly centred on practicalities surrounding the conduct of doing a doctorate and constructing the thesis. Supervisory informants (SG) were particularly keen to point out that key to their role was to watch and intervene when circumstances rendered it necessary. In addition to Claire making it clear that she left students on their own to read within the first four month period, before enforcing writing regulation, Alan too pointed out his own forms of mediation. He particularly pointed to the care that was needed to guide students away from focusing too much on the 'wrong things';

> *I had a student in the past who was doing loads of papers but doing none of the actual PhD. So that is another one to watch. You [the PhD students] can get sort of hooked on doing conference papers* (SG Alan: 512-515)

In this particular quote not only does he point to an ever more present reality of students having a tendency to focus on publishable papers but that his role involves 'watching' how they are spending their time. This idea and importance of the role of 'watching' is indicated further in the next quote also where Alan talks of students who might be 'getting lost' at the reading stage, when focus through writing was required;

> *You have to watch out for people who find that difficult [stopping reading]…There comes a time when you just have to reel that in [reading]* (SG Alan: 503-505)

Indeed, he indicated that his role involved the generation of balance and direction around key practices of teaching, research, conference attendance and thesis construction.

This myriad of activities was supported, in part, by explicit acknowledgements of supervisors about a changing nature of academic practice, and the requirement that now exists for publication. To this end, although the extract above indicates a desire to move students away from overly pursuing the publication of material, it was evident that this management included promotion of such writing also.

Additionally, it seemed that supervisors played a continual role in assessment, most visibly resulting in the production of an interim report on the progress of the student. This includes the outcomes of the monitoring practice of the supervisor on the student. On the basis of such, the supervisor then must provide direct feedback to the student. This includes outlining necessary 'corrective' practice stemming from such judgements.

4.5.3 The Judgement of the Supervisor

Importantly, as well as judging and monitoring, supervisors are judged and monitored themselves. Indeed, such is an outcome of their relation and role within the institutional field of interest here. In this regard, a number of sites are mentionable.

(1) Student assessment sheets. Herein students 'judge' the level of supervision they are receiving within their candidature, and make their ideas evident to the broader institution.

(2) 'Numbers' of successful students through the doctoral process. Success rates provide the basis through which future supervisory roles will be allocated to supervisors.

(3) Public Student Performance. The PhD group presentation is widely acknowledged within the empirical field not only as a domain wherein student progress is monitored, but one wherein the performance of the supervisor can also be ascertained.

4.6 Institutional bodies

As inferred, the practices of doing a doctorate, for both supervisees and supervisors, were set within institutional boundaries. As well as the rules and regulations set in the empirical site itself these include the wider disciplinary field, university quality assessment bodies and funding bodies.

4.6.1 Rules and Regulations of the Empirical Site

Underpinning doctoral activity and the production of the thesis, were regulative mechanisms put in place by the department and university. These, as understood with the aid of supportive documentary material, were substantial in breadth and depth.

They includes indication over deadlines, what should be achieved through training in terms of research skills; ideas around recruitment and selection and supervision as well as assessment. Before outlining two key aspects of such in more detail (particularly recruitment and selection and assessment) it should be mentioned that such mandatory guidelines are not particularly unique to this empirical site. Such practice is typical in UK universities under 'suggestions' made by regulative bodies[li].

4.6.1.1 Recruitment and Selection

A number of issues and stipulations make up policy within the empirical field on bringing students into the department. These are outlined below;

Table 4B - 'Empirical Site' 'Recruitment and Selection' Policy

- The student, in question, holds 'Appropriate' qualifications.
- A sound proposal is submitted (which adequately charts literature in field and methodological design, and that has been worked through and agreed upon with proposed supervisor).
- There are adequate expertise and facilities in order to 'support' the student in the pursuit of their degree.
- Work 'reasonably' conjoins with the research strategy of the department as it currently stands.

Interestingly, within the promotional material for the university and department in question, some of these rules are seemingly contradicted by underlining that that students are free do conduct any topic that they wish.

Additionally, the workings of these are demonstrated to some extent within the description of experiences of those talked to. In discussion, Fiona pointed to her

'suspicion' for example that her being approached to do a doctorate by 'the department' was at least on some level to do with the nature of research that she was interested in doing, and, as implied, how that fitted with a strategic desire within the department for such research focus:

> *I think the problem that they had was that quite a lot, there was a really heavy bias towards particular research areas so they were…there was certain types of research in the department that were, you know, are very popular if you see what I mean among doctoral students.… But yet things like the type of area that I'm interested in … there were very few.. So that was a reason why they approached me because I had been doing my dissertation in that sort of area and they thought that was perhaps trying to get the balance within the department in terms of research areas* (SD: Fiona 55 – 65)

4.6.1.2 Supervision

A number of points are central to university and department regulation around supervision – relating to both supervisors and students. These have been alluded to, within the section 4.5 on supervision.

4.6.1.3 Assessment

Policy within the empirical site outlines that a number of assessments should take place within the time of student candidature. These imperatives include in particular: interim progress reports; thesis presentations; final examinations.

With regard to the former, the rules and regulations state that supervisors and students must participate in assessments of each other, as part of their ongoing relationship.

The interim progress report is required to be completed every six months of the doctorate, and in terms of student evaluation, should consider whether the student has suitably met criteria laid out by the university (in terms of adequate progress). These criteria are not made fully explicit within university documents, and although some material is provided, it is felt ethically unsuitable to offer full insight into these here. It is perhaps enough to say that part of these forms of judgement surround a demonstration on the part of the student of adequate handling of 'disciplinary' research skills and material, as well as demonstrating appropriate 'disciplinary' communication. Thesis presentations constitute another form of interim assessment as laid out within the university/departmental regulations. Guidelines stipulate that after one full year of candidature, students must orally present their research work for critical consideration. With this in mind, regulations note that students must (again) meet disciplinary criteria (again not stated publicly by the university) and that failure to do so will mark termination of their course. Additionally in ways somewhat different to that of the interim report, this form of assessment is carried out by other members of faculty (i.e. not the supervisor). Other doctoral students are welcome and encouraged to attend these presentations, and to participate in questioning. Lastly as is the case within all UK institutions, the regulations of the empirical site note that students must conduct a final assessment; the viva. This entails an oral examination of the student, based on the thesis that they have produced and submitted. With regard to the viva, it is underlined in the guidelines that the overall decision regarding the external examiner lies with the supervisor, an appropriation which should (as stated) lead to the appointment of someone with suitable expertise in the field of study in question. Again, as like the previous two elements of assessment discussed within these official documents, the criteria upon which judgements are based in the viva

remain fairly underexposed. Despite this however, it is made clear that adequate knowledge of other work in field of expertise is a necessary requisite, as is (again) the importance of demonstrating key research skills recognised by the disciplinary community.

4.6.2 Wider Disciplinary Field

The empirical site under investigation within this study currently works as part of a broader disciplinary community of 'marketing academia' within the UK. Although occupying separately governed university sites there are binding practices and shared spaces which conjoin them. Such binding practices include for example specialised disciplinary journals, conferences, academies (such as the Academy of Marketing) and examinations (for example the external examination of the viva). Each of these has systems of expertise, which are made manifest in rules of conduct and standards, editing teams and teams of peer reviewers, for example.

At various instances throughout the interviews, people (and institutionalised statements) talked of and implied the import/influence of participation within these shared spaces. Firstly in this regard publication records and conference attendance was understood to be of paramount importance, even for those at the doctoral stage. As Alan notes;

> *there is far more attention on doctoral studies about the production of conference papers…research students are expected to publish, are expected to produce work outside the PhD… I mean from the PhD usually, I mean there is much more of that now"[li]* (SG Alan: 508-512)

153

Indeed, in line with this, it was evident that (as expanded on in the RAE section) publication interests influenced not only the topics to be pursued at doctoral level, but crucially also the selection of doctoral students also. Secondly it was noted within the interviews that 'good research' should always be aware of how it 'fits' or doesn't fit with research that has gone before.   As Claire goes on (from the previous section) to note of her supervisory duties and ideas;

> *I see my role as asking them to reflect on how that fits or doesn't fit on what has gone before so that you can get a sort of continuity or discontinuities between the development of thought or the development of ideas within marketing... A good piece of research to me is something which is one which again is very clear about where it fits...or again where it doesn't fit…*(SG Claire: 446-463)

4.6.3 University Quality Assessment

As indicated above, the rules and regulations set out within the empirical field were worked up in light of the participation of the university with QAA 'suggestions' (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education). In addition to this, time within the empirical field emphasised another relevant assessment body at work, the RAE. Attention now turns to this means of assessment.

The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)

A major governmental feature[li] defining the academic landscape of the UK university system, the RAE (est. 1992) currently operates as a form of professional assessment wherein standards of research are evaluated.   Justified primarily for its role in generating 'value for money' (Fournier and Grey, 2000), and creating visibility

around government (public) expenditure, (Willmott, 2003) the main premise of the RAE is to generate 'selectivity in the allocation of research resources based on assessments of the quality of research' (HEFC[li], 1994: para 4).

Very briefly, (for more see website: www.rae.academy.uk) the RAE works as a governmental tool intended to provide an informative basis through which funding councils may then allocate (financial) reward to those institutions it deems to be conducting high quality research, and by extension the 'non-reward' of those who it considers are not.

Table 4C - Factors relating to the RAE:

1. The RAE allocates 'ratings' to individual departments based on the relative quality of their research provision, and financial reward is allocated thereafter. *'Institutions conducting the best research receive a larger proportion of the available grant so that the infrastructure for the top level of research in the UK is protected and developed'*. (http://www.hero.academy.uk/rae/About Us/ - cf Geary et al, 2004:95) In other words departments are distinguished from each other through a system of classification.

2. The common definition for research within the RAE includes the following as part of its definition; *'Research for the purpose of the RAE is to be understood as original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce and industry, as well as to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances and artefacts including design'* (HEFCE, 1995, annex a)

3. Individual academics are held accountable for their own research activity with an indication of their performances making up such ratings.

4. 'Quality' is 'qualified' by a number of individuals who go to make up specially appointed panels. These individuals represent different 'interests' and groups, including those with high standing in their research communities, as well as those from *'research commissioning and user communities within commerce, industry, government and the public sector'* (Broadhead and Howard, 1998). As cited from the 2006 RAE website, Ed Hughes RAE manager states;

   We are fortunate to have been able to appoint individuals, including users of research, who have the respect of the academic and wider research community, extensive research experience, and a good understanding of the needs of research users and commissioners of research from both the public and commercial sectors (**http://www.rae.academy.uk/news/2005/panel.htm**)

5. 'Ratings' are also affected by factors tied to the PhD. Good practice for example with regard to completion times and rates, are taken into consideration.

An all pervasive part of UK academia currently (Broadhead and Howard, 1998) reference to the RAE was found worked through interview discussions implicitly and explicitly. Here talking directly around such a situation (as one particularly emblematic source of change within his academic career) is Alan;

> *….times have changed too... the university system, and it is more bureaucratised now…I mean the RAE and teaching, quality assessment…everything has to be documented…Paper trails for everything……academics spend a heck of a lot of time, and the most senior academic of all, will spend time ensuring those processes [RAE Strategies] work, because that is how the university and department are judged, and that is where resources come from – in direct relationship to how we score in these things... And as a university as a whole these things ..4s and 5s and things really matter, and so a lot of your time and attention is on that* (SG Alan: 179 - 211)

> *as academics you have to be involved in the setting of policy, and deciding what research to do. If you are trying to get a 5 in the RAE then it is a long term thing….it is a long term view. So academics have to decide…you know, where should we be putting our research, where should we put our resources, what sort of staff should we be taking, what should our PhD's be doing* (SG Alan: 216-222)

Within these responses, Alan underlines his perception of change which has occurred around academic practice through the arrival of such a means of assessment. Also, he notes the importance placed on this governmental practice within the empirical site, as expressed through 1) an increasing amount of skilled human productivity being utilised to such ends 2) research direction being affected and 3) PhD topic development being directed through such.

4.6.4 Funding Bodies (State and Private)

Outwith the funding bodies which the RAE informs, are a number of other sources of finance within the current academic realm; state (such as the ESRC[li]) and private (including commercial and charitable). These, like the RAE, were understood to be hugely important aspects of doctoral and academic life for the informants of this study. Indeed it was evident that such pools were targeted and 'tapped' as part of the research resources of the empirical field. Elizabeth substantiates this point within part of the quote outlined earlier;

> *…so I would say that [the topic] definitely that has changed quite a lot, but...in terms of funding… it is a lot more fundable than what I was originally planning, and I think that is why it has changed. (*SD Elizabeth: 667-669)

Herein she pointed to the generation of external and individual project funding being prime motivation behind the selection of her doctoral research topic. This was reflected broadly within the stories of participants, in relation to both state and private funds.

4.7 Conclusion

Based on an understanding that a Foucauldian analysis of the subject (and power) should involve its exploration around a variety of domains, this chapter has provided insight into what is has considered some of the 'key' experiences, understandings, knowledges and practices of, and around, those doing a doctorate. Relaying the stories and memories of the informants specifically highlighted a number of key social interfaces and characterisations of the field. In terms of social interfaces, the key relationships which seemed to define the students day to day lives were those which went on between the student and the other doctoral students, supervisors, wider academic community and institutional realm. Interestingly these contexts seemed to house something of a contradictory and complex picture of what common-sense academic life was to these doctoral students. For instance, the themes which arose depicted individualism and collectivism, freedom and sacrifice, pleasure and pain. To this end the tales of experience told underlined an environment wherein the pursuit of knowledge and scholarly scrutiny was central, but where difficult decisions had to be made, different types of sacrifices made, emotions ridden and continual self-questioning endured.

The following chapter goes on to provide such an analysis through Foucault, taking these tales and knowledges and subjecting them to more critical enquiry, commentary and discussion.

^{li} Within this chapter the informants are referred to as either (SD) or (SG); each of which denote supervised or supervising respectively.

^{li} The thesis to be produced by those in the empirical field was an 80000-word piece.

^{li} Numbers provided after extracts refer to the line references in the original transcripts.

^{li} The term 'PhD Groups' replaces the official term for such organised practice within the empirical site. This is to protect the anonymity of the institution, as well as those within it. Central to this group was a requirement of students to present aspects of their research as it was ongoing not only to doctoral peers and supervisors, but often to other members of the department in question. As part of this, students faced a range of questions from those present about their research ideas and their development. (For more in-depth description of such see section 4.6.1 rules and regulations).

^{li} Reference here is only made to those PhD students, in this regard, at the time of this study.

^{li} It should be noted that within the interviews 'supervision' was mainly characterised by the experiences of the students in relation to their primary supervisors. Although the role of second supervisors was made clear at times, it did not constitute a large proportion of informant stories.

^{li} From the outset within his interview Donald presents a situation whereby his decision to pursue switching behaviour is grounded in his own personal and business interests, which were developed whilst in industry. When asked what he was studying the following discussion ensued; **SD** Donald: *I am studying switching behaviours in the b-b service community. I am trying to come up with a model of switching, which can aim to predict, switching behaviour before it occurs.* **PF: OK, so what made you want to study that? SD** Donald: *My sales directors experience. I always had staff out searching for new customers and nobody really studied the customers that left us so I was most interested into putting some of my energy into what causes people to switch. And if you can try and identify that, try to prevent switching. We all switch for price and quickness, but I was looking for something else too that can cause switching, other than price.* (SD Donald: 172-181)

^{li} Excluded for anonymity reasons.

^{li} With this in mind, most UK higher education institutions subscribe to the *Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education* (QAA), whose *'mission is to safeguard the public interest in sound standards of higher education qualifications and to inform and encourage continuous improvement in the management of the quality of higher education'* (www.qaa.academy.uk/aboutus/). This being the case, the University of the Empirical Field - like most others in the UK - subscribes to the QAA remit relating to postgraduate research programmes. And most particularly that; *'institutions will put in place effective arrangements to maintain appropriate academic standards and enhance the quality of postgraduate research programmes'* (QAA Code of Practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes – September 2004).

^{li} Indeed, in this context, Alan went on to make claims that for him, in a supervisory role, a potential problem is students to whom publication becomes of more interest than completion of the actual doctorate.

^{li} Underlining its 'state-led nature' the Research Assessment Exercise within the UK *'is sponsored by the four UK funding bodies for higher education: the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the Scottish Higher Educational Funding Council, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, the Department of Employment and Learning Northern Ireland. A team based at HEFCE manages it.* (http://www.rae.academy.uk/news/2005/panel/htm) *NB:* HEFCE denotes the Higher Education Funding Council within the United Kingdom.

^{li} Denotes the Higher Education Funding Council within the United Kingdom.

^{li} The ESRC claims independence as a funding body. However it is partially guided/funded by the state, particularly through the Office of Science and Technology (www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx: May 2006)

Chapter Five

Analysis and Discussion of Findings

5.1 Summary

Having presented the main findings of the research study in the previous chapter, it is the aim here to offer a more detailed commentary and discussion around subjectivity formation within the discipline. In ways hoping to (1) illuminate the material 'found' in the empirical site, (2) relate the findings of this study to previous marketing literatures and to (3) open marketing up to new reflexive possibility, this chapter particularly engages its findings with readings generated through Foucault's oeuvre. After an introduction in 5.2, section 5.3 goes on to consider some of the individual practices and understandings defining everyday lived experience for those involved in the doctorate. Particularly, it is suggested from the outset that understandings, and modes of being, may be culturally located. Building on this idea the chapter goes on through 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 to consider the subject in light of other relational interfaces. In this sense the doctoral community, supervision and institutional sites were considered, respectively. Each of these furthers the suggestion of the mediated nature of the doctoral subject, and furthermore a 'disciplinary' reading through which we may come to understand conduct as the effects of power. As part of these explorations, the chapter also proffers the doctoral subject to be worked up through what may be regarded as problematic power relations within this pedagogic reality. In addition it suggests that the empirical site reproduces both positive and negative experiences for those 'learning to be' within. Section 5.7 concludes the chapter.

5.2 Introduction

Through the understanding that a Foucauldian analysis of the subject and power should *'discuss the interconnection between multiple domains of government and self-formation'* (Foucault, 2000:71), the previous chapter provided insight into what it considered to be some of the 'key' experiences, understandings, activities and relationships of those doing a doctorate (as well as those of others around them). Towards new insights of our disciplinary conditions and effects, this chapter provides such analysis. Acknowledging the promise of Foucauldian-led analysis - particularly

through its specific conception of power (Kendall and Wickham, 1999; Newton, 1998) - this work particularly turns to the Foucauldian concepts technologies of power and technologies of the self. They provide the basis through which new ways of understanding the production of the marketing subject (in this case doctoral student) will be formed here. The chapter begins proper by providing an account of some of the everyday processes and practices defining the stories of those interviewed.

5.3 Individual Conducts: Cultural Initiations

> ***Government as an activity could concern the relation between the self and the self***, private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or guidance, relations within social institutions and communities and, finally, relations concerned with the exercise of political sovereignty (Gordon, 1991:2-3 – emphasis added)

This analysis begins with a return to the start of the findings (chapter four) and most particularly to an observation of predominantly individualist practice within such. Specifically, tentative problematisation is initiated here with regard to the rhetoric of these practices.

On early reading, it is noted that participation for those at doctoral level, within the empirical site, largely entails highly individualist modes of conduct, everyday. More crucially, it is suggested that these means of working and being, heavily espouse ideas of independence, a notion of an independent self and freedom within the empirical site. Personal autonomy, to this end, is suggested through the everyday engagement by those in the field, around 'self-organised' activity, self action, self monitoring, and pursuit of 'individual research' through passion and ideas of inherent 'curiosity'.

Interestingly, these ideas reflect similar and strong expressions of freedom elsewhere within the research site. To this end the understanding and belief around independence and academic freedom may be seen as attributing Brian's, *'students learn to fly solo'* (SG Brian: 430) and Claire's explicit statement that the organisation of work within this site 'respects' individual freedom. Furthermore it may be seen to underlie Claire's further expression of import around the protection of academic freedom at the level of supervision (see section 4.5.1.1.1)[li]

These ideas, and early readings, are particularly interesting in light of this study and particularly its own departure from notions of the lone scholar. Indeed they fundamentally go against the theoretic hesitation that this study has provided around the 'subject'. Although these readings of independence are perhaps easy to make, Foucault would ask us not to accept these kinds of ideas in relation to subjectivity, or the social field. Here, within this section, working through Foucault as well as alternate readings of practice, initial steps can and are taken to problematise these seemingly reproduced ideas.

To this end, the section turns to some practices which may possibly be seen as acts of the self on the self; self-monitoring, self-regulation and self-questioning (in other words those rhetorically strong in respect to readings of independence). The section makes an early and brief suggestion that in acting on themselves through such judgements, people, (via a range of examples which suggest culturally defined legitimisations of practice - including judging themselves to be on the 'right or wrong' path, or understanding themselves in light of 'certain criteria' relating to progress) may be considered as drawing on notions of legitimised practice, stemming

from a broader cultural basis. In other words, that some of the modes of reason, rationality, understanding and value judgements that people operate through, may not be seen as inherent but as 'technologies of the self'; *'functions of being'* (Hammerberg, 2004) within this empirical site.

Of course this is only one small suggestion. However it provides one early substantiation towards the consideration of the doctoral student not as independent or detached, but as constitutively made up reflexively through some of the contexts within which they operate. Furthermore as an initiation also, this section, and its hesitations (based around possible cultural readings), provides an increasingly valid basis for going forward within this study, to ask further questions of the possible constitutive relations within which we may reconsider the subject as part 'regulated' through 'self regulation'. Also, it provides an early suggestion that ideas of independence and freedom may serve to obscure emerging sites of cultural production.

5.4 'Doctoral Community'[li] and its Practices

> **Government as an activity could concern the relation between the self and** the self, private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or guidance, relations within **social institutions and communities** and, finally, relations concerned with the exercise of political sovereignty (Gordon, 1991:2-3 – emphasis added)

Understanding the experiences surrounding the doctoral process, from a Foucauldian perspective, is to acknowledge the possibility/effects of a variety of constituent practices and relationships.

> power does not reside in things, but in a network of relationships which are systematically interconnected (Burrell, 1998: 20)

Partly following questions which were raised in the previous section, this section introduces the doctoral community. Herein, it is suggested that 'the doctoral community' and its practices play a significant part in doctoral participation and experience. Indeed it may be said that despite the individualist rhetoric surrounding such practice, this collective plays a part in effecting the nature of doctoral completion and the means of that completion for the students involved.

One reading is to suggest that fellow doctorate students have a role to play in 'directing' students in terms of the sorts of knowledge they come to hold and pursue. Ingrid particularly implies that both her (1) participation among other doctoral students in the doctoral group and (2) interaction within the doctoral community, pointed her to *'the right path of things'* with regard to the development of her work specifically. On a very basic level this, itself, suggests that knowledges pursued are - contrary to the rhetorics within individualist self-organised practice - mediated between people within this site. Moreover, that this site seemingly reproduces 'shared[li]' value judgements around particular forms of knowledge.

Extending the understanding of this influence it was also suggestible that Hilary pointed to the involvement of other doctoral students in the working up of particular practices;

'And they can tell you…[in terms of how one goes about it]… the difficulties that they faced, or things that worked well and things that didn't work so well. And they tell you, look this is what didn't work out right for me, but you better watch out for this when you are getting to that stage' (SD Hilary: 68-74)

Likewise, so too did Fiona and Hilary in the next two quotes;

*in the doctoral programme here…I participated in lots of discussion about, not only particular topics, but also how they were managing processes…also stuff like peoples experiences and how people were getting on. People were in the throes of doing a PhD. When people talk of their experiences it is like; when I come to do that… you know you can learn from what they are telling you and that sort of thing. I mean a lot of them spoke about time pressures and that sort of thing…*Fiona (295 – 305)

I have witnessed some people who have had… It is not that they have been slack, or they have not worked but just circumstances have kind of bogged them down time wise and then they get to the fourth year stage and then things start to take on monstrous proportions, and so that is something that I am really, really scared of I would say say (SD Hilary: 95-100).

These discussions pointed to the role doctoral students played in teaching each other what was required on a day-to-day level in order to get the doctorate. Included within this for example were the passing of ideas relating to how to handle and manage various aspects of the process in relation to its different aspects, such as its stages and time pressures.

Foucault within Power/Knowledge (1980a) underlined within his *'methodological imperatives and precautions'* (1980a: 94) the importance of considering within an analysis of the subject, the circulation of power between disciplinary technologies. In many ways this may be thought of in much the same way as reproduction within Bourdieu's work (1977b) and in particular the reproduction of cultural capitals. As an

expression of this, it is considered that the doctoral community perhaps works to circulate particular effects of power at the level of conduct and practice. In other words that they may distribute in their stories particular ideas of what makes good and bad practice within the doctoral process and how to think, do and act successfully within it. Indeed, one suggestion around the acknowledgement of teaching and learning which went on between students may be seen to provide an early substantiation of Roses' (1990) Foucauldian-inspired assertion that;

> Thoughts feelings and actions may appear as the very fabric and constitution of the intimate self, but they are socially organized and managed in minute particulars (Rose, 1990:1)

Taking this idea forward, it is possible to contest at this point that some of those acts which constituted the 'self-organised' doctoral student within their earlier stories can be seen, through Foucault, as being different to inherently 'individual' in nature. Indeed it may be suggested that contrary to this that they may be seen as 'acts of the self on the self', which although individually operative could be considered as the internalised operation of governance. Noting shared knowledges being passed between students relating to good and bad practice, for example, it can be suggested that the doctoral community may be read as a distributive technology of some of the knowledges through which the self comes to judge themselves or monitor their practices. 'Self-monitoring' through a Foucauldian reading of these practices can be considered a shared and social notion.

Importantly, this line of argument has implications for characteristic expressions of lived experience within the doctoral site, such as that of sacrifice around personal time

and social activity. Here, it is suggested that through the shared stories and teachings of the doctoral community ideas pertaining to those of sacrifice may be considered not as individual in nature but as socially mediated. Hilary for example learns, through fear, about the nature of time pressures and the importance of being disciplined to achieve success within the field.

At this point another suggestion is forwarded with regard to the ideas of sacrifice outlined in the earlier chapter. There particularly, through students such as Ingrid, it was seen that sacrifice was a necessary part of the field and inevitable in the pursuit of her own passion. With this in mind it is suggested that the propensity for students to 'sacrifice', may on some level be linked to ideas of academic freedom which pervade the field. It may be offered for example, that to be a 'true scholar', one who is driven and committed to the higher cause of knowledge should do anything it takes to achieve the fulfilment of their calling. Certainly ideas of being 'driven' were evident in the texts, as were stories which linked sacrifice to the ultimate goal of pursuing intellectual goals. Perhaps therefore, it could be thought about that academic freedom and its ideals lead students on some level to the belief and acts which are constituted within 'sacrifice'. In other words, that notions of academic freedom can be seen as a distributive technology. If we are to take that idea forward, it may further be argued here that the doctoral community be seen as a technology through which the nature and expression of such freedom are lived, but also where its often described harsh effects are perpetuated by their shared knowledges and practices. In other words, that those students who experience them, help in their very recirculation.

5.4.1 'Empowering Involvement'

Operation among fellow doctoral students was seemingly a positive experience for those students talked to. Supporting this, was Gillian who talked about the encouragement she gained from the people around her. Ingrid too talks, explicitly and implicitly, of the '*strong community*' helping her; '*to focus*', generate self confidence, boost [her] '*morale*', and to access new sites which were understood as important in the forwarding of her career; '*I started attending more and more conferences*' (SG Ingrid: 166). For Ingrid the discussion about the doctoral community arose from part of a wider discussion in which she compared her present institution from one in which her doctoral studies had commenced. For her, she believed the doctoral community within her present department had been a crucial factor in her successful development[li]. In this regard the doctoral community would appear to be an enabling technology in Ingrid's case, conceivable as a means to personal empowerment and enjoyment within the marketing academic realm. Indeed towards this it provided her with access to forms of knowledge and personal understanding seemingly required to operate successfully at that level.

5.4.2 'Doctoral Community': A Darker Technology?

Complementing such positive interpretations of the 'doctoral community' however is the possibility for more negatively construed accounts. These are expressed primarily around two ideas here. The first, is that the 'direction' outlined above may possibly be read as reproductive of particular sets of ideas, organisational practice and cultural capitals, over others. To this end, through the passing on and accepting of advice[li],

the doctoral community may be understood as a normalising platform for knowledge and day-to-day practice. The second, *stems* from an introduction of the possibility of the doctoral community as serving a panoptic function, wherein interactions with one another effect those who participate in disciplining ways.

Expanding on the second of these, the reader is reminded of the idea of the Panoptican, and particularly its use within Foucault's earlier work, *Discipline and Punish*: *The Birth of the Prison* (1977c). Within this idea, Foucault suggests that one way of understanding the practice of effective government within contemporary society, is to utilise Bentham's instructive model of a prison as a key metaphor. Central to the design of such a prison is, at least in part, the constant availability of visibility and observation. Moreover, that its operative effects still work even in the absence of 'authority';

> Even if there is no guardian present, the power apparatus still operates perfectly (Rabinow, 1984:19 – cf Shore and Roberts, 1993:3)

With this in mind, the reader is also reminded of an extract provided for by Hilary, in the course of her discussion around involvement within the doctoral community;

> *We talk amongst ourselves. We find that somebody might be ahead of somebody else in a particular area* (SD Hilary: 596-598).

With no guardian involved in these interactions *per se* (such as a supervisor for example) it is suggested that the interactions of students within the empirical field may usefully be read as panoptic in function. To this end, they may be seen to watch,

compare, and measure themselves in line with their peers. Indeed, they use the very possibility of peers as a means to judge themselves, as well as to monitor and alter actions. Through this metaphor doctoral communities may be considered as disciplinary technologies within which students are controlled and contained to a certain degree through shared expressions of good and bad practice. In other words, the doctoral community, through such, may be seen as at least one mode through which the 'productive self' is made up in the empirical site. In one sense, this can be seen as seen as imparting and distributive of the more 'positively' experienced outcomes of the field, as demonstrated above. In other words, that some of the positive expressions within the field of study may be 'administratively' circulated in the Foucauldian sense.

Another suggestion which can be suggested about this 'panoptic' context however is its possible linkage to some of the more 'negative' experiences and feelings as they were represented through the lived experiences offered up in chapter four. With this in mind, although the talk of the doctoral community espouses a dominant rhetoric of support and collegiality[li], it is suggested that such interactions may also provide the conditions for distilling and distributing aspects of candidature, such as those related to sacrifice, as well as anxiety, worry and guilt.

First, with regard to ideas related to sacrifice it is argued that the quote above could be representative of a notion of comparison among students, even facilitative of competition between them. If that were the case, then it could feasibly be offered, as one reading, that expressions of sacrifice such as the resignation of social time and engagement in high levels of hard work may be considered as linked in other ways to

the doctoral community; this time via panoptic effect. Students, for example, when making themselves aware of 'how far ahead' someone else may be, perhaps are likely to also take the necessary steps not to be left too far behind and hence make necessary sacrifices. With this in mind, notions such as 'sacrifice' and hardship deemed necessary for gaining the reward of the doctorate may be seen as socially constituted and reproduced through a technology such as the doctoral community.

Raising ideas of emotional experiences around the doctorate is not new *outwith* marketing. Indeed, in interesting ways, both the works of Lee and Williams (1999) and Traweek (1988) point to experience in such terms - as contingent outcomes of both historical supervisory practices[li] and scientific training respectively. Adding to these contributions, this study suggests that through an acknowledgement of the community being a place where students make judgements about themselves in accordance with personal comparisons with others, and noting these judgements to be productive of the above mentioned forms of emotionality, this otherwise 'collegially' considered site may endow similar productions. Therefore, not only it is argued that the doctoral community may be a disciplinary technology to the extent that the 'productive' and empowered-self are its outcomes, but that negative experiences may be its effects too. Put another way, negatively experienced emotions may be a product of generating the 'productive self'. Interestingly, it should also be noted that an articulation of negative experiential outcomes around the doctorate is not wholly new to accounts of the pedagogic practice within marketing. Lindgreen et al. (2001), within their 'reflections on the doctoral process', note to readers that the process of the doctorate is one wherein students are likely to;

Experience a whole palette of emotions; joy and pride, but also guilt,
frustration, anger and perhaps even depression (Lindgreen et. al, 2001: 512)

On one level, this perhaps raises the significance of what is suggested here. Indeed it suggests such outcomes to be experienced on a much broader scale throughout marketing discourse. Crucially however, unlike this aforementioned work which merely seems to accept these aspects of the doctorate, the consideration of them here does so organisationally, contingently and critically. To this end, not only does this work consider these ideas with hesitation, but through insight into their cultural situation is able to provide important clues around how such outcomes may be rethought.

5.5 The Supervisory Relationship

Although only tentatively, these readings of 'the doctoral community' helped to more broadly locate the idea of the meditated nature of subjective reality within the empirical site. Beyond doctoral peer groups, it is argued that the context of interpersonal relations and governance is experienced in broader ways within the empirical field. Supervision, more particularly, is understood here to be a key constituent around the doctoral experience. The following section analyses stories of such relationships from the interview material, and suggests the supervisory relationship to be a site wherein particular ideas of practice are circulated and normalised, where student resistance is enacted, where problematic power relations are reproduced and where particular cultural capitals are formed. Further, the section raises the suggestion that notions of independence and academic freedom are

reproduced around the disciplinary technology of the supervisory relationship itself, furthering the understanding that these act as a basis through which power relations and their acknowledgement be obscured.

5.5.1 Influential Interactions

The section begins by providing examples and exploration of seemingly influential interactions, characterising the relationship.

5.5.1.1 Topic development and selection

It was clear through the interview material that that those 'supervising' provided input/guidance to students throughout their period of candidature. Sites of topic development and selection, marking and conceptual discussions, and the management of conduct, were all understood to be areas of influence. In the first instance, it is the extracts of both Donald and Elizabeth which lead to an understanding of supervisory involvement around topic development.

Firstly, Donald indicates the role his supervisor played in pointing him away from the topic he had originally chosen – loyalty. More specifically, he notes the nature of the intervention to reside particularly around his supervisor's assertion that 'loyalty' [his original choice of topic], was not the best choice of topic. As Donald relays about his topic and supervisory discussion *'It was going down loyalty and that wasn't really cool, so we will go this way, and I said absolutely...'* (SD Donald: 577-581). In Donald's presentation of the event, it can be suggested that an acceptance of supervisory reasoning was unproblematically accepted. Of course, the ease in which

this was expressed may not actually have been the case. Either way, supervisory intervention was accepted.

It is interesting at this point therefore to say that the initial construction of Donald's doctoral premise was based around ideas of the validity of the topic, and his assurance of his supervisor's reasoning around such. The acceptance of such intervention can be seen to have worked around supervisory value judgement/reasoning and not his own. Furthermore, although it cannot be suggested here which if any, other factors may have helped account for the legitimisation of supervisory thought over his own here, such an example indicates at least some feeling of desire or necessity to go along with the thoughts of the supervisor at this point, and in doing so supervisory reasoning was treated as more valid than his own.

Secondly, the experiences of Elizabeth also point to an interaction with a supervisor leading to the alteration of original plans for a doctoral topic. In this respect, it was read here that Elizabeth was understood to talk with slight unease about foregoing her original topic - which at the point of interview she still thought valid, and which she still very much wanted to pursue;

> *…I think this is where I slightly naïve to a certain extent - when I first came in that was exactly what I wanted to do, and I was quite clear with where I wanted to go with it. But…[supervisor] was quite keen for it to move along in a slightly different direction, and I think it is quite easy to look back and think well maybe I shouldn't have done that but, basically, now it is on [different topic stated]…Sometimes I sit back and think 'wait a minute...how did I get…' it is a lot more fundable than what I was originally planning, and I think that is why it has changed…you know it is difficult because you are with someone who has been in the game for so long…but at the time it is difficult because at the time, they make so much more sense than you if you know what I mean* (SD Elizabeth: 674-697).

Like Donald above, here Elizabeth attributed 'sense' to her supervisor – although in this example that notion was literally indicated. She spoke about his knowledge and experience in 'knowing' about aspects such as 'funding' as playing a central part in her justification to go with her supervisors reasoning over her own, although, again this cannot be raised without an acknowledgment that other factors may have been influential. Another possibility to note in this regard is the suggestion of a changing and developing relationship between student and supervisor here, one wherein it is possible to read supervisory reading as being more valid at the start of the doctoral process.

These early examples of supervisory practice and topic development help make the suggestion that at least on some level knowledge-production is mediated by the supervisor. Supervision is noted as acting as an intervening technology on some level, with the supervisor, or at least the 'thoughts and actions' of the supervisor, carrying legitimacy for these students on some level. Although the attribution of such legitimacy on the part of the students here is not able to be fully articulated (i.e where some of the technologies may be located which help render such legitimacy) an acknowledgment of such helps here to suggest that there is a political means through which we may come to understand knowledge production in this doctoral site - political means which do not necessarily offer fairness or impartiality around the nature of research direction. Interestingly also, such examples help to suggest that there may be a number of factors which play a part in providing the context for supervisory rationales around certain decisions, as exemplified by the championing of the import of funding here for example, and perhaps even a sense of fashionability around some disciplinary topics of enquiry.

Finally, it is argued that both these accounts also lend themselves to further attributing readings of 'academic freedom' as being operative in the site. To this end, in the case of Donald, a disparity existed between the reality that his supervisor had chosen his topic and his recounting of a story which had earlier revealed that his interest had stemmed directly from an interest developed earlier within his business experience[li]. Likewise Elizabeth showed considerable unease about having been led with regard to her topic stating '*I can look back and think maybe I shouldn't have done that*'. Both arguably reveal a desire to remain independent, or at least the impression of independence. Put another way, both perhaps reveal something about a need within the site to demonstrate an ownership of ideas which should perhaps not be compromised. With this in mind perhaps they also raise a point, not only about ideas of independence which may be operating through people's 'sense of self' within the process of the doctorate but that these perhaps exist uneasily within other aspects of the process of becoming an academic. Elizabeth in her extract points to the naivety which she believes she demonstrated when coming into the discipline founded on a belief that she could study what she wanted – a naivety which she could latterly and learnedly account for. Having noted this learning process to include an acknowledgement of the importance of aspects such as funding for example in the process of research, perhaps it can be suggested that the field requires its participants to move beyond 'independence' in action to some extent at the same time as idealising it and its sense of importance?

5.5.1.2 Judgement and Conceptual Discussions.

Judgement and conceptual discussions may also be understood as sites of influence and mediation in the supervisory relationship.

Within her paper; *'Classrooms as Learning Environments'*, Hammerberg (2004) explicitly outlines the training of 'self-conduct' within an elementary environment. Particularly describing an arena espousing the need for 'self-managed' children who are able to work unattended whilst the teacher is otherwise engaged, she notes teachers to be engaged in year-round demonstrations which show youngsters *'how to be and think'* (365) like a 'self-managing' learner. Demonstrating how to use the materials and particular areas of the classroom for example, Hammerberg (2004) points out teachers as engaging in the repetition of particularised routines; such as getting and using books or moving from one classroom location to another. It is argued here, that although set within a different educational setting, one possible means of considering supervisory practices, such as marking, is to read them in similar terms – i.e. as demonstrations of conduct.

Marking when discussed depicted a seemingly iterative process, wherein work was moulded and developed via the ongoing and increasingly tailored comments of supervisors. In line with Hammerberg (2004) therefore it can be suggested that such a practice can be considered demonstrations of sorts, wherein supervisors (via their value judgements) provide illustrations of appropriate self-conduct with regard to academic, or in this case, writing 'skills'.

As implied elsewhere within the interviews such demonstrations may be seen to contain guidance on content, ordering and style. Regarding conceptual discussions, attention is drawn again to Claire, this time to her practice of engaging in the creation of pictorial representations of research in supervisory meetings.

> *I try to have …these white board sessions with them, or I book a room somewhere and we just sit and talk about ideas, and we sit and we draw patterns and circles, and we do much more of that… talking about the ideas of something and we see where it goes from there.* (SG Claire: 495-498)

Having noted that her intention was to generate ideas and, particularly to help in the ordering of ideas this can additionally be considered a demonstrative practice, in the sense that the supervisor displays means through which to 'do research' to the student. Through her example, Claire can be seen to demonstrate verbally and visibly the ways in which material may be ordered; why questions may/should be asked of the material (in the process of research), and how ideas can be made to fit to one another.

Interestingly, in a slightly different way to those examples above, Gillian points to the potentially influential and meditative nature of site of the supervisory meeting, this time through what may be considered the non-directed actions of both her first and second supervisors. Asked about how her supervisory meetings worked, she pointed to an arrangement which saw her meet with both supervisors;

> *at least once a month we would meet all together…the meetings where we were both together worked better - you could sort of watch the discussion between them* (SD Gillian: 545-548)

Interestingly here, she points to a non directed supervisory demonstration, and in particular alludes to her learning aspects of research and argumentation from 'watching the discussion between them'. This provides the basis for two arguments here. The first is that such processes can be considered as sites wherein particular ideas and practices around 'appropriate' conduct are reproduced, and hence much like the doctoral community can be seen as technologies through which certain ways of being are worked up. The second is to articulate that many of the practices outlined within chapter four may be inextricably linked to the processes of supervision and the demonstration of how particular practices should and can be done therein. Within the context of the classroom as outlined earlier, Hammerberg (2004) states;

> The art of living and being in the learning environment is exercised daily and is a work of the self of the self on the self, but it is also the internalized transformation of teaching into self-action (Hammerberg, 2004:365)

To this end, it is suggested that personal and 'individually' conceived acts such as writing and research skills, may be seen to incorporate particular rules of conduct expressed/demonstrated/directed through supervision. Beyond considering them as inherent and neutral therefore these acts can be considered as Foucauldian acts of 'the self on the self' (Foucault, 1988a) wherein particular modes of operation and government are brought into being through the internalized actions of the doctoral students at the level of their everyday practices.

5.5.1.3 The 'Management' of Conduct

Finally, the stories of informants pointed to a wider directive experience. More particularly they pointed to the organisation and management of students' time and activities through supervision. These, too, point to a continuation of internalization and *'transformation of teaching into self-action'* (Hammerberg, 2004:365). Claire and Alan for example, as supervisors, pointed to their involvement and control around aspects such as the allocation of time for reading, and encouragement of writing, conference attendance and publishing at particular instances throughout students' candidature;

> *the other thing that I do is that I make them write…I make them write… you see after that first 4 month period where …they are going to be left alone I say right I want regular writing, because I need to check up on their writing skills if you like… because you can have students who are very good at articulating abstract concepts…they can even draw lots of these circles saying that this is an issue, and demonstrate it with an arrow and saying how that links to that. And then you ask them to write a paragraph on that and it is gobble-de-goop. At the end of the day they have to be able to express themselves in the written medium because that is what will be examined.… So those are things that have become much more.., I don't want to say controlling, I hope I am not controlling, but I make them do things to time…*(SG Claire: 512-522)

> *'I had a student in the past who was doing loads of papers, but doing none of the actual PhD. So that is another one to watch. You [the PhD students] can get sort of hooked on doing conference papers'* (SG Alan: 512-514)

Through 'managing' certain aspects of self practice; for instance, practices which may be seen to lead to the development of the writer self, the researcher self, and the publisher self, the supervisor may be seen to mediate areas which may easily be read through the rhetoric of individualism. Indeed, these interventions would suggest there

to be a circulation of power through the supervisory technology, whereby supervisors play a part in governing practice to an extent, and providing the basis through which some understandings of good and bad practice are reproduced.

Summary

As inferred, these three aspects of the research interviews provided the basis for readings and insights around 'sites' of supervisory influence. To begin with, they help provide the means through which conducts and practices, which may be understood as individual, may be considered problematic. To this end, although the student and supervisor evidently did not see each other all that often, and understandings of 'self-organisation' pervaded accounts of practice, supervisors evidently mediated some aspects of practice which were earlier expressed as making up the routines of the students' everyday. The implication of this 'mediation' around 'thinking and doing' (Foucault, 1988a) would appear significant in light of this study. Based, after all, on initial hesitation around ideas of the lone or detached scholar, such readings serve in some way to justify initial trepidations around dominant perspectives held on the subject and agency expressed earlier. To this end, this section tentatively suggests that the 'student gaze' (as exemplified by the forms of knowledge and expertise being developed by and defining some of these students here) be the result of relational practice. It is suggested here through the examples above, that supervisors direct students where to look, and how things should look, for example, towards the successful creation of a doctoral thesis. With this in mind such a marketing 'gaze' may also be seen as a site of the reproduction of particular forms of knowledge and one which is potentially political.

Before going on to add to these understandings, it may also be raised that notions of individualism and self-organisation defining students' accounts may be productive in the sense that they serve to obscure the practices and influences suggested here. It is suggested, that they may 'write-out' some of these relational contexts of student production. Furthermore, in light of the above, it may also be suggested that the organisational practice of 'becoming independent' (which may be seen as brought into being through the technology of supervision itself and its corresponding dependence and nurturance), may obscure the existence of some of these 'internalisations of teaching' once the student has passed and the process of supervision is halted. The rhetoric of independence may not only be seen as further reproduced within this site therefore, but to be centrally productive.

5.5.2 Supervision and Power

> Foucault's works have argued for an appreciation of how power is affected, and affects us, through our subjectivities (Wray-Bliss, 2003:308)

Towards the engendering of particular effects at supervisory level (including the internalisation of teachings of the supervisor and reproduction of certain forms of knowledge) there are suggested to be a number of technologies at play. These provide a partial picture and understanding of these power effects as dispersed across a network.

> For Foucault, power does not reside in things, but in a network of relationships which are systematically interconnected (Burrell, 1998: 20)

5.5.2.1 The Non-Docile Subject: Co-constituting Power Effects

Given the authority distributed to the supervisor throughout the process of supervision it may be easy to ascribe readings of domination to these extracts. In other words, the student as dominated, in terms of direction or gaze, in a unilateral way by the supervisor. It should be remembered, however, that Foucault did not intend his notion of power to be understood as residing within a particular person;

> To ask how power is constituted is, for Foucault, a way of moving beyond the naïve view that power is a capacity or possession of a given social agent (Crossley, 1996:135)

> power is not seen as possessed by particular individuals… but dispersed as a web throughout society and enacted through a myriad of everyday practices (Chapman, 1997: 294)

On the contrary he considered power and its analysis to be located everywhere; *'affected and affecting us through our subjectivities'* (Wray-Bliss, 2003:308). As Foucault put it;

> In thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am thinking rather of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives (Foucault: 1988b:39)

A reading of domination, therefore, would not only be to misrepresent Foucault in his later works, but (again borrowing from Wray-Bliss, 2003) to potentially represent the supervised as victimised (and passive), *'underestimate the insidious nature of power*

relations' in research processes (308), as well as *'ascribe intentionality' (*ibid.) on the part of the supervisors.

Considering a partial understanding of the means through which the power effects of the supervisory relationship are worked up within this site is to consider how the effects of power are distributed, relationally, by the informants within supervision. It is with this in mind that an active and co-constitutive picture is painted of the 'direction of gaze' in the empirical site. Casting back to the example provided above, it is suggested that the power evidently worked up within such supervisory sites (i.e. the decision to pursue particularised research), may be the co-constituted product of relations between the two parties. Consider the last of the extracts wherein Elizabeth justifies supervisory intervention;

> **SD Elizabeth:** *Yeah, because basically my dissertation was on [topic stated[li]] …whereas - and I think this is where I slightly naïve to a certain extent - when I first came in that was exactly what I wanted to do, and I was quite clear with where I wanted to go with it. But [supervisor] was quite keen for it to move along in a slightly different direction, and I think it is quite easy to look back and think well maybe I shouldn't have done that but, basically, now it is on [different topic stated]…Sometimes I sit back and think 'wait a minute...how did I get...' although I... you can see the link... it is a massive difference in terms of what I was actually researching... So I would say that [the topic] definitely that has changed quite a lot, but I would not say necessarily that that is for the worst, you know I think you know in terms of funding... it is a lot more fundable than what I was originally planning, and I think that is why it has changed.*
> *…you know it is difficult because you are with someone who has been in the game for so long, they are a professor and you are this little researcher who has one idea but at the time it is difficult because at the time, they make so much more sense than you if you know what I mean.*
> **PF**: Now do you still think it is…a valid research topic?
> **SD Elizabeth:** *Yeah definitely, I do think it is*…(SD Elizabeth: 674-697)

Rather than passive in the research process, Elizabeth may be read as co-constituting this power relationship. Although the acceptance of such supervisory judgement was, in part, justified through her supervisors argument that the pursuit of such a topic would be better placed to generate funding, it can also be attributed to her allocation of validation around the ideas of the professorial subject position; *'they make so much more sense than you'*. Not being coerced into making decisions *per se,* justification for the pursuit of topic may be seen as coming through her attribution of 'sense' to the supervisor.

Within his work in Discipline and Punish (1977c) Foucault presents his *'principle of enclosure'*. As part of this - and therefore as part of the means through which he understands society to function - he introduces notions of rank and hierarchy. These refer to everyone being;

> distributed across a network of relations, but also circulated – moved up or down or across in the network. Ranks remain permanent but the individuals change according to their most recent assigned rank. What is important is the place the individual occupies in the ranking (Hopper and MacIntosh, 1998:130).

Towards an achievement of the 'productive machinery' which Foucault attributes to the time-space locations of his earlier theorisation, it is thought that, in this case, 'sense', and the power effects it induced, were generated through certain mechanisms. These include, experience, i.e. the picture of the person *'who has been in the game for so long'*, and hierarchy and rank; *'they are a professor and you are a little researcher'*. In terms of the latter, it can also be noted that the co-constitution of power effects links to the de-legitimisation of ideas from someone of her *own* subject

position i.e. the novice; *'this little researcher who has one idea'*. Elizabeth therefore, through ideas of rank, particularly appears to play a significant part in co-constituting her own subjugation. Indeed from this, it is suggested that the gaze of those involved in the doctoral process within this site may, at least in some instances, be demonstrated as local, situated, relational and political; constituted through dynamic relationships.

Problematic power relations

As well as demonstrating the co-constitution of power effects, this example may also be considered as pointing to the idea of problematic power relations defining practice at supervisory level. Noting Elizabeth's subjugation, and an understanding that this entailed the reproduction of particular research, one argument would be to suggest that our organisation and 'sense-making' around disciplinary technologies leads to the validation of particular cultural capitals over others. In this case to the cultural capitals held and accepted as valid by those of superior 'rank'. Substantiations of this idea go further. Indeed, attention may point to suggest dismissive and subjugating action of supervisors through similar technologies. A pertinent example of this comes through recourse to the process of interviewing within this research. Herein the author notes that one of the senior ranked informants talked to in this study – although no quote is available – was considered to have continually attempted to guide the questions asked, and inform the nature of research. This was particularly interesting, particularly as it provides an example of what may be read as an attempt to assert authority on the part of the informant of senior position and furthermore in doing so may be seen as attempting to 1) dismiss the validity of the authors value judgements 2) position the researcher as novice, and 3) subjugate.

Together, these readings perhaps lead to a slightly worrying picture. In his critical work around the research interview process as 'research site' Wray-Bliss (2003) made the suggestion that within Critical Management Studies (CMS) academic alienation was a possible effect of power relations being reproduced at the level of typically held subject positions within that field. By academic alienation, he alluded to a situation wherein, potentially, CMS researchers would lose out in terms of their (and disciplinary) knowledge and understanding, through readings of 'oppression' imposed on organisational workers;

> An effect of the subjectification as CMS researchers is the constitution of an alienating academic superiority, alienating because we come to be so sure of our knowledge that we do not seek to have our understandings challenged or broadened through actual engagement with the researched. By so constituting ourselves we will miss out on the possibility of exploring what an engaged critical/political academic practice might be (Wray-Bliss, 2003:321)

To this end, he acknowledges that academics in CMS, through their sites of research, play a part in creating and stunting their own limits. With respect to the co-constitution of power effects outlined above, a similar argument may be imported to this doctoral domain. On the first level therefore, through a suggestion of subjugation around the position of novice specifically, it is suggested that both students and supervisors alike, may be playing a part in writing-out some of the ways in which supervision may possibly facilitate new understandings; in other words, to play a part in the normalisation of outcomes around doctoral practice. In particular, supervisors (in ways analogous to the CMS researcher in the work of Wray-Bliss) may be understood to be 'culturally impoverished' (Habermas, 1987), through what may otherwise be an emancipatory relationship with those new to the discipline. Additionally, however, these examples may also lead to readings of the

disempowered student. They, who through these technologies, are unable to generate self-legitimacy or pursue particular ideas.

With recourse to completely different practice and emotional outcomes, this idea supports the view of Lee and Williams (1999) that the supervisory relationship can be one wherein problematic power relations are imbued. However, it is the first time that such a notion has been raised specifically in the context of the marketing discipline. In short therefore these insights offers up a troubled view of the supervisory relationship not evoked within marketing before.

5.5.2.2 Supervisory Effects and the Assessment

Engendering particular effects at supervisory level (including the internalisation of teachings and reproduction of certain forms of knowledge), it can be argued that there are a number of other enabling technologies. Bringing this possibility into being are two examples to be discussed here. These extend the partial picture of power effects, not being held or possessed by the supervisor, but rather as being dispersed across a network. Both surround assessment[li] and in particular the assessment of the student by the supervisor, and that of the supervisor themselves.

With regards to the assessment of students via the supervisor as noted in table 4A (Chapter Four), supervisors are granted both the authority to make particular suggestions regarding what practices/content should be altered with respect to the thesis, in the event that they [the supervisor] deem progress to be unsatisfactory. Moreover they are granted the ability to suggest the termination of a student's

candidature if the student fails to meet supervisory standards. These are likely, it is suggested, to constitute supervision as effective and 'productive' in the sense of distributing particular forms of power.

Firstly, it is argued the technology of 'supervisor as assessor' may serve to distribute and constitute legitimacy and therefore ideas such as 'sense' to supervisory knowledge – such as that '*sense*' which was understood to be attributed to supervisors within some of the extracts provided above (Donald and Elizabeth as examples). Although of course it is in no way sensible to attribute the notion of 'supervisor as assessor' to be entirely constituent of an idea such as 'sense', it is at least on one level suggested that such an attribution and positioning of responsibility and hierarchical control to supervisors, through the assessment, may play a part in distributing a 'legitimacy' of supervisor thought – however such 'legitimacy' may be understood or perceived by other actors. The 'supervisor as assessor' therefore may arguably therefore be considered as a technology through which validation was attributed to particular ideas within the selection of a topic.

Secondly it is suggested that the positions afforded to supervisors in terms of assessment may arguably play a significant role in enabling effects such as the student internalisation of the supervisor gaze – a normalising outcome which has been suggested above. Gillian goes on '*From the beginning until that viva you are driven by your supervisor's input saying yes this is fine that is fine*' (SD Gillian: 702). Here although she talks not of the punative role of the supervisor as such, the connection between assessment and supervisor is one which is arguably operating in ways which help support the proposition. Indeed with the supervisor as assessor in mind a

possible line of argument is to re-introduce Foucault's panoptic gaze. Working

through an interpretation of Foucault's that the efficiency of *'governance lies not with*

direct punishment but with the internalisation of the ever present

panoptic/disciplinary gaze' (Shore and Roberts, 1993[li]) it is proffered that the

presence of the supervisor alone, or at least the student's knowledge/appreciation of

such a gaze (along with its relative authority), may be 'directive' or indeed

normalising in its effects. As just one reading, it may be attributable to student

participation around supervisory direction and normalising outcomes that were

suggested above.

Supporting this idea of the panoptic gaze is an extract from Elizabeth below;

> *…I worry that he thinks that I don't work hard enough on my PhD. And I*
> *worry sometimes that I think he thinks that I am not up to it sometimes. I don't*
> *know why I think that, but I do…constantly feel that I want to prove myself to*
> *him, if you know what I mean. Like I want him to read this and think, that is*
> *really good rather than this is a shoddy 2-minute job… I worry that he*
> *doesn't think that I work as hard as maybe other PhD students* (SD Elizabeth:
> 731-737)

Earlier, in chapter four this extract pointed to what was considered the importance of

self-impression within Elizabeth's account. It also pointed to the importance which

she placed on providing a good impression to her supervisor. Although of course

there may be other analytic explanations available which would account for her desire

to 'constantly prove herself' to her supervisor, it is suggested here, not only that her

supervisors judgement plays a continual part a monitoring of herself in key ways

(including how hard she works) but that the attribution around the perceived

importance of such judgement may relate to the afforded supervisory position as

'assessor'. This point of the supervisor as assessor being 'productive', may be particularly supported in light of her seeming perception that supervisors evaluate all students / 'other doctoral students' – and in some respect compare those students to her, as well as her concern around particularly assessed criteria of the field such as that of the 'quality' of research work that she produces (see also section 5.6.1.2). On the basis of this argument therefore it may be further postulated that 'supervisor as assessor' may be a circulative technology not only which reproduces emotional outcomes such as that of anxiety, and self doubt (particularly in light of the supervisor ability to terminate the student candidature) but of the ways and means through which students' monitor, evaluate and work on themselves and their own doctoral work practices in light of such a gaze. With the latter part in mind, given that 'hard work' was one of the central categories of 'impression' which pervaded the account above, it is possible also to attribute the distribution of earlier key notions such as sacrifice and guilt to the 'supervisor as assessor' technology. Hard work, after all, was something which was central to the sacrifices which were made by students and likewise in coming to feel guilty or not around times when they felt that they may not have done enough work. To this end therefore, the supervisor as assessor, beyond anxiety as expressed within the quote above, may be considered as a distributive technology which circulates particular 'ways of being' (Foucault, 1988a) within the doctoral programme. Actions of sacrifice for example may be considered as worked up through the notion of surveillance and the internalization of the idea of the watching supervisor – an idea which may further dislodge any idea of these 'acts of the self' being independent in the sense of not being socially mediated.

It should also be noted here that earlier the idea of sacrifice through hard work was also linked tentatively to the panoptic possibility of the doctoral community, particularly through a notion of comparison which seemed to reside there. Indeed it was suggested that the operation of sacrifice, with its incarnation through hard work could perhaps be attributed to a competitive environment. Interestingly, in ways which perhaps support that line of argument here Elizabeth's quote strongly suggests that part of her impression making to her supervisor comes in acknowledgement of how he may compare 'how hard she works' to other students. Interestingly therefore this presents the further possibility therefore that ironically the, at times 'supportive' community of the doctoral students, also works as a means of distributing the effects of sacrifice which were disliked among them; factors such as giving up social time and 'the best years of their lives'.

The supervised supervisor

Introduced within Discipline and Punish (Foucault, 1977c) as part of Foucault's oeuvre, was his understanding that no one escaped the operation of power. It worked through everybody (1977c). In line with his metaphor of the panoptican, this idea was demonstrated through his assertion that all members of the institution were on some level watched, and therefore in their own ways could not escape discipline in some respect.

> In this central tower, the director may spy on all the employees that he has under his orders: nurses, doctors, foremen, teachers, warders; he will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose on them the methods he thinks best; and it will even be possible to observe the director himself (Foucault, 1977c:204) although surveillance rests on individuals, its functioning is that of a network…supervisors, perpetually supervised [that function] like a piece of machinery (Foucault, 1977c: 176-177).

From such, it is critical that the supervisor within the supervisory relationship is not considered as somehow existing outwith relations of power, and that their actions are not seen as distinct from the organisational network. To do so would be to consider supervisory influences and effects as potentially free from their own contexts of production. Eluding to a site wherein the supervisor is watched, and wherein the effects of power (as located in their knowledge) may be considered as distributed, are the assessments of supervisors. Mechanisms such as student assessment sheets and departmental record keeping are an indication that supervisors (not students) are being '*spied'* on (1977c).

> By inducing a state of conscious and permanent visibility the panoptican transforms the inmate into the instrument of his own subjugation and thereby guarantees the automatic functioning of power (Shore and Roberts, 1993: 5)

These may be read as 'panoptic' to the extent that they provide the calculative basis through which to judge, reward and punish supervisors on performance and through such to play a normalising and guiding role on supervisory conduct. Towards the inevitable rendering of a 'good performance' within these 'calculative' scales, whereby they will be judged on pass rates and productivity supervisory action, it is here argued that supervisory action may be further generative of power.

Although there were no explicit examples from the texts whereby supervisors' inferred pressure felt themselves with regard to these practices, there was reference to the pressure felt to fulfil certain criteria and an understanding that in fulfilling this criteria, they met what was required to meet successful ends. In this way, supervisors talked in clear ways of needing to '*get them through'*, and in the context of shaping

their aspects of student 'doing' (in this case writing), *'that is what they are going to be judged on'*.

On one level this suggests the mediated nature of supervisory conduct (and hence the broader 'management' of student conduct through this technology) but also, significantly, perhaps may help to account for the nature of intervention and 'control' which were expressed earlier. With this in mind it is suggested that any action relating to *'needing to get them'* through may arguably lessen the possibility for students to foster less rigidly controlled ways of being, doing and acting (Foucault, 1988a). With this in mind, the supervision of the supervisor may be seen as productive of some of the arguably normalising outcomes outlined earlier.

5.5.2.3 Resisting Power Effects

So far discussion has centred around the supervisory relationship as one which leads to reductionism in the types of knowledges produced – wherein the power relation has led to normalisation and possible subjugation. Based on interview material it is also critical to note alternative readings of the relationship. To this end (and extending the readings of the data through the notion of the non-passive marketing 'subject'), it is suggested that resistant practice on some level defined supervisory relationships. A good example of this again comes with recourse to the talks which were had with Elizabeth;

I would say that I have become more confident in meetings with [supervisor] because I think that at the start I was like I don't know if this is right, and although it was my PhD I don't think I had that much ownership over it... Now, I am a lot more like; 'right ok... I know what I am doing, this is what I am doing, I know the route that I want to go down now ...and this is what I have got'. So I would say that I can challenge him... I can stand up to the research. I would say that that is definitely something that has changed, because at the start I was definitely something that I was like; 'well... I don't know...' (SD Elizabeth: 700-703)

Describing her relationship with her supervisor, Elizabeth suggests its changing and developing nature across the course of her candidature. Indeed to this end she talks latterly about becoming more 'confident in meetings with him'; standing up to her supervisor, not accepting and challenging what was said or suggested to her under certain situations. With this in mind it can be argued that particular forms of knowledge helped in altering the operation of power. Elsewhere Alan describes how, as a student in the supervisory relationship, he got '*uppity after a while*' (SG Alan: 114). Opposing the sole validity of earlier readings of the relationship therefore, it is clear that resistant practice does on some level define what goes on. Students at least in some respects, found ways to oppose normalising practices particularly the acceptance of supervisory value judgements.

On one level, this provides an alternate spin to the reference to academic alienation, as suggested to be reproduced through technologies within the supervisory site (see above). Perhaps reflecting this positive spin further, Alan, through revealing evidence of a more balanced supervisory relationship, implies that the relationship is one which fosters and facilitates new means of understanding, in the case of both parties. Alan responded as such;

PF: *Do you get new understandings through your PhD students, are your ideas challenged?*
SG*: Alan: yeah definitely…they bring me things [ideas]* (SG Alan: 277-278)

On another positive level it moves beyond readings of student disempowerment and suggests the doctorate to be productive of happiness and empowerment, through supervision.

A limited freedom

Despite this reading of resistance within the supervisory relationship however, caution ought to be applied here around any idea of student activity being *free* – a caution which stems through an application of Foucault's thoughts in deriving such readings in this case. As outlined earlier within the literature review Foucault, with his later offerings worked through the proposition that any ease through which agency or indeed resistance may be imagined at the level of self-transformation should be at the very least cautionary. For, as earlier outlined, in the spirit of Foucault's earlier work *'technologies of the self' / 'matrices of reason'* are in no way inherent or freely available. They are learnt *'functions of being'* (Hammerberg, 2004:361) and as such they are situated. As such, in applying a Foucauldian reading here, wherein strides are evidently made in the evasion of 'oppressive' forces, any idea of 'independence' should be hesitant. The examples here point to a change in student action, and that a central part of such change is formed around having or gaining, particular forms of knowledge. Understanding, as will be made apparent in the sections to follow, that student knowledge must regularly be tested and worked up around particular criteria, it is argued that this means of achieving independence (taking ownership), changing and hence altering operations of power is arguably regulated. Indeed, this is perhaps

the first step towards arguing that successful student practice seems not only about achieving independence, but that the achievement of independence is something, ironically that is learned (technologies of the self).

5.5.3 A Summary

Overall, having considered supervision, this section has come to 1) note various effects and supervisory influences 2) situate the effectiveness of those influences among various technologies and 3) underline the co-constituted nature of subjectivity formation within this relationship. Having done so, crucially, it has not only rendered the idea of the independent scholar as somewhat limited but also suggested that a number of various outcomes were the result of this constitutive site. In this regard, as well as the suggested reproduction of particular forms of knowledge (Bourdieu, 1977b) problematic power relations were also noted via student disempowerment. Furthermore, it was suggested that, through facilitating, organisationally, a number of practices leading to notions of independence, 'supervision' leads to the veiling of its own various power effects.

5.6 Institutional bodies.

> **Government as an activity could concern the relation between the self and**
> the self, private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or
> guidance, **relations within social institutions and communities** and, finally,
> relations concerned with the exercise of political sovereignty (Gordon, 1991:2-
> 3 – emphasis added)

So far, this analysis has presented the idea that the self, other doctoral students and supervisory relations may be read as providing a layer of (panoptic and disciplinary) governance around doctoral practice, in the empirical field. In other words, it has presented the understanding that these 'technologies' play a conditional part in effecting marketing reality and subjectivity formation therein. Acknowledging fully the accounts of informants *and* Gordon's assertion that Foucault's notion of government (and hence its analysis) may reasonably; '*concern the relation between the self and…relations within social institutions and communities*' (Gordon, 1991:2-3 – *emphasis added*), it is suggested that forms of governance in this site reach further. With the help of supportive material[li] also, it is considered not sufficient to think of doctoral acts and experiences as constituted solely at the individual or inter-personal levels, but in light of these 'social institutions'.

Considering the subject in relation to institutions is, of course, not something new. As outlined already in the literature a number of works taking a Foucauldian view have come to offer insights into the subject and its relation to practice at this level. Examples include those concerned with education (Shore and Roberts, 1993; Hammerberg, 2004) marketing (Hodgson, 2002), and the organisation (Anderson-Gough, 1998; Grey, 1997). Here, this broadened view of subject constitution within

the doctoral site is worked up around a discussion of three aspects of the discourse more particularly: (1) internal guidelines, (2) wider disciplinary community and (3) contexts of constitutive funding and assessment. The first of these sections, like those before, keeps the analysis of formation within the realm of the university and/or department of the empirical site.

5.6.1 Internal Guidelines: Rules and Regulations of the Empirical Site

Bevir's (1999) reference to Foucault underlines that 'local' programmes of governance[li] are analytically pertinent in that they can act to *'inform individual behaviour'* and provide grids through which *'the perception and evaluation of things'* are formed (Bevir, 1999:352). Here, such locality is understood as applicable in relation to the internal rules and regulations of the empirical site. Having already introduced the constitutive nature of guidelines briefly, in relation to supervision, here such material is analysed in more detail. The reader should note that, in respect to both aspects to be discussed here; 'recruitment and selection' and 'assessment', paraphrasing is practised, in order to protect the identity of the empirical site[li].

5.6.1.1 Recruitment and Selection

With regard to recruitment and selection, two aspects are highlighted as being of particular interest in relation to 'formation'. The first is the rule that that new work should reasonably conjoin with research strategies in the department, and the second, is that there should be adequate expertise and facilities in place within the department, in order to 'support' the student's pursuit of a topic. Both of these, it is argued, serve

to provide the basis through which subjective reality may be mediated and, more particularly, the conditions for specific forms of 'knowledgeablility'/expertise within the site.

A reading of 'normalisation' is proffered in relation to the first, and particularly with recourse to extracts such as that of Fiona's from section 4.6.1.1 wherein the suggestion was made that part of her recruitment related to generating the required 'balance' within the department in question. Indeed although in no way stating that this sort of rationale was all-pervasive in reaching a decision to bring Fiona to the department it arguably does suggest a reality beyond and contradictory of the rhetoric of 'freedom' espoused within departmental web-based recruitment material (a partial suggestion that students may choose to study any topic). Although as a policy such may be 'productive' and enabling, in the sense of developing departmental strength around particularly selected areas of research and teaching, it may equally be considered stunting with respect to the scope for forms of expertise and cross-fertilisation of ideas occurring and developing at the empirical site. Although of course it is *only* suggestion, it is worth offering up that this sort of policy may have been a constitutive factor in decisions taken within doctoral encounters such as that where topic development was in process.

In relation to the second, much the same argument may be made. Here, despite its moral 'roots' in issues of 'welfare' and 'student support' such an act entails the requirement and availability of supervision around a particular topic and hence a matching of new expertise around those already established. To this end, although the rhetoric supporting both of these guidelines espouses student support and welfare,

the outcomes of such may be suggested to limit the means of their future training/disciplinary possibility in very particular ways.

Crucially, it should also be noted that as a rule set out within this university, the precedent for such 'supportive' action is provided for within the more broad institutional guidelines of the QAA[li]. These guidelines, therefore, and an increasingly accountable academic culture which they may arguably be seen to represent (Shore and Roberts, 1993), must be considered as constituent in any such (un)intended consequences.

5.6.1.2 Assessment

Alongside recruitment and selection, specific attention here also falls on those regulations concerned with assessment; and to this end those governing 'interim forms of assessment', including interim reports and thesis presentations. Specifically, it is suggested that they, and the outcomes they induce, may usefully be considered as modes of disciplinary operation; effectual, distilling and distributing – particularly in light of the evident influence they have on shaping student thinking throughout the doctorate as exemplified by Gillian;

> *The pressure is whether it's good enough for you to then get that doctorate. From the beginning until that viva you are driven by your supervisor's input saying yes this is fine that is fine. …you are not just doing it for the sake of the research you are doing it for a degree…* SD Gillian: 701-704)

Towards this conception aspects from two concepts making up Foucault's notion of disciplinary functionality within modern society, are utilised towards a reading

(1977c) of these: his principles of the efficient body and disciplinary power. It is particularly to the latter of these that this section firstly turns, and perhaps unsurprisingly, to Foucault's notion of the examination;

> The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish [or treat]. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. This is why in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth. At the heart of the procedures of discipline, it manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected. The superimposition of the power relations and knowledge relations assumes in the examination all its visible brilliance (Foucault, 1977c: 184-185)

For Foucault, the examination was one of the most effective means of control and disciplining in Western society (1977c). It is argued that both of the main aspects of assessment focused on here (interim reports and thesis presentations) may be considered in the same way[li]. When considered as technologies, both are understood to work through key aspects incorporated within the examination, and by extension they may be seen to objectify, individualize and normalize people within the doctoral pedagogy.

Objectification may be considered as a key concept through which Foucault outlines power to operate on individuals (Townley, 1998). By becoming an object of knowledge in a particular way; *'that is…becom[ing] known objectively',* such operation works through individuals being either *'managed in a particular way'* or being *'presented an image of themselves, an identity, which then becomes the basis of their self-knowledge'* (Townley, 1998:199). Objectification is centrally relevant to the

examination and, as such, to the context of assessment within the empirical site. As Townley (1998) eludes in support of this, it relates to the measurement, categorisation and judgement of the individual;

> Essentially a system of marking and classification, the simple device of questions and answers provides the basis for judgement and measurement. It allows individuals to be classified and managed, placed in a particular sequence, a hierarchy indicating quality or quantity… It locates individuals and their respective positions in populations and enables the calculation of 'gaps' between individuals. By referring individual actions to the population it also allows 'norms' to be established. The worker becomes enmeshed in a series of calculative norms and standards. The examination enables individuals to become compartmentalised, measured, reported, inscribed and calculated for the purpose of administrative decision making. (Townley, 1998:200)

Students within the empirical site may be understood as compared and classified, through assessments, on the basis of 'pre-determined' criteria. Those *'pre-determined desirable features'* (Hopper and MacIntosh, 1998:138) include[li] (in the case of both interim reports, and thesis presentations) set standards relating to both 'disciplinary' skills, material and ability, in the areas of both research and communication. These evidently form the criteria and requirement within this site through which successfully becoming a marketing scholar is based, and around which normalisation may ensue.

Students may be understood as objectified; both in terms of being *'managed in a particular way'* and by *'being presented an image of themselves'*. With regard to the first, it is understood that these assessments particularly provide the basis through which supervisors and departmental members generate judgements on the 'nature' of the student. For example understandings around what the ability of that student is, (in this case how knowledgeable they are in relation to the criteria outlined) what they need to achieve in order to pass or succeed, and indeed whether they should be

granted continuation on their course of study. Indeed to this end these assessments are understood here to provide the basis through which 'corrective' action is ensued over the student (in relation to best practice[li]) and the basis through which supervisors come to understand the necessary activity or provision of 'direction' required to guide or manage their student on the basis of keeping within established guidelines.[li] As inferred, students must, within this process, demonstrate 'knowledgeabilty' as defined above, as it is on *this* basis that decisions are made regarding student continuation; in other words they have to assume the position of the 'knowledgeable self'.

With regard to the second, (and the suggestion that these assessments *'present an image to students, an identity, which then becomes the basis of their self-knowledge')* it is suggested that evidence of self-knowledge derives from these assessments. With this in mind, key statements surrounding 'knowledgeability' and self-ability pervade the texts; key means through which students may be seen to understand and judge themselves and their ability. In extracts from the interviews, for example, students note that they are 'knowledgeable' 'on the right path of things', have been on the wrong path previously, are 'maybe…just not cut out for this' or demonstrate a real desire to have confidence in respect to knowledge and general ability (hence be in possession of the right forms of knowledge or characteristics). Additionally they demonstrate confidence in their ability or previous concerns over such. On some level it may be argued that they may have internalised particular forms of criteria surrounding disciplinary research and communication practice.

> While technologies of the self are techniques of self-constitution, they are at one and the same time techniques of administration and regulation (Hammerberg, 2004:360)

On top of this, these assessments may be understood as the basis through which students not only come to understand themselves, but to understand themselves in relation to others; *'It locates individuals and their respective positions in populations and enables the calculation of 'gaps' between individuals'.* With this in mind, the assessment may be seen as a technology which distributes power. As one interesting and pertinent instance here it may be suggested that through distributing power through responsibility and hierarchy to the supervisor (on the basis of trust around their knowledgeabilty as one aspect) for instance the assessment may well be a technology through which supervisors are ascribed more '*sense*' (see the example of Elizabeth in the previous section).

Through all of this, it can be further suggested that the assessment plays a part in providing the limits for particular ways of being, thinking and doing (Foucault, 1988a). Through a system of necessary compliance, people have to adhere to them, and hence it would appear come to internalise the calculative basis of predetermined 'desirable elements'. In this case students of the empirical site are seemingly required to become the 'knowledgeable self'. Overall, this provides the basis for further problematisation around the idea of the independent student, or indeed the independent academic being the result of doctoral practice. Indeed, like Townley (1998), assessments here are read as;

technologies of the self in the sense that…through their operation on bodies, thoughts and conduct, they enable individuals to be transformed, rendered more productive and in certain cases re-constituted (Townley, 1998:1999)

Importantly it is understood that the doctoral subject may be seen, not only as influenced, but constituted in their very nature.

The Timetable

The efficiency of such examinations and their established outcomes may also be understood through Foucault's notion of the timetable, and in this sense, the timetable may be considered as helpful in further interpreting 'assessments'. As a brief background, towards a reading of disciplinary society and its operation, Foucault within Discipline and Punish (1977c) presented his idea of the 'efficient body'. Alongside and ultimately towards his other principles of enclosure and power,[li] this related to the organisation of the individual's activity and time (Hopper and Macintosh, 1998:131). Having acknowledged Foucault's use of the timetable in particular, Hopper and Macintosh (1998) offer clarity around their notion of such, through the following extract which refers to the disciplining of French soldiers;

> The timetable is the first stage in disciplining time. It articulates…when specific activities and routines are to be performed. It establishes a rhythm and a regularity to actions…The timetable effects a clockwork-like world of daily repetition and regular cycles of 'useful' activities. It programmes each individual in a constraining chain of….actions for the entire time the individual occupies that space...While the timetable specifies at what moment the activity is to be performed and defines the general framework for an activity, 'the temporal elaboration of the act' goes even further by specifying the precise way to perform the activity' (Hopper and Macintosh, 1998:131-132)

Here, in respect of the assessments outlined, the timetable becomes a useful analytic concept for understanding. In this regard it helps to underline the technology of the assessment organising or conducting the 'conduct' (Foucault, 1978) of the everyday.

Crucially, the field in question has a temporal basis through which assessments operate. Interim reports for example - which involved the participation of the candidate - were required to be conducted twice yearly, and the thesis presentation, after the first year of candidature. Furthermore, a thesis of eighty thousand words was expected to be produced within a four year time period.

With this in mind, one argument is to suggest that such a temporal basis and the provision of some sort of scheme through which particular criteria have to be met, may be considered as the technological means through which a number of the taken for granted activities of the everyday, and their outcomes are mediated. One example of this, for instance, may be the particular means through which supervisory activity is conducted day-to-day. Here particular attention is drawn to the 'management' of students which sees supervisors 'having' to 'watch' students in at particular times and to monitor particular activities that their students were involved in at certain moments of their candidature. Additionally, seemingly individual and 'self-organised' activities such as 'timelines' talked about by students, and impactual in their performance of personal sacrifice, can be thought about in a more socially and temporally constituted way; i.e. as an organisationally mediated outcome of particular rules and regulations presented by the university in question. Rather than just the way things 'need' to be in the pursuit of a PhD and knowledge therefore, the amount of

investment given, through sacrifice as one example, is linked to the temporal organisation of the PhD requirements.

Students and supervisors alike therefore are arguably provided a basis through which activities need to be conducted temporally, in order to fall in line with the criteria set by the discipline. It can therefore be argued as the basis of such that this temporality distributes particular forms of power which have strong impacts in terms of what is achievable in terms of our knowledge productions, as well as the personal effects of spending time in this empirical site.

Another analytic point to make surrounds the regularity around which such a temporal administrative reality is 'enforced' - interim assessments (every six months) and the doctoral presentation (after one year). Holme's representation of Bentham's (1843)[li] assertion is as follows;

> The more constantly the person to be inspected is under the scrutiny of the persons inspecting them, the more perfectly the purpose of the establishment is attained (Holmes, 2001:9)

Herein, given the normalising potential of the assessment and its requirement that students adhere to particular criteria, it is argued, more specifically, that the continual nature of assessment within the site may be 'productive' in the sense that it works *'more perfectly [towards] the purpose of the establishment'* (Holmes, 2001:9). Attention is drawn back at this stage to a comment by Elizabeth;

> *you are constantly trying to prove that you are good enough to be* here (SD Elizabeth: 588-589)

Here it is argued, through Holmes reading of Foucault (2001), that pressure felt by Elizabeth may be an outcome of the technology of assessment within the field – where the student not only feels pressure 'to prove' but that such pressure is constantly on her. Crucially, in reading this quote from such an understanding it should be reiterated that rather than applying a pressure on her from the outside – like a sovereign form of power (Chapman, 1997), we can perhaps reconsider her need to prove, through her desire to stay in the discipline and succeed. This therefore, can be considered as an 'act of the self on the self' which ascribes the effectiveness of a technology such as the timetable in its distribution of power.

Further it is suggested here to be particularly problematic that the student is so immediately and frequently asked to participate in these rituals. Although justified as a process around the notion of accountable practice (i.e. protecting both supervisor and student from misconduct or disparity of service) and, ironically, the development of student thought, it is suggested that such practice may serve to limit disciplinary outputs in this site. To this end, through this rigorous regime wherein all parties must evidently prepare (what they are to be examined on), it is suggested that students and supervisors may find it difficult to conduct themselves in ways outwith the defining criteria set by the discipline. In other words, to think outwith 'normal science'. On the basis of an understanding that academic reality should aspire to change what is thinkable, such practices appear particularly worrying.

> The work of an intellectual is…to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions and starting from this reproblematization (where he occupies his specific profession as an intellectual) to participate in the formation of a political will (Foucault, 1989: 30).

Interestingly, in this case also, through their import placed on accountability around the student and academic practice, bodies such as the QAA may not be seen as distinct from these practices of assessment.

The PhD Group/Presentation

The organisational context of the PhD group is interesting in further ways. In particular it may be seen as distributing particular forms of power, and generating experiences of personhood as earlier outlined. Specifically although (within the PhD community analysis section) it was suggested that the doctoral community was enabling and positive, here it is to the darker productive side that this discussion turns. Through such it is argued two things.

To begin with the PhD group may seem to broaden the workings of the panoptican (Foucault, 1977c). Extending the argument earlier made that power is distributed through the supervisory gaze, it is noted that this site with a variety of assessors may act in similar ways. To this end, understanding that such a group involves judgement via a range of parties including, senior departmental members, doctoral peers, and the supervisor, it may be postulated that observation and visibility is extended. In other words this all may be suggested to add to the power of the panoptic system through an increase in the theatres of visibility within which the student operates;

> By inducing a state of conscious and permanent visibility the panoptican transforms the inmate into the instrument of his own subjugation and thereby guarantees the automatic functioning of power (Shore and Roberts, 1993: 5)

The second of these argues that far from contingent, some of the aforementioned feelings and outcomes expressed earlier and within chapter four may be attributable to the organisational context of this group. To this end, as much as students are watched (see above), crucially this largely public arena also enables students to watch. This extends not only to observations of other students, but also to the nature of their work. This sight facilitates a means through which students are enabled to observe and understand how rewards and punishments are being attributed. In other words the student is equipped with the capacity to observe and compare. The implications of these *'small theatres through in which each actor is…constantly visible'* (Foucault, 1977c:200) arguably distil earlier expressed notions including competition, self-judgement, and emotionality and therefore, personal comparisons between students, anxieties and guilt. In other words what have earlier been highlighted as productive technologies. Similar ideas are also raised in relation to their mediation at the site of the RAE.

Summary

Defining his move into Discipline and Punish (1977c), Foucault juxtaposes an account of the death of Damiens with the sterility of a timetable as a means through which to demonstrate the shift and change in the punitive reality of the modern era, from corporeal to administrative. Particularly, through such he points to the nonetheless 'punishing' effects of the latter, and indeed their more effective and efficient operational means;

> …punish better, to punish with an attenuated severity perhaps, but in order to punish more universality and necessity; to insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body (Foucault, 1985:82)

With analytic recourse to these rules and regulations, the 'horrific' and effectual outcome of his latter penal style has been demonstrated in relation to this empirical site. To this extent, these technologies have been acknowledged to help define the routines and conducts of the everyday (and ways of adequately being and becoming) in ways which fundamentally contradict the notions of espoused freedom and individual practice characterised by informants' tales and organisational practice. Indeed they help reflect a sentiment articulated by Hammerberg (2004) around the work of Foucault, that;

> While technologies of the self are techniques of self-constitution, they are at one and the same time techniques of administration and regulation (Hammerberg, 2004:360)

Crucially, it should be said that far from innocent or unproblematic these modes of conduct distribute particular power effects. Indeed through legitimisation of particular forms of knowledge and expertise they may be seen not only to enable and facilitate, but to normalise and impoverish (Habermas, 1987)

5.6.2 Wider Disciplinary Field

As noted within chapter four, the empirical site of this study was acknowledged to be part of a wider disciplinary field. Like those other institutional sites discussed so far, the wider disciplinary field may be considered constitutive. Briefly, this point is made with respect to two ideas here. The first of these is that via its provision of legitimised modes of knowledge of the field (through journals, editorials and conference specialisms for example) the wider disciplinary field may be seen to play a

major part in writing definitions of 'knowledgeability' required of the self within the empirical site. Understanding that within departmental 'rules and regulations' all forms of assessments lay down a criteria for judgement based, at least in part, on 'disciplinary' skills, material and ability in the areas of both research and communication (that students have to show a relative expertise in knowledge of their field) it may be suggested that the knowledge required of students is defined at this level. The second of these ideas relates to an acknowledgment that this wider disciplinary community plays a part - through its various mechanisms - in defining particular forms and styles of legitimate practice. With this in mind those particular rules of conduct, expressed and demonstrated by the supervisor (see section 5.5.2.1) (and which formed the basis of internalised teachings) may be seen as worked up around the wider disciplinary field.

5.6.3 Contexts of Constitutive Funding and Assessment

Finally, discussion centres on 'institutions' external to the university in question, and specifically, what are argued to be their constitutive relations to the lives of those within. Dialogue within this first section relates solely to the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) – a governmental tool intended to provide an informative basis for its funding councils to allocate future funding to university departments.

The RAE has for some time now received critical commentary for the role it plays in new academic structures (Willmott, 2003; Elton, 2000; Shore and Roberts, 1993; Ball, 1990a; Burchell et al, 1991; Miller, 1995). However, in relation to the doctorate, it has received little analysis, especially not within the marketing literature. Here, it is

discussed as a mechanism of power through which notion of the personhood may be increasingly problematised. Indeed, aligning to the position that; *'there are interesting parallels to be drawn between current* [state] *policy initiatives and those conditions of existence for the institutions…which have come to shape so much of our society'* (Shore and Roberts, 1993:4), it is suggested that the RAE be *a* mode through which the 'lived experiences' of those within this research, are distilled and shaped.

Considering 'state'[li] influence on subjectivity formation, through a Foucauldian lens, has been considered in a variety of works. Shore and Roberts (1993), Grey (1997) and Hodgson (2002)[li] for example, have pursued critical interest around governmental interventions in society. Importantly, these works demonstrate appropriate awareness of the complex and dynamic proposition that is 'the state'[li] within Foucauldian thinking, most particularly in light of his theorisation of power relations. To this end 'the state' and its effects are considered not in Marxist (sovereign) terms, but as working through a variety of 'assemblages';

> Incorporating, shaping, channelling, and enhancing subjectivity have been intrinsic to the operations of government. But while governing society has come to require governing subjectivity, this has not been achieved through the growth of an omnipotent and omniscient central state whose agents institute a perpetual surveillance and control over all its subjects. Rather, the government of subjectivity has taken shape through the proliferation of a complex and heterogeneous assemblage of technologies. These have acted as relays, bringing the varied ambitions of… authorities into alignment with the ideals and aspirations of individuals, with the selves each of such want to be' (Rose, 1990:213)

Here, in developing a 'constitutive' argument around the RAE, a similar position is adopted. To this end, a key assumption is that the RAE – as a tool through which funding is later allocated - does not provide enabling or constricting effects alone,

rather these are achieved simultaneously via the desires of those in the field also. With this in mind, a number of instances from the data are drawn upon within this section. Although not exhaustive, these examples point significantly to a partial 'state' role in the ways those of the empirical field may be seen to think, act and behave (Foucault, 1988a). The first two examples relate to a suggestion that the RAE helps provide the conditions for forms of knowledgeablility within the empirical site.

The first alludes to the RAE as effecting doctoral 'strategy' in the empirical site, and henceforth expertise through such. It begins by framing this argument around understandings of the RAE as a 'legitimising technology', and the RAE as engendering compliance.

The RAE: A legitimising technology. For some time now, critical commentators have inferred that one effect of the RAE is its legitimisation of particular forms of knowledge and practice over others (Willmott, 2003; Broadhead and Howard, 1998; Shore and Wright, 1999). By allocating rankings to particular research publications (such as scholarly journals) as well as providing definitions of research[li] for example, (within which researchers are obliged to comply) it has been read as a central means through which particular value is distributed to certain types of research and knowledge production over others.

The RAE: Eliciting Departmental Compliance. In addition to this, it is argued that the RAE serves to ensure compliance to its structures at departmental level, via what may be read as a 'publish or perish' mantra (Broadhead and Howard, 1998). Through its use as a basis for the allocation of research funding or funding withdrawal (on the

basis of research ratings), successful participation within Research Assessment Exercises at departmental level is understood to be vital in terms of ensuring *survival and growth in these terms* (Willmott, 2003; Broadhead and Howard, 1998). Indeed understandable as a penal mechanism in Foucauldian terms, such mechanisms of reward and punishment can be said to be potential 'murderous' (Foucault, 1977c) and henceforth forceful towards the generation of participation.

Compliance around the RAE in the empirical site, at the level of the Doctorate.

Having made these arguments, this section goes on to suggest the operation of the RAE at the empirical site, and more particularly around doctoral activity. To this end it draws specific testimony from Alan, who suggests that the RAE frames strategic departmental decisions around '*what our students should be doing*'. Acknowledging firmly that the department within the empirical field (towards departmental success in the RAE) actively managed doctoral topics (to fulfil the legitimised ends of the RAE) it may be suggested that at least on some level developing subjective knowledges of doctoral students (in terms of form and expertise around particular areas of interest) are (1) brought into play and (2) defined by the RAE.

This suggestion that the RAE provides a technology through which knowledge and expertise is fostered at the empirical level can be made too, with recourse to the importance and attention paid to publication within the empirical site. Here, not only does Alan talk of a new requirement within academic structures for doctoral students to publish (attributable to the RAE – see table 5A below), but doctoral students/supervisors themselves demonstrate (1) the importance of publication (2) and most importantly the importance of publishing and presenting whilst in the doctorate.

Regarding the first of these points the RAE may be seen as a technology through which publication has become of increasing academic importance. Earlier, via discussion of Foucault's 'examination' (1977c), 'judgement', 'comparison' and 'calculability' were introduced as key notions. These terms are similarly applicable to the RAE. To this end, acknowledging the RAE as a mechanism through which future funding is based, publishable output has become the basis through which departments and individuals are calculated, measured and compared. This therefore provides a key basis through which - toward the acquisition of personal and departmental reward (not punishment) - academics arguably have to prosper. (Broadhead and Howard, 1998).

In this regard, therefore, it is strongly inferred that throughout the doctoral process the RAE, and more importantly its structures of legitimised knowledges may be 'in mind' when developing forms of knowledge and expertise. Although, students did not explicitly talk of achieving 'ratings' particularly, they referred to the value of research in terms of it being; 'applicable', 'fundable' and 'publishable', these judgements evidently playing a part in decisions over research decisions also. When coupling this with their awareness of the RAE, and publishing as a key means towards gaining a career, some of these value judgements may well be attributable to the legitimised structures put in place by the RAE.

Importantly, new readings around both of these instances leads to the suggestion that definitions of knowledgeabilty, as expressed within this site, and as expressed by the people who are pursuing knowledge, are worked up and made available through technologies such as those incorporated within the RAE. On one level this provides the basis for the suggestion of normalisation of knowledge production within the empirical site; something of concern within any academic situ, and of significant

import when recognising that these students will take marketing disciplinary knowledge, and its possibilities forward. On another, and in acknowledgment of the RAE being an historically situated practice (the result of Thatchers neo-liberalism) we are further able to displace ideas of knowledge and expertise within the doctoral site as something inherent or real. Indeed rather they may be further located and understood as ongoing, and contingent on power relations embedded within discursive practice.

Other Distributions

In addition to being considered as a constituent in subjectivity formation through the mediation of developing expertise, the RAE may also arguably be read as a mechanism through which subjective 'ways of being' are fostered in different ways. Providing the basis for this is not only the content of table 5A above but an assertion by Willmott (2003) that

> 'a simultaneous expansion of higher education with a reduction in unit costs [has]…stimulated pressures and competition [at departmental level]' (Willmott, 2003:130).

Also a reading here which attributes such '*stimulated pressures and competition*' to be played out at the individual level.

Indeed, noting this context to be one wherein '*researchers in [departments] are compared to each other, and in many cases penalised or rewarded for success or failure in meeting goals set within the hierarchical structure of both the RAE and the [department]*' (Broadhead and Howard, 1998:5) it is suggested that the RAE may be a

site wherein ideas of competitivism or 'the competitive self' may be engendered. Earlier in this chapter and in chapter four, for example, students were noted as working through ideas such as the importance of '*getting ahead*' and the requirement to '*prove oneself*'. Additionally, students were noted as regularly making self-judgements and comparisons between other students, actions which themselves led to an expression in feelings such as self-doubt. All may perhaps be seen as the outcomes of this pressurised environment, the mechanisms it provides for the judgement of people, and the inevitable need for personal differentiation which it arguably requires.

Interestingly, having raised this suggestion, attention is drawn to the work of De Groot (1997). Within her work on the changing structures of academic practice (and in particular those structures set up and 'lived' post Thatcherism) this author not only raises the suggestion of 'competition' as an outcome (hence supporting the ideas above) but, crucially, relates this to gender. More particularly, it is her assertion that that '*competitive, individualist, and output-oriented aspects of academic life*' (De Groot, 1997:135) typically privilege the male. Traweek (1988) too, interestingly alludes to similar ideas within her work. Noting a culture of competition to define the cultural practices of socialisation within a physics environment she notes that; '*competition, and individual victories are strongly associated with male socialization in our [Western] culture*' (Traweek, 1988: 104). Through such ideas the suggestion may tentatively be raised that the RAE, a governmental mechanism, be implicated in the generation of gendered practices and forms of socialisation in and around the doctoral process of the marketing academy.

Interestingly too, in mind of this suggestion, it should not be forgotten that earlier panoptic practices of comparison between students were understood to distil negatively experienced emotions. In this regard, it should perhaps be emphasised that the RAE may be implicated and productive in these terms too. This section finishes by broadening two key understandings of power effects outlined previously within the chapter.

The first is to suggest that 'the management of conduct' as expressed through self-organisation, supervision and the assessment sections may also be seen as the mediation of the RAE. Herein through the 1) evident requirement to publish within the RAE 2) its legitimisation of particular forms of knowledge and 3) its regulation around completion times, the temporal activity of both students and supervisors may be seen as ascribable in part to this 'exercise'. With this in mind, 'self-organisation' and circulative interventions at supervisory and departmental level may be seen as pedagogically mediated in this regard.

Additionally it may also be suggested that a move towards 'portfolios of interest' or the promotion of specialisms within the department (which were demonstrated earlier as operative within the department through extracts from informants such as Fiona, and which ultimately, as argued earlier, led to normalising effects around the reproduction of particular legitimised knowledge) may be a response to broader ruptures in the organisation of academic practice nationally. More particularly to the way our universities are funded through mechanisms such as the RAE. Supporting this, is the view of Shore and Roberts (1993) who have, of new academic funding structures noted that;

universities increasingly have to place the emphasis not on individual research but on setting up new 'research centres' as they struggle to develop Unique Selling Points (USP's) which will attract attention and funding (1993: 11).

Crucially, an understanding that the RAE effects policy change at this level adds mileage to the increasing evidence within this site of the managerial nature of doctoral practices at the level of the institution.

Funding Bodies (State and Private)

In addition to those councils which fund on the basis of the RAE, are other sources of funding. These, as embodied by other state (such as the ESRC[li]) or private bodies (commercial or charitable) can also be seen to provide a backdrop to research activity within the empirical field, and hence the basis for subjective reality. As discussed earlier, (section 5.6.1.1) for example, the empirical site can be understood to have engaged in 'pro-funding' strategy at recruitment level, wherein the establishment and strengthening of departmental specialisms was arguably key. Additionally, by way of suggesting empirical interface with such 'bodies', students such as Elizabeth indicated the generation of private funding to be a central consideration in the creation of her doctoral topic. Alongside the possible implications of the RAE as 'mediator', the significance of such for a discipline such as marketing are outlined in the section to follow. Before this however it should briefly be suggested that this context of funding should itself not be seen as detached from the RAE. Indeed despite constituting a different source of funding, the necessity for such within the academic realm comes as an arguable result of a more competitive research/funding environment (Willmott, 2003). Any possible 'effect' of such funding should not therefore be seen as distinct.

Government/Industry-Defined Interest

In bringing this section to a close, the reader is reminded that in Chapter Two profound limitation was ascribed to means-ends works which 'evaluated' knowledge production practices from a perspective pertaining to the uncritical promotion of particular logics of the field. Through the section above this chapter introduces an issue of similar concern, this time in relation to the practices of the empirical field. Particularly, with reference to two things; firstly Roses (1996) general statement that *'national prosperity'* may be one objective through which the practice of governance is operated *'upon the actions of others'* (Rose, 1996:29) and secondly, the understanding that interests of *'commerce, industry, government and the public sector'* (Broadhead and Howard, 1998: 3) may be served through major assessment and funding practice, it is suggested that subjectivity formation within the empirical field be worked up around 'industry/state-centric' logics. In other words, it is suggested that the training academic is in some respects incorporative/productive of broader state/industry values. Willmott (2003) within his consideration of the RAE underlines a problematic *'tightening of the coupling between research…and industry'* (ibid. 2003:129) via agencies such as the RAE. Critically, such narrowing is attributed here to the doctoral process and the reproduction of particular academic socialisations.

Of course this throws open a number of issues. For many years now, scholars within marketing and consumer research highlighted problems around the dominant research orthodoxy in the discipline; that of its managerial focus (Belk, 1984; Hirschman, 1986; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Levy, 1981; Olson, 1983). Outlined in more detail in section 2.4.3, part of their criticism was that marketing research considered

its end-user too predominantly in its design; hence limiting the sorts of 'interests' served and explored. Here, similar concerns may be raised; for managerialist *modus operandi* may be considered as increasingly engrained within the logics of our organisational practice - its values centrally reproduced, and reproducing at the level of doctoral pedagogy explored within this study.

The literature review of this study also eluded to Foucault's notions of regimes of truth, and more specifically to the view that political interests (power effects) were the inevitable result of such. Here through the suggestion that personhood in the empirical site may increasingly be said to reflect state interests (and to an increasing extent the 'needs' of industry) the nature of what may be excluded within this discourse comes into question. To this end, although the engagement in these discourses undoubtedly leads to a healthy and 'productive' discipline (person) in terms of financial certainty, growth, visibility and competitiveness, it may also be considered as very specifically limiting, with respect to the subjective possibilities/knowledge that it engenders. Particularly it is considered worrying that our potential may be becoming increasingly bound[li] by agenda-led parameters. Indeed as the above would suggest, regardless of any theoretic stance taken within research, managerialist or not, successful operation within the marketing doctoral pedagogy may involve, on some level, participation in and around pre-defined (market) logics of the field.

5.7 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter set out to provide a detailed analysis of the findings presented in chapter four and, more particularly, insights into the possible conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the doctoral site, of one major UK University. Specifically, it was interested in applying some of the ideas informing Foucault's notion of subjectification (1983), and through such finding a way to think critically about some of the taken for granted means through which the lived experience of this 'doctoral' site were experience by those within it. It has, in a variety of ways, been able to shed light on this empirical site.

One key notion formed an important part of this chapter from the outset. This was the emergent notion of independence, and the independent self, which were understood, in part, to characterise the practice and experience of the doctorate in this empirical site. The 'appearance' of these ideas was, of course, interesting and relevant in light of the theorisation, and broad departure of this work, which expressed significant problematisation around notions of the lone or detached scholar. Critically, however, this chapter came, in the pursuit of its broader interests, to problematise and destabilise such notions. This it achieved, primarily via their contradiction and location at the level of organisational practice.

Firstly (in ways substantiating this contradiction) through an exploration into the situated nature of the marketing doctoral subject this chapter came to negate any conceptions of the self as inherent. Instead it suggested the subjective realities of those interviewed to be the ongoing, relational product of various power/knowledge

discourses. As part of this understanding it suggested the mediated nature of the doctoral subject within this empirical site to be worked up around a number of relational 'interfaces'. These included: 'the state'; external funding bodies; institutional regulations; supervisory relations; and even the (panoptic) role played by fellow doctoral students. In addition, the study drew attention to the significance of an individual's relationship with their own experiences and desires as a means through which we may understand the production of the situated self.

Secondly, with regard to the 'location' of independence, this chapter also came to suggest notions of independence and freedom as written into sites of doctoral pedagogic reality. Particularly suggested was its reproduction within technologies such as supervision and the rhetoric of 'self-organising' practice. To this end, as well as providing us with the ability to see these notions as worked up culturally, and hence being contingent, the chapter laid the basis for an understanding of any effects of such independence to be mediated at the level of the organisation. This may be considered particularly significant in light of the suggested obscuring nature of these notions, in respect to the conditions of production defining the empirical site (i.e. the mediated nature of reality).

Lastly, by way of expanding on the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation as understood through this site, a number of additional points should be raised as key readings from this chapter. Firstly it was suggested that problematic power relations to some extent defined the doctoral process in this field, most particularly around the supervisory relationship. This in part was suggested to constitute academic alienation and disempowerment for both the discipline and those involved. Additionally, by

way of providing insight around the 'human effects' of marketing knowledge production, the analysis came to suggest that training in this domain was both positively and negatively experienced. In this regard the doctoral process of the empirical site involved pleasure and empowerment, alongside disempowerment, anxiety and guilt.

[li] This example, interestingly, is suggestive of a 'Mertonian' (see section 2.4.2) like view of the academic within this site wherein, as much as influence is acknowledged to play a part at the level of doctoral practice, there resides an inherent view of academic freedom and the suggestion that, if the 'ideal' conditions could be provided for, then independent results will be achieved.

[li] This was as a grouping of fellow PhD students was described within the interviews.

[li] Hence, immediately supporting the 'culturally-derived' reading of reason pervading in the previous section.

[li] Which included going on to hold a lectureship in the department in question.

[li] Via the evident technology of power which renders more experienced PhD student knowledge as more legitimate.

[li] As made evident by both the rules and regulations of the empirical site, and the utterances of informants.

[li] Across a number of disciplinary sites.

[li] From the outset within his interview Donald presents a situation whereby his decision to pursue switching behaviour is grounded in his own personal and business interests, which were developed whilst in industry. When asked what he was studying the following discussion ensued*; D: I am studying switching behaviours in the b-b service community. I am trying to come up with a model of switching, which can aim to predict, switching behaviour before it occurs. P: OK, so what made you want to study that? D: My sales director's experience. I always had staff out searching for new customers and nobody really studied the customers that left us so I was most interested into putting some of my energy into what causes people to switch. And if you can try and identify that, try to prevent switching. We all switch for price and quickness, but I was looking for something else too that can cause switching, other than price. (SD Donald: 172-181)*

[li] Excluded for anonymity reasons.

[li] Assessment is discussed and analysed at more depth within the 'institutional' section (see section 5.6)

[li] *By inducing a state of conscious and permanent visibility the panoptican transforms the inmate into the instrument of his own subjugation and thereby guarantees the automatic functioning of power* (Shore and Roberts, 1993:3)

[li] Having learned through informants that their experiences were located among particular institutional 'modes', documentary material was collected. Used as supportive material to the extent that it provided a contextualising indication of the practices involved around the doctorate such material was primarily web-based. More specifically, the websites of university policies, governmental policies, funding bodies, and 'independent' assessment agencies, were accessed and utilised. All of this was done in the context of work such as that of Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) who note that potentially useful research insights can be generated around documents, partly as they can provide an indication of the contexts within which they were produced.

[li] Foucault of course in regard to such 'local' forms referenced asylums, hospitals and prisons, for example (1977c).

[li] This is most specifically relevant with regard to discussions around the rules and regulations stipulated by the university centrally constituting the empirical field.

[li] 'institutions will appoint supervisors who have the appropriate skills and subject knowledge to support, encourage and monitor research students effectively' (QAA, (www.qaa.academy.uk/aboutus/).

[li] As a reminder, 'interim progress reports' are documents required to be drawn up every six months of the PhD and are assessments of whether the student has suitably met criteria laid out by the university

(and supervisor) relating to their progress. Thesis presentations are also a form of 'progress assessment' and a requisite part of candidature. In respect of the latter, guidelines stipulate that after one full year of candidature, students must orally present their research work for critical consideration. Failure to adequately perform within either or indeed to comply with necessary amendments which may be the result of such will mark termination of their course.

[li] As a reminder the criteria of judgement within this empirical site could not be fully ascertained. Nor, when known could they be fully represented here. This was again to protect the anonymity of the university and academics in question.

[li] Rules and regulations state that failure to meet certain standards will result in termination.

[li] Claire's extract: '*At the end of the day they have to be able to express themselves in the written medium because that is what will be examined*' (SG Claire: 512-522) provides a good example of this.

[li] Within which the 'exhaustive use of time' is also a key constituent.

[li] Bentham of course is the inspirational figure behind Foucault's use of 'the Panoptican' (1977c)

[li] To reiterate the RAE is state led. It is sponsored '*by the four UK funding bodies for higher education: the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the Scottish Higher Educational Funding Council, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, the Department of Employment and Learning Northern Ireland. A team based at HEFCE manages it.* (http://www.rae.academy.uk/news/2005/panel/htm) NB*:* HEFCE denotes the Higher Education Funding Council within the United Kingdom.

[li] In relation to marketing discourse, in this particular case.

[li] Critically it is noted that recourse to 'the state' here follows a move within Foucault's work on Governmentality (1978) wherein he reacted to criticism of Discipline and Punish (1977c) which argued that his work failed to address the relation between society and the state. In this work Foucault presented his understanding that to consider the state was methodologically no different to the consideration of individuals through techniques and practices within particular, and more localised institutions (Gordon, 1991). Indeed, as Gordon goes on to note, the more explicit broadening of his work to such consideration was under way by the time of The History of Sexuality Volume One (1977d), wherein he had worked up the notion of bio-power to articulate; '*forms of power exercised over persons specifically in so far as they are thought of as living beings: a politics concerned with subjects as members of a population, in which individual sexual and reproductive conduct interconnect[s] with issues of national policy and power*' (Gordon, 1991: 4-5)

[li] *'Research' for the purpose of the RAE is to be understood as original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce and industry, as well as to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances and artefacts including design* (HEFCE, 1995a, annex a)

[li] The ESRC claims independence as a funding body.   However it is partially guided/funded by the state, particularly through the Office of Science and Technology (www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx: May2006)

[li] And ever more inescapable through some of the mechanisms of compliance outlined above.

Chapter Six

Conclusions, Contributions and Reflections

6.1 Summary

This chapter brings the thesis to a close. It starts in section 6.2 by reminding the reader of the initial aims and objectives around which this work was based. Then, it goes on to do four things: firstly, (6.3) to present a summary of its main empirical finding and to discuss some of the more general implications of these in the context of the 'marketing' discipline; secondly, (6.4) to summarise the main contributions to knowledge of this work; thirdly (6.5) to offer brief discussion around this works limitations and fourthly; (6.6) to directions for future research.

6.2 A Brief Reminder

From its beginning this study located its interest in knowledge production, and in particular the knowledge production processes of the marketing academy.

For some time now scholars from a variety of fields have come to demonstrate, with conviction, the value and worth of considering 'knowledge production' from a non-essentialist position; a position wherein any notion of truth or reality surrounding 'knowledge' can intellectually and socially be taken apart. Sociologists, have for instance come to reflect on the ultimate expression of twentieth century 'objective knowledge'; science, in ways which demonstrate scientific knowledge not only to be worked up socially, but politically (Kuhn, 1967; Latour and Woolgar, 1979; Knorr-Cetina, 1981; 1983; Law, 1994).

Crucially, although having awakened the possibility for scrutinising knowledge discourses in these ways, marketing it seems has been slow to respond. Disappointingly, if not dangerously, the majority of inspectoral reflections on knowledge production within our discipline have remained doggedly managerialist in focus; largely mirroring a dominant logic within the discipline to work within sets of dominant logic.

That said, there have been a number of works within marketing which have acknowledged and acted upon the significance of such ideas for the development of a reflexive scholarship around our own knowledge production. Scholars such as Morgan 1992; Brownlie and Saren, 1997 and Brownlie et al 1999 for example initiated the idea that marketing and the marketing academy were socially operative: not real, a priori, unaffected or non-effecting. Furthermore, that its reality assumed an important cultural position and therefore should be brought forth for social consideration.

Centrally therefore, on the basis of the promise of some of these offerings, this thesis found real value in pursuing a social evaluation of marketing knowledge production. It was very much its hope from the outset to contribute to the disciplines critical school of thought via a piece of empirical work set within marketing academic discourse.

On the basis of further limitations within marketing's literature, the study then called on 'marketing subjectivity' for closer examination, and more particularly its inspection as set within the empirical context of the doctorate. Not only was it apparent that marketing had significantly overlooked a consideration of the marketing

'subject' within its inspectoral history but that its training and pedagogic practices were similarly underrepresented - at least in problematising ways.

Finally, the study introduced the work of Michel Foucault as a tool through which to consider subjectivity formation in this context. Foucault appealed for a variety of reasons. For one, his work had been applied liberally and valuably in many of the disciplinary areas closely linked to the developing interests of this study. So, within fields concerned with education and the workplace for example, his repertoire was understood to have provided strong analytic value, particularly around notions of the 'subject' (Townley, 1993; Knights and Willmott, 1994; McKinley and Starkey, 1998; Shore and Roberts, 1993). Again however, marketing had not fully exploited that available to it, with only a small number of works having brought his work to the discipline (Thompson, 2003; Mclaughlin, 1998 and Skalen and Fougere, 2004). It was however, the work of Morgan (1992) which fully awakened a realisation of the potential within a study like this to combine Foucault and marketing academic practice. Within his early initiation, Morgan pointed to the work of marketing monolith 'Kotler' and in so doing not only exposed marketing scholarship to be an implicated part of a non-neutral and non-responsible body which brought 'marketing' discourse into effect, but of Foucault's theoretical potential to us as a discipline. As a collective he believed marketing ought to challenge our own orthodoxy through a reflexive engagement with such ideas.

In light of the anti-essentialist basis of this work and its intentions, Foucault offered up a socially situated conception of subjectivity. Through his theoretical premise

'subjectification' (Foucault, 1983) he dismisses any idea of inherent selfhood, suggesting that the subject is instead; *'constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts, etc.'*(Foucault, 1980a:97). Of course moving beyond ideas of pure agency is necessary if here we are to think about the marketing 'subject' beyond some of the inherent means through which it has been assumed before in the marketing discourse. Perhaps more crucially however, in conceiving the operational nature of these constituents, Foucault's work does so with a distinct conception of power. Particularly through his later works, he suggests not only that we can think about power as central to the enactment and bringing into being of discourse, but that power operates within and through a variety of technologies, including even acts of the self on the self (Foucault, 1988a). To this end therefore, his work – through 'technologies of power and technologies of the self' - allows for an analytic language through which this study could come to conceive not only of the mediated nature of the academic within marketing, but of their meditative nature. Furthermore, it provides a basis wherein some of our organisational practices may be considered as implicated in the making of some of the ways that we 'think, act and do' (Foucault, 1988a) within the doctoral processes of the discipline.

Overall then, in locating its evaluation around the organisational site of the doctoral training process within the marketing academy and the formation of academic subjectivity this investigation hoped to offer reflexive promise as a means to illuminate the construction of our discipline, its potentials, as well as the effects of 'disciplinary production' on those involved in 'making up' the marketing academy. Further it was its intention to offer up a critical voice around some of these sites, particularly through the vocabulary offered up by Foucault.

Towards its broad aim of exploring the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy, the study worked towards the following objectives;

- To explore the doctoral process, as a site of social interaction and reproduction, through the conceptual lens of Foucault's concepts, technologies of power and technologies the self.

- To locate processes of subjectivity formation through investigating the lived experience of participants within a doctoral programme of a UK University.

- To consider the potential power effects working through this process, and their possible implications.

Exploration around these provided the basis for a number of conclusions and contributions to knowledge in this study. Before the contributions achieved by this thesis are conclusively outlined later in section 6.4, the following section takes time to reflect on and make commentary around the main findings of this study. What do they help us see in terms of our knowledge production processes, our doctoral pedagogic organisation and our existing literature?

6.3 Conditions and Effects: A commentary on key analytic findings

Presenting the conditions and effects of subjectivity formation as understood within this empirical site is a difficult task, due to the 'circulative' nature of discourse. Despite this, five key readings were generated. As noted, there are understood to be inferences and ramifications which can be drawn from such, in light of the marketing discipline more broadly. These begin around key finding one: the constituted self.

1). 'The self' as constituted, not inherent.

By the end of its literature review this work presented a key and crucial notion: that to some extent all of the existing inspectoral works within the marketing literature inadequately dealt with the subject of 'the subject'. In other words, and in different ways, those works which existed to reflect on the production of knowledge making within the discipline failed to account for agency; the academic; the mediator of ideas within their accounts in ways which were fully acceptable. Furthermore through its socially inspired critique the literature review, came to suggest that existing marketing inspections were not only theoretically limited but academically irresponsible by conceiving the academic in solitary, socially detached terms.

Through its empirical phase, and through its readings of Foucault's conceptions of technologies of power and technologies of the self, this study came to suggest that the subjective realities of those at doctoral level were not real or inherent, but the product of various power/knowledge discourses. Offering that the 'thoughts, conducts and actions' (Foucault, 1988) of those in the empirical field being were mediated, the study drew attention to a number of key constitutive modes. These included such

things as the role of the state and external funding bodies, institutional regulations, supervisory relations and the panoptical role played by fellow doctoral students. In addition, the study drew attention to the significance of an individual's relationship with their own experiences, and hence to the 'governmental' role of the academic via their own internalized 'ways of being'.

Crucially, this provides the basis within this thesis to further emphasise the limited means through which the knowledge-maker and, by extension, knowledge, are conceptualised within existing inspectoral accounts. By demonstrably removing the notion of non-inherent reality around the idea of the academic, it also helps us to go beyond the underpinnings and assumptions which are subsumed under the lone academic rhetoric, as well as to unpack and understand such as the product of social constitution. Furthermore, it provides the basis for demonstrating some sense of what is written-out of these dominant evaluations via their 'closed' theoretical assumptions; i.e. the effects and possibilities outlined through the course of this work.

2). Notions of reproduced subjectivity included 'independence' and that the rhetoric of independence served to obscure power relations and everyday interactions within the doctoral process.

In opening subjectivity for examination, ironically, one of the first sets of understandings to be revealed through readings of the data was that a residing notion of freedom and independence defined academic practice and selfhood within the field. This reading was set alongside the notion of 'knowledgeability' which also defined subjective reality and shall be discussed shortly.

Noting independence was of particular interest, specifically in light of the theoretical hesitation around ideas of the lone/ detached scholar stated from the outset of this work. In particular having earlier criticised the merits of independence as a conceptual underpinning, it was intriguing to note that similar ideas were being played out and lived by within another of marketing's realities - this time within the site of doctoral training.

Having come to suggest that these ideas of independence were historically situated and reproduced through various technologies within the empirical site, this thesis notes it to be of crucial interest that doctoral pedagogy may be considered as involved in nurturing and reflecting such rhetorically powerful ideas. On one level it points to another site of knowledge production within the discipline which may be 'circulative' in the sense of nurturing and reflecting rhetorically powerful ideas such as independence within marketing discourse. It also opens the possibility for there being various other areas beyond our reflexively closed literature which may be implicated in producing similar outcomes. On another however, it raises the suggestion that through the obscuring and limiting capacity of independence, our doctoral process - a significant site for bringing new blood to the discipline, and hopefully with it new possibilities – serves itself to distribute such limiting and idealistic beliefs about the academic situ and our best means of representing it.

Taking this latter idea a bit further, it is suggested here that notions of independence and hence the doctoral process in marketing as a site of its reproduction may play a part in generating a climate of non-reflexivity within the discipline. To be more specific, there have, for a long time in marketing now, been calls for us to be 'more

reflexive' (Morgan, 1992; Brownlie and Saren, 1997); to account more 'socially' and hence adequately for the conditions of our possibility. Indeed, it was in partial response to these that this study was born. Crucially however, through the suggestion that certain effects of discourse, namely 'independence', obscure conditions of production, it is proffered that the possibility for reflexive practice/research be organisationally limited within marketing and that furthermore this may be extended to the organisation of our pedagogies. To this end, the suggestion is made that wherein rhetorics of realism are reproduced, not only are sites of production masked but so too are possibilities for people to acknowledge such sites, or indeed to foster question-asking around cultural situation and make-up. To this extent, it is argued that calls for reflexivity (above) are perhaps futile or stunted in their possible effect, without a partial rethinking of our pedagogic realities.

Overall, noting the reproduction of independence within marketing's doctoral pedagogy emphasises the need to ask more questions of the technologies through which we organise our day to day practice within the discipline. What purposes do these technologies serve for example? What effects do they have, and can they be reconciled with some of our other scholarly ambitions? Additionally, it also asks us to consider how a self-reflexive marketing academy could be achieved. What might this look like, and even more curiously, how would it function beyond the authoritative remit of the limiting 'independence'.

3). Notions of reproduced subjectivity also included 'knowledgeability'

Alongside independence, 'knowledgeability' was another notion to emerge from the analysis: a key technology of the self.

Defined by a number of constitutive elements, this notion is understood to be centrally important to this study in that it helps present a problematisation of the idea of true marketing expertise – a notion which so often finds itself manifest in the power-free presumptions of our inspectoral literatures and the demonstration of successful organisational practice in our doctoral realities. Indeed not only does it underline expertise to be worked up, but does so in ways which can help us reflect more broadly on what makes up our knowledge making reality.

Of central importance to this work has been an acknowledgement and criticism of means-end managerialist work within inspectoral literature; work, which at its core works towards, and within, the preserve of existing disciplinary logics. Crucially, 'knowledgeability', as an indicator of current knowledge making reality, points to a doctoral pedagogy founded on a necessity to engage in similar managerialist practice through an increasingly heavy context of governmental intervention, accountability, and (self) funding within academic practice. It appears not only that marketing subjectivity is in part defined by the regimes of external stakeholders, but that what it is to be a marketing academic and how to engage in its discourse 'successfully' is evermore the preserve of the political.

As often repeated, the intention of this work was to situate a study of knowledge production in the domain of the marketing academy. Having done so, its time in 'marketing' has not thrown up findings which may be considered wholly unique to the discipline – an outcome difficult in any non-comparative piece. Crucially however although perhaps not singular to the discipline – it is argued that notions such as this political context of subjectivity formation have a relevance which is particular to our discipline.

To this end, acknowledging this changing context of research and subjective knowing it is considered particularly dangerous that academic possibility be increasingly defined through these political means – particularly within marketing. Surely, after all, a useful marketing academy is one wherein 'the market' and all aspects of its outcomes should be available for scrutiny, including markets which may include governmental stakeholders.

Acknowledging increasing steps to continue this line of managerial control and accountability within academia (De Groot, 1997) it is thereby suggested to be of critical importance that we in marketing find ways of resisting such means of potential subjugation – in order at the very least that we can assume our position as able to engage critically in some of these guiding logics. Within their paper on government policy in academia, Shore and Wright (1999) develop a notion of 'political reflexivity' as a conceptual initiation away from the effects of such intervention. Devos (2000) too, within her understanding of an Australian university system (with the propensity for similar managerialism) underlines a women's research development programme housing similar dissidence. It is thought that both represent

important reactions. Importantly, this study began by raising the significance of cultural intervention around marketing's academic discourse on the basis that it held a key and privileged cultural position. Again, it is particularly in acknowledgment of marketing's situation – and more particularly this situation as affording the marketing academy with authority regarding the 'market environment' - that it would appear especially crucial that ways are found, however modest, to work outwith these confines. Such a critical stance is vital and healthy, at least when sustaining the view that scholarship should essentially be about emancipatory potential. It was this school of thought which inspired this study, and which has provided the basis for hugely important works in marketing previously. It is this same school which, it is suggested, should continue to be pursued, in whatever ways possible.

4). Problematic power relations and the effects of training as positively and negatively experienced.

As outlined within chapter two, the vast majority of attention paid in the literature to the doctoral process within marketing covered the topic in ways which were largely uncritical and means-end in nature. In other words, they largely depicted the process with a nod to best practice, rather than a problematising scholarly reflection. This thesis slightly broadens the offerings of these works by highlighting two key interpretations; first, that problematic power relations defined the doctoral process in this site, including within the supervisory relationship and, second, that the effects of training in this domain were both positively and negatively experienced.

With regards supervision first, the examination of the doctoral experience within this thesis points briefly to a complex and difficult relationship - one wherein not only are

certain knowledges and positions privileged over others, but where the narrowing of our disciplinary knowledge potential may be one unintended consequence. Of course this is problematic, and with the additional acknowledgment too that supervision was considered a central distributive technology of power within the empirical site here, it is strongly argued that further research consider this relationship further.

Regarding the experiential outcomes, another key point to note was that the doctoral process of the empirical site involved pleasure and empowerment, alongside disempowerment, anxiety and guilt. Importantly, these were reproduced at various levels of practice, including those set by 'the state' and through supervision.

As already mentioned, a key justification of this research, and its selection of subjectivity formation as a 'site' of study, was the possibility it created to consider the nature and experience of productions in 'human terms'. The relative importance of such was raised through studies such as that of Traweek (1988) and Lee and Williams (1999) who alluded to the value of attaining such insights. Here, having considered the effects of subjectivity formation, a somewhat contradictory picture around experience is acknowledged. On one hand, the doctoral process was evidently one which was positively experienced in a variety of ways. Towards reading a 'certain state of happiness' (Foucault, 1988:18) for instance, students felt enabled and empowered at various times, and in relation to various organisational processes. Importantly, on the other hand there were negatively 'lived' experiences. These too were part of the 'productive' doctoral process within which people were living, working and becoming socialised everyday. Simply, in raising these experiential outcomes for particular discussion here it is suggested that some of these outcomes

constitute a worrying aspect of our pedagogy. Building critically on the work of Lindgreen et al. (2001) (who elsewhere in marketing have eluded to a more widespread 'existence' of these kinds of negative effects) and that of Lee and Williams (1999) (who note similar things on a broader disciplinary basis), it is proffered that these may form the basis for useful practical reorganisation. After all, as states the theoretic basis of this study, none of these outcomes – positive or negative – are intrinsic to any rite-of-passage into the discipline.

To end, further limitation must also be specifically directed to those 'means-end' evaluations concerned with marketing practice and organisation. Having explored training and pedagogic processes within one particular site in this thesis, and come to note what can be 'done' or achieved (Fournier and Grey, 2000) through unreflexive functional practice[li], the potentially dangerous nature of these works may be brought into greater question. Indeed from the learned perspective of this chapter, questions are asked with greater concern, about what the outcomes may be of similarly unreflexive promotions embodied within these works? What is (unwittingly) accomplished through the very existence of functionalist texts? Additionally, further inadequacy must be ascribed to the current levels of critical attention and understanding around the doctoral process in marketing broadly speaking. As an early 'outing' into pedagogic reality here, a picture was painted which raised a number of problematic issues around key pedagogic processes – enough to stress urgency around a rethinking of research focus in the domain.

6.4 Contributions of this study to 'Marketing'

There is a growing critical school within marketing who in more frequently asking and pursuing new and reflexivity led questions about the nature of our discipline, find less adequacy in a discipline which so often operates unquestioningly within its own taken for granted ideas (Morgan, 1992; Brownlie and Saren, 1997; Saren et al, 2007). These works hope to enact scholarly responsibility by locating the ways in which we operate as contingent, often problematic outcomes of discourse.

As noted above, it was the original aim of this study to contribute to the development of this critical school of thought within marketing and particularly to the collective whose works called for reflexive engagement around marketing's scholarly practices. It believes to have achieved that as its ultimate contribution.

One key factor in the achievement of this, and all of this study's contributions has been the work of Michel Foucault. Further, in light of his very limited application in marketing thought thus far, an exploitation of his work within the context of marketing academic practice is itself considered to be another of this study's main achievements.

Crucially, the later works of Foucault, allowed within this work the location of a space whereby we could think about knowledge production and reflexivity as constituted experientially at the level of subjectivity and organisational practice. Also, it provided the basis through which we could conceive of various academic realities as worked up through fluid power arrangements.

Partially defined through the work of Foucault, another of the main contributions of this work was bringing forward the idea of the situated marketing academic for scrutiny. As noted earlier, part of our critically under-scrutinised marketing academy involved serious lack of understanding around marketing academics themselves within the literature; a contention all the more serious in the context of anti-foundational developments within social theory. This study has now rectified this to some extent, and in doing so has not only revealed a suitable vehicle through which to study disciplinary possibilities through practice, but to have conducted what it considers responsible scholarship. With the latter in mind, this research has both suggested and pursued what it considers to be key importance within any reflexive and critical disciplinary project - an adequate accounting for human production. In other words, critical reflection into human experiences and how they may be mediated through academic discourse.

Crucially also, a key contribution of this work has been its critically led insights into the doctoral pedagogy within marketing. Until this point, although the doctorate was reflected on to some extent within the discipline, most often its reflection was 'managerial' in the sense that these works were honed towards 'best practice' outcomes, based on the existing logics within the field. In allowing the doctorate to be taken apart critically this work has been able to offer up a different set of understandings.

Importantly, through Foucault, this work was able to offer up a de-naturalised vision of the doctoral process, and the experiences that students were living within it. So, for

example, it allowed for ideas and experiences such as independence, knowledgeability and personal hardship to be thought of as worked up, historically and contextually, through various technologies within organisational practice. This is significant as a contribution, because it highlights 1). that taken for granted aspects of the doctoral process are not real but part of the way in which we organise ourselves 2). that the possibility of our subjectivity / discipline can be seen as linked to the organisation of our pedagogic realities 3) that these taken for granted ideas and ways of organising ourselves can often be problematic for those experiencing them, and for the sorts of knowledges that we produce through them, and that 4) as a process of contingent outcomes our doctoral processes can be conceived at reimaginable and considerable for change – all aspects which are written-out of the oeuvre of managerial texts. It also points to the scope and importance of further critical engagement around sites of the doctorate and indeed pedagogy more broadly within the marketing discipline.

To end this section, it is noted with interest that the contribution of this doctorate has arrived at a time where there are signs of increasingly serious consideration around pedagogic research more widely. As part of a broader disciplinary effort for example, The Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) managed by the Economic and Social Research Council has, since 2000, coordinated a large body of empirically-led research around issues relating to teaching and learning. The purpose of this was to go someway towards generating 'independent evidence for public debate and decision making processes of both practitioners and policy makers' (Pollard, 2007: 639) – hence use for a variety of stakeholders. As Pollard (2007) also notes – in ways which somewhat seem to reflect the current situation in marketing - this research movement was founded on an earlier criticism that most educational

research in the UK was *'small scale, irrelevant, inaccessible and of low quality'* (2007: 639).

That said, there have also been moves within marketing very recently to abate its lack of self-understanding with regard to pedagogy. To this end, 'The Academy of Marketing and the Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for Business Management Accountancy and Finance' has recently (2007) initiated a programme of funding to *'support and encourage pedagogic research [and] to promote the development of evidence-based examples of innovative and effective learning, teaching and assessment methods related to Marketing'*[li].

On the basis of this work as its own 'evidence-based' example of pedagogic reflection in marketing and what it can achieve, this move would appear hugely positive – not least in the sense that pedagogy perhaps is less likely than other 'marketing topics' to receive funding from other stakeholders. Caution however ought to be applied around the possibility that such funding will be attributed mainly towards a perpetuation of current disciplinary orthodoxy – i.e. by supporting research which does not trouble the perpetual and perpetuating logics of pedagogical commentary as they exist now.

This research, in preceding these new sets of work which are to come within marketing, therefore suggests the importance of critical engagement around some of disciplinary ideas as played out within these settings. Having ascribed the possibility for critical relevance around the voices within the doctoral site here, this study helps to state the importance and demonstrate a scholarly responsibility around re-evaluating some of the means by which we come to operate 'normal science'.

Further, beyond being sceptical of the ways things are, it suggests the importance for marketing, and its academics, of asking questions around what the often unintended achievements of its practices are.

In expressing the more precise nature of this study's contribution to the critical school within marketing therefore, is not only to underline its critically and reflexively-led insights around the doctorate within the empirical site of this study but to strongly emphasise the idea that our continued critical contributions need to be set more among pedagogic issues within marketing.

6.5 Limitations

When assuming a constitutive view of social reality, every study harbours 'limitations' by definition. As such, as well as writing-in the possibility of what this study has achieved, some of the 'choices' which were made in its course wrote out the possibility of others. With this in mind, there are some 'choices' which it is considered important to reflect on again here, in relation to the possible impact they had on the study. These, in different ways relate to the data which was available and used.

Firstly, the process of generating PhD-level recruits for this study (see section 3.3.3) is worth revisiting. Here, doctoral candidates were recruited via their supervisors, on the request of the Head of Department within the institution in question. The reader is reminded that through its findings this study very briefly introduced notions of negative experience existing around the doctoral site; including, for example,

suggestions of anxiety and disempowerment. These were important in the sense that they introduced a context of emotionality with regard to doctoral productions, and constituted insights into the human effects of subjectification. It is suggested here however that through the particular methods of this research design, the study potentially limited voices which may have been alternate to those made available through the 'gatekeeping' supervisors. What may, for example, have been the testimonies of those who may not have so readily been approved for participation? Might there have been some who were marginalised in the system (Fine, 1991). Of course, this provides alternate means for a study of doctorate candidates to be organised in the future but also importantly points to the discourse of any empirical field writing in its own possibility for those researching within it.

As noted within chapter three, semi-structured interviews were used methodologically within this study; a decision owing to both experiences at the pilot stage and a demonstration of their strength within other key Foucauldian inspired studies (Trethewey, 1999) to 'captur [e] participants' articulations of their (always discursively constituted) realities' (Trethewey, 1999:429) – a key objective. These provided a strong basis of rich material through which critical analysis was formed. Another of the choices which was taken at this research design stage was to take a snapshot approach to these interviews – i.e. to work around the articulations made within the discourse at one moment of its history. This decision was built on the strength of retrospective insights which could be gained through the interviews, examples of such from other work (Traweek, 1988), as well as the belief that this too would provide an adequate means, data wise, on which to work through a Foucaultian

analysis. It is believed that this approach achieved this. It should also be noted however that a longitudinal approach was also considered. Despite the perceived strengths around this which were understood as providing the possibility for a different account of disciplinary becoming, and perhaps even more data, it was considered that justice to such an approach within the usual constraints of a PhD would be limited and hence it should perhaps be returned to as a methodological option, post-PhD.

As well as being taken from material made available through the semi-structured interviews of this research, the data used within this study largely stemmed from the outcomes of the process of a Foucaultian-led discourse analysis (see section 3.5). Tying to the theoretical intentions of this study, such an approach led to the generation and representation of a number of themes which usefully helped to unpack elements of the doctoral process. As one point relating to the use of data via these means, it is also important to note that having located the study within a relatively small community of marketing scholars the author was mindful of issues of confidentiality and anonymity whilst selecting representative 'lived experiences' within the text. Although its effects on critical interpretation were only minimal, due to the closed nature of the academic community in the UK as a whole this was considered ethically and methodologically unavoidable.

6.6 Reflections and Suggestions for Future Research

Each of the limitations provided above offers possible scope for an extension of this research. This chapter and thesis closes with a brief discussion of what it considers to be possible and interesting ways in which this work may be usefully taken forward. All of the suggestions imply a belief firstly that significant merit exists around further exploration of subjectivity formation within the marketing academy.

As indicated, it is suggested that conducting a similar study on a longitudinal basis may provide a valuable means for different reflexive richness. With options to recruit new research participants at various intervals and/or to follow the same research participants over a significant period of time; this, it is argued, would (1) allow for additional assessment of any contextual changes occurring around the academic/doctoral process within the disciplinary field of marketing, and/or (2) understanding into how various practices of career progression may impact on marketing subjective capacity respectively – both interesting propositions. Further, it is suggested that one possible way may be to pursue an autobiographical method (Gummesson, 2001).

Secondly, with regard to recruitment, it is suggested that any future research consider the generation of participants through more 'independent' means (i.e. without the gatekeeping function of supervisory intervention). Although in no way detracting from the interpretative or analytic achievements of this work, it is suggested that such a tactic may be one way to open up potential understanding around the thoughts and

experiences of any 'othered' voices and appropriately account for the possible effects of marketing academic practice on the human subject.

Thirdly, redirection may formulate around specific (and emergent) 'categories' of interest, such as gender for example. Although only in a very brief manner, this study went some way to introducing the possibility of marketing academic socialisation being gendered (more particularly with the guidance De Groot, 1997). Despite its brevity, this comment certainly raises questions around this as a meaningful wider interpretation of marketing academic discourse. Particularly in light of other work which already exists around notions of gender and; marketing business practice (MacLaren et al, 1998); organisational reality (Trethewey 1999); and education (Traweek,1988) the importance of such understanding is heavily emphasised. Without such, for example, we stand potentially to exclude and 'write out' particular ways of being.

[li] Managerialism, of course, was considered to be organisationally reproduced within the pedagogic process considered in this work.

[li] www.academyofmarketing.info/education2.cfm

Reference List

Abbas, A. and McLean, M. (2001) Becoming Sociologists: Professional Identity for Part-time Teachers of University Sociology. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 22, 339-352.

Adams St. Pierre, E. (2004) Care of the Self: The Subject of Freedom. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 325-359. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Addelson, K.P. (1991)   The Man of Professional Wisdom. In: Fonow, M.M. and Cook, J.A., (Eds.) *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholorship As Lived Research*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Alderson, W. (1957) *Dynamic Marketing Behaviour: A Functionalist Approach to Marketing Theory*. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin.

Aldridge, J. (1993) The Textual Disembodiment of Knowledge in Research Account Writing. *Sociology.* 27, 53-66.

Alferoff, M. and Knights, D. (2002)   Quality Time and the 'Beautiful Call'. In: Holtgrewe, U., Kerst, C. and Shire, K.A., (Eds.) *Re-organising Service Work: Call Centres in Germany and Britain*, pp. 183-203. Aldershott: Ashgate.

Alvesson, M. (1994)   Critical Theory and Consumer Marketing. *Scandinavian Journal of Management.* 10, 291-313.

Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (1996) Critical Theory and Postmodernism. Approaches to Organization Studies. In: Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R., (Eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 191-217. London: Sage Publications.

Alvesson, M. and Skoldberg, K. (2000) *Reflexive Methodology*. London: Sage Publications.

AMA Task Force (1988)   Developing, Disseminating, and Utilizing Marketing Knowledge. *Journal of Marketing.* 52, 1-25.

Amaya, H. (2004) Photography as Technology of the Self: Matuschka's Art and Breast Cancer. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 17, 557-573.

Anderson-Gough, F., Grey, C. and Robson, K. (2002) Accounting Professionals and the Accounting Profession: Linking Conduct and Context. *Accounting and Business Research.* 32, 41-56.

Anderson-Gough, F., Grey, C. and Robson, K. (1998) *Making Up Accountants: The Organisational and Professional Socialization of Trainee Chartered Accountants*. Ashgate: Aldershott.

Anderson, P.F. (1983) Marketing, Scientific Progress and Scientific Methods. *Journal of Marketing.* 27, 18-31.

Anderson, P.F. (1986) On Method in Consumer Research: A Critical Relativist Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 13, 155-173.

Appadurai, A. (1986) *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arndt, J. (1985) The Tyranny of Paradigms: The Case For Paradigmatic Plurism in Marketing. In: Dholakia, N. and Arndt, J., (Eds.) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory (Research in Marketing Supplement 2),* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ashmore, M. (1989) *The Reflexive Thesis: Writing the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge.* 1 edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ashmore, M., Myers, G. and Potter, J. (1992) Discourse, Rhetoric, Reflexivity: Seven Days in the Library. In: Jasanoff, S., Markle, G., Pinch, T. and Peterson, J., (Eds.) *Handbook of Science, Technology and Society,* London: Sage Publications.

Atkinson, P. and Delamont, S. (1985) Sociolisation Into Teaching: The Research Which Lost Its Way. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 6, 307-322.

Atkinson, P., Delamont, S. and Parry, O. (1994) Disciplinary Identities and Doctoral Work. In: Burgess, R.G., (Ed.) *Postgraduate Education and Training in the Social Sciences,* pp. 34-52. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Atkinson, P. and Hammersley, M. (1994) Ethnography and Participant Observation. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* pp. 248-261. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Avlesson, M. (1994) Talking in Organizations: Managing Identity and Impressions in an Advertising Agency. *Organization Studies.* 4,

Baker, B.M. (2001) *In Perpetual Motion: Theories of Power, Educational History, and the Child.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E. (2004) Dangerous Coagulations? Research, Education, and a Travelling Foucault. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education,* pp. 1-85. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E. (2004) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Baker, M.J. (2001b) Selecting a Research Methodology. *The Marketing Review.* 1:3, 373-398.

Baker, M.J. (2000a) Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review.* 1, 219-247.

Baker, M.J. (2000b) Writing a Research Proposal. *The Marketing Review.* 1, 61-76.

Baker, M.J. (2001a) Writing Up and Getting Published. *The Marketing Review.* 1, 441-471.

Ball, S.J. (1990) *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Banks, A. and Banks, S. *Fiction and Social Research: By Ice or Fire.* London: Altamira Press.

Barker, J.R. (1993) Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-managing Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 38, 408-37.

Barkhuizen, G. (2002) Beginning to Lecture at University: A Complex Web of Socialisation Patterns. *Higher Education Research and Development.* 21, 93-109.

Beck, J. and Young, M.F.D. (2005) The Assault on the Professions and the Restructuring of Academic and Professional Identities: A Bernsteinian Analysis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 26, 183-197.

Belk, R., Sherry, J.F. and Wallendorf, M. (1988) A Naturalistic Enquiry Into Buyer and Seller Behaviour At a Swap Meet. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 14, 449-470.

Belk, R.W. (1991) *Highways and Buyways.* Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Belk, R.W. (1984) Manifesto For a Consumer Behavior of Consumer Behavior. In: Anderson, P.F. and Ryan, M.J., (Eds.) *Scientific Method in Marketing,* Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Bentham, J. (1843) *Jeremy Bentham: Collected Works.* London:

Berkowitz, D. and Trocchia, P.J. (1999) Getting Doctored: A Proposed Model of Marketing Doctoral Student Socialization. *European Journal of Marketing.* 33, 746-759.

Berry, L.L. (1989) Becoming a Marketing Academic: A Strategic Career Planning Seminar for Doctoral Students. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 11, 2-6.

Bettany, S. Conceptualising Marketing Theory as an Emperical Domain: A Speculative Taxonomy of Research Approaches to the 'Practice' of Marketing Theory and Suggestions for Feminist Ethongraphic Interventions. Academy Of Marketing Doctoral Colloquium. Lancaster University. 2002.

Bettany, S. (2004) Unpublished PhD. Thesis: The Making of Marketing Knowledge. University of Lancaster.

Bevir, M. (1999) Foucault, Power, and Institutions. In: Political Studies Association, (Ed.) *Political Studies*, pp. 345-359.

Biagioli, M. (1999) *The Science Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Blades, D.W. (1997) *Procedures of Power and Curriculum Change: Foucault and the Quest for Possibilities in Science Education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Bloom, L.R. (1998) *Under the Sign of Hope: Feminist Methodology and Narrative Interpretation*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Bloor, D. (1976) *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Academic Discourse: Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professional Power. (Trans. R. Teese)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1979) *Algeria 1960: The Disenchantment of the World, the Sense of Honour, the Kabyle House or the World Reversed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988) *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1977a) *Outline of a Theory of Practice. (Trans. Nice, R)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996b) *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power. (Trans. L.C Clough)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996a) Understanding. *Theory, Culture and Society*. 13, 17-37.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1977b) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant Loic J.D (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Broadhead, L. and Howard, S. (1998) "The Art of Punishing": The Research Assessment Exercise and the Ritualisation of Power in Higher Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. 6,

Brown, S. (1994) Marketing as Multiplex: Screening Postmodernism. *European Journal of Marketing* 28, 27-51.

Brown, S. (1993) Postmodern Marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*. 27, 19-34.

Brown, S. (1995) *Postmodern Marketing*. 3 edn. London: Routledge.

Brownlie, D. and Saren, M. (1997) Being the One Dimensional Marketing Manager: The Discourse of Theory, Practice and Relevance. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 14, 147-161.

Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R. and Whittington, R. (1999) *Rethinking Marketing: Towards Critical Marketing Accounting*. London: Sage Publications.

Brownlie, D., Hewer, P., and Ferguson, P. (2007) Theory into Practice: mediations on cultures of accountability and interdisciplinarity in marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Management.* 23, 395-409.

Brownlie, J. (1999) Between Discourse and Practice: Creating the Therapeutic Subjectivity of the 'Young Sexual Abuser'. Doctoral Thesis, University of Stirling.

Bryman, A. (1988) *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Burgess, R.G. (1994) *Postgraduate Education and Training in the Social Sciences*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Burkitt, I. (1992) Beyond the 'Iron Cage': Anthony Giddens on Modernity and the Self. *History of the Human Sciences.* 5, 71-79.

Burrell, G. (1998) Foucault and Organization Theory - Modernism, Postmoderenism and Organizational Analysis: The Contribution of Michel Foucault. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Managemenr and Organisational Theory*, ` edn. pp. 14-28. London: Sage Publications.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979) *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. England: Ashgate .

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A.S. (1993) Critical Ethnography of a Sri Lankan Classroom: Ambiguities in Student Opposition to Reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly.* 27, 601-626.

Carabine, J. (2001) Unmarried Motherhood 1830-1990: A Genealogical Analysis. In: Wetherall, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J., (Eds.) *Discourse As Data: A Guide for Analysis*, pp. 267-310. London: Sage Publications.

Carnap, R. (1956) The Methodological Character of Theoretical Concepts. In: Feigl, H. and Scriven, N., (Eds.) *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Minneapolis: Minnesota Press.

Casey, C. (1995) *Work, Self and Society, After Industrialisation.* London: Routledge.

Cavanagh, S. The Call to Matrimony in the Shadow of the Female Homosexual: The Changing Manifestation of Female Teacher Sexuality in Mid-twentieth Century Ontario, Canada. International Standing Conference for the History of Education XXIV. 2002.

Chapman, G. (1997) Making weight: Lightweight Rowing, Technologies of Power and Technologies of the Self. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 14, 205-223.

Cherryholmes, C. (1987) A Social Project for Curriculum: Post-structural Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies.* 19, 295-316.

Cheville, J. (2005) Confronting the Problem of Embodiment. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 18, 85-107.

Chia, R. (1996) *Organizational Analysis as Deconstructive Practice.* Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Cicourel, A. (1964) *Method and Measurement in Sociology.* New York: Free Press.

Clegg, S. and Dunkerley, D. (1977) *Critical Issues in Organizations.* London: Routledge.

Clegg, S.R. (1998) Foucault, Power and Organizations. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory: From Panoptican to Technologies of the Self*, pp. 29-48. London: Sage Publications.

Clifford, J. (1988) *The Predicament of Culture* . London: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politcs of Ethnography.* London: University of California Press.

Clouder, L. (2003) Becoming a Professional: Exploring the Complexities of Professional Socialization in Health and Social Care. *Learning in Health and Social Care.* 2, 213-222.

Coe, M.D., Weber, M. and Parsons, T. (2003) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Courier Dover Publications.

Collins, H.M. (1983) The Sociology of Scientific Knowledge: Studies of Contemporary Science. *Annual Review of Sociology.* 9, 265-85.

Collins, H.M. (1981) What is TRASP? The Radical Programme as a Methodological Imperative. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences.* 11, 215-24.

Collinson, D. (1992) *Managing the Shop Floor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Collinson, D. (1994) Strategies of Resistance: Power, Knowledge and Subjectivity in the Workplace. In: Jernier, J., Knights, D. and Nord, W., (Eds.) *Resistance and Power in Organizations*, pp. 25-68. London: Routledge.

Conant, J.S., Smart, D.T. and Redkar, D. (1998) Success in Academia: Navigating the Introduction Stage of the Faculty Career Life Cycle. *Marketing Education Review.* 8, 1

Contardo, I. and Wensley, R. (2004) The Harvard Business School Story: Avoiding Knowledge By Being Relevant. *Organization.* 11, 211-231.

Cooper, D. (1994) Productive, Relational and Everywhere? Conceptualising Power and Resistance Within Foucauldian Feminism. *Sociology.* 28, 435-454.

Cooper, L. (1987) 'Do We Need Critical Relativism?' Comments on Method in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 14, 126-7.

Covaleski, M.A., Dirsmith, M.W., Heian, J.B. and Samuel, S. (1998) The Calculated and the Avowed: Techniques of Discipline and Struggles Over Identity in Six Big Public Accounting Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 43, 293-327.

Creswell, J.W. (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications .

Crossley, N. (2003) From Reproduction to Transformation: Social Movement Fields and the Radical Habitus. *Theory, Culture and Society.* 20, 43-68.

Crossley, N. (1996) *Intersubjectivity: The Fabric of Social Becoming*. London: Sage Publications.

Crotty, M. (1998) *The Foundations of Social Research : Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. London: Sage Publications.

DaMatta, R. (1991) *Carnavais, Malandros, e Herois*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

Davies, B. (1995) *Poststructural Theory and Classroom Practice*. Geelong, Austrailia: Deakin University Press.

Davies, C. (1996) The Sociology of Professions and the Profession of Gender. *Sociology.* 30, 661-678.

Davis, L.J. (1995) *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness and the Body*. New York: Verso.

Day, A. (1997) How to Get Research Published in Journals. *European Journal of Marketing.* 31, 896-900.

Day, G.S. (1996) Using the Past as a Guide to the Future: Reflections on the History of the Journal of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing.* 60, 14-16.

de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

De Groot, J. (1997) After the Ivory Tower: Gender, Commodification and the 'Academic'. *Feminist Review.* 55, 130-42.

Deetz, S. (1998) Discursive Formations, Strategized Subordination and Self Surveillance. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory*, London: Sage Publications.

Deetz, S. and Mumby, D. (1990) Power Discourse and the Workplace: Reclaiming the Critical Tradition. *Communication Yearbook.* 13, 18-47.

Delamont, S. (1987) Three Blind Spots: A Comment on the Sociology of Science by a Puzzled Outsider. *Social Studies of Science.* 17, 163-170.

Delamont, S. and Atkinson, P. (1980) The Two Traditions in Educational Ethnography: Sociology and Anthropology Compared. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 1, 139-152.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1992) *The Academic Socialisation of Doctoral Students in Social Science Disciplines*. Swindon: ESRC.

Delamont, S. and Eggleston, J. (1983) A Necessary Isolation? In: Eggleston, J. and Delamont, S., (Eds.) *Supervision of Students for Research Degrees*, pp. 23-46. Birmingham: British Education Research Association.

Delamont, S., Parry, O. and Atkinson, P. (1997) Critical Mass and Pedagogic Continuity: Studies in Academic Habitas. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 18, 533-549.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Desai, S., Damewood, E. and Jones, R. (2001) Be a Good Teacher and Be Seen as a Good Teacher. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 23, 136-144.

Desmond, J. (2002) *Consuming Behaviour*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Devos, A. Productive Learning of Technolgogies of Government: A Foucauldian Reading of the Politics of Professional Development in Higher Education. Annual Conference of the Austrailian Association of Reasearch in Education. 2000. http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/dev00496.htm.

Devos, A. (2004) Women, Research and the Politics of Professional Development. *Studies in Higher Education.* 29, 591-604.

Diamantopolous, A. (1996) A Model of the Publication Performance of Marketing Academics. *International Journal of Research In Marketing.* 13, 163-180.

Douglas, M. and Isherwood, B. (1979) *The World of Goods*. London: Allen Lane.

Drummond, J. (2000) Foucault For Students of Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education.* 34, 709-719.

Du Gay, P., Hall, S., Janes, L., Mackay, H. and Negus, K. (1997) *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage Publications.

Du Gay, P., Salaman, G. and Rees, B. (1996) The Conduct of Management and the Management of Conduct: Contemporary Managerial Discourse and the Constitution of the 'Competent' Manager. *Journal of Management Studies.* 33, 263-282.

Du Gay, P.E.J. and Redman, P. (2000) *Identity: A reader*. London: Sage Publications associated with Open University.

Duncan, I. Bourdieu On Bourdieu: Learning the Lesson of the Lecon. In: Harker, R., Mahar, C. and Wilkes, C., (Eds.) *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu: The Practice of Theory* , pp. 180-194. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

Duncan, M.C. (1994) The Politics of Women's Body Images and Practices: Foucault, the Panoptican and Shape Magazine. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues.* 18, 48-65.

Dwyer, P.J. (1995) Foucault, Docile Bodies and Post-Compulsary Education in Australia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 16, 467-477.

Easton, G. and Araujo, L. (1997) Management Research and Literary Criticism. *British Journal of Management.* 8, 99-106.

Elliot, R. (1997) Existential Consumption and Irrational Desire. *European Journal of Marketing* . 31, 285-296.

Elliot, R. and Ritson, M. (1997) Post-structuralism and the Dialectics of Advertising: Discourse, Ideology, Resistance. In: Brown, S. and Turley, D., (Eds.) *Consumer Research, Postcards from the Edge*, London: Routledge.

Elliot, R. and Wattanasuwan, K. (1998) Brands as Symbolic Resources for the Construction of Identity. *International Journal of Advertising.* 17, 131-144.

Ellis, C. and Flaherty, M.G. (1992) *Investigating Subjectivity: Research of Lived Experiences*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Elton, L. (2000) The UK Research Assessment Excercise: Unitended Consequences. *Higher Education Quarterly.* 54, 274-283.

Featherstone, M. (1988) In Pursuit of Postmodernism: An Introduction. *Theory, Culture and Society.* 5, 195-217.

Fendler, L. (1998) What is it Impossible to Think? A Genealogy of the Educated Subject. In: Popkewitz, T.S. and Brennan, M., (Eds.) *Foucault's Challenge, Discourse, Knowledge and Power in Education*, pp. 39-63. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ferguson, P. (2002) After Marketing and Social Construction. *Ephemera Reviews.* 2, 258-262.

Feyerabend, P. (1993) Against Method. In: Anonymous London: Verso.

Fine, M. (1991) *Framing Dropouts*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Firat, A.F. (1990) The Consumer in Modernity. *Advances in Consumer Research.* 17, 70-76.

Firat, A.F., Dholakia, N. and Bagozzi, R.P. (1987) *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*. Massacusetts: Lexington Books.

Firat, A.F., Dholakia, N. and Venkatesh, A. (1995) Marketing in a Postmodern World. *European Journal of Marketing.* 29, 40-56.

Firat, A.F., Sherry, J.F.J. and Ventakesh, A. (1993-1994) Special Issues on Postmodernism. *International Journal of Research in Marketing.* 10/11,

Firat, A.F. and Venkatesh, A. (1995) Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption. *Journal of consumer research.* 22, 239-267.

Flax, J. (1993) *Disputed Subjects: Essays on Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaelogy of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1975) *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980g) Body/Power. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 55-62. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1980b) The Confession of the Flesh. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 194-228. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1977c) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Allen Lane, London: Penguin Press.

Foucault, M. (1979b) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1988b) The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom. In: Bernauer, J. and Rasmssen, D., (Eds.) *The Final Foucault*, pp. 1-20. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1996) The Ethics of the Concern for Self as a Practice of Freedom. In: Lotringer, S., (Ed.) *Foucault Live [Interviews, 1961-1984]*, pp. 432-449. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (1980c) The Eye of Power. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 146-165. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1989) *Foucault Live: (Interviews, 1966-84). (Ed. Lotringer, S. Trans. Johnston, J)*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality. In: Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P., (Eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago, ILL: Chicago University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980e) The History of Sexuality. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 183-193. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1979a) *The History of Sexuality. (Trans. Hurley, R)*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1977d) *The History of Sexuality, Volume One*. London: Allen Unwin.

Foucault, M. (1988d) *A History of Sexuality, Volume Three*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1977a) 'Intellectuals and Power': A Conversation Between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. In: Bouchard, D.F., (Ed.) *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*, pp. 207-208. Oxford: Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1977b) *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (2000) Omnes et Singulatim: Toward a Critique of Political Reason. In: Faubion, J.D., (Ed.) *Power: The Essential Works of Foucault, Volume 3*, pp. 298-325. New York: The Free Press.

Foucault, M. (1984a) The Order of Discourse. In: Shapiro, M., (Ed.) *Language and Politics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1973) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980f) Power and Strategies. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 134-135. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1980a) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 - 1977.* London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1980h) Prison Talk. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, pp. 37-54. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1985)   Sexuality and Solitude. In: Blonsky, M., (Ed.)   *On Signs*, London: Basil Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1983)   The Subject and Power. In: Dreyfus, H.L. and Rabinow, P., (Eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd edn. pp. 208-266. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1988a)   Technologies of The Self. In: Gutman, H., Hutton, P. and Martin, L.H., (Eds.) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, pp. 16-49. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1980d)   Truth and Power. In: Gordon, C., (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1984b) Truth and Power. In: Rabinow, P., (Ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, pp. 51-75. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1988c)   Truth, Power, Self: An Interview with Michel Foucault, October 25 1982. In: Martin, L.H., Gutman, H. and Hutton, P., (Eds.) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, pp. 9-15. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1986) *The Uses of Pleasure: A History of Sexuality, Volume Two*. Harmondsworth: Viking.

Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (2000) At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations.* 53, 7-32.

Fox, S. (2005)   An Actor-Network Critique of Community in Higher Education: Implications for Networked Learning. *Studies in Higher Education.* 30, 95-110.

Franklin, B. (1994) *From "Backwardness" to "At Risk": Childhood Learning Difficulties and the Contradictions of School Reform.* Albany: State University of New York.

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garsten, C. and Grey, C. (1997) How to Become Oneself: Discourses of Subjectivity in Post-Bureaucratic Organizations. *Organization.* 4, 211-228.

Geary, J., Marriott, L. and Rowlinson, M. (2004) Journal Rankings in Business and Management and the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise in the UK. *British Journal of Management .* 15, 95-141.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Fontana Press.

Gergen, K. (2001) Self-Narration in Social Life. In: Wetherall, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J., (Eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, pp. 247-260. London: Sage Publications.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1993) *Sociology*. 2 edn. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Studies .* Cambridge: Polity Pree.

Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Suffolk: Pelican Books.

Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Goodson, I. (1981) Becoming an Academic Subject: Patterns of Explanation and Evolution. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 2, 163-180.

Goodson, I. and Cole, A. (1993) Exploring the Teacher's Professional Knowledge. In: McLaughlin, D. and Tierney, W.G., (Eds.) *Naming Silenced Lives: Personal Narratives and the Process of Educational Change*, pp. 71-93. London: Routledge.

Gordon, C. (1991) Government Rationality: An Introduction. In: Burchell, G.e.a., (Ed.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 1-53. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gore, J. (1994) Enticing Challenges: An Introduction to Foucault and Educational Discourses. In: Martusewicz, R.A. and Reynolds, W.M., (Eds.) *Inside/Out: Contemporary Critical Perspectives in Education*, pp. 109-120. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Grant, B. (1997) Disciplining Students: The Construction of Student Subjectivities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 18, 101-114.

Gray-Rosendale, L. (1999) Investigating Our Discursive History: "JBW" and the Construction of the "Basic Writer's" Identity. *Journal of Basic Writing.* 18, 108-135.

Grbich, C. (1998) The Academic Researcher: Socialisation in Settings Previously Dominated by Teaching. *Higher Education.* 36, 67-85.

Green, B. and Lee, A. (1999) Educational Research, Disciplinary and Postgraduate Pedagogy: On the Subject of Supervision. In: Holbrook, A. and Johnston, S., (Eds.) *Supervision of Postgraduate Research in Education (Review of Research in Education, 5)*, pp. 207-222. Lilydale: Australian Association for Research in Education.

Grey, C. (1994) Career As a Project of the Self and Labour Process Discipline. *Sociology.* 28, 479-497.

Grey, C. (1997) Surburban Subjects: Financial Services and the New Right. In: Knights, D. and Tinker, T., (Eds.) *Financial Institutions and Social Transformations*, Basingstoke : Macmillan.

Griffith, D.A. (1997)   An Examination of Marketing Educator Training in US Doctoral Programs. *Marketing Education Review.* 7, 81-95.

Gummesson, E. (2001) Are Current Research Approaches in Marketing Leading Us Astray? *Marketing Theory.* 1, 27-48.

Gumport, P.J. (1993) Fired Faculty: Reflections on Marginalization and Academic Identity. In: McLaughlin, T. and Tierney, W.G., (Eds.) *Naming Silenced Lives: Personal Narratives and the Process of Educational Change*, New York: Routledge.

Gutman, H., Hutton, P. and Martin, L.H. (1988) Truth, Power, Self : An Interview with Michel Foucault, October 25 1982. In: Gutman, H., Hutton, P. and Martin, L.H., (Eds.) *Technologies of the Self*, London: Tavistock.

Habermas, J. (1986) Taking Aim at the Heart of the Present. In: Hoy, D.C., (Ed.) *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, pp. 103-8. Oxford: Blackwell.

Habermas, J. (1987) *The Theory of Communication Action, Volume Two: System and Lifeworld*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hacking, I. (1999) Making Up People. In: Biagioli, M., (Ed.) *The Science Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.

Hackley, C. (1999b) An Epistemological Odyssey: Towards Social Construction of the Advertising Process. *Journal of Marketing Communications.* 5, 157-168.

Hackley, C. (2001) *Marketing and Social Construction: Exploring the Rhetorics of Managed Consumption*. London: Routledge.

Hackley, C. (2002) The Panoptic Role of Advertising Agencies in the Production of Consumer Knowledge. *Consumption, Markets and Culture.* 5, 211-229.

Hackley, C. (1999a) Tacit knowledge and the Epistemology of Expertise in Strategic Marketing Management. *European Journal of Marketing.* 33, 720-735.

Hair, Jr.J.F., Johnston, M.W. and Roach, S.S. (1994) The Current State of Marketing Education: Perceptions of Marketing Academicians and Doctoral Students. *Marketing Education Review.* 4, 2-9.

Hall, S. (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representaitions and Signifying Practices.* London: Sage Publications in association with the Open University.

Hammerberg, D.D. (2004)   Technologies of the Self in Classrooms Designed as "Learning Environments": (Im)possible Ways of Being in Early Literacy Instruction. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 359-385. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles and Practice.* London: Tavistock.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1992) *Ethnography. Principles and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Harker, R., Mahar, C. and Wilkes, C. (1990) *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu: The Practice of Theory.* Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press .

Harwood, V. and Rasmussen, M.L. (2004)   Studying Schools With an "Ethics of Discomfort". In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 305-325. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and Time.* New York: Harper and Row.

Heikkala, J. (1993) Discipline and Excel: Techniques of the Self and Body and the Logic of Competing. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 10, 397-412.

Hirschman, E.C. (1986)   Humanistic Inquiry in Marketing Research: Philosophy, Method and Criteria. *Journal of Marketing Research.* 23, 237-249.

Hockey, J. (1996)   Motives and Meaning Amongst PhD Supervisors in the Social Sciences. *Journal of Sociology of Education.* 17, 489-506.

Hodgson, D. (2002) "Know Your Customer": Marketing, Governmentality and the "New Customer" of Financial Services. *Management Decision.* 40, 318-328.

Hogg, M.K., Bettany, S. and Long, G. (2000) Shifting the Discourse: Feminist Perspectives on Consumer Behaviour Research. In: Catterall, M., Maclaren, P. and Stevens, L., (Eds.) *Marketing and Feminism: Current Issues and Research*, pp. 113-128. London: Routledge.

Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E.C. (1982) The Experimental Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings of Fun. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 9, 132-140.

Holland, K. (1999) A Journey to Becoming: The Student Nurse in Transition. *Journak if Advanced Nursing.* 29, 229-236.

Holmes, D. (2001) From Iron Gaze to Nursing Care: Mental Health Nursing in the Era of Panopticism. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing.* 8, 7-15.

Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. (1997) Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology and Interpretative Practice. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp. 262-271.

Holtgrewe, U. Locked Into the Present or Transforming The Future: Flexible Organisations and Identities? Critical Management Studies. 2003. University of Duisburg/Essen. 2003.

Hooley, G.J. and Hussey, M.K. (1994) Quantative Methods in Marketing: The Multivariate Jungle Revisited - Introduction and Overview to Special Edition. *Journal of Marketing Management.* 10, 3-12.

Hopper, T. and McIntosh, N. (1998) Management Accountant Numbers: Freedom Or Prison - Geneen Versus Foucault. In: MacKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory: From Panoptican to Technologies of Self*, pp. 126-151. London: Sage Publications.

Hoy, D.C. (1986) *Foucault: A Critical Reader.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Huberman, A.M. and Miles, M.B. (1994) Data Management and Analysis Methods. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, California: Sage Publications.

Hunt, S.D. (1992) For Reason and Realism in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing.* 56, 89-102.

Hunt, S.D. (1976) The Nature and Scope of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing.* 40, 17-28.

Hunt, S.D. (1994) On Rethinking Marketing: Our Discipline, Our Practice, Our Methods. *European Journal of Marketing.* 28, 13-21.

Hunt, S.D. (1984) Should Marketing Adopt Relativism. In: Anderson, P.F. and Ryan, M.J., (Eds.) *Scientific Method in Marketing*, Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.

Hunt, S.D. (1990) Truth in Marketing Theory and Research. *Journal of Marketing.* 54, 1-15.

Hunt, S.D. and Goolsby, J. (1988) The Rise and Fall of the Functional Approach to Marketing: A Paradigm Dsiplacement Perspective. In: Nevett, T. and Fullerton, R.A., (Eds.) *Historial Perspectives in Marketing*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hunter, I. (1994) *Rethinking the School: Subjectivity, Bureaucracy, Criticism.* New York: St. Martin's.

Hutton, P.H. (1988) Foucault, Freud and the Technologies of the Self. In: Martin, L.H., Gutman, H. and Hutton, P.H., (Eds.) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, pp. 121-144. London: Tavistock.

Jack, G.A. (2000) The Politics of Identity and Difference in Intercultural Management Communication: An Anglo-German Study. Heriot-Watt University School of Management.

Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.* London: Verso.

Johns, D.P. and Johns, J.S. (2000) Surveillance, Subjectivism and Technologies of Power: An Analysis of the Discursive Practice of High Performance Sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport.* 35, 219-234.

Johnson, L., Lee, A. and Green, B. (2000) The PhD and the Autonomous Self: Gender, Rationality and Postgraduate Pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education.* 25, 135-147.

Jones, D. and Ball, S. (1994) Michel Foucault and the Discourse of Education. In: McClaren, P. and Giarelli, J., (Eds.) *Critical Theory and Educational Research*, pp. 39-52. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kant de Lima, R. (1992) The Anthropology of the Academy. *Knowledge and Society.* 9, 191-222.

Kavanagh, D. (1994) Hunt Versus Anderson: Round 16. *Eurpean Journal of Marketing .* 28, 26-41.

Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999) 'I'm Interested In Foucault...". In: Kendall, G. and Wickham, G., (Eds.) *Using Foucault's Methods*, London: Sage Publications.

Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

King, N. (1994) The Qualitative Research Review. In: Cassell, C. and Symon, G., (Eds.) *Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, pp. 14-36. London: Sage Publications.

Kirk, D. (2004) Beyond the "Academic" Curriculum: The Production and Operation of Biopower in the Less-Studied Sites of Schooling. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 117-135. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kirk, D. (1998) *Schooling Bodies: School Practice and Public Discourse, 1880-1950*. London: Leicester University Press.

Knights, D. (2002) Writing Organizational Analysis Into Foucault. *Organization.* 9, 575-593.

Knights, D. and Collinson, D. (1987) Disciplining the Shopfloor: A Comparison of the Disciplinary Effects of Managerial Psychology and Financial Accounting. *Accounting, Organisations and Society.* 12, 1-19.

Knights, D. and Morgan, G. (1991) Corporate Strategy, Organizations and Subjectivity: A Critique. *Organistion Studies.* 12, 251-73.

Knights, D. and Sturdy, A. (1997) Marketing the Soul: From the Ideology of Consumption to Consumer Subjectivity. In: Knights, D. and Tinker, T., (Eds.) *Financial Institutions and Social Transformations*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Knights, D. and Wilmott, H. (1989) Power and Subjectivity at Work: From Degradation to Subjuagation in Social Relations. *Sociology.* 23, 535-558.

Knorr- Cetina, K.D. (1981) *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Knorr-Cetina, K.D. and Mulkay, M. (1983) *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage Publications.

Kohn, T. (2002) Becoming an Islander Through Action in the Scottish Hebrides. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.* 8, 143-158.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd edn. Chicago: Univerisity of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (1970) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamont, M. and Molnar, V. (2001) How Blacks Use Consumption to Shape Their Collective Identity: Evidence From Marketing Specialists. *Journal of Consumer Culture.* 1, 31-45.

Lather, P. (2004) Foucauldian "Indiscipline" as a Sort of Applicaiton: Qu(e)er(y)ing Research/Policy/Practice. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 279-305. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univerisity Press.

Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. (1979) *Laboratory Life*. London: Sage Publications.

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

Law, J. and Lynch, M. (1988) Lists, Fields Guides, and the Descriptive Organization of Seeing: Bird Watching as an Exemplary Observational Activity. In: Lynch, M. and Woolgar, S., (Eds.) *Representation in Scientific Practice*, London: MIT Press.

Lee, A. and Williams, C. (1999)   Forged in Fire: Narratives of Trauma in PhD Supervision Pedagogy. *Southern Review.* 32, 6-26.

Levy, S.J. (1981)   Interpreting Consumer Mythology: A Structural Approach to Consumer Behaviour. *Journal of Marketing.* 45, 49-61.

Lima, R.K.d. (1992) The Anthopology of the Academy. *Knowledge and Society: The Anthopology of Science and Technology.* 9, 191-222.

Lindlof, T.R. (1995) *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*.   Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lloyd, G. (1984) *The Man of Reason. 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy*. London: Methuen.

Lusch, R.F. (1982) Creating a Successful Career: Guidelines and Suggestions for Recent Doctorates in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 4, 2-6.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition*.   Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mackinnon, J. (2004) Academic Supervision: Seeking Metaphors and Models for Quality. *Journal of Further and Higher Education.* 28,

MacLaren, P., Stevens, L. and Catterall, M. (1998)   The "Glasshouse Effect": Women in Marketing Management. *Journal of Marketing Practice.* 4, 1355-2538.

Mahar, C. (1990) Pierre Bourdieu: The Intellectual Project. In: Harker, H., Mahar, C. and Wilkes, C., (Eds.) *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu*, pp. 26-57. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

Marcus. G.E (1998) *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Markula, P. (2003) The Technologies of the Self: Sport, Feminism, and Foucault. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 20, 87-107.

Marshall, J. (1997) Michel Foucault: Problematising the Individual and Constituting 'the' Self. *Educational Philosophy and Theory.* 29, 32-49.

Marshall, J.D. (2004) Michel Foucault: Marxism, Liberation and Freedom. In: Baker, B. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 265-279. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Marshall, J.D. (1996) *Michel Foucault: Personal Autonomy and Education: Vol 7.* Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic.

McCracken, G.D. (1988) *The Long Interview*. London: Sage Publications.

McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K. (1998) *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K. (1998) Managing Foucault: Foucault, Management and Organisational Theory. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Managemenr and Organisational Theory*, London: Sage Publications.

McLaren, P. (1993) Border Disputes: Multicultural Narrative, Identity Formation, and Critical Pedagogy in Postmodern America. In: McLaughlin, D. and Tierney, W.G., (Eds.) *Naming Silenced Lives: Personal Narratives and the Process of Educaitonal Change*, London: Routledge.

McLaughlin, D. and Tierney, W.G. (1993) *Naming Silenced Lives: Personal Narratives and the Process of Educational Change*. London: Routledge.

McLaughlin, T. (1998) Theory Outside the Academy: Street Smarts and Critical Theory. *Consumption, Markets and Culture.* 2, 105-231.

McNay, I. (1997) The Impact of the 1992 Research Assessment Excercise in English Universities. *Higher Education Review.* 29,

McNay, L. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

McNay, L. (1999) Gender, Habitas and the Field. *Theory, Culture and Society.* 16, 95-117.

McWilliam, E. (2004) Changing the Academic Subject. *Studies in Higher Education.* 29, 151-163.

Meadmore, D. (1993) The Production of Individuality Through Examination. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 14, 59

Merton, R.K. (1973) *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Middleton, S. (1998) *Disciplining Sexuality: Foucault, Life Histories and Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, D. (1995) *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies*. London: Routledge.

Miller, D. (1997) Consumption and Its Consequences. In: Mackay, H., (Ed.) *Consumption and Everyday Life*, pp. 14-50. London: Sage Publications.

Miller, D. (1987) *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Miller, H. (1994) States, Economies and the Changing Labour Process of Academics: Austrailia, Canada and the United Kingdom. In: Smythe, J., (Ed.) *Academic Work*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Miller, P. and O'Leary, T. (1987) Accounting and the Construction of the Governable Person. *Accounting, Organisations and Society.* 12, 235-65.

Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge.

Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organization*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Morgan, G. (1992) Marketing Discourse and Practice: Towards a Critical Analysis. In: Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H., (Eds.) *Critical Management Studies*, pp. 136-158. London: Sage Publications.

Morgan, G. (1980) Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organization Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 25,

Motes, W.H. (1989) What Our Publishing Students Should Know About the Publishing Game. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 11, 22-27.

Murray, J.B. and Ozanne, J.L. (1991) The Critical Imagination: Emancipatory Interests in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 18, 129-144.

Newton, T. (1996) Resocialising the Subject? A Re-reading of Grey's Career as a Project of the Self... *Sociology.* 30, 137-144.

Newton, T. (1998) Theorizing Subjectivity in Organizations: The Failure of Foucauldian Studies? *Organization Studies.* 19, 415-433.

O' Doherty, D. and Willmott, H. (2001) Debating Labour Process Theory: The Issue of Subjectivity and the Relevance of Poststructuralism. *Sociology.* 35, 457-476.

Oakley, A. (1981) Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms. In: Roberts, H., (Ed.) *Doing Feminist Research*, pp. 30-61. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Olson, J.C. (1983) Presidential Address - 1981: Toward a Science of Consumer Behavior. In: Hunt, S.D., (Ed.) *Marketing Theory*, pp. 395-405. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin.

Parry, O., Atkinson, P. and Delamont, S. (1994) Disciplinary Idenities and Doctoral Work. In: Burgess, R.G., (Ed.) *Postgraduate Education and Training in the Social Sciences*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Parry, O., Atkinson, P. and Delamont, S. (1997) Research Note. The Structure of PhD. Research. *Sociology.* 31, 121-129.

Parry, S. (1998) Disciplinary Discourse in Doctoral Theses. *Higher Education.* 36, 273-299.

Perry, C. (1990) Matching the Minimum Time Requirement: Notes for Small Business PhD. Candidates. *Proceedings of the Fifth National Small Business Conference.* 28-30.

Perry, C. (1999) A Structured Approach for Presenting Theses. *Australiasian Marketing Journal.* 6, 63-85.

Pollard, A. (2007) The UK's Teaching and Learning Research Programme: findings and significance. *British Educational Research Journal.* 33, 639-646

Pole, C. (2000) Technicians and Scholars in Pursuit of the PhD: Some Reflections on Doctoral Study. *Research Papers in Journalism.* 15, 95-111.

Ponder, N. (2004) Doctoral Comprehension Exams in Marketing: Current Practices and Emerging Perspectives. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 26, 226-235.

Ponder, N. and Lueg, J.E. (2004) Methodology Training for Doctoral Students: A Proposed Three-Course Sequence. *Marketing Education Review.* 14, 39-46.

Popkewitz, T.S. (1991) *A Political Sociology of Educational Reform: Power/Knowledge in Teaching, Teacher Education, and Research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewiz, T.S. and Brennan, M. (1998) Restructuring of Social and Political Theory in Education: Foucault and Social Epistemology of School Practices. *Educational Theory.* 47, 287-313.

Popper, K.R. (1959) *The Logic of Scientific Delivery.* New York: Basic Books.

Potter, J. (1996) *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction.* London: Sage Publications.

Pryce, A. (2000) Frequent Observation: Sexualities, Self-Surveillance, Confession and the Construction of the Active Patient. *Nursing Inquiry.* 7, 103-111.

Rabinow, P. (1985) Discourse and Power: On the Limits of Ethnographic Texts. *Dialectical Anthropology.* 10, 1-14.

Rail, G. and Harvey, J. (1995) Body at Work: Michel Foucault and the Sociology of Sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 12, 164-179.

Rajchman, J. (1992) Foucault, the Ethic and the Work. In: Armstrong, T.J., (Ed.) *Michel Foucault: Philosopher*, pp. 215-224. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Rimke, H.M. (2000) Governing Citizens Through Self-Help Literature. *Cultural Studies.* 14, 61-78.

Ritson, M.B. (1996) The Interpretation of Advertising Meaning. Lancaster University.

Roberts, K. (1992) *Careers and Identities.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Rose, N. (1990) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self.* London: Routledge.

Rose, N. (1996) *Inventing Ourselves: Psychology, Power and Personhood.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roth, W.-M. and Bowen, G.M. (2001) Of Disciplined Minds and Disciplined Bodies: On Becoming an Ecologist. *Qualitative Sociology.* 24, 459-481.

Saren, M. (1999) Marketing Theory. In: Baker, M.J., (Ed.) *IEBM Encyclopedia of Marketing*, pp. 794-809. London: International Thomson.

Saren, M., Maclaran, P., Goulding, C., Elliot, R., Shankar, A., and Catterall, M. (2007) *Critical Marketing: Defining the Field.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann

Saussure, de.F. (1974) *The Lesser Evil and The Greater Good: The Theory and Politics of Social Diversity.* London: Rivers Oram Press.

Savage, M. (1998) Constructing the Modern Organization - Discipline, Surveillance and the 'Career': Employment on the Great Western Railway 1833-1914. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organisational Theory*, pp. 65-92. London: Sage Publications.

Seale, C. (1998) *Researching Society and Culture.* London: Sage Publications.

Shapin, S. (1992) Discipline and Bounding: The History and Sociology of Science As Seen Through the Externalism-Internalism Debate. *History of Science.* 30, 333-369.

Shapin, S. (1995) Here and everywhere: Sociology of Scientific Knowledge. *Annual Review of Sociology.* 21, 289-321.

Shapin, S. (1991a) "The Mind Is It's Own Place". Science and Solitude in Seventeenth Century England. *Science in Context.* 4, 191-218.

Shapin, S. (1991b) "A Scholar and Gentlemen": The Problematic Identity of the Scientific Practitioner In Early Modern England. *History of Science.* 29, 279-327.

Higher Education and the Panopticon Paradigm: Quality Assessment as "Disciplinary Technology". Shore, C and Roberts, S. Society for Research into Higher Education Conference. 93. 93.

Shore, C. and Wright, S. (1999) Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S).* 5, 557-575.

Siegel, H. (1988) Relativism for Consumer Research? (Comments on Anderson). *Journal of Consumer Research.* 15, 129-132.

Silverman, D. (2004)   Developments in Social Theory. In: Seale, C., (Ed.) *Researching Society and Culture* , 2nd edn. pp. 33-46. London: Sage Pubilcations.

Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction* . London: Sage Publications.

Silverman, D. (1970) *The Theory of Organizations*. London: Heinemann.

Smart, B. (1983) *Foucault, Marxism and Critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Smart, B. (1985) *Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Smart, D.T. and Conant, J.S. (1990)   Marketing Dissertations: Profiling the Successful Thesis Candidate. *Journal of Marketing Education.* Autumn, 2-8.

Smith, D. (1978b)   'K is Mentally Ill':   The Anatomy of a Factual Account. *Sociology.* 12, 23-53.

Smith, D. (1990a) 'K is Mentally Ill: The Anatomy of a Factual Account'. In: Smith, D., (Ed.) *Texts, Facts, and Femininity*, London: Routledge.

Spiggle, S. (1994)   Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 21, 491-503.

Stabile, C.A. and Morooka, J. (2003) 'Between Two Evils, I Refuse to Choose the Lesser'. *Cultural Studies.* 17, 326-348.

Starkey, K. and Hatchuel, A. (2002) The Long Detour: Foucault's History of Desire and Pleasure. *Organization.* 9, 641-656.

Starkey, K. and McKinlay, A. (1998) Afterword: Deconstructing Organization - Discipline and Desire. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organisational Theory*, pp. 230-240. London: Sage Publications.

Stern, B. (1998) *Representing Consumers: Voices, Views and Visions*. London: Routledge.

Stern, B.B. (1996) Deconstructive Strategy and Consumer Research: Concepts and Illustrative Exemplar. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 23, 147-163.

Stina Lyon, E. (1995) Dilemmas of Power in Post-graduate Practice: A Comment on Research Training. *Sociology.* 29, 531-540.

Stone, L. Notes of Foucault's Philosophy of History. American Educational Research Association Meeting . 2002.

Sturdy, A. (1992) Clerical Consent: "Shifting Work" in the Insurance Office. In: Sturdy, A., Knights, D. and Willmott, H., (Eds.) *Skill and Consent*, London: Routledge.

Svensson, P. (2001) Setting the Marketing Scene: Discourse and Ideology in Marketing Practice. *Paper Delivered at the Marketing Stream, Critical Management Studies Conference.*

Tamboukou, M. (2000) Of Other Spaces: Women's Colleges at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century. *Gender, Place and Culture.* 7, 247-264.

Tarr, J. (2004) Embodiment, Reflexivity and Movement Re-education. In: Seale, C., (Ed.) *Researching Society and Culture* , pp. 454-461. London: Sage Publications.

Thompson, C.J. (2003) Natural Health Discourse and the Therapeutic Production of Consumer Resistance. *The Sociological Quarterly.* 44, 81-107.

Tinkler, P. and Jackson, C. (2000) Examining the Doctorate: Institutional Policy and the PhD Examination Process in Britain. *Studies in Higher Education.* 25, 167-180.

Toll, C.A. and Crumpler, T.P. (2004) Everything is Dangerous: Pasterol Power and University Researchers Conducting Interviews. In: Baker, B.M. and Heyning, K.E., (Eds.) *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, pp. 385-405. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Tonkiss, F. (2004) Analysing Text and Speech: Content and Discourse Analysis. In: Seale, C., (Ed.) *Researching Society and Culture* , pp. 367-382. London: Sage Publications.

Townley, B. (1998) Beyond Good and Evil: Depth and Division in the Management of Human Resources. In: McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K., (Eds.) *Foucault, Managemenr and Organisational Theory*, pp. 191-210. London: Sage Publications.

Townley, B. (1993) Foucault, Power/Knowledge, and its Relevance for Human Resource Management. *Academy of Management Review.* 18, 518-28.

Traweek, S. (1988) *Beamtimes and Lifetimes: The World of High Energy Physicists*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Trethewey, A. (1999) Disciplined Bodies: Women's Embodied Identities at Work. *Organization Studies.* 20, 423-450.

Trotter, J. (2003) Researching, Studying or Jumping Through Hoops? Reflections on a PhD. *Social Work Education.* 22, 60-70.

Tynan, C. (2001) Editorial. *The Marketing Review.* 1, 407-408.

Varadarajan, P.R. (1996) From the Editor: Reflections on Research and Publishing. *Journal of Marketing.* 60, 3-6.

Walker, M. (1998) Academic Identities: Women on a South African Landscape. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 19, 335-376.

Wallendorf, E.C. and Brooks, M. (1993) Introspection in Consumer Research: Implementation and Implications. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 20, 55-70.

Weedon, C. (1997) *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. 2nd edn. Cambridge MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Wensley, R. (1995) A Critical Review of Research in Marketing. *British Journal of Management.* 6, 63-82.

Wensley, R. (1990) The Voice of the Consumer? Speculations on the Limits to the Marketing Analogy. *European Journal of Marketing.* 24, 49-60.

Wensley, R. (2007) Relevance of Critique: Can and Should Critical Marketing Influence Practice and Policy. In: Saren, M., Maclaran, P., Goulding, C., Elliot, R., Shankar, A., and Catterall, M. (Eds.) *Critical Marketing: Defining the Field*, pp233-244. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann

Wesely, J.K. (2001) Negotiating Gender: Bodybuilding and the Natural /Unnatural Continuum. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 18, 297-305.

Wetherell, M. (2001) Themes in Discourse Research. The Case of Diana. In: Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J., (Eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, London: Sage Publications.

Willis, A.I. (2002) Literacy at Calhoun Colored School 1892-1945. *Reading Research Quarterly* . 37, 8-44.

Willmott, H. (1994) Bringing Agency (Back) Into Organisational Analysis: Responding to the Crises of (Post)modernity. In: Hassard, J. and Parker, M., (Eds.) *Towards a New Theory of Organisations*, London: Routledge.

Willmott, H. (2003) Commercialising Higher Education in the UK: The State, Industry and Peer Review. *Studies in Higher Studies.* 28, 129-141.

Wilson, A.L. (1999) Creating Identities of Dependancy: Adult Education as a Knowledge-Power Regime. *International Journal of Lifelong Education.* 18, 85-93.

Winfield, G. (1987) *The Social Science Ph.D.: The ESRC Inquiry on Submission Rates.* London: Economic and Social Research Council.

Wisker, G., Robinson, G., Trafford, V., Warnes, M. and Creighton, E. (2003) From Supervisory Dialogues to Successful PhDs: Strategies Supporting and Enabling the Learning Conversations of Staff and Students at Postgraduate Level. *Teaching in Higher Education.* 8, 383-397.

Witz, A. (1990) Patriarchy and Professions: The Gendered Politics of Occupational Closure. *Sociology.* 24, 675-690.

Woodruff, R.B. and Cravens, D.W. (1990) Challenges for Graduate Marketing Education in the Twenty-First Century. *Marketing Education Review.* 1, 34-44.

Woodward, K. (1997) *Identity and Difference.* The Open University: Sage Pubilcations.

Woolgar, S. (1988) *Science: The Very Idea.* Milton Keynes: The Open University.

Wray-Bliss, E. (2003) Research Subjects/Research Subjections: Exploring the Ethics and Politics of Critical Research. *Organization.* 10, 307-25.

Website Reference List

Higher Education and Research Opportunities in the United Kingdom. (2004)
www.hero.ac.uk

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2006)
www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus

Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) (2005)
www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2005/01/

Economic and Social Research Council. (2006)
www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx

Higher Education Funding Councils. (HEFC) (1995) *Guidance on Submissions*. In:
RAE 96 2/95

Academy of Marketing (2007)
www.academyofmarketing.info