

ARTICLE

Academic Subjectivities: Governmentality and Self-Development in Higher Education

Fabian Cannizzo, Monash University

ABSTRACT: International debates surrounding the management of universities in Western states have focused heavily upon the implications of neo-liberalism and the economisation of knowledge at national and international levels. However, investigations at the institutional level reveal that programmes for the development of human capital, organisational reputation and service quality in education and research are encouraged through regimes of self-development, directed towards organisational objectives. This article utilises governmentality theory to explore the relationship between governance and subjectivity within the Australian higher education system. The governance of higher education, it will be argued, is enabled by mentalities of government which are dependent upon contemporary technologies, techniques for self-evaluation and career-planning, expertise about university labour, and—importantly—practices which engender an enterprising academic identity. To explore the utility of this analysis in contemporary Western liberal states, this study explores the construction of subjectivity implicit within Monash University’s Performance Development Online (PDO) technology. Embedded with “technologies of the self,” this performance management platform is positioned within Monash as a gateway which requires academics to reflect upon their careers and selves, encouraging the genesis of marketable identities. This article points to the utility of further research into the development of career in a changing academic environment.

Keywords: governmentality; subjectivity; technologies of the self; academia; higher education; performance development.

What does it mean to be an academic? The consequences of neo-liberal reforms to the higher education sector in Australia have been documented and debated.¹ The dependency of universities on government and private-sector funding has led some to claim that science and aca-

¹ See Linda Butler, “What Happens When Funding is Linked to Publication Counts?” in Henk F. Moed, Wolfgang Glänzel, and Ulrich Schmoch (eds.), *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research* (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2005), 389-405; Raewyn Connell, “MyUniversity: Notes on Neoliberalism and Knowledge,” *NEXUS: Newsletter of The Australian Sociological Association*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2012), 11-14; and Simon Marginson, “Towards a Politics of the Enterprise University,” in Simon K. Cooper, John Hinkson, and Geoff Sharp (eds.), *Scholars and Entrepreneurs: The Universities in Crisis* (North Carlton, Victoria: Arena Publications Association, 2002), 109-136.

demia have distinct “goals, traditions, and values that have been thrown together.”² In his critical investigation of Australian and British universities, titled *Whackademia*, Hil argues that “this situation has led to a generalised state of existential malaise in which many disgruntled and disillusioned academics ponder what it means to be an academic in today’s university system.”³

The transformation of universities into economically-driven marketplaces for knowledge and qualifications has been mirrored by a need to co-opt the academic, and to fit that identity into a business model. Davison and Murphy claim that alongside the introduction of “user-pays” higher education at Australian universities rose the implementation of “carrot-and-stick mechanisms” for encouraging professional academic staff to improve their educational and research performance, and take on consumer-based approaches to the delivery of higher education.⁴ Brennan argues that as managerial roles become further embedded in the position of the Deans and other senior members of faculty—or as she describes them, “middle management” in the university executive—these positions become less attractive to younger staff, who are expected to replace their retiring seniors.⁵ The tighter coupling of the activities of senior faculty with the objectives of university central management has created increasing demands on senior staff to perform administrative duties, such as accountability and benchmarking activities, analysing data and the continuous redesigning of strategic plans, leaving little time for traditional academic work, such as teaching and research.⁶ The integration of academic and financial interests have reached a degree in some departments that it has warranted the generation of a theory of Academic Capitalism.⁷ Although such theorising has attempted to address the impact of capitalist relations upon academic labour, demands to stabilise academic-management relationships emerging from within the university sector have left the identities of academics largely under-described, and over-prescribed.

The purpose of this article is to explore an analytic method by which the production and governance of selfhood within academia may be demystified, beyond the polemic dichotomy of academic integrity versus managerial commoditisation. The governance of academics

² Edward J. Hackett, “Science as a Vocation in the 1990s: The Changing Organizational Culture of Academic Science,” *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 61 (1990), 248.

³ Richard Hil, *Whackademia: An Insider’s Account of the Troubled University* (Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2012), 11.

⁴ Graeme Davidson and Kate Murphy, *University Unlimited: The Monash Story* (Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2012), 244-245.

⁵ Marie Brennan, “Dividing the University: Perspectives from the Middle,” in Jill Blackmore, Marie Brennan and Lew Zipin (eds.), *Re-Positioning University Governance and Academic Work* (Rotterdam, Boston and Taipei: Sense Publishers, 2010), 125.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁷ Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades, *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2004). For an earlier formulation of the relationship between science and capital, see Harry Braverman, *Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, 25th Anniversary Edition* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998), especially chapter 7 detailing Braverman’s theory of the appropriation of science by industry in an historical phase he names “The Scientific-Technical Revolution.”

will be approached through the theoretical lens of “governmentality” theory.⁸ Governance, in this context, is not concerned with power “transfixed by the image of the state” as in conventional political philosophy, but rather with an assemblage of apparatuses which enable a mode of self-government: achieved through “the formation and transformation of theories, proposals, strategies and technologies for ‘the conduct of conduct.’”⁹ The utility of this analysis will be demonstrated through a case study of an Australian higher education institution, Monash University. This case study uses the theoretical lens of governmentality theory to describe how the present regime of governance, encouraged through national policies and funding initiatives common to all Australian public universities, influences the formation of selfhood and the conduct of academics. Building on this analysis, this article will also investigate the possibilities of how future developments may affect both academics and institutions.

Monash’s governmentality will be analysed through “an analytics of government.”¹⁰ Publicly available policy documents will have been analysed in order to map the strategic rationale behind the present regime that attempts to organise academic life. It will be argued that programs for the development of “performance” aim to align the interests of academics with the goals of the university through moral prescription: they “affect each of us, our personal beliefs, wishes and aspirations, in other words, our ethics.”¹¹ The operation of a regime of governance is a strategic and technological achievement which depends upon the enrolment of human and non-human actors into mutually-enforcing roles. Specific policies or programs for governing academic management, research or teaching, are therefore at risk when human or non-human actors are not successfully enrolled. As Miller and Rose remark, because rigid programs are introduced into highly fluid environments, they are “congenitally failing operation,” destined to be replaced by other policies and programs which are adapted to new environments and actors.¹²

Locating Subjectivity within Governmentality

Since Foucault developed his theory of “governmentality” in the seminar series, “*Security, Territory, and Population*,” analytical methods have developed which offer fruitful commentary on the relationship between governance and subjectivity.¹³ An analysis of governmentality reveals that government is both enabled and limited by the “expertise, vocabulary, theories, ideas, philosophies and other forms of knowledge” that are available to administrations.¹⁴ In par-

⁸ See the following. Mitchell Dean, *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007), 81-82; Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles and London: Sage Publications, 2010), 17; Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), 26-29.

⁹ Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 3.

¹⁰ For an accessible description of an Analytics of Government, see Dean, *Governmentality*, 30-37.

¹¹ Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*, 2nd ed. (London: Free Association Books, 1999), 3.

¹² Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 35.

¹³ Michel Foucault, “Governmentality,” in Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (eds.), *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (New York and London: The New Press, 2003).

¹⁴ Dean, *Governmentality*, 25.

ticular, empirical investigations of what Rose terms the “psy” sciences have suggested that psychological and psychiatric practices have made it possible for humans to speak, judge, and conduct themselves in new ways.¹⁵ That is, by enabling practices to reflect on our actions in terms of neurological activity, deterministic assumptions about biology’s impact upon choice, and the classification of normal and abnormal brain states, the psy sciences were successful in promoting a complex of theories of human action. Our present conceptions of the “psyche,” by which we assess and act upon our bodies and others, are historical practices and forms of expertise which place the “mind” or brain at the centre of explaining human agency.

Studies in the techniques of neoliberal governmentality in academia have documented shifts in academic governance, such as the standardisation of individuality through “e-government” to the autonomisation and responsabilisation of pre-service teachers through the self-management of “e-portfolios.”¹⁶ These methods for self-reflection and self-evaluation are both practices for constituting a sense of self within an institutional context, and the application of a theoretical understanding of worker motivation which promises to generate predictable workplace routines and outcomes. These techniques need not necessarily be recognised by academics to fulfil their purposes. In an in-depth analysis of the career of an Australian university professor, Bansel and Davies comment that the uptake of a subject position compatible with a neoliberal governmentality was presented within a rhetoric of personal career “choice” from the professor’s local perspective.¹⁷ The neoliberal technologies of economic rationalism, managerialism, marketisation, and entrepreneurialism are taken up by academics through discourses of “individuality” — where one’s choices are experienced as *individual* rational actions, and therefore “emerge as if driven from within.”¹⁸ Through such technologies, academics actively position themselves within neoliberal discourses, producing the experience of oneself as a free agent of one’s own choices. What is perceived as active resistance through individuality is also a form of complying with neoliberal governmentality, “not through a love of neoliberalism, but through a love of what neoliberalism puts at risk.”¹⁹ However, the success or failure of techniques of self-governance are inseparable from the ways in which academic life is defined as problematic or in need of intervention, and to which programmes for governing are able to be presented as solutions.

Governance is formed within “particular historical moments,” when programs with “shared problematizations, or modes of problem formation” join to create shared styles of

¹⁵ Nikolas Rose, *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 10-11; also see Rose, *Governing the Soul*, vi.

¹⁶ Paul Henman and Mitchell Dean, “E-government and the Production of Standardized Individuality,” in Vaughan Higgins, Simon Kitto and Wendy Lerner (eds.), *Calculating the Social: Standards and the Reconfiguration of Governing* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 86; Peter O’Brien, Nickolas Osbaldiston and Gavin Kendall, “ePortfolios and eGovernment: From Technology to the Entrepreneurial Self,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, advanced online publication, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2011.00826.x.

¹⁷ Peter Bansel and Bronwyn Davies, “Through a Love of What Neoliberalism Puts at Risk,” in Jill Blackmore, Marie Brennan and Lew Zipin (eds.), *Re-Positioning University Governance and Academic Work* (Rotterdam, Boston and Taipei: Sense Publishers, 2010).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 143.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 144.

thinking and acting, or “mentalities.”²⁰ One such moment occurred during a shift in academic governance towards a “performance culture of rewards and penalties” in Britain.²¹ The implementation of accounting and auditing expertise enabled this culture through translating the demands of the student, or education consumer, into techniques for evaluating the performance of university teaching. The delivery of educational services was both problematised and addressed within the consumer-based model which centred on pragmatic programs and techniques measuring and assessing educational services. Forms of expertise, such as auditing, become realised through practical “intellectual techniques” and solutions to the problem of how to promote customer/student satisfaction. They are not purely theoretical solutions, but practical technologies which Latour might describe as “thinking with eyes and hands.”²² These techniques are not adopted simply because they claim to be effective, but because they are also compatible with prevalent political ideologies—such as the neoliberal national government which aims for cost-effectiveness and transparency in budget allocation—and fit the design of already prevalent programmes for governance—such as the managerial approaches to university governance, such as in Australia and the UK.²³ In presenting practical solutions to problematizations, our present governmentality is limited by the discourses which allow and encourage certain modes of problem-solving over others.

Within current Western governmentalities, which Rose describes as “advanced liberal,” governing agents must seek to foster particular types of subjectivities through an “Enterprise Culture.”²⁴ Individuals must be governed through their own choice and free will, rather than coercion or through the use of violence, as “experts of themselves.”²⁵ Where this culture enters the arena of governance, government becomes characterised by “action at a distance.”²⁶ As Dean notes, a liberal government “steers rather than rows.”²⁷ Authorities may provide individuals with “technologies of the self” through which they may reflect upon and regulate their conduct through their own will and effort.²⁸ The construction of specific selves—of experiences of academic life which reinforce governmental rationalities and programmes—is a necessary aspect of advanced liberal governance.

An Analytic Methodology

An analytics of government attempts to reveal the contingent nature of government through exposing the discourses which make government possible.²⁹ Institutional policies, within this

²⁰ Nikolas Rose, Pat O'Malley and Mariana Valverde, “Governmentality,” *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences*, vol. 2 (2006), 88.

²¹ Michael Power, *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 103.

²² Latour quoted in Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 36.

²³ Michael A. Peters, “Managerialism and the Neoliberal University: Prospects for New Forms of “Open Management” in Higher Education,” *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, vol. 5 (2013), 11-26.

²⁴ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 140.

²⁵ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 215.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 33-34.

²⁷ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 48.

²⁸ Dean, *Governmentality*, 18; also see Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*, 153.

²⁹ Gavin Kendall and Gary Wickham, *Using Foucault's Methods* (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1999), 35.

analytical frame, are performative artefacts, through which actors attempt to order their world. Policy-making is “the unification of a political space [...] a successful hegemonic attempt to define a political reality, subject identities and modes of action.”³⁰ But governance cannot be explained by institutionalised thought alone: governance is a practical ordering of people and spaces. Analytically, there are several distinguishable elements of governance, each contributing to the nexus of governmentality: practices, programmes, and political rationalities.

Governance is “the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific and complex form of power.”³¹ Within this matrix, political rationalities are the formalised thoughts and arguments of political and social thinkers, rendered into practice through their translation into the realm of government, as programmes which address specific problems.³² Programmes of government are more than mere wishes or intentions—they are arrangements of intellectual technologies, such as social, economic or psychological theory, which tame reality by subjecting it to “disciplined analyses of thought.”³³ Political rationalities, such as the neoliberal shift in Western states, are enacted through programmes of government which offer remedies to problematizations.³⁴ Programmes of government are not deterministically implemented based on political rationalities, but are dependent upon the available technologies which may allow their objectives to be achieved. Such technologies include Foucault’s “techniques of the self” that are central to advanced liberal governance.³⁵ Of course, the operation of governmentality cannot be described on this purely analytical level alone but, nonetheless, governmentality theorists provide some suggestions on how to approach an empirical analysis of governance in Australian universities. The mentality of governing institutions are often negotiated and codified within policy and procedural documents.

Institutional policies are an element of a governmental apparatus or, as Pongratz describes, a response to a “strategic imperative” within a specific historical context.³⁶ Policy documents are never ends in themselves—they do not constitute the university or the subject itself—but are strategies aimed at solving problematizations. These strategies become formalised in policy as inscriptions of a political consensus.³⁷ Problematizations are not simply responded to with policies, but are also produced and disseminated through policy itself. The purpose of policy analysis here is not to measure a policy’s “sense of reality” or criticise it, but

³⁰ Herbert Gottweis, “Theoretical Strategies for Poststructuralist Policy Analysis: Towards an Analytics of Government,” in Maarten A. Hajer and Hendrik Wagenaar (eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 260.

³¹ Foucault, “Governmentality,” 244.

³² Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 61.

³³ *Ibid.*, 62.

³⁴ Dean, *Governmentality*, 175.

³⁵ Rose, *Governing the Soul*, 244.

³⁶ Ludwig A. Pongratz, “Voluntary Self-Control: Education reform as a Governmental Strategy,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 38 (2006), 475.

³⁷ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 15.

to recognise the discourses contained within as an outcome of the will to organise subjects and to render some time and space predictable.

In order to demonstrate how the elements which form governmentality may be used as analytic tools, policy documents were collected from an Australian higher education institution, Monash University. Monash University ranks 91 on the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-2014*, ranking 5th in Australia and the Oceania region.³⁸ Although there is a degree of differentiation between the institutional missions and strategies of Australian higher education institutions (and even more between Australian and international institutions), Monash University is an Australian-borne international enterprise which aspires to compete within the global knowledge marketplace. In this sense, it reflects global trends towards greater international competition and a focus on attaining “academic prestige” at the international level, recognised excellence in research and value-for-money at the national level, and tighter controls on funding at the institutional level.³⁹ To attempt to map the range of discursive strategies used within Monash University, a range of policies and strategic documents were selected from its online policy archive. Any policy which pertained to Monash’s overarching education and research strategies, human resource strategy, risk assessment strategy and international strategies were analysed. The purpose of this analysis was firstly to lay bare the discursive technologies by which academic governance is both problematised and enacted, and secondly, to locate the academic subject within those discourses and strategies.

The “selfhood” described in the following analysis is constructed through historically-specific discourses that have attained a working consensus, and is not necessarily a reflection of the experiences of academics working within that institution. Rose suggests that selfhood is located within the practices and regimes created to govern human conduct and encourage people to become predictable “as if they were selves of certain sorts.”⁴⁰ To that extent, governmentality is always an ideal—an imagining of potential. New subjectivities are constructed through innovations in knowledge and ways of knowing which weave individuals into practices of government.⁴¹ By attempting to map the relationship between the discourses which enable practices of government and the subjects upon which they depend, an analytics of government may provide a powerful tool for understanding the success of neoliberal forms of governance and our own enrolment into programs which some would prefer to surpass.

Discursive Strategies within Monash University

Within the advanced liberal context, governance emerges from specific relationships between institutions, expertise and subjectivity in which individuals are envisioned as potentially active in their own government.⁴² Increasing focus upon the “human factor” of organisational

³⁸ See “World University Rankings,” *Times Higher Education*, accessed March 14, 2014. Available online at: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/>.

³⁹ Jenny M. Lewis, *Academic Governance: Disciplines and Policy* (New York and London: Routledge, 2013), 167. Also see Monash University, *The Next Ten Years* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2012), 7 for an overview of the international and global focus of Monash’s overarching policy aims.

⁴⁰ Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*, 4.

⁴¹ Rose, *Governing the Soul*, 8.

⁴² Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 131-132.

strategic planning has encouraged the emergence of discourses which champion the “cultivation of the individual.”⁴³ Two discursive strategies through which Monash University has sought to realise the potential for academic self-governance are identified here as the pursuit of both “Excellence” and “Innovation.” These terms do not refer simply to their colloquial use, such as “teaching excellence” or “innovative technologies,” but signify strategies through which actors, technologies, and programs are arranged and implemented. These discourses are ordered through “technologies of government,” institutionalising expert knowledge which renders academics thinkable and hence governable.⁴⁴

Within their *Research Strategic Plan*, Monash University explicate the meaning of Excellence in research and the means by which Excellence is recognised and fostered:

Excellence involves leadership in the national research effort in areas of particular strength or focus, while maintaining a broad base of high quality across a wide range of disciplines. *Indicators* of research excellence include: overall research performance (including *outputs, income and research training*); Monash *performance assessments* such as ERA [Excellence in Research for Australia initiative] and league table rankings; the number of high profile researchers and research projects based at the university.⁴⁵

Excellence is quantified through performance measurements, reflecting the entrepreneurial characters of researchers and research groups. These means, by which research Excellence is made visible and calculable, are “intellectual technologies” that constitute the excellent researcher or research group through the inscription and calculation of performance measurements.⁴⁶ “Talent Enhancement” designates a group of tactics used to promote Excellence.⁴⁷

Talent Enhancement tactics build Excellence through programmes which aim to “achieve world class research leadership.”⁴⁸ The Monash Professorial Fellowship (MPF) program and Larkins Fellowship program aim to attract “high performing” professors and early/mid career researchers, respectively. The success or failure of these initiatives is determined at the level of the individual, via the

research performance of new recruits attracted with MPF and Larkins Fellowship funds (including contribution to research income, publications, awards, impact, contribution to improved ERA results and leadership roles—collectively expected to generate over \$35 million per annum in external research income by 2015)⁴⁹

This discourse of Excellence limits a domain of subjects to be governed—the high performing researcher or world class research leadership—through generating a vocabulary which distinguishes the successful from the failed individual and the technical apparatus of the fellowship

⁴³ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 5.

⁴⁴ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 63.

⁴⁵ Monash University, *Research Strategic Plan 2011-2015* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2011), 6, *italics added*.

⁴⁶ Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*, 120.

⁴⁷ Monash University, *Research Strategic Plan 2011-2015*, 9.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

programs' criteria. Excellence binds the interests of potential senior and mid-career employees to the research and financial objectives of the institution—to generate external research income—which is discussed further in the next section. The creation of such a vocabulary is, as Rose comments, a necessary step to creating a governable field.⁵⁰ By drawing on the language of “high performance,” these programs create the expectation that potential fellowship applicants will demonstrate both their commitment to competition with other potential applicants and to engaging in their research practices in a way which appeal to Monash's pursuit of reputation, research funding, and the status associated with employing “high performing” researchers.

The individualised discourse of Excellence is also present in Monash's *Education Strategic Plan*. Monash aim to strengthen their approach to education through “[e]nsuring excellence in learning and teaching through *clear performance standards, targeted support and development, and an academic staff profile* that supports the strategic goals of the University.”⁵¹ As noted in the *Education Strategic Plan*, academics are expected to be motivated by rewards for “excellence and innovation in learning and teaching,” optimal management of research in learning and teaching, the refinement of performance standards, and the provision of “support for academic colleagues enabling them to deal more effectively with diverse student backgrounds and needs.”⁵² Similarly to the function of Excellence in research, Excellence in teaching becomes a strategy through which the methods and career orientation of academics are directed toward the economic objectives of the university. The development of performance standards, self-profiling, and engagement in self-development are directed towards the demands of the perceived demands of the student-consumer. “Individuals are to become, as it were, entrepreneurs of themselves,” adaptable and self-motivated.⁵³ As in research, Excellence in teaching is reified through performance measurement criteria which render abstract notions of “excellence in learning and teaching” into inscriptions which can be accumulated and compared. Excellence is a discourse firmly grounded in technical apparatuses and procedures, but it is not the only vocabulary through which academics are described and evaluated.

Monash University also supports several strategic programmes grounded in a vocabulary of “Innovation,” recognising the interdependency between academic conduct, the expectations of students and research customers, and how education is facilitated. The university invests in a “Digital Education Strategy” described as “Blended Learning”—online and technologically-enhanced study programmes and procedures “to provide staff and students with more environmentally sustainable, intuitive, mobile and innovating online learning and teaching opportunities.”⁵⁴ Staff and students, with the university's support and training, are expected to comply with the Blended Learning initiative and “deploy the digital education tech-

⁵⁰ Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*, 102.

⁵¹ Monash University, *Education Strategic Plan 2011-2015* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2011), 8, *italics added*.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 9.

⁵³ Rose, *Governing the Soul*, 230.

⁵⁴ Monash University, *Education Strategic Plan 2011-2015*, 12.

nologies with maximum skill and impact,” depending upon the production of an entrepreneurial academic subject.

Enabling strategies, such as Blended Learning and the provision of “e-research systems” aim to foster “optimum use, sharing and dissemination of knowledge needed to undertake research.”⁵⁵ As stated in Monash’s *Research Strategic Plan*:

Monash will assist its researchers to become *more outwardly engaged, better connected, more influential and entrepreneurial* so that the research agenda is informed by continual dialogue and feedback, to generate greater impact.⁵⁶

Innovation becomes a programmatic rationale, which is enabled by the emergence of information technologies and learning platforms, as well as institutional investment in an entrepreneurial academic subject who is expected to engage with these technologies out of professional self-interest. Blended Learning and e-research initiatives attempt to limit academics’ possibilities for acting beyond institutional interests, to encourage them to conform with Monash’s business model, to become “A university ‘in the world’.”⁵⁷ The academic is not innovative per se, but is expected to utilise the digital technology strategy which is pre-packaged—or “black-boxed”—as a technical solution to the need for academic engagement in industry-targeted research, or teacher-student interactions in need of refreshing. Innovation is not a radical process through which organisational change might be affected from teaching- or research-upwards, but a reified program for the implementation of institution-led developments. The growth of digital and distance education across the globe, combined with pressures placed upon institutions to become more accountable to their student-consumers and more cost-effective have been reflected in the increasing demand and supply of online academic courses and blended learning more generally.⁵⁸ These modes of education provision have been adopted through the enrolment of academics into programs and routines: a process that, once enabled, translates the interests of academics to align them with the ideal operational goals of the university. The discourses of Excellence and Innovation not only describe desirable organisational strategies, but presume the existence and creation of kinds of human subjects whose role it is to fulfil the needs of programs and interact appropriately with prescribed technologies.

Constructing Enterprising Subjectivities

Both discourses of Excellence and Innovation place a burden of expectation upon the ethical constitutions of the academics which policy practices attempt to organise into predictable variables. Policy is not just a description of plans, procedures and events, but expresses an “ethical culture.”⁵⁹ Within Monash’s policies, Excellence and Innovation are not able to enrol aca-

⁵⁵ Monash University, *Research Strategic Plan*, 14.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 17, *italics added*.

⁵⁷ Monash University, *Monash Directions 2025* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2011), 1.

⁵⁸ Hanover Research Council, *Student Demand for Alternative Modes of Course Delivery* (Washington: Hanover Research Council, 2009), 4, accessed March 16, 2014. Available online at: http://www.mq.edu.au/learning-and-teaching/reports/docs/Student_Demand_Alt_Course.pdf

⁵⁹ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 61.

demics through rationality alone. Through defining academics as individual components of a larger institutional framework, Monash draws upon a theoretical—and ideological—understanding of human agents which is expressed through its practical governance programmes. As Dean argues, “individualism is not pure: it is something constructed with the help of experts and has an institutional face.”⁶⁰ Mentalities of government rely upon the theories, ideas, vocabularies, and philosophies of expertise, to create a common language and the technical means to govern. Subjectivity is organised through the language of experts which is visible in the programmes that become possible through their expertise.

Monash’s “Talent Enhancement” strategy encourages academics to pursue institutionally-desired goals by filtering the actions of academics through managerial and accounting expertise.⁶¹ The aims of two Talent Enhancement strategies, the Monash Professorial Fellowship (MPF) and Larkins Fellowship programs, are virtually identical: to attract “internationally competitive” researchers who can contribute to Monash’s research policy priorities.⁶² The demands placed upon potential fellowship applicants are the outcome of the pursuit of talent enhancement and an attempt to ensure the accountability of the funds distributed through fellowships via compliance with “reporting requirements.”⁶³ The academic enters the institution under both the expectation of cultivating an entrepreneurial self, and the obligation of managing the risks generated by their actions through auditing and evaluation. The desires of individuals are “translated” through mediating techniques which promise to fulfil the desires of individuals in ways which also benefit the university. The expertise underpinning these fellowship programs are hence of both an economic-rational and psychological nature: they aim to impact upon both economic relations within the university, and the decisions-making framework in which potential fellowship applicants operate. The translation of interests of academics, departments, and universities are central to the success of these strategies.

Rose notes that managerial doctrines of excellence are accompanied by an image of a successful entrepreneurial subject yearning to learn the skills “of self-presentation, self-direction and self-management.”⁶⁴ The Monash Research Accelerator program (MRA) also shares the MPF’s and Larkins Fellowship’s psycho-rational knowledge assumptions, as it seeks to encourage researchers to further develop their careers in alignment with Monash’s strategic goals. According to the MRA’s guidelines, successful MRA applicants are to

develop a plan that sets out their research career vision, where they would like to be at the end of the MRA program period, and what support they require to get there. This plan will also identify activities and their costs, forming the MRA grant budget. These plans should be devel-

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁶¹ Monash University, *Research Strategic Plan*, 9.

⁶² Monash University, *Monash Professorial Fellowships Program, 2012 Guidelines (Rounds 8 & 9)* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2012), 1; Monash University, *Larkins Fellowships Program, 2012 Guidelines (Rounds 8 & 9)* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2012), 1.

⁶³ Monash University, *Professorial Fellowships Program*, 6; Monash University, *Larkins Fellowships Program*, 6.

⁶⁴ Rose, *Governing the Soul*, 116-117.

oped by researchers in consultation with their supervisor, Academic Head, Faculty ADR [Associate Dean (Research)], and/or other relevant advisers.⁶⁵

Academics are asked to think from the perspective of the university in order to develop their budget in a manner which can be justified to policy planners. This technique of the self proposes a model for the researcher to engage in forms of self-evaluation and self-presentation which is consistent with Monash's policy goals.⁶⁶ Implicated within policy is an ethical culture which is negotiated with academics through programmes which both offer and require the development of academic performance.

The development of external and internal grants and fellowships, such as those just mentioned are embedded with techniques of the self and an expectation of the enrolment of academic subjects who are competent in the operations of the respective programmes. These kinds of performance-based grants and fellowships may be becoming increasingly important in an era where accountability for the value of academic labour is as important as the value added as a consequence of disciplinary or public reputation. However, these examples (MRA, MPF, and Larkins Fellowship) are only illustrative of the subjectification required for institutional programmes to operate effectively: they do not explain how or why academics become engaged with these programmes in the first place. To explore this latter issue, this article will explore a technology which has flourished within what Power⁶⁷ might describe as an "audit culture": academic performance development and systematic performance auditing.

Academic Performance Development

Academic performance development and auditing, since its development through the British higher education system, have come to have a consciousness-transforming impact upon academic subjects worldwide.⁶⁸ Monash University endorses a programme of self-governance and accountability which they describe as the Performance Development Process. Monash's performance management process consists of annual cycles of planning, evaluation and feedback procedures which require academic staff to become active members in the governance of their conduct.

The performance development process is a planning and review cycle that supports staff *to reach their full career potential and to achieve their work goals* through:

- the provision of professional development opportunities (growth);
- *regular, meaningful performance conversations* with their performance supervisor and a process of giving and receiving constructive feedback (feedback); and

⁶⁵ Monash University, *2012 Monash Research Accelerator Program, Guidelines* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 2012), 2.

⁶⁶ Rose, *Governing the Soul*, 245.

⁶⁷ Power, *The Audit Society*.

⁶⁸ Erica McWilliam, "Changing the Academic Subject," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 29 (2004).

- clearly identifiable and *documented performance development plans* that create an awareness of the staff member's contribution toward faculty, campus and university goals (accountability).⁶⁹

Performance development is constituted by a moral objective ("growth"), which is normalised through interpersonal routines ("feedback"), and enabled by "ethical technologies"⁷⁰ which ask academic staff to reflect on their conduct and redirect energy towards Monash's institutional goals ("accountability"). Each cycle, a performance development plan is prepared between academic performance supervisors and the head of the academic unit. From the locale of the supervisor, these policies become strategic objectives which can be realised through procedures which Rose describes as "technologies of the self" – moral instruction, ethical reflection, and self-evaluation.⁷¹ Central to disseminating these technologies is an interactive computerised platform called Performance Development Online (PDO).

PDO is a digital technology which fulfils a number of tasks. It complies with Monash's programmatic demands of cost-accounting and attempts to autonomise and responsabilise academics. As Latour claims, machines are "folded" to satisfy many desires, increasing their complexity.⁷² According to Monash's staff development webpage, the PDO technology is

[an] online performance planning tool that supports academic staff to manage the performance development cycle in a timely and consistent way. It is a hosted, web-based product that is easy to use, offers a secure repository for documentation, streamlines user data entry [...] and gives heads of unit and deans oversight of unit/faculty performance development activity.⁷³

This digital technology is characterised in policy discourse as an aid, or a convenience for "users" (academics) and performance developers alike. PDO operates between the interests of policy makers, performance development supervisors, and academic staff, and exerts demands upon the actors involved. PDO is a repository of documentation, a place where "performance development activities" are coded into forms that allow for the evaluation of the conduct of academic staff. However, which activities are recorded and reflected upon depend on management expertise. It places expectations upon the subjects that operate through it, and is hence an ethical technology.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ Monash University, "Staff Development Procedure–Performance Development Process: Academic Staff," Monash University Webpage, accessed July 25, 2012. Available online at:

<http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/workplace-policy/staff-development/performance-development-process-acad.html>.

⁷⁰ See Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*, 156; and Michel Foucault, "Technologies of the Self," in Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (eds.), *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (New York and London: The New Press, 2003).

⁷¹ Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*.

⁷² Bruno Latour, "Where are the Missing Masses? The Sociology of a Few Mundane Artefacts," in Wiebe E. Bijker and John Law (eds.), *Shaping Technology/Building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 168.

⁷³ Monash University, "Staff Development Procedure–Performance Development Process: Academic Staff."

⁷⁴ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 43-44.

An ethical technology allows for the production and refinement of self-knowledge. This production is the basis of subjectivity in Foucauldian theory: “the subject is produced out of a doubling of force upon itself, an attention to the self.”⁷⁵ During the performance development cycle, PDO is used to practically monitor and review academic staff. As part of this process, staff are required to input “performance goals”:

[performance goals] are rolling three-year performance goals that will enable a staff member to achieve their work objectives and career aspirations. They should be concise, measurable, achievable, and *address relevant areas of academic activity in education, research and service*.⁷⁶

Academics are requested to compile documentation which both demonstrates, and asks them to reflect upon, their professional development towards Monash’s strategic goals of “excellence in learning and teaching,” “impact through excellence and relevance” in research, and engagement between Monash and the communities which it serves, “local, national and international.”⁷⁷ By dividing academic activities into these three categories (of teaching, research, and service) it reinforces the performativity of academic labour as divided amongst those three categories. Staff are expected to categorise, develop and amend their plans within the performance development cycle, and also provide evidence of their “achievements” through uploading documents, described as “attachments.”⁷⁸ The reinforcement of this three-stream model of academic work is a continuous technological achievement, reinforced through technologies such as performance development, which use them as practical means for categorising academic work. These designations are historically-contingent constructions which have emerged and are at least in part sustained by the practical politics of bureaucratic administration.

When a technology such as the PDO is adopted by a regime of governance, its adoption and standardization is not inevitable. Rather, as Latour suggests, PDO is a powerful tool for Monash’s performance development programme because it has come to occupy a “*strategic position*” within Monash’s governmentality which might be described as an “obligatory passage point.”⁷⁹ Firstly, PDO has been integrated into Monash’s academic staff career advancement program—across promotion levels B (Lectureship) through to E (full Professorship), as well as within promotion levels, in the form of incremental salary increases. To advance, a staff member must demonstrate that he or she has:

⁷⁵ Kendall and Wickham, *Using Foucault’s Methods*, 53.

⁷⁶ Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure—Performance Development Process: Academic Staff”; *italics added*.

⁷⁷ Monash University, *Education Strategic Plan*, 7; Monash University, *Research Strategic Plan*, 8; Monash University, *Monash Directions 2025*, 2.

⁷⁸ Monash University, “Performance Development Online Process, Step 1,” Monash University Webpage, 3, accessed July 25, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/human-resources/performance-development/academic/assets/docs/pdo-online/manuals/training-manual-8-step-one.pdf>

⁷⁹ Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 245.

- been a sustained high performer at the present level of appointment, at or above the ‘faculty expectation’ level of academic performance for the candidate’s current level according to the academic performance standards; and
- the capacity to perform satisfactorily at the level to which promotion is sought, at least at the ‘minimum’ level of academic performance for that level according to the academic performance standards.⁸⁰

Academic performance is defined through the performance development process and documented through the PDO technology, normalising PDO by its centrality to evidencing academic achievement. Secondly, the PDO platform is currently at the centre of a process of calculation which allows for the living, unstable reality of academic life to be transformed into a series of statistics, charts, and figures which render academic conduct visible to governing authorities—that is, PDO assists in the creation of “immutable mobiles,” which can be transported, combined and compared.⁸¹ The standards against which academic performance is measured—particularly for the purposes of “probation, promotion and performance management”—are “qualitative, quantitative or a mixture of both across the three key areas of academic activity—research, education and service.”⁸² Academic performance must first be quantified and qualified by the techniques of calculation and organisation offered by the performance development process and the PDO platform. Hence, PDO has become an obligatory passage point for both academics seeking career advancement, and performance management staff who govern by stabilising academics and their activities into administrable objects. Monash’s performance development process would not be possible without two such technologies of the self which operate through the PDO technology, namely “pastoral guidance” and “self-reflection.”

Pastoral Guidance and Self-reflection in Performance Development

Academic supervisors provide staff members with advice and guidance which are instrumental to the operation of the performance development process. They are responsible for advising and coaching academic staff as well as providing them with feedback on their performance and their proposed performance development plans.⁸³ Supervisors occupy the dual subjective roles of adjudicator and advisor of performance development, exercising a form of “pastoral power” through which academic staff and supervisors are both subjectified.⁸⁴ Through self-exposure and self-documentation, academic staff reveal their inner selves, in-

⁸⁰ Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure—Academic Promotion for Candidates Level B,” Monash University webpage, accessed July 25, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/human-resources/academic-promotion/procedures/candidates-promotion-b.html>; Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure—Academic Promotion for Candidates Levels C-E,” Monash University webpage, accessed July 27, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/human-resources/academic-promotion/procedures/candidates-promotion-c-e.html>

⁸¹ Latour, *Science in Action*, 227.

⁸² Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure [...] Level B”; Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure [...] Levels C-E.”

⁸³ Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure—Performance Development Process: Academic Staff.”

⁸⁴ Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” in Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (eds.), *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (New York and London: The New Press, 2003), 131.

scribing their career aspirations into a naked and visible form which is already subject to examination, self-reflective planning and the expectations of both supervisors and potentially promotion or probation panels. Self-examination and self-evaluation enable the technology of pastoral guidance: staff are expected to internalise the advice of their supervisors and actively adapt their career plans, “actively seeking opportunities for professional development.”⁸⁵ The PDO platform encourages academic staff to expose their career aspirations for their own sake, to receive advice and direction, and to assist their self-development in accordance with the university’s programmatic rationale. In other words, performance development is firstly the communication of expectations, and secondly a practice of imbuing the academic subject with an obligation to adopt those expectations. To the extent that performance development is central to career advancement, academic careers will become measured by the criteria set out in university policy.

In addition to this inter-personal level of expectation-building, performance development is also implemented on a personal, ethical level through self-reflection. Staff are asked to assess their performance development portfolios in relation to Monash’s three goals of education, research and service excellence. Asking academic staff to reflect on their career progress promotes the operation of the performance development process by directing academic self-reflection towards Monash’s policy discourses. By acting through academics’ desires for career advancement, policy-makers govern the academic *at a distance* through a standardised practice. Self-reflection is then reinforced when academics are asked to problematize their private motives through evaluation. The staff development website states that “the process is intended to be a dynamic and interactive one between staff and supervisors which encourages trust and regular, open communication.”⁸⁶ However, the communication of intention flows in one direction—through the PDO platform, from academic staff to performance development supervisor and other evaluating committees. This unidirectional flow of inner thought, desire and intention is characteristic of Foucault’s description of the “examination”⁸⁷: this highly ritualised form of discipline renders the individual visible, establishing a form of truth. By breaking the dichotomy between private intention and interpersonal communication, this form of examination encourages academic staff to reconcile their public and private motives, increasing the degree to which academics must self-govern. These two techniques, of guided reflection and of examination enable the technology of performance development to influence how academic staff govern their careers.

Marketing Our Selves

The analysis presented here dissects a mentality of academic governance envisioned at Monash University, within the context of our present ideas and theories about the human subject. The academic is preconceived as a self-responsible, vastly self-interested creature with measurable and definable attributes and, most importantly, an ever present capacity for self-governance given the appropriate circumstances and training. The parameters by which Excel-

⁸⁵ Monash University, “Staff Development Procedure—Performance Development Process: Academic Staff.”

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan (London: Allen Lane, 2003), 184.

lence is defined, by which the worth of academics is judged within performance development regimes, are situated within larger discursive networks.

Indicators of research excellence are responses to the shifting discursive and organisational structures of universities to what Davison and Murphy describe as “The Educational Supermarket”⁸⁸: the relationship between student and university “changed from a semi-feudal to a commercial one.” Because state regulatory agencies manage tertiary education as a “sector” of economic activity, the mechanisms and agencies which provide the impetus for Monash to restructure are likely to affect other higher education institutions. The Australian Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency has published that from January 2012, higher education institutions will be audited against their Higher Education Standards Framework, which “comprises five domains: Provider Standards, Qualification Standards, Teaching and Learning Standards, Information Standards and Research Standards.”⁸⁹ The standards set by TEQSA as well as sources of funding for universities have implications for the governance of academics across Australia. On an international level, the technologies of self which are demonstrated in this article are likely to be mirrored within other institutions, as the pressure to strive for internationally-recognised teaching and research reputations are hardly localised to the Australian setting. So how might international developments impact upon the constitution of academic work and subjectification?

One potential consequence is the changing role of post-graduate students, especially in the “hard” sciences. Discourses of Excellence generate “pressures” which crystallise at the level of the faculty, even influencing the training of potential academic staff.⁹⁰ In the United States in the early 1990’s, Hackett noted that pressures to obtain external research funding “are transmitted through department and faculty to graduate students,” placing students in the dual roles of customers and assets to their supervisors.⁹¹ Students more likely to obtain external funding for their research projects were perceived as more desirable from a budgetary standpoint, and were thus socialised early into the entrepreneurial culture of academic science.⁹² The expectations generated from early higher education experiences are likely to impact upon expectations throughout an academic career, perhaps further normalising performance measurement and auditing. These pressures, which Hackett identified two decades ago in American science culture, are present in the current academic entrepreneurial culture. However, pressures emanating from federal and state government agencies are only one dynamic transforming higher education globally.

Information technologies are also playing a crucial role in discourses of Innovation, raising questions of how those technologies are to be implemented before the issues of whether particular technological solutions are the best course of action have been assessed. The discourse of Innovation presented here presumes the cooperation of academic staff and students

⁸⁸ Davidson and Murphy, *University Unlimited*, 245.

⁸⁹ The Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency, “About TEQSA,” TEQSA Webpage, accessed November 11, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.teqsa.gov.au/about-teqsa>.

⁹⁰ Hackett, “Science as a Vocation,” 258-259.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 259.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 260.

in the implementation of Blended Learning initiatives, while the task of evaluating these technologies is presumed to be adequately handled by policy experts and information technology service providers. A new generation of learners and research collaborators must fit the mould that these information technologies cast for them: the advantages of adopting new communication platforms seem self-evident.⁹³ However, as Kendall and Wickham argue, this form of technological determinism must be avoided, as “technology and society mutually condition each other.”⁹⁴ Technological determinism is reflected in the widespread expectation that academics will master, integrate and become empowered through new e-technologies.⁹⁵

Through the corporatisation of the university, the increasing demand for flexible academic labour becomes engrained into the higher education business model. Worsening staff-to-student ratios and a shrinking core of full-time tenured faculty create a demand for more flexible and adaptable staff who can be enticed to maximise the efficiency of the university’s educational enterprise.⁹⁶ The use of standardized e-technologies such as “Blackboard and Pearson-eCollege” acts to segment educational products such as courses or degrees into “commodified instruction.”⁹⁷ Within performance development, feedback acts to continuously re-problematize the conduct of academics, proposing models of Innovation which depend upon the e-technologies of Blended Learning, sanctioned by policy gurus. The discourse of Innovation present at Monash and other universities steers academics and management towards technical solutions to the problematisation of changing staff-student relations, while failing to address the issue of human resource development that follow as a consequence of casualisation. Rather than focusing on providing academic staff members with better resources and training to engage with a changing education environment, energy is being put into maximising potential customers’ access to educational services. A balanced approach is required to ensure that the digitisation of education is not followed by the impoverishment of educational quality.

Conclusion

Central to the analysis presented here has been a concern for the constitution of a moral being. How do the choices made by individuals and organisations bear upon the subjects of academia? Governmentality theory conceives of collective organisation as a nexus of perpetual planning and strategic action. By theorising governance as the conduct of conduct, an analytics of government reveals the mutual dependence of programmes of government and the cultivation of a particular kind of subjectivity; one which is both compliant and free—an enterprising self. The map which was charted through Monash University’s policy documents revealed a will to

⁹³ Kendall and Wickham, *Using Foucault’s Methods*, 73.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁹⁵ See Gayani Samarawickrema, “Blended Learning and the New Pressures on the Academy: Individual, Political, and Policy Driven Motivators for Adoption,” in Elizabeth Stacy and Philippa Gerbic (eds.), *Effective Blended Learning Practices: Evidence-Based Perspectives in ICT-Facilitated Education* (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2009).

⁹⁶ Chris Lorenz, “If You’re So Smart, Why are You Under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism, and New Public Management,” *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2012), 605-606.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 612.

govern espoused within the analytical framework of discourse theory. Excellence is situated between higher policy discourses emanating from bodies which seek to direct universities through advanced liberal forms of governance, and subordinate technologies, such as fellowship grants and the MRA program, through which excellence in research is rewarded. Innovation is constructed through the expert discourses which surround e-technologies and the assumed benefits of their implementation.

It is easy to think that technologies have a unilateral impact on teaching and research, but this assumption is the outcome of “complex social, cultural and political assumptions” which become embodied in discourses.⁹⁸ These discourses provide the academic self with structures of thought which suggest a means by which the academic may develop their selves in accord with a presupposed desire to become enterprising, self-actualising and responsible actors. Through the strategic positioning of performance development processes, academics are situated within programmes that encouraged guided self-reflection and action. The very experience of “career” and academic labour are mediated through such technologies of the self, which frame experiences and create expectations that career-oriented academic will comply with performance development technologies and align their personal goals with the goals of the university.

The need to extend this analysis is becoming ever more apparent as crises, such as the student demonstrations at the Sydney University over the marketisation of their educational services, suggest.⁹⁹ Moves to restructure Sydney University, featuring the use of research output rates as a means of assessing which staff face the threat of redundancy, surfaced in an open letter to the ABC’s news website.¹⁰⁰ These developments have germinated the seed of a cultural narrative about action and resistance within organisational change. Non-compliance with procedures of government, such as the tabulation of achievement through journal publication rates, potentially places the academic on the chopping block. It has therefore become more imperative than ever, under a neo-liberalising regime of academic governance, that we investigate both the current states and the future possibilities of academic life. Exploring the forms of compliance with—and resistance to—governance become crucial for understanding how government develops, and how the goals, aspirations, and identities of academics globally become intertwined with institutional programmes and strategies.

Fabian Cannizzo
School of Social Sciences
Monash University
fabian.cannizzo@monash.edu

⁹⁸ Kendall and Wickham, *Using Foucault’s Methods*, 78.

⁹⁹ Paul Benedek, “Sydney Uni Staff, Students Step Up Resistance to Cutbacks,” Green Left Webpage, accessed August 15, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/50658>.

¹⁰⁰ Australian Broadcasting Corporation, “Disappearing Jobs at Sydney University,” The Drum Opinion ABC Webpage, accessed August 15, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/3822688.html>.