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Abstract

Academic staff in New Zealand Polytechnics are mostly industry professionals who have been recruited directly into higher education with little or no background in academia. They have effectively immigrated to a new profession and often struggle to adapt to the culture of their new working environment. Academic immigrant leaders, who share strong identity bonds derived from their shared work histories with their staff, are positioned in the centre of relationships between themselves, their colleagues, and the organisations in which they are employed. Their identity is a complex hybrid amalgam of industry professional, academic and academic leader.

The study examined theories of identity focusing on how individuals construct and adapt their identities in changing circumstances. Acculturation to new working environments was explored using an ‘immigrant’ metaphor. Prior studies have examined professional and academic identities of teachers, however, few have explored relationships between academic leaders and staff who share non-academic professional identities.

This research employed an interpretive lens, within a constructivist paradigm to examine the personal experiences of sixteen academic leaders who identified as academic immigrants. Individual and group interviews illuminated personal experiences of embracing an academic identity, becoming an academic leader and sharing a professional identity with colleagues.

Findings demonstrated that academic immigrants do not identify with traditional notions of academic identity, rather they frame their understanding of being an academic through the filter of their previous professional identity. They are deeply socialised in their professional identity and their loyalty lies with their discipline, rather than with the institution. This enables them to operate in discipline ‘silos’ which link strongly to professional values and practices and which can provide validation for behaviours that result in disconnection and tension with the institution. Academic immigrant leaders,
who share these strong identity bonds with their staff, can contribute to this siloed behaviour by acting as ‘gatekeepers’ and choosing to prioritise their staff and discipline over the needs of the institution.

Academic immigrant staff are attracted to polytechnics because of the applied and practice based learning, rather than ‘hard core’ academic processes. Institutions need to recognise the differences between their ‘old’ and ‘new’ profession and plan induction and socialisation processes that will support complex identity transition. Academic immigrant leaders are well placed to mitigate the identity-divide because they are in the middle of relationships between the institution and their staff with whom they hold a strong values bond based on their shared professional identity.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

One of the most important constituents of the ground on which the individual stands is the social group to which he/she ‘belongs’. Whatever a person does or wishes to do, he/she must have some ‘ground’ to stand upon. This is probably the primary reason why he/she is extremely affected the moment this ground begins to give way. (Lewin, 1948, p. 145, italics added)

Organisations are made up of living people who are driven by feelings and motives and relationships (Robinson & Aronica, 2009). They are defined by their paradigms; that is, the prevalent view of reality shared by their members (Schein, 2010). They are recognised as socially constructed systems (Jenkins, 2008) based on the regularised patterns of action and interaction that shape the behaviours and relationships of their members (Stets & Burke, 2014). Bilton (2007) maintains that “without some sense of a core identity and the norms and boundaries around that identity, there is little scope to evaluate the meaning and purpose of the organisation” (p. 28).

1.1   Background

In my work in the New Zealand Institute of Technology and Polytechnic (ITP) sector, I am surrounded by a significant number of academic staff who have professional backgrounds from fields other than education, and who deliver teaching and learning across a range of vocational discipline areas. The majority of these staff regard themselves as industry professionals first and foremost, and as academics second, if at all. Their attitudes, language, and working behaviours appear to be firmly rooted in the culture and histories of the industry discipline from where they have come and they often struggle to connect with the academic world into which they are now working. I have also observed these staff developing and maintaining distinct siloed groups based on their previous industry discipline cultures, which seem to set them at odds with the institution in terms of academic requirements (often bureaucratic) and
institutional (often economic) priorities. This is especially true when those institutional priorities are regarded by the staff as not being in the best interests of their discipline (teaching) and therefore their students (learning) needs.

My working background is in the creative arts and I share a professional background with my staff, for whom I act as their academic leader. I have experienced siloed behaviours among my staff, and encountered the blocks and barriers that are built when trying to deliver institutional requirements. I have also found that my connection with my staff on a professional discipline level, which originated from outside of the institution, has allowed me to understand where they are coming from, and to learn how to bring them along on the journey by leveraging our shared understanding of how to accomplish outcomes.

Another experience, which influenced my interest in this area, was an extended study that I undertook which involved academic ‘middle’ leaders who were identified as successful leaders of change from a range of New Zealand higher education institutions. A particular example from the data collected in that study described a situation that resonated with me with regard to the relationship between an academic leader and his staff, who shared related industry backgrounds, and who were exhibiting sub-culture and silo behaviours. I have included it here as it may help to deepen the explanation of my personal interest in this phenomenon.

The study focused on a middle leader who was appointed to transition the move of a small department into an ITP and his relationship with the staff of that department who had undergone substantial, and repeated, change over a number of years. The department was originally a private training establishment (PTE) before joining a higher education college where it transitioned its diploma programme into a degree. Very soon thereafter the college underwent a merger with a local university who decided that the
programme did not fit with its desired academic profile. The department was faced with another transfer to another institution. This was not simply a transfer of locations; it was a transfer in terms of academic processes, culture, a new institution, and also physical resources, including buildings, computers, teaching resources, etc.

For the staff members of the department this became the second time that they had relocated and experienced ‘dramatic’ change in a short amount of time. This in turn led to issues of employee anxiety about change and a sense of outrage at the way that they were treated, which threatened to lead them to withdraw or to resist further change. These staff could be described as academic immigrants because of their shared professional background in a creative arts discipline. They were operating as a totally autonomous sub-culture within the organisation with their own highly developed and distinct set of values, beliefs and attitudes. Some of these included processes such as quality assurance, financial restraints, how budgets work, how resources had been divvied up and who made decisions. They had a reputation for being insular and isolated.

The middle leader, who already worked at the institution, volunteered to help them execute the transition because he was interested and passionate about their discipline, having a professional background in a related area. However, he was seen by the staff as an outsider who was charged with coming to do a ‘hatchet job’ on them and to ‘clean them up’ and move them to ‘yet another institution’, despite his professional connection. This resulted in him feeling inadequate and vulnerable and left him wondering why he was putting so much energy into the work at all. Over time, he developed an understanding of why the staff were feeling the way that they were and to position himself between them and their anxieties around the change. Whilst he might not have been able to quickly change the
circumstances which existed within the sub-culture group, he was able to change how he perceived and reacted to them. As he continued to demonstrate that he really was ‘on their side’, through his continued actions towards achieving a successful transition for them, they began to change how they perceived him and to develop a more trusting relationship, treating him more as an insider and therefore ‘part of their group’. (Marshall, 2008)

When reflecting on all of these experiences, a number of questions were raised for me around whether other academic leaders in similar institutions experienced the same issues of identity tensions and siloed behaviour, and if there was any indication of how this came to be, what sustained it and what might be done to mitigate it. I was also interested in the potential of the academic leader who shares a professional background and culture with their staff, to be a mediating agent to bridge the perceived identity divide between their staff and the institution. This led in turn to an interest in uncovering the nature and significance of the relationship between academic leader and staff and what effect, if any, it might have on the work of the academic leader.

I began to consider the central issue of staff perceptions and behaviours being related to ‘identity’ and the way that it affects how people ‘feel about themselves’ and how they ‘see themselves’ in a range of circumstances. I considered that there might be cultural differences between the identities of industry professionals and those of academics and that this has influenced the way that these identities relate to each other for these people. In order to make sense of this conundrum I noted Schein’s (2010) proposition that, one must “perceive and decipher the cultural forces that operate in groups, organisations, and occupations” by learning to “see the world through ‘cultural lenses’, and becoming competent in cultural analysis” (p. 12). Similarly, Robinson and Aronica’s (2009) examination of human growth and development contributed to my thinking by suggesting that no one sees the world directly, rather it is perceived through frameworks of ideas and beliefs,
which act as filters on what is seen and how it is seen. I also took heed of Schein’s (2010) cautionary tale about making assumptions:

I initially did not understand what was going on because my own basic assumptions about truth, turf, and group relations differed from the shared assumptions of the members of the group. And my assumptions reflected my ‘occupation’ as a social psychologist and organisation consultant, while the group’s assumptions reflected their occupations and experiences as electrical engineers and electrical workers. (p. 12)

Here he is suggesting that in order to understand cultural issues such as the ones presented in this study around professional and academic identity and the shift between the two, there is a need to be cognisant of the differences among peoples background and world view. He concludes that by learning to see the world through cultural lenses, “all kinds of things begin to make sense that initially were mysterious, frustrating, or seemingly stupid” (p. 13).

With all of these ideas in mind, the following sections of this chapter define the object of this research and its context and rationale. Then the aims of the project and the research questions are presented followed by the conceptual framework for the investigation. Finally, an overview of the structure for this thesis is detailed.

1.2 Defining the object of the research
This study is located in the higher education context of the New Zealand ITP sector, where institutions pride, and market, themselves as being focussed toward the provision of vocational and occupational learning across a variety of industry sectors. In these institutions it is not unusual to find the majority of academic staff, who have professional backgrounds from fields other than education, involved in the delivery of teaching and learning across a range of discipline areas. These staff are generally recruited directly from the relevant discipline industry and possess a stock of knowledge of a substantive area of
expertise or knowledge derived from their background in other organisational, industrial or creative cultures (Hotho, 2008). They have little or no background in academia and can be said to have effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession in tertiary education where they may be described as ‘academic immigrants’.

Like all immigrants who choose to adopt a new culture, these academic immigrants must make sense of their new social environment and decide how and to what extent they are going to integrate themselves into the host culture (Lee, 2009). However the difference between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ environments may affect the amount of time and effort that academic immigrants take to achieve any integration (Whitchurch, 2008). As these academic immigrants learn to adapt to their new environment they “retain to some degree, their ‘accent,’ that is, their foot in the past” (Prensky, 2001, p. 3), which is guided by the rules and guidelines of an unwritten ‘cultural manual’ which is shared among group members (Schein, 2010). The difference between their old and new environments can also contribute to them displaying divided loyalty between their employer organisations and their own professional fields and forming into organisational subcultures or silos which can display resistant behaviours that may inhibit successful integration (Erwin & Garman, 2010).

The term ‘immigrant’ is laden with meaning and it is important that I clarify its usage in this study. Whilst it may be argued that the majority of staff employed in the ITP sector could be described as ‘immigrants’ due to the various discipline pathways that they may take prior to joining an organisation, it is important for this discussion to discern between those who have a background in formal teaching and those who do not. This distinction is important when considering the professional identity of those who have little or no previous experience or connection with their new culture. To them, the organisational culture of tertiary education is indeed a foreign land and they can be said to have truly immigrated to somewhere new (Robinson & Aronica, 2009).
Context
Higher education organisations are socially constructed around concepts of collegiality where members interact as equals, with a minimum of status difference, thereby allowing for a greater collective voice and involvement (Hellawell & Hancock, 2003). However, higher education organisations have also been noted for the complex and contrasting beliefs system that guide and shape their culture and structures (Meyer, 2007). Henkel (2010) describes academic community membership as being grounded in interactions between the individual and two key communities: first, the discipline and second, higher education as an institution. She examined how academic identities were formed and sustained upon individual and collective values in the frame of the primacy of the discipline in academic working lives. Becher and Trowler’s (2001) investigation of academic “tribes and territories” also provided a comprehensive picture of the ways that disciplinary epistemology, which they describe as “the ‘actual’ form and focus of knowledge within a discipline”, combines with the phenomenology of that knowledge, being “the ideas and understandings that practitioners have about their discipline” (p. 23), to influence how particular groups of academics organise their professional lives. Schein (2010) defines these in terms of the strength of social identities that form as a result of discipline membership. He notes them as being:

Those assumptions, beliefs and values that are a pattern of shared basic assumptions… learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 18)

A number of researchers have suggested that staff who come from different occupational cultures and who strongly identify themselves as a distinct group within organisations will often form organisational subcultures (Gioia, Price, Hamilton, & Thomas, 2010; Robertson, 2011; Shreeve, 2011). These are also referred to as ‘silos’ (Cilliers & Greyvenstein, 2012) which are often defined in
relation to organisational constructs such as departments or discipline groupings. Morgan and Ogbonna’s (2008) study into subcultures of professional clinicians and nurses in a public healthcare setting emphasised that “professional loyalties of respective subcultures may be stronger than loyalty to the organisation” (p. 43). In their study, this loyalty factor (which may be described as a component of the clinicians’ and nurses’ professional identity) directly impeded the authority of ‘lay’ managers (those seen as ‘not’ sharing the same professional identity as the group because of their ‘lay’ status) to influence working practices within the organisation. Examples such as this, demonstrate that strong subcultures have the potential, and often the capability, to generate resistance that can derail organisational initiatives (Owens, 2004).

Staff in higher educational organisations are recognised as being different from employees in non-higher education settings in that they generally create and sustain relatively independent and unique work identities and cultures which may vary with organisational goals (Boyd, Smith, & Beyaztas, 2014). These subculture groups may be based around subject knowledge, professional backgrounds, disciplinary societies, and other external groups in which they participate (Raid, 2007). Academic staff may place more importance on their professional authority than on formal hierarchical authority (McKenna & Maister, 2002) which may result in them either rejecting or ignoring policies supported by hierarchical authority, especially when the policies challenge traditional long-held professional values, beliefs and practices (Drazin, Kazanjian, & Glynn, 2008). A question to be asked by educational leaders is whether staff consider themselves to be part of the same institutional ‘community’ (‘other than having the same employer’), or whether they are more likely to have an affinity with others in a distinct group and therefore separate themselves from the community (Silver, 2003). Evidence from the literature suggests that academic staff who have strong connections with their disciplines may be divided in their loyalties between their disciplines and their institutions, with the latter generally taking second place (Harvey, Novicevic, Zikic, & Ready, 2007; McInnis, 2010). Many researchers agree that institutional affiliation can only develop after the right
kind of socialisation (Smith & Boyd, 2012; Swart & Grauerholz, 2012; Trowler & Knight, 1999).

**Rationale**

Organisational culture researchers generally agree that leaders who separate themselves, and who hold very different social identities than the staff group for whom they are responsible, are less effective at achieving organisational goals than those who can exemplify the group's identity and lead from the inside rather than from the outside (Barth, 2013a; Gioia et al., 2010; Schein, 2010; Smith, 2011). These views on the identity relationship between leader and staff groups are primarily located in the wider business context of organisational literature; however there is little investigation of these issues in the context of higher education. There is currently little available research into the role that a shared professional background and identity between an academic leader and their staff may have in mitigating the organisational identity divide associated with discipline sub-cultures and silos in higher education organisations. Moreover there is a lack of specific research on this topic within higher educational organisations where there is a high proportion of academic staff with professional backgrounds from fields other than education such as New Zealand ITP’s. There have been a range of prior studies into the relationships between professional identities and academic identities for teachers, notably in the clinical professions (Beckett & Gough, 2004; Hothro, 2008; Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008; Smith & Boyd, 2012), the art and design fields (Adams, 2007; Shreeve, 2009, 2010), as well as a significant study across six non-related fields - architecture, clinical psychology, law, medicine, nursing, and social work (Fairbrother & Mathers, 2004). These studies however, focus on identity relationships for teachers rather than academic leaders. While there is a body of literature that focuses on the management of higher education in the area of vocational education (and TAFE) and further education in Australia (Harris, Simons, & Clayton, 2005), and the UK (Avis, 1999; Gleeson & Knights, 2008), there are few, if any, studies, which specifically explore the relationships of shared identity between academic leaders and their staff and the relationship between...
professional identities and academic identities for these academic leaders.

Relevance
This research has specific relevance in higher education contexts such as the New Zealand ITP sector, in which academic immigrant staff are highly represented and where subcultures of academic immigrants may exist. It is acknowledged that in the ITP sector staff have often been recruited directly from a relevant discipline industry with little or no background in academia and like all immigrants who choose to adopt a new ‘home’, these academic immigrants must make sense of their new social environment and decide how and to what extent they are going to integrate themselves into the host culture (Hotho, 2008). A critique of the theoretical construct of ‘academic immigrant’ identity may help to explain the identity divide which can result in the formation of subcultures within an organisation. This research therefore could hold particular relevance for any higher education environment in which an ‘academic immigrant’ cadre is represented.

For academic middle leaders who are engaging in leading and managing learning, there is no easily accessible manual of success. As mentioned previously, the area of academic middle leadership identity in higher education is under-researched and there is a specific gap with regards to the effect that a shared professional identity and background, between leaders and their staff, in the execution of their work as leaders of learning.

For senior organisational leadership, who recognise their staff in the narratives presented here, the outcomes of this research may be useful in planning processes for academic immigrants that help to bridge the transition between an academic immigrants’ ‘old’ and ‘new’ profession. The results may assist in the development of responsive support mechanisms which contribute to enabling middle leaders to succeed more often when engaged in change action. This holds significance for both New Zealand and international contexts where development and training for middle leadership is not consistent across the sector and is severely lacking in some quarters.
(Hancock & Hellawell, 2003). The outcomes may also help to clarify these issues and allow for a refining of, as well as adding to, the body of knowledge associated with academic leader identity in higher education.

1.3 Conceptual framework

We don’t see the world directly. We perceive it through frameworks of ideas and beliefs, which act as filters on what we see and how we see it. Some of these ideas enter our consciousness so deeply that we’re not even aware of them. They strike us as simple common sense. They often show up, though, in the metaphors and images we use to think about ourselves and about the world around us. (Robinson & Aronica, 2009, p. 198)

With Robinson and Aronica’s (2009) provocation in mind, it became apparent that in order to generate new theoretical insights into academic immigrant identity and the significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders, their staff who share professional identity and backgrounds, and the institutions in which they are employed, a flexible theoretical framework that would allow for the analysis of interrelationships between identities was required. A framework was developed that explored concepts such as organisational, professional and personal social experiences helping to form our identity(s) as suggested by Giddens (2009), Hotho (2008) and Jenkins (2008), and that this identity then helps people adopt certain roles within an organisation, as suggested by Gioia (1998) and Turner (2013). The assumption of different roles within an organisation as suggested by Stryker (2007) and Hogg (2008), and the resulting changes in identity as described by Henkel (2010) was also explored. Attention was also paid to Fulcher and Scott’s (2007) discussion of the strength of the identity forming experience (socialisation) and its effect on the depth of incorporation into Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of a ‘permanent disposition’ of the ‘self’.

The metaphor of ‘immigrant’ was employed to create a ‘visible anchor’ for the concept of identity change and transitioning from one culture to another. Metaphors are often used to ‘describe ourselves and our communities’ and
have the power to point to our similarities (Robinson & Aronica, 2009). Tyler (2005) suggests that the advantage of using metaphors to conceptualise abstract ideas is that metaphors are “easily remembered, compact, involve the audience and highlight certain issues through association with feelings and perceptions” (p. 29). Weick (2012) goes further by relating metaphor, which he refers to as the ‘glue’ of shared meaning, to making sense of a situation and finding a common way of encoding and talking about it. The concept of ‘immigrant’ in this study may be regarded as a foundational metaphor, or a ‘deep surface’ metaphor which Schön (1995) describes as one that defines the centrally important features of the concept being studied.

Therefore, within the framework of a qualitative methodology, with a focus on interpretation and co-construction of meaning in real-life situations, the study employed semi-structured interviews for data collection followed by narrative theme analysis techniques (Birks & Mills, 2011). A qualitative interview approach allowed the unfolding stories of the participants to be focused on the exploration of ‘own’ experiences within the frame of becoming/beeing an academic. A range of individual and group qualitative semi-structured interviews were employed because of their highly individualised and unstructured nature and their ability to elicit unanticipated information and insights by adapting to the interviewee’s personality and priorities (Denzin & Giardina, 2015).

The personal narratives in this study are autodiegetic and situationally placed from the interviewees’ viewpoint, as they ‘told it as it was for them’, which meant that there is a rich, and sometimes confusing amalgam of fact and fiction, objectivity and apologetic (Bryant & Cox, 2004). In terms of this research project the issue under investigation was defined as the phenomena of academic immigrant identity occurring within the bounded context of the New Zealand ITP sector of higher education. The narrative approach was designed to be both holistic and exhaustive as a way to capture the meaningful characteristics of realistic events while examining the multifaceted aspects of immigrant academic identity. Both paradigm and approach are justified by the nature of the research aim and research questions, namely, to
understand through their own perceptions how academic immigrants experience and construct identity and how relationships of identity between academic leaders and staff, who share the same professional background, affect the work of academic leaders and their relationships with their employer institutions.

Such an approach may be a helpful addition to the literature on academic identity, that pertains to staff who may be defined as ‘academic immigrants’ - as those who possess a stock of knowledge of a substantive area of expertise or knowledge derived from their background in other organisational, industrial or creative cultures and who have been recruited directly into higher education from relevant discipline industries, with little or no background in academia. By introducing the conceptual frame of the ‘academic immigrant’ I was endeavouring to provide a context in which to illicit and test the available evidence pertaining to the relationships that develop between academic leaders who identify as being academic immigrants, and who hold a strong values bond with their staff based on their shared professional identity and background, and what affect these relationships have in enabling those leaders to successfully lead their teams.

1.4 Research aims and questions

In the context of the frame of this research project, academic immigrant refers to those staff members in the New Zealand ITP sector who have been recruited directly into higher education from a relevant discipline industry and who have little or no formal background in teaching or teacher training. These staff often share professional backgrounds from fields other than education and have effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’ in higher education.

The overall aims of this study are:

To critically examine the identity of those industry professionals who have taken up careers as academics, and who may be known as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector;
To describe and understand the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrant leaders;
To examine and interpret the nature and significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders and their staff and the effect that their shared professional background and identity have on their work as academic leaders.

Research Questions
The key research question for this study is:

What is the nature of academic immigrant identity, and what is the significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders, their academic immigrant colleagues who share a professional identity and background?

In order to address this main research question the following specific research questions have been posed:

Question 1: How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?
Question 2: How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?
Question 3: What influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?

1.5 Structure of thesis
This thesis has been structured in seven chapters.

Chapter One, Introduction, presents the background to my interest in the phenomenon and identifies the object of the research, introduces the conceptual framework which explores the interrelationships between...
identities, and employs the metaphor of ‘immigrant’ and frames research aims and questions to guide the study.

Chapter Two, Literature Background, critically reviews the literature, which is linked to this study and the research questions. It reviews various theories of identity and understandings about identity constructs such as those of professionals and academics. It also examines the contexts of higher education in which this study takes place.

Chapter Three, Approach and Method, provides a rationale and justification for choosing a qualitative methodology for data collection and analysis for this study. Key methodological issues linked to answering the study's specific research questions are discussed. The chapter describes the qualitative interview method employed; identifies and addressed the participant choice and sampling methods; explains data management procedures and details the analytical procedures.

Chapter Four, Introducing the Participants, introduces the sixteen participants by detailing their personal stories of how they made the choice to become academics.

Chapter Five, Research Findings, presents a summary of the data collected from sixteen semi-structured interviews with academic leaders who identified with the metaphor of ‘migration’ as representing their personal journeys from industry professional to teacher and then to academic leader. It establishes key findings for discussion in the next chapter.

Chapter Six, Discussion of Findings, provides a discussion of the key findings presented in Chapter Five by examining connections and interpretations of the data in relation to the published literature presented in Chapter Two.

Chapter Seven, Conclusions and Recommendations, emphasises the study’s original contribution to knowledge and draws conclusions regarding the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in
the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector. Implications are drawn about the nature and significance of the relationships between academic immigrant leaders and their staff with whom they share professional backgrounds and identity, and the institutions in which they are now employed. In addition recommendations for practice and future research are included.

**Integrating statement**

As has been suggested throughout this chapter, identity seems to offer an insight into how individuals see themselves and their relationships to working environments. It is the interrelationships individuals’ experience that require adjustments and the reconstructions of a sense of self which requires constant work in order to sustain the sense of self. Such identity work takes place in environments where there is a potential separation of ‘us’ and ‘them’, where identities are partly ordered by the way in which people identify themselves with others like them, through the kinds of jobs that they do. Wenger (1998), when discussing communities of practice, describes identity as being about negotiation and participation with the social structures that people encounter. Even though people are subject to cultural influences, they are also individual agents with histories of participation formed by unique interactions over time, thus forming ‘personal trajectories of participation’ or ‘non-participation’.

Such forms of negotiation are relational between the structures of the workplace and the individual and learning is a natural outcome of working, however, what and how a person learns is also dependent on the opportunities that the work situation provides; the social mediation provided by activities, guidance from others, the tools and artefacts available. Individual trajectories of participation result in personal ontogenies, which will “result in unique dispositions, ways of knowing and knowledge, how they engage in work activities and interactions will not be wholly determined by what the workplace affords them” (Billett, 2001, p. 22).
I am an academic immigrant leader myself, with a professional working background in the creative arts. I am also an immigrant to New Zealand, having lived and worked here for over 35 years. Employing the metaphor of ‘immigrant’ was a useful tool to describe the breadth (and depth for some) of the identity transition from industry professional to academic. It supports my central contention that these industry professionals have effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’ in higher education. It is said that all cultures have an unwritten ‘manual’ for success, the rules and guidelines of which are transparent to group members, and those who move from one culture to another can gain insight into the different rules and guidelines relatively easily. I believe that this is true and that if you can communicate with each other from a basis of shared values and language, then you can help, and be helped, through any transition. The positive here is provided by Robinson and Aronica’s (2009) optimistic observation of hope:

Some people born in one culture end up adopting another because they prefer its sensibilities and ways of life, like cultural cross-dressers; a French person may become an Anglophile, or an American a Francophile. Like people who change religions, they can become more zealous about their adopted culture than those who were born into it. (p. 124)
Chapter 2  Literature background

By identity I mean an evolving nexus where all the forces that constitute my life converge in the mystery of self: my genetic make-up, the nature of the man and woman who gave me life, the culture in which I was raised, people who have sustained me and people who have done me harm, the good and ill I have done to others and to myself, the experience of love and suffering—and much, much more. In the midst of that complex field, identity is a moving intersection of the inner and outer forces that make me who I am, converging in the irreducible mystery of being human. (Palmer, 2007, p. 38)

Introduction

This research project sets out to describe and understand the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector. The study also examines and interprets the nature and significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders and their staff and the effect that their shared professional background and identity have on their work as academic leaders.

This chapter critically examines key literature that supports the choice of the study’s research questions. It achieves this by reviewing literature in relation to the conceptual framework which is based on the interrelationships of identity and the metaphor of ‘immigrant. When considering the review of literature for this study I decided to frame the story in a sequence of parts that build from the general, to the specific. Through this process the development of the research questions is demonstrated. This research focus is on the identity of academic immigrant leaders and those factors which contribute to the working relationship between academic leaders and their staff who identify as ‘academic immigrants’. Academic immigrants are those staff who have professional backgrounds from fields other than education and who have effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’ in the New
Zealand Institute of Technology and Polytechnic (ITP) higher education sector.

The chapter is divided into three parts. Part one discusses the theoretical underpinnings of various theories of identity, which seek to contribute to our understanding of the organisational players under discussion. Part two examines various identity concepts, including professional and academic identity, and organisational identity, as a way of distilling the broader theories and aligning them to the context of this study. And finally Part three addresses, in general terms, the context of higher education, in which these shared relationships between academic immigrant leaders and their staff takes place, including the organisational cultures and subcultures of higher education and a brief overview of leadership and organisational change as is relevant to the study in an effort to provide an overall frame for this study. At the conclusion of this chapter, a brief overview of the relationships between the reviewed literature and the research questions is presented as a way of drawing all the parts to a conclusion and setting a direction for the forthcoming chapters.

2.1 Theorising identity

Identity is arguably more fundamental to the conception of humanity than any other notion. That is a strong statement, but consider some of the key questions that we might use to assess the reach of the concept: What other issue is quite so important than answering the nebulous question, Who am I? What other concern is quite so captivating than dealing with the ongoing, lifelong project of assessing identity and figuring out how one relates to others and the surrounding world? What other question so influences understanding and action so heavily (if perhaps out of conscious awareness)? I can think of no other concept that is so central to the human experience, or one that infuses so many interpretations and actions, than the notion of identity. (Gioia, 1998, p. 17)
Identity theories are sociological theories, which link self-attitudes, or identities, to role relationships and role-related behaviour of individuals in group settings. It is important to examine these theories given that the group of individuals who are the subject of this study have adopted additional identities as they have migrated from their original professions into academia. Organisational, professional and personal social experiences help to form a persons’ identity (Giddens, 2009; Hothe, 2008; Jenkins, 2008), and this identity then helps people adopt certain roles within an organisation (Gioia, Patvardhan, Hamilton, & Corley, 2013; Turner, 2013). Identity can be defined a persons’ answer to the question ‘Who am I?’ (Stryker, 2007). Many of the ‘answers’ are linked to the role a person occupies, so they are often referred to as ‘role identities’. These role identities are said to influence behaviour in that each role has a set of associated meanings and expectations for the self (Deaux & Burke, 2010). Assuming different roles within an organisation means a person is likely to be subjected to new experiences that in turn help to form new personal identities (Stryker, 2007) and new social identities (Hogg, 2005). These may then be added to a former identity (Henkel, 2010) which can sometimes result in conflicting identities (Robertson, 2011). It is also understood that depending on the strength of the identity forming experiences (socialisation) (Fulcher & Scott, 2007), identity can become deeply incorporated in the ‘self’ (Burke & Stets, 2009) in the form of a permanent disposition (Bourdieu, 1990).

Several theorists agree that identity has multiple meanings and it is primarily the context that determines how people define themselves at any given time (Bourdieu, 2000; Burke & Stets, 2009; Giddens, 2009; Jenkins, 2008). This section will examine a range of theoretical perspectives that discuss the various forms of identity and identity theory. It will also examine role-identities and how individuals perceive themselves and others because of the roles they occupy. Generally the theories and theorists discussed below emphasise the social structural version rather than the traditional version of symbolic interaction. This is because the assumption that society is patterned and
organised, and the ‘self’ emerges within the context of a complex, organised society is relevant to this study, which is positioned within organisational settings and in which identity influences the people involved. Stryker (1980) posits that the ‘self’ reflects the ‘society’ in which it resides, therefore if society is organised, so too must the self be organised. This is based on the notion that there are as many selves as there are different roles that one holds in society (McCall & Simmons, 1978). Burke and Stets (2009) summarise this when they explain that:

Identity theory seeks to explain the specific meanings that individuals have for the multiple identities they claim; how these identities relate to one another for any one person; how their identities influence their behaviour, thoughts, and feelings or emotions; and how their identities tie them in to society at large. (p. 11)

In identity theory, different theorists focus on different aspects of a persons’ identity and for this reason, identity theory has slightly different emphases. In the work of Stryker and his colleagues (Serpe, 1987; Stryker, 1980; Stryker & Serpe, 1994; Stryker, Serpe, & Hunt, 2005), the focus is on how the social structure influences a persons identity and behaviour. Thoit's (1983, 1991, 1995) research also has this emphasis. The work of Burke and his associates (Burke, 2003; Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Cast & Burke, 2002; Stets, 2005; Stets & Burke, 2003) emphasises the internal dynamics within the self that influence behaviour. A third emphasis is in the work of McCall and Simmons (McCall, 2003; McCall & Simmons, 1978) who focus on how identities are maintained in face-to-face interaction. Below, is provided a brief overview of the immediate history of identity theory as well as more detailed sections on each of the aspects of identity theory that have pertinence for this study.

**The journey from self to identity**

The notion of ‘identity’ has become the prominent way to re-conceptualise the early work that described the notion of ‘self’. A range of philosophical ideas, rooted in the view of the sociologist, has grown to become the amalgam that
is today known as identity theory. The term ‘identity’, however, means many things to many people.

In the 1940’s George Mead developed an idea of the self in his portrayal of the process through which the self appears as a result of the assumption of various specific and general roles (McKinney, 1955). This foundational work was termed ‘symbolic interactionism’ and evolved to focus on the dynamics of self more than either symbols or interaction (Turner, 2013). Stryker’s (2008) work on ‘symbolic interactionism’ included thoughts about what makes up identities as well as how they function. In his view, human social behaviour is organised by symbolic designations of all aspects of the environment, both physical and social. Among the most important of these designations are the symbols and associated meanings of the positions that people occupy in social structures.

McCall and Simmons (1978) emphasised that roles are typically improvised as individuals seek to realise their various plans and goals. A role identity is, therefore, “the character and the role that an individual devises for himself (herself as well) as an occupant of a particular social position” (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 67). In this frame, role identity constitutes an imaginative view of oneself in a position, often a rather idealised view of oneself. Each role identity thus has a conventional portion linked to positions in social structure as well as an idiosyncratic portion constructed in people’s imaginations.

Another root from which identity theory stems is ‘perceptual control theory’ as developed primarily by Powers (1973). This set of ideas was concerned with the nature of control systems and provides an understanding of ‘purpose” and “goals’, which underlay all living things. Taylors’ (1989) seminal work Sources of the Self, went further when he brought together a range of philosophical ideas from Plato to Descartes as well as the latest contemporary thinking to articulate a view of identity in modern Western society. These various ideas are incorporated into identity theory as the basis for understanding how identities function.
Working squarely within the symbolic interactionist tradition, Burke (1980) and various colleagues, particularly, Stets (2009), developed yet another variant of identity theory where individuals carry general views of themselves to all situations, or an ‘idealised self’, but it is the ‘working self’ or ‘self-image’ that guides moment-to-moment interaction. The idealised self may, of course, influence just how individuals see themselves in a situation, but the key dynamics of self revolve around trying to verify this working self or self-image in situations as individuals play roles.

_Hierarchy of prominence_
McCall and Simmons (1978) believe that to better understand the identity formation process, one needs to differentiate the separate hierarchical aspects of the identity roles, which they called ‘hierarchy of prominence’. To these researchers prominence of identity could be measured by three characteristics of individual actors:

1. The degree of support that self is receiving from others to shape its identity.
2. The degree of self’s commitment to the identity that he or she accepts and was given by the structure.
3. The degree of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards that he or she is given by the structure and other identities for submitting to their norms and accepting their supremacy over his or her identity formation process.

(McCall & Simmons, 1978)

Higher levels in the scale of the above mentioned indicators means higher amounts of group acceptance of the new member, and in return higher levels of group participation. The implications here are that higher amounts of participation and acceptance from the group will result in higher levels of internalisation of the norms and activities of the host group. This does not only apply to new comers in a group, it can also be applied on existing group members to adjust them to the changing norms and perspectives in the group. For example, due to organisational change interventions, staff groups might
need to adjust themselves to a newly emerging environment, and they also need their members not only to adjust to it, but also internalise new rules for the survival of the group. According to the principles of ‘hierarchy of prominence’, it can be supposed that if the group offers higher roles and support to a member, this will increase levels of commitment to the cause of the group by the individual (Brenner, Serpe, & Stryker, 2014).

*Hierarchy of salience*

Stryker (1980) offers a similar approach, where he proposes ‘salience hierarchy’ instead of ‘prominence hierarchy’. According to Stryker (1980), the various identities that comprise the self exist in a hierarchy of salience, where the identities that are ranked highest are most likely to be invoked in situations that involve different aspects of the self. Stryker and Burke (2000) assert that “the higher the salience of an identity relative to other identities incorporated in to the self, the greater the probability of behavioural choices in accord with the expectations attached to that identity” (p. 286). The concept of a salience hierarchy is important in identity theory because the salience we attach to our identities influences how much effort we put into each role and how well we perform in each role (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Thoits, 2012). Identities fit together in a hierarchy of salience which is defined as the likelihood of a particular identity's activation (Stets & Burke, 2000).

Identity formation and salience is influenced by individuals' relationships with other people. Identity theory uses the term ‘commitment’ to describe the degree to which a persons' relationships to others in their networks depend on possessing a particular identity and role, and a higher commitment to an identity increases its salience (Burke & Stets, 2009; Stryker & Burke, 2000). As an example, one could suggest that a person with close family, friends, or other significant relationships in a shared religion is likely to have a more salient religious identity than a person with fewer ties. This salience may therefore predict behaviour, where one could predict that a person with a more salient religious identity is likely to spend more time involved in religious activities (Hogg, 2008).
According to Stets and Burke (2003), the main difference between the two hierarchies is evident where ‘prominence hierarchy’ focuses on how individuals play their roles in a situation, while ‘salience hierarchy’ tends to focus on individual values and their affect over identity formation. To Stryker and Serpe (1994) one cannot overlook the importance of the values and their influence over individuals’ behavioural choices and their identity formation process. However, to them we also need to include the situational constraints that have a negative effect over them.

**Social identity**

In social identity theory, a social identity is a person’s knowledge that he or she belongs to a social category or group (Burke & Stets, 2009). Social identity theory should not be confused with identity theory, which emphasises role behaviour rather than group process and intergroup relations. Identity theory focuses on the self as comprised of the various roles an individual occupies (e.g., spouse, parent, employee), while social identity theory posits that the groups to which people belong (e.g., profession, professional body, union) can provide their members a definition of who they are (Hogg, 2008).

According to social identity theory, group membership and activation of the self by this group (acceptance and approval) are sufficient to explain the formation of identity. The category or group membership will provide an understanding to the self that he or she is part of a group and should associate himself or herself with that group and needs to act accordingly (Stets & Burke, 2003). A social group is understood to be a set of individuals who hold a common social identification or view themselves as members of the same social category, and in our case, this could be seen as members of the same profession or industry discipline group. According to social identity theory, this awareness will encourage/force individuals to learn the structure, dynamics of the group and change themselves to better fit in. It is at that point where we see the emergence of in-group and out-group concepts.
These concepts dictate that the self will associate itself with the ones whom he/she thinks similar to him/her, and will label them as ‘in-group’, while the ones who are not members of his/her group will be labelled as ‘out-group’ persons (Burke & Stets, 2009). In-group members are seen as trustworthy and share identity and values with other group members (Kahan, 2010). According to Hogg and Terry (2000) while creating a sense of belonging, this self categorisation and self comparison also creates the concept of ‘other’ which will be used to boost the group identity formation process. This ‘other’ or ‘out-group’ notion can also be used by the group to maintain its existence by creating a tension to provide a sense of uniqueness for its followers. This will help group members to cluster around basic and fundamental values of the group. It will also encourage or even force in-group members to see the things happening around the individual from that group’s perspective. In other words individuals will cease to have personal opinions and will become a reflection of the group.

Intergroup relationships and comparisons between themselves (the in-group) and others (the out-groups) are the major sources for identity formation (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). This process resembles ethnocentrism, which is described by Henslin (2010) as “a tendency to use our own group's ways of doing things as the yardstick for judging others” (p. 38). Ethnocentrism has both positive and negative consequences. On the positive side, it creates in-group loyalties and trust. On the negative side, ethnocentrism can lead to harmful discrimination against people whose ways differ from ours (Stets & Burke, 2014).

According to social identity theory, in order to maintain their existence, groups need to have members who have a similar outlook to life and to the events happening to them. When individuals do not feel the need to distinguish themselves from other in-group members the homogeneity of the group tends to be higher (Oakes, Haslam, Morrison, & Grace, 1995). Simon and Pettigrew (1990) discuss the consequences of homogeneity by suggesting that individuals who tend to identify themselves with the group also tend to have strong connection with the group and believe that their personal attachments
and values are of secondary importance. The status of the group in the society does not change this. Even in a very low level group, once the membership is activated and internalised by the member, they tend to ignore the criticisms coming from the rest of the society and still choose to fulfil the requirements of their allegiance. This demonstrates the power of the group over the individual. According to social identity theory, uniformity, not only in perception, but also in action becomes the natural outcome of group membership (De Cremer, 2001).

People are social organisms, and generally do not like to live in isolation, therefore identities are assigned directly or indirectly by the groups and institutions in the given society and individuals gain their meanings and statuses through their interactions with that society. Stets and Burke (2009) claim that individuals can only survive if they fulfil the identity roles that they are assigned. Even individual's who have moved on from the original society and could easily be named as outcasts, still maintain an attachment to the society. Identity standards that were created out of the interaction with others (other identities, society, and groups) have become tools for controlling the individual in the society and it is these standards that are used as the benchmark for a person’s compatibility with the identity that was given to them (Cast & Burke, 2002).

**Role identity**

Role identity theorists have focused on the match between the individual meanings of occupying a particular role and the behaviours that a person enacts in that role while interacting with others (Burke & Stets, 2009). This match includes the negotiation of meanings for situations and identities, and how they fit together to provide a situated context for interaction. By taking on a role identity, persons adopt self-meanings and expectations to accompany the role as it relates to other roles in the group, and then act to represent and preserve these meanings and expectations (Serpe & Stryker, 2011). The meanings and expectations vary across persons in the set of roles activated in a situation.
The core of an ‘identity’ is seen as the categorisation of the ‘self’ as an occupant of a role, and the incorporation, into the ‘self’, of the meanings and expectations associated with that role and its performance (Stets & Burke, 2000). These expectations and meanings form a set of standards that guide behaviour. In general, one’s identities are composed of the self-views that emerge from the reflexive activity of self-categorisation or identification in terms of membership in particular groups or roles. Thus, although the basis of self-classification is different in the two theories (group/category versus role), theorists in both traditions recognise that individuals view themselves in terms of meanings imparted by a structured society (Hogg, 2008; Stryker, 2007).

Many theorists have proposed models of how identity is affected by roles. Jenkins (2008) built a concept of role identities based on the earlier work of Charles Taylor by proposing three ways to view identity which he argued are distinct, but interlinked, and should not be separated:

- the individual order is the human world as made up of embodied individuals, and what-goes-on-in-their-heads;
- the interaction order is the human world as constituted in relationships between individuals, in what-goes-on-between-people; and
- the institutional order is the human world of pattern and organisation, of established-ways-of-doing-things. (p. 39)

Turner’s (2013) work on a theory of transactional needs contends that humans have certain fundamental needs and states that, to varying degrees, are always activated when individuals interact. He describes these as transactional needs in two senses with the first being some of these needs are activated during interaction; and second, success or failure in meeting these needs dramatically affects the flow of interaction. Turner (2013) also adds to the interpretation of identity theory when he visualises self as composed of four fundamental identities:
Core identity - the fundamental cognitions and feelings that people have about themselves that are generally salient in almost all situations (some have termed this person identity);

Social identities - the cognitions and feelings that people have of themselves as members of social categories (for example, gender, sexual preference, ethnicity, class, or any social category) that define people as distinctive and that generally lead to differential evaluation of memberships in social categories;

Group identities - cognitions and feelings about self that stem from membership in, or identification with, corporate units revealing divisions of labour (groups, communities, and organisations being the most likely sources of a group identity); and

Role identities - the roles that people play in any social context, but particularly the roles associated with membership in the divisions of labour in corporate units and, at times, memberships in social categories or what I term categoric units. (p. 349)

Similarly Burke and Stets (2009) posit a definition of this model of identity as being:

The set of meanings that define who one is when one is an occupant of a particular role in society, a member of a particular group, or claims particular characteristics that identify him or her as a unique person. (p. 11)

In the terms of this study, a person could therefore be, at the same time, ‘a spouse, a parent, a plumber, a teacher, and a leader’. Each individual will have different ideas about what it means to be ‘a parent’ or ‘a leader’, however each of these terms has shared meanings and expectations that are understood within the larger culture. When people internalise these cultural meanings and expectations, these roles and group memberships are termed ‘identities’, and become a set of standards that guide behaviour (Burke & Stets, 2009).
Multiple identities

The literature clearly supports the notion that everybody has multiple identities, but not all are actively guiding behaviour at any one time (Stryker, 2007; Thoits, 2012). As discussed previously, Burke and Stets (2009) identify three types of identities: person identity or an individual self-conception (or what some call core-identity); role identity tied to particular roles; and social identity tied to a social group. Individuals can have all three of these identities in play during an interaction, but the dynamics of identity control operate in the manner described above. Also, people have different levels of identity, such as a master identity, or a moral identity, that shapes or at least influences all other identities that that particular individual occupies (Thoits, 1983).

Having multiple identities is good for the individual since it offers alternative solutions to the problems of daily life, gives meanings to what’s happening around the self and provides guidance in the choice of appropriate behaviours (Burke, 2006). Burke (2003) claimed that having multiple identities provides different consequences for individuals who occupy different structural positions (identities). He compared individuals who had managerial identities with individuals without managerial roles, and claims that the ones with managerial identities were more aware of organisational activities and therefore they became more participating members in the group. On the other hand, the ones without managerial roles still developed a sense of attachment to the group, but their levels of participation were dramatically lower than the former group. For Burke (2003), the nature and/or power of the identities defines the level of group encouragement for the individual’s participation in group’s affairs and consequently developing a sense of belonging.

However, it is important to note that if these identities are in conflict with the mainstream in a way that they are not compatible to and approved by the dominant society, then having such multiple identities will have a negative effect for the person (Larson & Pepper, 2003). In this circumstance it will create tension in the persons’ dealings with the dominant society, while on the other hand it might still provide a healthy relationship in its in-group dealings. This may present itself in terms of this study when the relationship between
groups of staff who identify strongly with a distinct discipline group come into conflict with a change action being undertaken by the wider organisation. It may manifest as a ‘resistance’ action by the group in question to the proposed change action.

**Changing identities**

There is agreement that identity development is influenced by both internal psychological factors and external life events. Thus change may be initiated by the individual characteristics of the person, including personality, cognitive ability, and current identity, as well as by life experience (Cramer, 2004; Deaux & Burke, 2010; Stets & Burke, 2014). Jenkins (2008) suggests that identities are in a constant state of change over time. Identity change may occur when people have multiple identities that are related to each other in the sense that they share meanings and are activated at the same time.

According to Burke (2006) identity may be viewed as a set of self-relevant meanings held as standards for an identity in question. For each identity there is a standard that indicates the level of each dimension of meaning (for example, of “task-orientation” with respect to the leader identity), which defines the person’s identity: what it means to be who one is. The meanings that define an identity are the identity standards of any group-, role-, or person-based identity such as electrician, spouse, or ‘honest’ (Brenner et al., 2014). Change in identities thus refers to changes in the meanings within the identity standard, for example, changes in what it means to be a spouse.

Identity change theorists have identified four conditions under which identity change occurs (Burke, 2006; Deaux & Burke, 2010; Stets & Burke, 2014; Thoits, 2003). The first condition occurs if two or more identities with shared meanings have conflicting standards and are activated together in a situation. Burke (2006) describes how simultaneous activation of identities with shared meanings, but with different standards, can result in verifying one identity at the expense of not verifying another identity unless both undergo shifts in their meanings so that they can be verified simultaneously. The second condition
suggests that behaviour that does not match an identity standard can lead to identity change because the identity standard will shift in the direction implied by the behaviour. For example, Stets (Stets, 2005) found that low status individuals engaged in negative conversation tactics when their self-worth was disturbed. She theorised that over time, an individual’s control identity would shift towards being more dominant to match their behaviour. The third condition suggests that by taking the role of another, an identity standard can adapt to another person’s identity to bring about what is termed a mutual verification context. Burke and Cast (1997) measured the gender identities of newly married couples as well as the extent to which each ‘took the role of the other’. They found that greater role sharing led to shifting one’s gender identity toward their spouse’s gender identity. This occurs so as to reduce conflict and persistent discrepancies between self-in-situation and identity standard meanings. The final occurrence involves how changes in the context in which identities are invoked change the meanings held in the identity standard. Burke and Cast (1997) investigated how the birth of a first child affected the gender identities of newly married men and women. They found that because the roles of mother and father are ‘gendered’, identities shift in those directions with the birth of a child. They proposed that persistent mismatches between an identity standard and inputs are likely when individuals take on new roles, such as that of parent.Thoits (2003), in a similar study, proposed that the parent role (once entered into) can be seen as an obligatory (as opposed to a voluntary) identity. Thus, persistent disturbances are more likely to lead to identity change since many behavioural changes, like exiting the situation, are not possible.

Deaux and Burke (2010) have also employed social identity theory to explain a distributional understanding to account for the way an individual’s social identity changes as the in-group defines itself relative to an out-group. They suggest that the distribution of meaning for the social identity may become less dispersed, less flexible, more important, and better defined as the in-group further distinguishes itself.
**Socialisation and identity**

Socialisation describes the process by which a person enters a social structure and acquires the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that allow them to belong as members of a particular society (Burke & Stets, 2009; Turner, 2013). Socialisation processes lead to the development of an ‘assumed identity’ perceived by the outside world, and also the recognition by the individual of an identity within themselves through a process of ‘internalisation’ (Swart & Grauerholz, 2012). Mead (1934) saw socialisation as a process through which children learn to see the world as others see it as they ‘internalise’ the viewpoints of others. Socialisation is a life-long process (Fulcher & Scott, 2007) and is generally divided into two phases. The first (primary) begins with children learning from their parents, books, television, and movies about the different roles that exist in the culture. This is referred to as primary socialisation where as children grow, they become more aware of the different positions in society and learn what it means to be in one of those positions and how to fulfil the expectations associated with the position. The immediate family acts as the main “agents of socialisation” for the individual (Giddens, 2009, p. 288). The next phase (secondary) takes place later in childhood and on into maturity as individuals interact with people and social entities outside of their immediate family. In this phase, school, peer groups, media, organisations and the workplace become the agents of socialisation. It is through these varied experiences that people develop their identity, their sense of self.

Scott (2005) contends that the shared ideas and values of a group are learned by individuals through socialisation (he also employs the term enculturation). These become the basis of the motives that inform their actions and ensure that these are geared to the expectations of others. He maintains also that:

> The communication of ideas and values from person to person ensures that they become incorporated into the minds of a large number of people and so become part of the shared heritage of ideas and values. (p. 25)
Jenkins (2008) maintains that identity is never fixed when he describes it as a process of both ‘being’ and ‘becoming’:

One’s identity – ones identities, indeed, for who we are is always singular and plural – is never a final or settled matter. Not even death freezes the picture: identity or reputation can be reassessed. (p. 17)

The process of ‘becoming’ is linked to socialisation processes where an individual has learned that there are more possible outcomes for themselves than were apparent when they were young and seeing themselves within the frame of primary experiences and observations within their immediate familial society. This form of socialisation has been described as the period of transition from ‘youth to adulthood’ where ‘career choices’ for example, are influenced as much by self-identification and self-determination as through the consequences of categorisation experienced during younger years (Jenkins, 2000). During secondary socialisation, as people observe or try out new roles, they learn about what to do, what not to do, what constitutes best practices, as well as how to do things that must be done. Anticipatory socialisation accounts for individuals seeking to develop the skills that a particular coveted role-identity calls for (Stryker, 2007).

Role-identity theory underlines the importance of the individual’s planning of the future where the individual constantly is revising his or her agenda parallel to calculating how his or her image is going to be received by others. This is described as ‘modelling’ by Burke and Stets (2009) and constitutes an important part of the social learning that takes place as people take on the identity associated with a new position. Who we want to be, and who we can be, are questions about negotiating positions, and values. In this way identity can be seen as an individual’s idea about his or her own set of role-identities, dynamically and hierarchically ordered, and also ‘changeable over time’ (Smith & Boyd, 2012).
Professional and organisational socialisation

Organisational socialisation is where a person comes to understand the knowledge, values and behaviours needed to perform a particular role within an organisation (Schein, 2010). Professional socialisation is where a new member learns what it is to be part of a new profession (Arnett, 2006). Socialisation is a social learning process that is known to involve two types of actors, the target and the agents of socialisation (Fulcher & Scott, 2007). It also includes two positions in social space, the old role and the one the person is entering. In this way socialisation processes are concerned with the way the person learns as he or she makes the transition from the old role to a full integration in the new one.

Early research into organisational socialisation and its relationship to careers, such as work by Eastin, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) discussed it as “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organisational role” (p. 211). To function effectively in a new role, individuals must develop ways of viewing themselves in that role often by developing a sub identity related to that role. The role is the external or objective status, and the sub identity is the internal or subjective self-conception associated with that role (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). A career can be thought of as a ‘bundle’ of socialisation experiences, as the person moves in, through, and out of various work-related roles (Hall, 1987).

In contemporary societies, it is no longer the case that individuals are raised with a set of skills that can last them a lifetime. Most adults change careers or shift to significantly different kinds of jobs at least once over the course of their adult work lives. Each change involves learning a new language, skills, and attitudes (Swart & Grauerholz, 2012). Reinharz (1979) explains this as the process of socialisation not being merely “the transfer from one group to another in a static social structure, but the active creation of a new identity through a personal definition of the situation” (p. 374).
Direct Socialisation

Direct socialisation refers to conscious programmes activity designed to ensure that as people move into new positions and take on new identities, they have the correct identity standards from the beginning. These may take the form of both formal and informal instruction about what is expected for fulfilling a new position. In organisations, this may take the form of formal induction processes and job training for a new job. In larger, more complex societies, there seems to be more reliance on education and direct socialisation than on the more informal social learning that takes place (Smith & Boyd, 2012). This is true partly because of the complexity of the learning that must take place, but also because of the interconnectivity of positions, groups, and organisations and rhetoric that states “there is no time for trial and error; we must be up and running from the beginning” (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 103). Nelson (1990) suggests that:

> Direct socialisation occurs regardless of formalisation; that is, even if an organisation does not have a formal orientation program, the informal organisation will work to socialise the individual. It is in the best interest of the organisation, therefore, to assist newcomers in the adjustment process and help make the transition smoother… Organisations need to form ‘psychological contracts’ with newcomers, which are both ‘reciprocal and characterised by integrity’. (p. 136)

Role transitions and re-socialisation

According to Bridges (2003) a transition is a movement from one status to another, and comprises three phases: separation from the old status (or role), initiation into the new status and incorporation of the new status into one’s self-identity. Nelson (1990) describes transitioning as a process of sense-making in which the individual experiences three phases of transition which begins with ‘anticipatory socialisation’ (prior to the first day); followed by ‘encounter’ where the individual experiences the new environment for the first time; and the final phase of ‘change and acquisition’ where the individual settles down to master the demands of the job.
Re-socialisation is described the process of learning attitudes, values, and behaviours that are markedly different from those in which the individual was previously socialised (Bebb, 2009; Jones & Galloway, 2012; Turner, 2013). Re-socialisation typically comes with the acquisition of new roles or positions in life, as well as the loss or letting go of other previously held roles. Sociologists conceptualise re-socialisation as what occurs when there is a drastic change in an individuals’ life and may emerge in any circumstance in which an individual is experiencing swift and significant changes (Bridges, 2003). Most re-socialisation takes place during adulthood when an individuals’ sense of self is more stable and their prior experiences have had a great deal of time to affect their attitudes, values, and behaviours (Giddens, 2009).

Re-socialisation can occur as the result of voluntary or involuntary life changes. Voluntary re-socialisation (getting married, attending college, changing career) involves taking on a new role under one's own volition, Involuntary re-socialisation (being sentenced to prison, becoming disabled) results from changes that go against an individual’s own wishes. Under voluntary re-socialisation, the individual is committed to undertaking the changes at hand, and is therefore more likely to accept rather than resist the re-socialisation that accompanies these changes. Involuntary re-socialisation can be much more traumatic because the individual is essentially dealt a new identity without having much (or any) say in the matter (Swart & Grauerholz, 2012).

Part one discussed the theoretical underpinnings of various theories of identity as a way of contributing to our understanding of the organisational players under discussion. This research identified key issues related to questions about how people experience and construct identity. The discussion of the various theories linked self-attitudes, or identities, to the role relationships and role-related behaviour of individuals. It also examined how people understand and experience taking on a particular role, such as
academic leadership, and the way that they experience multiple identities such as those from a previous profession alongside an emerging academic identity. The theories help to explain the specific meanings that individuals have for the multiple identities they claim; how these identities relate to one another for any one person; how their identities influence their behaviour, thoughts, and feelings or emotions; and how their identities tie them in to society at large.

A number of questions around identity were raised which contribute toward the study’s specific research questions. For the first research question, “how do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?” the following questions were raised:

• What has been your personal journey towards a career in higher education?
• How do you, and your staff, demonstrate a sense of belonging to both your ‘old’ and your ‘new’ profession?
• Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you joined the institution?

For the second research question, “how do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?” the following question was raised:

• To what extent do you experience multiple contexts of identity? ie: both professional and academic

The next section of this chapter reviews literature related to a range of relevant identity constructs.

2.2 Identity constructs

For most of human history, forming an adult identity was by all accounts a relatively straightforward process. The average person simply assumed and fitted into the culturally prescribed roles that his
or her parents and grandparents had themselves adopted. Those who did not do so might have been banished from their community, or at least sanctioned in some way. (Côté & Levine, 2002, p. 3)

A person’s construct system represents the truth as they understand it (Kelly, 2003). The term construct is particularly effective, because it reflects the concept’s dual role. On the one hand, a person’s constructs represent the view that a person has constructed about the world as they experienced it. On the other hand, a person’s constructs indicate how they are likely to construe the world as they continue to experience it (Stewart, 2010). A person’s construct system can be seen as both their history and their predisposition to perceive

One of the main tenets that personal construct theory maintains is that there are always alternative constructions possible, alternative ways of making sense of events and experiences (Warren, 2006). Like other theories, the psychology of personal constructs is the implementation of a philosophical assumption according to its originator George Kelly. He suggests that “the assumption is that whatever nature may be, or howsoever the quest for truth will turn out in the end, the events we face today are subject to as great a variety of construction as our wits will enable us to contrive” (Kelly, 2003, p. 3).

However individual’s reactions to change are not inevitably positive. Kelly (1955), the noted clinical psychologist, in his work on personal constructs found that the constructs ‘threat’, ‘fear’, ‘anxiety’, ‘guilt’, ‘aggressiveness’ and ‘hostility’ are related to transition. From a constructivist orientation, explicit exploration of professional perspectives could play an important role for the organisation members as, according to Kelly’s experience corollary, “a person’s construction system varies as he successively construes the replications of events” (Kelly, 1955, p. 50). Robinson and Aronica (2009) add to this by suggesting that no one sees the world directly, rather it is perceived through frameworks of ideas and beliefs, which act as filters on what is seen and how it is seen. This vision of the world is often interpreted into the
metaphors and images we use to think about ourselves and about the world around us. They illustrate how some ideas enter our consciousness so deeply that they strike us as simple common sense so that we’re not even aware of them with the following:

Sir Isaac Newton, the great physicist, composed his theories at the dawn of the mechanical age. To him the universe seemed like an enormous mechanical clock, with perfectly regular cycles and rhythms. Einstein and others have since shown that the universe is not like a clock at all; its mysteries are more complicated, subtle, and dynamic than even your favourite watch. Modern science has changed metaphors, and in doing so has shifted our understanding of how the universe works. (p. 251)

**Professional Identity**
Professional identity refers to the enduring beliefs, values, motives and experiences that are characteristic of individuals who enact the same professional role (Winter, 2009) and which is entwined with working and social histories replete with local paradigms, unique cultures and individual epistemology (Whitchurch, 2008). Professional identity is one of the multiple social identities an individual holds (Hotho, 2008) and has been described as the “view of self as a professional plus competence as a professional, resulting in congruence between personal worldview and professional view” (Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010, p. 21). Hall (2000) suggested that professionals derive their identity from association with a group or with an ideal, determining that membership in a professional community provides a sense of stability, belonging, and values, and it reduces ambiguity. Beckett and Gough (2004) describe this in terms of a strong scholastic tradition, where people learn powerfully in and from their ‘sociality’, such as through work experiences, trade unions and professional associations. The work of Stryker and Burke (2000) has evolved an integrated identity theory from two strands of identity research in which “one emphasises the social structural sources of identity and the relations among identities, and the other focuses on internal, cognitive identity processes” (p. 288). In this complementary form,
identity theory focuses mostly on role identity within the organisational structure (Larson & Pepper, 2003). In a recent study into the changing identity of health care professionals in the context of organisational change, Hotho (2008) draws on structuration theory, to suggest that "change participants are likely to draw upon strategies and values derived from within their profession to reassert and (re)legitimise their professional identity" (p. 731). She expands this with insights from social identity theory which suggest that "individuals may also realign their social identity according to the options the change context offers" (p. 731). The connectedness of the role and the organisation influences the salience of the role occupant’s identification, while the nature/form of identification depends on the “gap between self-relevant perceptions in situations and identity standards” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 290). These theoretical lenses may be useful in examining a more situated understanding of the dynamics that reconstitute or reshape the boundaries of professional identity during change.

Professionals may be seen as communities of people within organisations who create and sustain relatively independent and unique work cultures consisting of task rituals, standards for proper behaviour and work codes (Briggs, 2007), a construct that will be further explored when considering professional identity in a later section. Professionalism can therefore embody espoused values or codes, which are consciously ‘professed’ and are monitored through individual reflection and/or through organisational systems (Toma, Dubrow, & Hartley, 2005b). Professionalism, like culture, is a social construct where each definition is grounded in its own set of discourses (Lok & Crawford, 1999). Characteristics such as autonomy and protection of independence form part of the ideology of professionalism. This autonomy means that professional groups will tend to embody different values, attitudes and orientations. This inevitably leads to the creation of different sub-cultural behavioural patterns that are often at variance with an organisation’s homogenous cultural goals (Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008). According to Schein (2010), it can be assumed that most mature organisations encompass one or more subcultures that have developed their own guiding assumptions and beliefs based on what they have learned through shared past experiences. To
the extent that subcultures align with the dominant culture, they can strengthen it. When subcultures significantly deviate from the dominant culture, they can destabilise or create dysfunction within the organisation (Owens, 2004).

Professional education is not education for understanding alone; it is preparation for accomplished and responsible practice in the service of others. It is preparation for 'good work'. Professionals must learn abundant amounts of theory and vast bodies of knowledge. They must come to understand in order to act, and they must act in order to serve. Shulman (2005) suggests that the best way to understand the culture of a profession and the way that they develop is to “study their nurseries, in this case, their forms of professional preparation” (p. 52). He describes this professional preparation as the characteristic forms of teaching and learning that he has labelled ‘signature pedagogies’. These are types of teaching that organise the fundamental ways in which future practitioners are educated for their new professions. In these signature pedagogies, the novices are instructed in critical aspects of the three fundamental dimensions of professional work – “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” (p. 52).

**Academic identity**

Traditional forms of academic identity are regarded as a form of professional identity that is characterised by a highly developed professional sense of self (Briggs, 2007) that is strongly influenced by both academic (professional/collegial values) and managerial (bureaucratic/administrative values) identities (Billot, 2010). This is recognised as creating conflict between the collegial and the administrative forms of work organisations (Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008). Raelin (1985) notes that “there is perhaps no greater source of strain between managers and professionals than over the conflict between bureaucratic and professional standards” (p. 163).

It is proposed that academic identity is tied strongly to its past, and is related to a perception of what comprised the professional role in the academy.
through history. Historically, the traditional university has represented a collective of scholars, which Harris (2005) suggests exhibited “exclusion, elitism and power” (p. 424), who held ideological rewards and peer esteem to be paramount (Winter, 2009). Certain values were held as precious, namely collegiality, collaborative management and academic freedom (Winter, 2009), but this was when universities were more autonomous and internal practices were less subject to external influences.

Traditionally many of the core functions of higher education were considered to be in the control of the individual academic, with institutional governance characterised by collegiality (Jaeger & Pekruhl, 1998), however recent evidence points to widespread systems restructuring through the adoption of new forms of governance and managerialism (Huy, 2001). As academics enact their roles, they are influenced by both academic (professional) and managerial (bureaucratic) identities and the contradictions and conflicts that arise from these competing identity claims (Viskovic & Robson, 2001). Winter (2009) supports this by suggesting that:

As academic identities are not unitary and fixed but pluralistic and fluid, there exists the context for different expectations and discourses as to: (1) the roles, rights, and obligations of academics (e.g. academics as autonomous professionals; academics as managed employees); and (2) the nature and purpose of the institution (e.g. a crucible of learning and education; a profit-making enterprise). (p. 124)

Archer (2008b) describes academic identity at a simple level, as being a combination of teaching and research that provides the label ‘academic’. She suggests that ‘being academic’ is constructed in terms of “embodied qualities and practices of being intellectual, critical and knowledgeable and committed to scholarship” and also involves “being ethical, professional and respectful and being collaborative, collegiate and part of a wider academic community” (p. 397). However, Churchman (2006) suggests that “the notion of a single ‘academic identity’ may be obsolete in an environment in which the academic
role is becoming increasingly diverse” (p. 3). This may be true of the higher education environment, where change and compromise affects the role of the academic (Chan, 2012; Winter, 2009), and where there exists “a complex multiplicity of accounts and understandings of being part of academe” (Billot, 2010, p. 712). Clegg (2008) maintains that there is no longer a homogenisation of academic identity which is supported by Churchman (2006) who notes that there may be a disjuncture between “the rhetoric and experiences of academic life” (p. 8) to be considered. Henkel (2005) suggests that the “interactions between the institution, the discipline and the individual are seen to be crucial” (p. 164).

Clegg (2008) proposes that academic identity is extremely complex and personal and cannot be discussed in simple terms of teaching, management or research. In a recent study she proposed that “academic identities were being actively shaped and developed in response to the changes in university structures and external environments” (p. 340). She describes a situation of hybridity where:

Newer emerging [academic] identities, or ‘hybrids’, were mostly not shaped by a reference to nostalgia for an elitist past, but were based on different epistemological assumptions derived from other professional and practice based loyalties. (p. 340)

**Divided loyalties**

Henkel (2010) provides a ‘communitarian perspective’ by describing academic identity as a function of community membership that is grounded in interactions between the individual and two key communities: first, the discipline and second, higher education as an institution. She examined the impacts of changes upon the dynamic between individuals, disciplines and universities within which academic identities were formed and sustained and upon individual and collective values central to academic identity, namely the primacy of the discipline in academic working lives and academic autonomy. These ‘academic communities’ have been described by Clegg (2008) in terms of ‘groups of people who write and review papers and go to conferences’. She
suggests that these different perspectives result in a position where “discipline rather than being static emerged as a site of contestation” (p. 338) and suggests that simple assumptions about disciplinary loyalties and behaviours across institutions, within departments, or for individual academics are not universally valid.

Becher and Trowler’s (2001) investigation of academic “tribes and territories” explores the myths, unifying symbols, and contested borders that reflect and reinforce the complex and overlapping disciplinary cultures in which academic identities are forged. They believe that characteristics such as networks, social circles and academic standing contribute to academic identity. Their central contention is that:

The ways in which particular groups of academics organise their professional lives are related in important ways to the intellectual tasks on which they are engaged... Both disciplinary epistemology, understood as the 'actual' form and focus of knowledge within a discipline, and the phenomenology of that knowledge, the ideas and understandings that practitioners have about their discipline (and others) are important here. (p. 23)

Building on these concepts, Clegg (2008) suggests that traditional assumptions are breaking down in some areas and new disciplinary identities are forming. She proposes that it is also possible that new academic identities are less firmly entrenched in the disciplinary epistemology and that academics are creating new meanings for themselves as they integrate different strands of work. Quigley (2011) also suggests that culture should not be ignored when thinking of academic identity in terms of community. He contends that reflecting on academic identity in terms of both community and culture can help to situate an academic in terms of goals, values and interests. Taylor (1989) stated “to know who you are is to be oriented in moral space, a space in which questions arise about what is good or bad... what has meaning and importance to you and what is trivial and secondary” (p. 28). Robinson and Aronica (2009) also use the ‘tribal’ analogy when describing how people seek
out groups of like-minded people when entering a new social setting, and how important this is, as they suggest, “finding your tribe can have transformative effects on your sense of identity and purpose” (p. 95).

Churchman (2006) contends that the use of academic language also relates to the notion of identity. She suggests that the use of ‘teaching’ as a shared concept is losing relevance. Teaching in the modern university covers a huge range of genre; face to face work on campus, creating distance-learning materials, delivering short blocks of courses in international venues. The same could be said for the meaning of research. Macfarlane and Hughes (2009) express concerns about how “the persistent demarcation between research and teaching in higher education has encouraged academic staff to identify primarily with one or the other” (p. 12), rather than seeking any synergy or integration which may offer a better solution in the contemporary environment.

The impact of organisational and academic structures on academic identity may also affect the way that academics connect with their various institutions. While there is little research in this area, Sy and D’Annunzio (2005) point to a number of issues surrounding the use of matrix structures in organisations, such as: misaligned goals; unclear roles and responsibilities; ambiguous authority; lack of a matrix guardian; and silo-focused employees (those who concentrate their focus upon their own departments / subject areas without any recourse to the greater institution). Academic identities are also subject to changing organisational, social and political imperatives as well as being strongly related to disciplines (Henkel, 2010).

Organisational identity
Organisational identity is characterised by a relational construct defined by contrasts such as between ‘how we are’ and ‘how others see us’; for example, an organisation’s culture, its role in society, and its internal community structures form part of its identity (Flynn, 2005). Organisational identity theorists have used social identity theory as a lens through which to view the
process whereby individuals identify with organisations (Foreman & Whetten, 2002; Gioia, 1998; Whetten, 2006). Researchers have employed the connections between identity and identification to explain a variety of organisational processes and behaviours, including cooperation and citizenship (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994), loyalty (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), control practices (Barker & Tompkins, 1994) and commitment (Foreman & Whetten, 2002).

Recent accounts assert that organisational identity must be actively maintained (Ravasi & Phillips, 2011) and portray identity as an ongoing accomplishment arising from leaders' and members' actions (Foreman & Whetten, 2002; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Such accounts combine two formerly disparate perspectives on identity. The social actor perspective attributes identity continuity to the persistence of identity claims (Whetten, 2006) which are often expressed as ‘institutionalised mission statements, policies, and routines’ (Johnson & Jackson, 2009). These claims specify appropriate behaviour to members and convey core attributes to external audiences (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Leaders, particularly founding leaders, are central to establishing and perpetuating identity claims. The social constructionist perspective asserts that identity is perpetuated by identity understandings sustained by members and derived from their everyday organisational experiences (Parker, 2000).

In each perspective, cognitive processes are central to how actors perpetuate identity (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In the social actor perspective, leader-driven ‘sense-giving’, an attempt to shape others’ interpretations, is a primary mechanism through which identity claims are established (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). In the social constructionist perspective, member ‘sense-making’ underlies the construction of identity understandings (Gioia et al., 2010). Recent empirical work observes that sense-giving and sense-making can “generate an embedded dynamic” (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006, p. 436) that is "mutually recursive and constitutive" (Gioia et al., 2010, p. 6) when identity claims and understandings coincide, suggesting that identity perpetuation has a ‘structurational’ character. Giddens’ (1984) describes these characters in
terms of structures which are not seen as external entities, but rather as a virtual concept (‘structural properties’), and that are produced and transformed through the agency of individuals towards them in the process of ‘structuration’.

Social identity in organisational settings

Organisations may provide one answer to the question, ‘who am I?’, therefore it can be recognised that organisational identification is a specific form of social identification. However an individual's social identity may not only be derived from the organisation, but also from his or her work group, department, union, external industrial affiliation, guild membership, and so on. Organisationally situated social identity may, in fact, be comprised of more or less disparate and loosely coupled identities (Stryker, 2007; Thoits, 2003).

Integrating into a new workplace is regarded as a challenging experience with the process of joining an established community of practice involving learning the unwritten rules of interaction and the taken-for-granted norms and underlying values and beliefs which make each workplace and workplace team distinctive. Jenkins (2008) identifies the construct of institutional identity as comprising:

- A pattern of behaviour in any particular setting that has become established over time as ‘the way things are done’;
- An inter-subjective relevance and meaning in the situation concerned: people know about it and recognise it, if only in the normative specification of ‘how things are done’. (p. 157)

Learning ‘how we do things around here’, as workplace culture has been described, often takes a considerable amount of time. Holmes (2007) discusses a type of gatekeeping which is aligned with social identity concepts where colleagues and workmates employ strategies to admit a newcomer to a team, or to not fully accept them. The social identity of staff groups and what that means for leadership and their relationships with those groups is an important field in the research of leadership within the wider social sciences.
(Hogg & Terry, 2000; Yukl, 2004) and at the core of this study. When a new leader assumes the responsibility of leading a group, some people in that group will have serious concerns about how well the new leader will understand them and their organisation (Saksvik & Hetland, 2009). Some leaders become a part of the group and purposely try to decrease the social and hierarchical distance between themselves and the people they lead (McGuire, Rhodes, & Palus, 2008). Reicher, et al. (2007) describe this as a contingency style model where leaders analyse and identify the social identity of the group, and then lead based on this identity while guiding groups from the inside. Other leaders, however, will position themselves as leading from outside the group, ascribing to the adage that ‘familiarity breeds contempt’ and therefore they will purposely not get enmeshed in the social structure of the group (Hogg, 2001).

**Immigrant identity**

In choosing to introduce concepts of immigration theory I felt that there were some conceptual ideas embedded within the field of immigration that might assist in explaining the phenomena under study. It, therefore, became important to understand the concepts (and various theories) of assimilation, acculturation, adaption, and accommodation. The metaphor of ‘immigrant’ was employed to create a visible anchor for the concept of identity change and transitioning from one culture to another.

Early accounts of ethnic identity assumed that a person would claim the identity that was defined by birthplace, either one’s own or one’s parents. Over the years, however, it has convincingly been shown that identity, ethnic or other, is a subjective manner (Deaux, 2000). In light of this self-identification is not to be seen as biological or primordial, but rather as involving a great deal of choice (Gibson, 2001).

**Assimilation**

In immigration terms ‘assimilation’ is a politically-charged word that can be defined as the process whereby a minority group gradually adopts the
customs and attitudes of the prevailing culture. Some view assimilation as a path to success while others view it as an abandonment of ancestral culture and traditions. Despite the difference of opinions, assimilation theory does not actually predict whether one culture will overcome the other or whether the two will mix (Alba & Nee, 1997).

The concept of assimilation has its roots in historical immigration studies and has been revisited by many scholars. The linear process of assimilation is seen as one in which all immigrant groups were believed to follow the same path towards possessing economic and social characteristics like those of the mainstream culture. Variations have been developed to explain changing contexts such as a ‘segmented assimilation’ approach proposes that members of different immigrant groups may follow different paths and participate in different social arenas, while ‘spatial assimilation’ concepts are based in an immigrant enclave model, examining immigrant groups where members live in close proximity to one another (Lee, 2009). All of these theories see the social capital of the immigrant culture as a critical factor in the process of assimilation, which may apply in this study when considering the strength of links to the prior profession of the immigrant academic.

Assimilation consists of several distinct dimensions – economic, social, cultural, and political – and assimilation in one area does not lead into nor indicate assimilation in another (Skerry, 2000). A component of assimilation theory referred to, as ‘the context of reception’ is relevant to this study as it describes immigrants’ encounters upon arrival in their new environment. This context of reception is created by the new host’s policies, attitudes, beliefs, stereotypes, and prejudices, as well as the qualities of the immigrant enclaves (Lee, 2009). The ‘context of reception’ shapes how immigrants become “incorporated into the system of stratification in the host society” and determines to what segments of society they will assimilate (Zhou, 1997, p. 975). This borrowed idea may be relevant in this study when considering induction process afforded to new immigrant academics by their host institution.
**Acculturation and Adaption**

Acculturation is the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members. At the group level, it involves changes in social structures and institutions and in cultural practices. At the individual level, it involves changes in a person’s behavioural repertoire; these psychological changes come about through a long-term process. Acculturation is a process that parallels many features of the process of socialisation (and enculturation). Because acculturation takes place after an individual’s initial socialisation into his or her original culture, it may be viewed as a process of re-socialisation, or secondary socialisation (Berry, 2006).

Acculturation is defined as the process whereby the attitudes and behaviours of immigrants are modified as a result of contact with the host culture. Sociologists at the University of Chicago created the concept, with Robert Park the best known of these ‘melting pot theorists’. Park advanced a three-stage model - contact, accommodation, and assimilation. Contact, he hypothesised, had to occur first. Then, as newcomers began to interact with the dominant group, they would learn to accommodate their culture. Finally, he believed, the immigrants would fully assimilate. He saw assimilation as a linear, progressive process that was irreversible (Padilla & Perez, 2003). Since the time of linear models like Park’s there have been many variations, however a multidimensional model advocated by Sodowsky and Plake (1991) defines three dimensions of acculturation: assimilation, biculturalism (belonging to two different cultures at once), and observance of traditionality (rejecting the dominant culture in favour of the native culture), which may assist in this current study.

**Accommodation**

Initially proposed by Jean Piaget, accommodation is part of the adaptation process where immigrants react to new information and experiences by altering their existing schemas or ideas (Piaget, 1997). By ‘accommodating’ or making room in their concept of identity to learn the behaviours and skills of
the majority group, it is suggested that the immigrants may became successful (Gibson & Koyama, 2011).

Part two focussed on the various identity concepts which are specific to higher education, including organisational, professional and academic identity, as a way of distilling the broader theories and aligning them to the context of this study. Organisational identity was characterised by a relational construct defined by contrasts such as between ‘how we are’ and ‘how others see us’. However it was recognised that an individual's social identity may not only be derived from the organisation, but also from his or her work group, department, union, external industrial affiliation, guild membership, and so on, implying that organisationally situated social identity may, in fact, be comprised of more or less disparate and loosely coupled identities. It also examined concepts of immigrant identity to explore how people experience significant identity change.

A number of questions around identity were raised which contribute toward the study’s specific research questions. For the first research question, “how do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?”, and the second research question, “how do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?”, the following questions were raised:

- What is your sense of connection with your previous profession and your current profession?
- What is your understanding of titles such as Academic, Lecturer, Teacher, Tutor, Instructor?
- Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you joined the institution?

The next section of this chapter reviews literature related to the context of higher education as it relates to this study.
2.3 The context of higher education

For much of the twentieth century it remained plausible to conceive of higher education in exceptionalist terms, occupying a unique, bounded, and protected space of action in many societies and characterised by substantially self-defined and exclusive forms of knowledge and inquiry, educational ideas, and academic values. However, the contexts in which they (function) have been transformed. (Henkel, 2010, p. 29)

Organisations are defined by their paradigms; that is, the prevalent view of reality shared by its members (Schein, 2010). They are recognised as socially constructed systems (Jenkins, 2008) based on the regularised patterns of action and interaction that shape the behaviours and relationships of their members (Stets & Burke, 2014). This system in turn becomes known as organisational culture which represents a symbolic resource which is enacted by organisational members as a reality that defines what to do and what not to do (Morrill, 2008; Serpe & Stryker, 2011) and it is widely recognised that organisational culture has a significant effect on organisational performance (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Notions of the university as a protected space for unhurried scholarly contemplation with images of ivory towers where time moves at a leisurely pace have long since been rendered obsolete (Anderson, 2006). The global context of the late 1970s and 1980s saw intense downward pressure on higher education funding. New Zealand higher educational institutions (universities and polytechnics), as in other western democracies, have fared similarly (Grey & Scott, 2012). In light of the severe cutbacks in the private sector and the new global economy, expenditure and program performance in higher education has been placed under increased scrutiny by the general public to ensure more effective utilisation of available funds (Edwards, 2003). As a response to this altered economic environment and the shifts in broader political, social, and economic trends, universities and polytechnics in New
Zealand have experienced widespread, sustained, and transformative change over the last two decades (Curzon-Hobson, 2004). The changes aimed to improve efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of all parts of the public sector, including the university and polytechnic sectors.

**New Zealand Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics**

This study is located in the higher education context of the New Zealand ITP sector, where there are many discipline areas with a high proportion of faculty staff with professional backgrounds from fields other than education who have effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession in tertiary education. It is therefore relevant to present a brief overview of the New Zealand ITP sector.

Three decades of policy development and change has significantly altered the operation of the New Zealand tertiary education sector. The policy approaches of successive governments have imposed a market-led framework on tertiary education; have created a single ‘tertiary education sector’ and, have heightened the government’s ‘strategic steering’ of the sector (Strathdee, 2009). The result is that the primary focus of the tertiary education sector has moved from that of broad-based social, human, scientific, and economic progress, to the much narrower goal of economic advancement (Grey & Scott, 2012).

As in other systems around the world, New Zealand government policy and funding have also had a considerable impact of the manner in which education and training is provided. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, governments in New Zealand have taken a keen interest in the development of the education and training of the workforce. In the first half of the twentieth century demand by employers for workers with formal skills was not strong and were catered for mainly through the provision of part-time courses in technical schools and colleges. Such courses concentrated primarily on the building trades and commercial subjects, as the level of industrialisation of the New Zealand economy was relatively un-advanced
(Abbott, 2000). In the post-war period growing numbers in industrial based courses led to the establishment of the technical institutes.

Prior to 1989 the government-owned ITP’s in New Zealand were administered by the Department of Education and had little control over their own strategic management and long-term development. The Department tended to allow the polytechnics to compete directly with each other, but restricted them to providing education and training programmes for a particular centre or region of the country. ITP’s were restricted to providing certificate and diploma level programmes and universities and ITP’s were clearly demarcated – universities were academic institutions and could award degrees, while ITP’s taught vocational and trade courses (Pollock, 2012). Polytechnics and institutes of technology came from a very different history and set of traditions than universities.

The OECD (1989) ‘education at a glance’ report recorded that universities in member countries showed an: ‘increased vocationalisation’ and a tendency to assume a growing number of functions, which were originally perceived as being specific, and sometimes exclusive, to non-university programmes. This led to a certain blurring of the boundaries between the two sectors and the possibility of the polytechnics developing degree programmes in vocationally orientated subjects.

Tensions in the framework arose from the decision in 1990 to allow institutions other than universities to teach and confer degrees. Two factors combined to create a rapid rise in degree programmes at non-university institutions. The first factor was the “bums on seats” approach that dominated the 1990s tertiary education policy, and that created incentives for institutions to rapidly develop degree programmes in a variety of areas. The second factor was the exponential growth in the sophistication and complexity of knowledge required for vocational and trade areas (Donnelly, 2007). It was recognised that polytechnics were failing to attract sufficient numbers of students in the traditional trade certificate and technicians certificate courses with enrolment in these areas slumping during the 1980’s (Abbott, 2000).
Instead the polytechnics were beginning to attract increasing numbers of school leavers into fulltime courses. In response to this, in 1990 New Zealand ITP’s were made autonomous institutions, operating under their own governing councils and were allowed to offer degrees if certain standards were met.

The education reforms abolished the old Department of Education and replaced it with a Ministry whose job it was to be responsible only for overall policy. There were also a number of separate national statutory bodies such as the Trades Certification Board (for trade level qualifications) and the Authority for Advanced Vocational Awards (for technician level awards) that were important to the polytechnic sector. A national qualifications authority, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), was established to replace all other statutory bodies. From June 1990 each individual polytechnic was free to develop its own courses subject to accreditation and validation by the NZQA although the Authority also retained responsibility for prescribing some courses, which polytechnics could choose to deliver. The Ministry of Education became responsible for providing education policy advice to the government and for overseeing the implementation of approved policies and for the distribution of funds to the various educational institutions.

Since major education reform 1990 the New Zealand polytechnics have been granted a degree of institutional autonomy, which has meant that they have been able to develop their own strategic responses to changes in student demand (Abbott, 2005). Each institution was able to become autonomous and pay its own staff, own its own buildings and within the limit of its Charter and the funds available, plan its own destiny. The purpose of the changes was that it was hoped that by making them autonomous institutions and funding them according to the students they attracted, the polytechnics would become more market orientated and more responsive to the needs of students and industry. Since the early 90’s, successive Governments have honed the purpose of ITP’s to arrive at todays focus on the delivery of technical, vocational and professional education. ITP’s are also charged with promoting research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids
development. It is within this context that an ITP academic staff member must frame their understanding of academic identity.

**Academic staff in ITP’s**

Tertiary education in New Zealand encompasses all post-school learning. It includes higher education, applied and vocational training, and training in foundation skills where these have not been obtained during schooling. It includes structured learning in a range of settings, including workplaces, universities, and polytechnics (TEC, 2014). The New Zealand ITP sector focuses on the delivery of technical, vocational and professional education and is also charged with promoting research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids development. Beyond this focus, there is no specific differentiation by Government between the ITP sector and Universities. While each has its own focus, they share strategic priorities as described by the Tertiary Education Strategy, which is published by the Ministry of Education on a cyclical basis. ITP’s differ from similar sectors in other countries, such as VET sector in Australia (Harris et al., 2005) or Further Education in the UK (Avis, 1999), in that their mandated purpose is not directed to a specific audience, but rather embraces all of the possibilities on offer through tertiary education.

As a result of this, teaching staff in New Zealand ITP’s are regarded as ‘Academic Staff’ regardless of the level at which they teach. They are not regarded as ‘trainers’ and must engage in all of the activities usually attributed and expected of Academic staff in any tertiary institution, with the exception of the mandated responsibility to engage in research which is applied according to the level at which a staff member teaches. Academic staff are described in Tertiary Education Union (TEU) collective agreements as ‘persons employed in a teaching position or a non-teaching academic position’ in a tertiary teaching environment (TEU, 2015). Terms such as Tutor and Lecturer are generic terms which also refer to academic staff members. There are no distinctions drawn between those who teach vocational subjects and higher level subjects.
Organisational culture
It is widely recognised that organisational culture has a significant effect on organisational performance (Bennis, Goleman, & Biederman, 2008; Schein, 2010; Trowler, 2008) yet there is no consenus of opinion on what culture is. This is a problem that often occurs when a term is borrowed from another discipline, as ‘culture’ has been from anthropology. Some authors see culture as intangible shared meanings and basic assumptions (Schabracq, 2007). Others see it in tangible forms, and still others as a mixture of observable forms and non-observable meanings and assumptions (Schein, 2010). Studies have defined organisational culture as a world view, a frame of reference, or a set of assumptions about what sorts of things make up the world, how they act, how they hang together, and how they may be known (Argyris, 2010). The culture is a symbolic resource which is enacted by organisational members as a reality that defines what to do and what not to do (Morrill, 2008). Simsek and Louis (1994) propose that this world view is composed of three interrelated components: 1. A way of looking at the world which creates an image of the subject matter about the world’s phenomena and constructs a system of beliefs; 2. A way of doing things that provides the methods and instruments needed to apply fundamental beliefs to internal and external realities; and 3. An interaction among human agents to support both the belief system and the normative behaviour, including social networks that support the adoption and practice of a particular paradigm. (p. 673)

Schein (2010) similarly defines elements of organisational culture as being those assumptions, beliefs and values that are shared or held in common. Organisational culture can also be seen as the way that language is used, in the way that power is distributed and decisions are made, and particularly in the symbols, stories, myths, and legends that infuse specific organisations with meaning (Deal & Peterson, 2013). Schein (2010) suggests that organisational culture can be analysed at three levels: 1) visible artefacts; 2)
espoused values, rules and behavioural norms; and 3) tacit, basic underlying assumptions (p. 24). He further suggests that unless the level and interrelationships of basic assumptions are explored, it is difficult to decipher the artefacts, values and norms.

Higher education cultures have been characterised in terms of both faculty professional values (collegium) and administrative values (bureaucratic); a clashing of different value sets (political); and ambiguity and unclear structures (anarchical) existing (Trowler, 2008). This organisational identity dictates that members interact as equals, with a minimum of status difference, thereby allowing for a greater collective voice and involvement (Hellawell & Hancock, 2003). However, higher education organisations have also been noted for the complex and contrasting beliefs system that guide and shape their culture and structures (Meyer, 2007). Some values and beliefs tend to be shared across institutions, such as the importance of research, integrity in research, freedom to teach what is considered appropriate, the significance of shared governance and academic freedom, the belief in access to higher education, the value in specialisation, and undoubtedly many more distinctive values that are unique to each specific organisational identity (Toma, Dubrow, & Hartley, 2005a). Contemporary views of the higher education community describe it less as a collective and more as a ‘mosaic’ or ‘kaleidoscope’ of staff (Chao & Moon, 2005; Whitchurch, 2008). The culture and organisation of this community has been described in terms of “the ‘tribal’ nature of academic disciplines and specialism’s and the relationship between academic cultures and forms of knowledge” (Archer, 2008a, p. 265).

One unique characteristic of higher educational organisations is that the two main employment groups tend to have differing values systems (Whitchurch, 2009a). Administrative power is based on hierarchy and values bureaucratic norms and structure, power and influence, rationality, and control and coordination of activities (Curren, 2008). In contrast, professional authority is based on knowledge and the values system emphasises collegiality, dialogue, shared power, autonomy, and peer review (Quigley, 2011). Faculty can also have divided loyalty between disciplinary societies, professional fields, and
other external groups in which they participate (Toma et al., 2005a). An obvious, but often overlooked, feature is that employee turnover is minimal, as faculty tend to stay in their job for their entire careers because of the tenure system. There are few other organisations with this type of employee stability. In addition, even part-time faculty and contract faculty, noted as a rising percentage in some institutional structures, also tend to stay at institutions for a long period of time (Allen, 2011).

**Power and authority**

Higher education organisations rely on referent and expert power rather than coercive, reward, or legitimate power. Referent power results from the willingness to be influenced by another because of one’s identification with them, while expert power is reflected when one allows oneself to be influenced because the other person apparently has some special knowledge (Bennett, 2003). Faculty are more likely to be influenced by members of their community whom they trust, or colleagues who share values with them, rather than salary increases or administrative sanctions (Harvey et al., 2007). Likewise, autonomous faculty are unlikely to be influenced by other means of administrative influence and power, such as control or strategy where power is partially masked or secret, because, in a collegial setting, it is socially unacceptable to exert power (Sinclair, 2007). This is a unique organisational condition which sets the organisational culture of educational institutions apart (Owens, 2004) and is linked to the notion of professionalism.

**Professionalism**

The small body of literature on the management of higher education was dominated in the late 1990s by a debate over the concepts of managerialism and professionalism (Briggs, 2004). Professionalism can be defined as the espousal of a set of values or codes, which are consciously ‘professed’ and are monitored through individual reflection and/or through organisational systems (Toma et al., 2005b). In simple terms, the individual must be able to relate their role to certain commonly-held purposes and value-systems, to engage with those purposes and values, and be able to gauge whether they
are acting professionally or not (Whitchurch, 2008). Morgan and Ogbonna (2008) identify the dominant theme in the literature on professionalism as being the inevitable conflict between the communal or collegial and the rational or administrative forms of work organisations. Raelin (1985), notes that “there is perhaps no greater source of strain between managers and professionals than over the conflict between bureaucratic and professional standards” (p. 163).

Professionals may be seen as communities of people within organisations who create and sustain relatively independent and unique work cultures consisting of task rituals, standards for proper behaviour and work codes (Briggs, 2007). Professionalism can therefore embody espoused values or codes, which are consciously ‘professed’ and are monitored through individual reflection and/or through organisational systems (Toma et al., 2005b). In higher education, there is evidence that the impact of managerialism has effected the autonomy of professional employees via the employment of strategies such as converting professionals into managers, thereby placing the responsibility for management tasks firmly in their domain (Briggs, 2004). In turn, middle and senior professionals are now expected to use their professional status to ensure that junior professionals embrace organisational changes (Meyer, 2002). To counter this, Raelin (1985) argues that professionals must be “allowed to experience the purity of professional knowledge, without the contamination of bureaucratic conditions . . . and their objective is to meet and even eventually raise the standards of excellence in their discipline” (p. 163).

Staff in higher educational organisations have traditionally been given considerable autonomy as they have been viewed as professionals who can be relied on to deliver the performance needed because of their personal interest in and commitment to their subject and are recognised as being different from other employees in that they have their own form of authority, culture and ethical codes (McInnis, 2010). Brunetto and Farr-Wharton (2004) refer to the Anglo-American model when describing professionals as those
who are eligible to belong to professional associations that “work with higher educational institutions and the government to control the number of employees gaining the skills and accreditation into the profession” (p. 586). McKenna and Maister (2002) suggest that as a result of this, professional employees place more importance on their professional authority than formal hierarchical authority, hence, professional employees may be able to reject/ignore new policies (perhaps relating to the implementation of managerialism) supported by hierarchical authority when the policies challenge traditional long-held professional values, beliefs and practices.

Organisational (sub)cultures and silos
It has been argued that professionalism, like culture, is a social construct where each definition is grounded in its own set of discourses. Characteristics such as autonomy and protection of independence form part of the ideology of professionalism. This autonomy means that professional groups will tend to embody different values, attitudes and orientations. This inevitably leads to the creation of different sub-cultural behavioural patterns that are often at variance with an organisations homogenous cultural goals (Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008).

Schein (2010) contends that most mature organisations encompass one or more subcultures that have developed their own guiding assumptions and beliefs based on what they have learned through shared past experiences. Staff who come from different ethnic or occupational cultures and who strongly identify themselves as a distinct group within an organisation will often form organisational subcultures (Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008). For staff in higher education, subculture groups may be based around subject knowledge, professional backgrounds, disciplinary societies, and other external groups in which they participate (Raid, 2007). It is commonly observed that academic faculty are divided in their loyalties between their disciplines and their institutions, with the latter generally taking second place (McInnis, 2010; Viskovic & Robson, 2001). Many researchers agree that institutional affiliation can only develop after the right kind of socialisation
Schein (2010) also suggests that subculture groups develop shared assumptions or identity traits which are determined by “the relative amount of interaction and the intensity of the shared experience that the members of that level have with each other as contrasted with members of other levels” (p. 270). For example, according to Schein's (2010) model, a group of staff in a small discipline-specific department will interact primarily with each other and therefore eventually form a subculture.

Morgan & Ogbonna’s (2008) recent study into subcultures of professional clinicians and nurses in a public healthcare setting emphasised that “professional loyalties of respective subcultures may be stronger than loyalty to the organisation” (p. 43). In their study, this loyalty factor (which may be described as a component of the clinicians’ and nurses’ professional identity) directly impeded the authority of ‘lay’ managers (those seen as ‘not’ sharing the same professional identity as the group because of their ‘lay’ status) to influence working practices within the organisation. Examples such as this, demonstrate that strong subcultures have the potential, and often the capability, to generate resistance that could derail a change initiative (Owens, 2004). However it must be noted that not all subcultures can be viewed from this negative perspective, and that many positive examples exist, such as Locke and Guglielmino’s (2006) study into the effect of subcultures on planned change in a community college which points to the ability of subcultures to “facilitate change by injecting diverse perspectives and innovative ideas into the organisation” (p. 109).

**Gatekeeping**

Gatekeeping involves monitoring boundaries (Holmes, 2007), and the term ‘gatekeeper’ has come to refer to an individual who acts as a filter and is part of the bureaucratic structure, often protecting a sector of organizational players (staff, leaders, colleagues) from unsought external influence. Around
every organisation is a boundary separating an environment of relative order and control from the chaos of the world outside (Macdonald & Williams, 1993). Within its boundaries, the organisation has deliberately created conditions conducive to the conduct of its business, conditions which are not to be found in the world at large. In a positive sense gatekeepers may be seen as individuals who maintain consistent, on-going contact within their organisations, who understand the way in which outsiders differ in their perspective from their own colleagues, and who are able to translate between the two systems. In a negative sense, it is a short step to perceiving the gatekeeper as someone who withholds information and who can legitimately grant or withhold permission for access (Crombez, Groseclose, & Krehbiel, 2005). This position has also been criticised by some as adopting a ‘near-sighted supply side’ outlook, where the gatekeepers may be seen as taking the easy route and failing to consider alternative ways of utilising their resources (McEvoy & Richards, 2007; Zohar & Luria, 2010).

**Leadership in higher education**

From a post-modern perspective, leadership in higher education is a collective activity among organisational members, a social relationship that focuses on good leading (Rost & Barker, 2000). New conceptions of educational leadership look at leadership as a process in which leaders are not seen as individuals in charge of followers, but more as members of a community of practice (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). In this context, leadership can be conceptualised as a web in which there is structure and an ever-evolving shape. The leader at the centre of the web works on building consensus and valuing the parts of the web building on relationships (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006). Leadership in higher education is shaped by wide ranging structural and cultural factors (Bennett, 2003), and it is these multidimensional and multilayered dimensions which set educational leadership apart as a unique form of organisational leadership, which is not found in commercial organisations (Caldwell, 2006; Dimmock & Walker, 2005; Fullan, 2000).
Ogawa and Scribner (2002) link the conceptualisation of leadership to the conceptualisation of organisation by suggesting that a key element of organisations is social structure which manifests itself as the regularised patterns of action and interaction that shape the behaviours and relationships of organisational participants. Structure and leadership are related in three ways, the first being that structure can inhibit and even replace leadership because the organisations’ members grow committed to existing patterns of action and interaction, which can have the effect of blunting efforts to change arrangements with which they have grown comfortable (Argyris, 2010). Second, that organisational structures can effect leadership by determining the access to resources that leaders can ply to exert influence over others (Hodge & Gempesaw, 2015). Third, that leadership is a form of social influence (Schein, 2010) that effects an organisation’s structure and therefore constructs, changes, interpolates and uses structure, including formal (bureaucratic) elements and informal (cultural) elements (Owens, 2004). Organisations are therefore recognised as socially created systems that rely on interactions and communications that occur in response to peoples’ individual and shared expectations (Gunter & Ribbins, 2002). In addition to the roles of leaders, the roles of followers are also highlighted as essential to organisational success with learning organisation tenets suggesting that involvement of, and feedback from, followers within the organisation are critical for organisational success (DeRue & Ashford, 2010).

Researchers in educational management and leadership have borrowed liberally from scholars who became identified with theories of scientific management, human relations, transformational leadership, and organisational learning during the 20th century (Heck & Hallinger, 2005) and the educational management literature may be considered to be a rather specialised subset of the ‘mainline’ management literature that contains the bulk of new leadership studies (Halpern, 2015).

According to Ogawa and Bossert (1995), educational leadership has been recognised as an activity that can ‘bubble up’ in various places within institutions and no longer is only focused on formal leadership roles.
Discussions of leadership throughout the organisation including team leadership (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007), servant leadership (Joseph & Winston, 2005), dispersed leadership (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003), and the role of cultural and moral leadership (Greenfield, 2004), have replaced the traditional discussions of the ‘great man’ or ‘hero’ leader. In addition to these traits a subset of ‘behavioural principles’ have been described as being influential in the development of education leadership theory which include – Traditional/autocratic; Behavioural/transactional; Contingency/situational; Instruction leadership/communities of leaders/constructivist leading (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). These principles represent a progression of thinking about leadership for education, from its roots in non-educational settings to those from which it has derived its theories – sociology and psychology as well as business and industry (Bush, 2008). Also borrowing from general leadership theory, a range of attributes or ‘dimensions’ have been developed for educational leaders which are based around function/structure, political/role, human/the individual, and culture (Spendlove, 2007). Cheng (2002) adds educational as a further dimension stating that:

Educational leadership provides direction and expert advice on developments of learning, teaching and curriculum, emphasises relevance to education in management, diagnoses educational problems and encourages professional development and teaching improvement. (p. 56)

This idea is supported by Webers’ (1987) description of educational leaders as professionals who use both research and practical innovations, whilst co-operating with other professionals – teachers and staff – to further student learning. It is this relationship between education leadership and teaching and learning that forms a unique framework in which leadership must function for education (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). In addition to being diligent and mindful sense-makers, academic leaders must also be persistent in the development of adaptive confidence in themselves and other members of the professional learning community: and ever moving individual efficacy towards collective
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efficacy (Walker, 2006). Henkel (2010) proposes that most academic leaders, particularly in more traditional universities, do not identify themselves as managers and that some academic leaders experienced tensions around acquiring their new identity as a manager and being perceived as different by their fellow academics. Fullen (2007) looks to the future and contends that educational leaders will have to become agents of cultural change, persons attuned to the big picture, and sophisticated conceptual thinkers. For him there are five essential components that characterise leaders in a knowledge society: moral purpose; an understanding of the change process; the ability to improve relationships; knowledge creation and sharing; and coherence making.

Cultural leadership
Cultural leadership has been variously defined as being a culturally dependant variable that frames the leader’s role in the culture in which the leader and the organisation exists (Barth, 2013a). Sergiovanni (2001) describes the organisational culture context of educational organisations as “loosely connected, messy, and generally non-linear” and as “organised anarchies” (p. 40). Dimmock and Walker (2002) point to the importance of the ‘constructed reality’ of the culture of an educational setting as being the ‘meaning’ behind the organisation. This therefore should become a primary consideration for educational leaders to identify, build and maintain as an organisational constructed reality from which they can create meaning for their leadership and therefore contribute to the enhancement of the organisation (McRoy & Gibbs, 2009). Educational leaders need to know ‘how’ and understand ‘what’ the organisational culture is and use their ability to modify that culture to meet the needs of the organisation as it progresses (Barth, 2013a).

A further development of cultural leadership is the concept of it being a form of moral leadership (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Sergiovanni (2013) takes a cultural ‘stewardship’ approach when suggesting a replacement of the traditional hierarchical structure, which entails removing
leaders and followers to a place of equal status away from the apex and
reserving that place for ideas, values, and commitments. Educational
leadership is described by its nature and focus, as a moral activity as it is the
relationships among people that are at the very centre of the work for
administrators, teachers and students alike (Gmelch & Buller, 2015).
Greenfield (2004) describes the attributes of moral leadership as “critical,
transformative, visionary, educative, empowering, liberating, personally
ethical, organisationally ethical, and responsible” (p. 180).

Trust Leadership
In organisations with a high level of trust, participants are more comfortable
and are able to invest their energies in contributing to organisational goals
rather than self-protection (Tschannen-Moran, 2013). Trust leadership is
aligned with forms of servant leadership in that it encourages collaboration
and trust, and the ethical use of power and empowerment (Russell, 2001).
Trust leadership can also be seen as a form of cultural and moral leadership
(Joseph & Winston, 2005). A process of building a trust culture within which
leader and follower can amicably relate in accomplishing mutually valued
goals using agreed upon processes (Tschannen-Moran, 2013). On the other
hand, distrust can impair organisational effectiveness and is likely to have a
deleterious effect on communication (Gronn, 2011). When interacting with a
distrusted person, especially a person who holds more power within an
organisational hierarchy, an employee may feel compelled to be evasive or to
distort attitudes or information in order to protect his or her interests (van den
Akker, Heres, Lasthuizen, & Six, 2009).

Leadership (and management) in the middle
During feudalism, middle managers were the king’s comptrollers (appointed to
examine and verify accounts) and protectors (Lapp & Carr, 2006). In terms of
class structure, they fell into the workspace between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have
nots’ but to survive, ultimately their loyalties needed to be with the ‘haves’ and
at the expense of the ‘have nots’ (Kanter, 1979). The traditional view of the
middle management job as simply listening to, understanding and interpreting
the strategic plans of senior management and then seeing that these plans are communicated to, and implemented by, the rank and file, is becoming obsolescent if not obsolete (Hancock & Hellawell, 2003). For Carr and Hancock (Carr & Hancock, 2006), today’s middle management resonates with Aristotle’s notion of the ‘intermediaries’ between ‘contraries’ of master and slave, “the more one desires to be master, the more one desires not to be slave” (attributed to Aristotle, circa 344-322).

The main concerns of the middle manager are frequently the management of the tension between long-term and short-term organisational purposes, the linking of dispersed knowledge and best practices across the organisation, and the development of individuals in embedding the processes of change and renewal into the organisation (Kanter, 2008). Middle managers need to be, synchronistically, masters and slaves and serve both the tops and bottoms (Russell, 2001) while enacting the complex roles of ‘living’ as a subordinate, an equal and as a superior (Huy, 2001) and having the ability to shift quickly and frequently from one to another. King, Fowler, and Zeithaml (2001) describe this as the middle manager acting as the “synapses within a firm’s brain” (p. 95) where the middle manager works with senior management to create a sense of shared organisational identity by fostering the linkages that are required for intensive knowledge transfer (Lok & Crawford, 1999).

The academic as educational middle leader may be seen as analogous to the concept of the master craftsman (Jaeger & Pekruhl, 1998). They operate, in environments in which teamwork is valued, as ‘motivator, moderator, or coach’ (Clegg & McAuley, 2005). There has been widespread growth throughout higher education of an academic middle management cadre, and a morphing of what were administrators, techno-structure experts and professionals into managers (Jaeger & Pekruhl, 1998). This approach to the assimilation of expertise and management capability can be a powerful approach to management in professional organisations, although the capability often seems to occur through personal predisposition rather than through processes of management development (Williams & Williams, 2014). Professional and managerial work, while having certain common elements, do
call for different sets of skills which forces one to question to what extent are the managers within the new managerial regimes prepared for their roles of managers? (Ellis, 2004). Within education the development of the self-managing educational institution has led managers to rush to training courses on strategic and human resource management in order to ensure survival in the new educational marketplace. The business culture has come to education with a vengeance and entrepreneurial processes are being promoted as the solution to managing open-ended change (Gunter, 1995).

Educational middle leaders see themselves as representing core academic values rather than representing core organisational values (French, 2001). They see themselves as being at the forefront of change in key areas such as teaching and learning and in the advancement of core pedagogical and academic, as well as organisational goals (Gunter, 1995). Maintaining this identity enables organisational change to take place in a less confrontational and abstracted manner through the middle leaders deep understandings of the networks within the professional organisation, through the requirement on the role to act as colleague during times of trouble and as people who are seen to learn with their colleagues in times of change (Huy, 2001). In this way the educational middle leader can be seen as representing forms of collegiality rather than those of managerialist control (Wallace, 2003).

Underpinning this discourse is the middle leaders concern with the management of the tension between long-term and short-term organisational purposes, the linking of dispersed knowledge and best practices across the organisation, as well as the development of individuals in embedding processes of change and renewal into the organisation (Clegg & McAuley, 2005). To deal with this situation the middle leader must be good at creating feasible alternative options, and good at helping people reason through the options, gently bringing to their attention considerations they may not have taken into account (McKenna & Maister, 2002). Educational middle leaders should therefore be regarded as a strategic assets through recognition of their link with organisational core capability and competitive advantage (Hodge & Gempesaw, 2015) as well as their crucial role in developing and maintaining
the firm’s core competencies (Gmelch & Buller, 2015). Sayles (1993) explains this in terms of managerial intervention often being needed where “middle leaders become the players who must ‘massage’ the parts and continuously ‘rejiggle’ and reconfigure the interfaces to resolve the contradictions and inconsistencies that exist in a large system” (p. 9). In his opinion without their initiatives the real work of the organisation will never be performed effectively.

Walker (2006) suggests that educational leaders need to be constantly and coherently thinking about the future, the ends, the greater good, the best interests, and larger purposes of each activity taking place in the learning community. This can be achieved by educational organisations creating rather than simply responding to the environment. Therefore what they offer to current and potential customers must not be about meeting customer needs but about shaping them (Fullan, 2007). According to Gunter (1995), educational leaders must be interventionist within the environment by seeing how small changes can have a considerable impact over time as “creative strategies emerge from instability in a seemingly unintended, uncoordinated manner” (p. 15).

However as educational organisations adapt management systems from collegial leadership to more management-like steering structures, middle leaders have been required to handle both external and internal changes in their organisation’s work processes, financial systems, networking, management and leadership, and complex goal structures (Bogotch, 2015). Therefore they must be able to handle issues of strategy, development, culture and personnel within a structural framework defined by top management and constrained by organisational change (Hancock & Hellawell, 2003) and often without all of the facts from above. French (2001) indicates that the notion of ‘negative capability’ may provide guidance here as it encompasses the capacity to live with and to tolerate ambiguity and paradox – to remain content with half knowledge. He suggests that a leader needs to find how to engage in a non-defensive way with change, resisting the impulse merely to react to the pressures inherent in risk-taking, while embracing “the capacity to integrate emotional and mental states rather than dissociating
oneself from aspects of emotional experience or attempting to cut oneself off from such experience altogether” (p. 482).

The educational middle leader possession of a stock of knowledge of a substantive area of expertise or knowledge can be a powerful approach to change management in professional organisations (Clegg & McAuley, 2005). Because they are in the middle of it all, they have a unique up, sideways and down perspective of the needs and process of successful organisational change (Fullan, 2007). Therefore, given these factors and the requirement on the role to act as colleague during times of trouble and as people who are seen to learn with their colleagues in times of change (Huy, 2001), there is general agreement that educational middle leaders may enable change to take place in a less confrontational and abstracted manner (Grint, 2003; Halpern, 2015; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011).

*Positional relationships*

Work-based relationships are seen as the stable ways in which specific people relate to each other, as determined both by history and the development of culturally determined scenarios, within an organisational setting (Diamond, 2008). Each member knows, more or less, what the other party expects them to do and attend to, as well as what each may expect from the other. As such, these relationships are important in bringing repetitiveness and stability into the work environment (Schabracq, 2007). However, this emphasis on defined hierarchy and structure can result in sharply defined boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Katzenbach & Khan, 2010).

Positional perceptions are often based on the way that staff identify the leader in relation to their own shared organisational identity and values (Rodgers, 2007). Insiders are seen as trustworthy and share identity and values with staff within familiar situations (Kahan, 2010), whereas outsiders can generate suspicion and mistrust and are seen to have little value-based connection (Schabracq, 2007). Outsiders are perceived as being disconnected and more aligned with organisational imperatives than with staff cultures. Effective
leadership may therefore rely on the choices that leaders make to adopt and apply certain shared values (Sergiovanni, 2013) and the way that they engage with staff. One approach is through the employment of contingency models of leadership that champion the view that “leadership style must consider the values of the group first, and then craft the leadership style around those values to develop synergy between the leader and the followers” (Kerfoot, 2009, p. 45). This is further elaborated by Haslam, Reicher, and Platow (2011) as:

Any individual group member will be seen to be more representative of a group (and hence more influential within it) to the extent that, in any given context, his or her characteristics are seen to embody both (1) what “we” have in common and (2) what makes “us” different from “them.” (p. 108)

Schabracq (2007) suggests that when “changing attitudes and assumptions are at stake, there are two basic ways of perceiving, namely looking from the inside and looking from the outside” (p. 65), and it is important to make a distinction between the two. He describes looking from the inside as looking at what is happening from the perspective of familiar situations inside the organisation. These could be defined as the everyday reality of shared attitudes and assumptions among members of the organisation (Klein, 2004). In contrast, Schabracq’s (2007) description of looking from the outside being “observing from a point of view that can see the greater picture in which the event in question is only part of another whole” (p. 65), implies a way of perceiving which may be necessary for leaders to overcome an impasse and to question existing assumptions and attitudes (Katzenbach & Khan, 2010). It is acknowledged that leaders who are guiding change need to use both ways of perceiving and they must be able to alternate at will and quickly between perceiving from either the inside or the outside (Kahan, 2010). An obvious risk here for the change leader is losing oneself in one of the two and neglecting the other.


Resistance

The mainstream literature which focuses on changing attitudes and beliefs within organisations, and specifically where it deals with the ‘professional’ in contexts of change, focuses on the individual as ‘victim’, as obstructive or as trying to accommodate or reconcile tensions between the requirements of the changing context and the tenets of his or her professional ‘ideology’ (Hothe & Pollard, 2007). Resistance to changing contexts is typically regarded in the management science and organisational behaviour literature as an obstacle or barrier, and is commonly regarded merely as behaviour not in line with the changing needs of the organisation and the work of the leader who is charged with achieving the change (Kee & Newcomer, 2008; Kotter, 2007). There are, however, often legitimate reasons for resistance to change and the capability of organisations to achieve change is, to a large degree, determined by the attitude of the people to respond to and adapt to it (Barth, 2013b). People can be either the major obstacle to change or the major success factor. Some leaders try to overcome this by the simple exercise of power and control, but resistance often increases when people feel change is being imposed arbitrarily (Saksvik & Hetland, 2009).

Effective management of resistance requires a clear understanding of the nature of and reasons for resistance (Knowles & Linn, 2004). Anxieties and reservations about change may be relieved and support for change strengthened by seriously listening to and taking account of feedback from those people impacted by change (Saunders, 2005). With this approach, resistance and opposition may be potentially turned into support for change (Kaplan & Norton, 2005). Smith (2005) suggests that “moral and organisational authority gained by engaging with and responding to expressed resistance – as opposed to simply attempting to overcome it – can also be of significant value to change leaders when they are faced with the task of dealing with residual, truly negative and intractable change resistance” (p. 521).
Part three addressed the context of higher education, in which the relationships between leaders and staff in higher educational organisational settings takes place. Organisational cultures and subcultures of higher education were discussed to frame the general understanding across the literature and a brief overview of leadership in the context of higher education was presented as a starting point for further commentary. It presented the organisational constructs and academic cultures associated with ITP’s as a way of framing how these influence peoples’ experiences of working in such structures. It also examined academic leadership and the various issues that influence leadership including the relationships that develop between leaders and staff.

A number of questions around the context of higher education and its effect on identity were raised which contribute toward the study’s specific research questions. For the second research question, “How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?” the following questions were raised:

- What has been your personal journey towards academic leadership?
- What is your understanding of titles such as Headship, Manager, Leader?
- Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you became an academic leader?

For the third research question, “What influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?” the following questions were raised:

- Do you, or any of your staff, consider yourself to be part of the same institutional ‘community’ (‘other than having the same employer’), or do you have more of an affinity with others in a distinct group?
• What specific factors associated with sharing a professional identity and background with your staff contribute to, or impede, your leadership?
• Do your staff regard you as an insider or an outsider?
• What attributes, if any, from your previous profession do you call upon to assist in your academic leadership?
• How do you bridge any perceived divide between an organisation's imperatives and those of your staff?

**Summary**

This chapter overviewed the literature that is pertinent to this study and was divided into three parts. Part one discussed the theoretical underpinnings of various theories of identity as a way of contributing to our understanding of the organisational players under discussion. The discussion of the various theories linked self-attitudes, or identities, to the role relationships and role-related behaviour of individuals. The theories help to explain the specific meanings that individuals have for the multiple identities they claim; how these identities relate to one another for any one person; how their identities influence their behaviour, thoughts, and feelings or emotions; and how their identities tie them in to society at large.

Part two focussed on the various identity concepts which are specific to higher education, including organisational, professional and academic identity, as a way of distilling the broader theories and aligning them to the context of this study. Organisational identity was characterised by a relational construct defined by contrasts such as between ‘how we are’ and ‘how others see us’. However it was recognised that an individual's social identity may not only be derived from the organisation, but also from his or her work group, department, union, external industrial affiliation, guild membership, and so on, implying that organisationally situated social identity may, in fact, be comprised of more or less disparate and loosely coupled identities.
Part three addressed the context of higher education, in which the relationships between leaders and staff in higher educational organisational settings takes place. Organisational cultures and subcultures of higher education were discussed to frame the general understanding across the literature and a brief overview of leadership in the context of higher education was presented as a starting point for further commentary.

This literature review has identified a range of questions that contributed to the construction of the three key research questions that are central to this study and that were employed in the participant interviews. These are mapped out in table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1   Linking literature review to research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of review</th>
<th>Questions raised by review</th>
<th>Research Questions for study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Theorising Identity | - What has been your personal journey towards a career in higher education?  
- How do you, and your staff, demonstrate a sense of belonging to both your ‘old’ and your ‘new’ profession?  
- Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you joined the institution?  
- To what extent do you experience multiple contexts of identity? ie: both professional and academic | 1: How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?                                                                                         |
| 2.2 Identity Constructs | - What is your sense of connection with your previous profession and your current profession?  
- What is your understanding of titles such as Academic, Lecturer, Teacher, Tutor, Instructor?  
- Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you joined the institution?  
|                                                                                                                                           | 1: How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?  
2: How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?                                        |
2.3 The Context of Higher Education

- What has been your personal journey towards academic leadership?
- What is your understanding of titles such as Headship, Manager, Leader?
- Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you became an academic leader?
- Do you, or any of your staff, consider yourself to be part of the same institutional ‘community’ (‘other than having the same employer’), or do you have more of an affinity with others in a distinct group?
- What specific factors associated with sharing a professional identity and background with your staff contribute to, or impede, your leadership?
- Do your staff regard you as an insider or an outsider?
- What attributes, if any, from your previous profession do you call upon to assist in your academic leadership?
- How do you bridge any perceived divide between an organisation’s imperatives and those of your staff?

2: How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?

3: What influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?

The next chapter describes the methodology adopted in collecting empirical data for the study through which the issues raised in this chapter, in relation to academic immigrant identity, might be further explored.
Chapter 3  Approach and method

All research is grounded, implicitly or explicitly, in philosophy; an ontological and epistemological position is assumed within any selection of data gathering and analysis methods. To be able to comment with any confidence on the outcomes of a study, it is necessary to demonstrate congruence between the study’s ontology, epistemology, methodology and method. (Viney & Nagy, 2012, p. 54)

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and understand the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand Polytechnic sector. The study also examined and interpreted the nature and significance of the relationship between these academic immigrant leaders, their staff with whom they share professional backgrounds and identity, and the institutions in which they are now employed. I believed that a better understanding of this phenomenon might provide insights and understandings into the phenomenon that will enable readers to transfer the findings to their own contexts or environments. In seeking to understand this phenomenon, the study addressed a main research question:

What is the nature of academic immigrant identity, and what is the significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders, their academic immigrant colleagues who share a professional identity and background?

In order to address this main research question the following specific research questions were posed:

Question 1: How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?
Question 2: How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?

Question 3: What influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?

To address the deficit of research and paucity of available literature that examines the identities of academic immigrant staff, a qualitative, interpretive study was undertaken. Qualitative research is inherently explanatory, and is used by researchers to probe a topic when the variables and theory base are unknown (Cresswell, 2013). Morse (1991) suggests a useful measurement that may be applied to determine when a qualitative approach is particularly appropriate:

(a) the concept is 'immature' due to a conspicuous lack of theory and previous research;
(b) a notion that the available theory may be inaccurate, inappropriate, incorrect, or biased;
(c) a need exists to explore and describe the phenomena and to develop theory; or
(d) the nature of the phenomenon may not be suited to quantitative measures. (p. 120)

Applying Morse’s (1991) measurements to the phenomena of industry professionals who become academics, suggests that all of the stated conditions have been met for this study. The first and second are met as there is a lack of empirical study or theoretical construction around this concept, which leads to the need for exploration as determined by the third condition. The fourth condition is also met when considered alongside Yin’s (2011) description of the constraints of other methodologies:

• the inability to establish the necessary research conditions (as in an experiment);
• the unavailability of sufficient data series or lack of coverage of sufficient variables (as in an economic study);
• the difficulty in drawing an adequate sample of respondents and obtaining a sufficiently high response rate (as in a survey); or
• other limitations such as being devoted to studying the past but not ongoing events (as in a history). (p. 6)

This chapter describes the research methodology employed for this study and includes discussion around the following:

3.1 Research approach
3.2 Research design
3.3 Analysis and synthesis of data
3.4 Ethical considerations

The chapter culminates with a brief summary.

3.1 Research approach

Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 24)

Qualitative research approaches ensure that flexibility will be maintained and that experiences that are not shared by all participants will be taken into account. By its very nature qualitative research is a time intensive process which can become very messy and convoluted (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2013). However, the time taken to collect and analyse data qualitatively is necessary if the finer details and unique features of events such as the relationships that develop over time between academic leaders and their staff groups, are to be investigated and understood (Yin, 2011).
Methodological positioning

For this research project I adopted an interpretive lens within a constructivist paradigm to examine the personal experiences of sixteen academic leaders who identified as academic immigrants. Constructivist epistemology embraces flexibility and maintains a heightened sense of how information could be hypothesised by the researcher and the participant as well as the subjective nature of individual realities as the investigation proceeded. The interpretive lens further blurs the distinction between researcher and researched by placing more emphasis on the interpretations of the informant (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011).

Working within a qualitative, broadly interpretivist theoretical perspective, this study is located in a constructivist paradigm where the ontology is driven by the investigation of local and specific constructed realities, none of which are more or less true than others. In this way I am recognising that identity is a socially and symbolically constructed notion intended to lend meaning to experience. This approach understands meaningful reality as something that can be constructed rather than discovered (Quigley, 2011). As Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba (2011) describe it:

A goodly portion of social phenomena consists of the meaning-making activities of groups and individuals around those phenomena. The meaning-making activities themselves are of central interest to social constructionists and constructivists simply because it is the meaning-making, sense-making, attributional activities that shape action (or inaction). (p. 183)

Supported by relativist ontology, this constructivist approach recognises that while participants may share similar experiences or common characteristics of a phenomenon, individual realities are contextually specific (Lincoln & Guba, 2013), thereby suggesting that no two experiences are exactly alike. Instead, concentrating on local understanding through exploring alternative forms of representation can more accurately illuminate and describe questions that we strive to understand (Cooper & White, 2012).
To assist in framing the use of an interpretive framework, it was useful to confirm the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions linked to this paradigm and relate these to the research aim and research questions of this study. Guba and Lincoln (1994) have clearly identified these and I have presented them and mapped them to the aim and research questions in table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1  Paradigm justification  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructionism/Interpretivism</th>
<th>Links to research aims and questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>The study investigates the academic identity of individuals and their relationship with their colleagues and the institutions in which they are employed by interpreting the subjective experiences of the research participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativist - Realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature, and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions.</td>
<td>The specific research questions are all based around perceived (subjective) experiences of the participants and can only be answered by constant interaction between the researcher and the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>The research presented here is <em>hermeneutical</em> (deriving from the mythological Hermes, the messenger in his role as interpreter of messages) in that I was seeking to find meaning in the respondents’ narratives of academic immigrant identity and their relationships with their staff, and <em>dialectical</em> (made popular by Plato to establish the truth of the matter guided by reasoned arguments) since respondents’ constructions of these phenomena were “elicited and refined only through interaction between and among investigator and respondent” (Guba &amp; Lincoln, 1994, p. 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional and subjectivist. The investigator and the object of investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermeneutical and dialectical. The variable and personal (intramental) nature of social constructions suggests that individual constructions can be elicited and refined only through interaction between and among investigator and respondents. These varying constructions are interpreted using conventional hermeneutical techniques, and are compared and contrasted through a dialectical interchange. The final aim is to distil a consensus construction that is more informed and sophisticated than any of the predecessor constructions (including, of course, the etic construction of the investigator).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schwandt (1998) argues that truth according to the constructivist “is the result of perspective” and that “we invent concepts, models, and schemes to make sense of experience in the light of new experience” (p. 236). From a constructivist orientation, explicit exploration of professional perspectives could play an important role for the organisation members as, according to
Kelly’s (1963) experience corollary, “a person’s construction system varies as he [sic] successively construes the replications of events” (p. 50). Robinson and Aronica (2009) similarly suggest that no one sees the world directly, rather it is perceived through frameworks of ideas and beliefs (constructs), which act as filters on what is seen and how it is seen. The term construct is particularly effective, because it reflects the concept’s dual role. On the one hand, a person’s constructs represent the view that a person has constructed about the world as they experienced it. On the other hand, a person’s constructs indicate how they are likely to construe the world as they continue to experience it (Smith & Boyd, 2012). A person’s construct system is their history and their predisposition to perceive (Stewart, 2010).

Construct approaches are epistemologically and ontologically consistent with qualitative research methods that focus on the interpretation of meanings (Hardison & Neimeyer, 2012). Meanings cannot be disconnected from their context, and must be understood in terms of both the similarities and the differences between people (Viney & Nagy, 2012). A constructivist approach recognises that each individual account of the phenomena, once endowed with meaning and context, will become meaningful and predictable, and will allow intelligent choices about its use(s) to be explored by a wider audience (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). With this in mind I selected a qualitative research approach to ensure that flexibility was maintained and that experiences that were not shared by all participants were taken into account.

The information gathered here about the phenomena following this constructivist paradigm was an individual perspective which is grounded in practice (Lincoln et al., 2011). Both the flexibility of this approach and the emphasis on the individual experience enables the reader to interpret the similarities and differences of the personal experiences as they add to a collective understanding of the phenomena in the defined context. To assist in the development of an integrated theory of the phenomenon within its specific context, I have employed an approach that is recognised as an inductive qualitative research method (Birks & Mills, 2011), which has allowed theoretical concepts to emerge from the data that was initially collected in the
field (Zhou & Shalley, 2008). In this regard, any generated theory has actually been ‘grounded’ in the data (Johnson, McGowan, & Turner, 2010) and therefore the reality of the participants’ practice.

3.2 Research design

Within the framework of a qualitative methodology, with a focus on interpretation and co-construction of meaning in real-life situations, the study was most suited for a narrative approach of interview, data collection and analysis techniques (Birks & Mills, 2011). Elliot (2006) describes a narrative approach as a way to “organise a sequence of events into a whole so that the significance of each event can be understood through its relation to that whole” (p. 3). In this way narrative approaches may convey the meaning of events by shifting the emphasis away from the process of conducting the research to the interpretations of the participants who provide the data (Czarniawska-Joerges, 2004). Humans organise their experience and their memory of human experience mainly in the form of narrative – stories, excuses, myths, reasons for doing and not doing. Bruner (2003) suggests that narratives are a “version of reality whose acceptability is governed by convention and ‘narrative necessity’ rather than by empirical verification and logical requiredness” (p. 44). Chase (Chase, 2005) characterises a contemporary narrative enquiry approach as:

An amalgam of interdisciplinary analytic lenses, diverse disciplinary approaches, and both traditional and innovative methods – all revolving around an interest in biographical particulars as narrated by the ones who lives them. (p. 651)

The personal narratives in this study are autodiegetic and situationally placed from the interviewees’ viewpoint, as they ‘told it as it was for them’, which meant that there is a rich, and sometimes confusing amalgam of fact and fiction, objectivity and apologetic (Bryant & Cox, 2004). In terms of this research project the issue under investigation was defined as the phenomena of academic immigrant identity occurring within the bounded context of the
New Zealand Polytechnic (ITP) sector of Tertiary Education. The narrative approach was designed to be both holistic and exhaustive as a way to capture the meaningful characteristics of realistic events while examining the multifaceted aspects of immigrant academic identity.

The participants
The participants were sixteen academic leaders from a variety of New Zealand ITP’s. The individual academic leaders were selected according to Weiss’ (1994) categorisation of a ‘panel of informants’ rather than a ‘sample of representatives’ in that they each presented information rich cases for in-depth study. They were selected purposively employing Bryman’s (2004) strategic definition which entails “an attempt to establish a good correspondence between research questions and sampling” (p. 333). The selection process can also be described in terms of Brady’s (2006) definition of opportunity sampling where “the knowledge and attributes of the researcher has been used to identify a sample... using local knowledge of an area on which to base a study or using a researcher's past experiences to contact participants or gatekeepers” (p. 206). A more specifically stratified purposeful and opportunistic sampling approach was used to select the range of disciplines from which the participants would be selected in which academic immigrants are well represented. This was to ensure that the participants included a number of cases of each type, to enable the researcher to “develop insights into each type, as well as insights into the variations that exist across each types” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 182). The objective here was to achieve the greatest possible amount of information on a given problem or phenomenon, and an atypical or extreme case such as those who clearly identified themselves as fitting the profile of the academic immigrant leader would reveal more information because they were able to relate immediately to the ‘real world’ situation being studied (Yin, 2012).

The representative disciplines
It was important for this study to apply similar sampling techniques to the discipline areas that would be represented as with the actual participants. A
review of the web sites of a range of New Zealand ITP’s revealed a large number of institutions, which pride, and market, themselves as being focussed toward the provision of occupational learning across a variety of industry sectors. Such institutions proclaim publicly that their staff are either ‘working currently, or have recently worked, in real jobs’, or are ‘working professionals who are authorities in their fields’ and ‘industry specialists with in-depth knowledge of their subjects’. Within these organisations it is therefore not unusual to find that a significant number of staff involved in the delivery of teaching and learning in a large range of specialist discipline areas have been recruited directly from the relevant discipline industry with little or no background in academia. For this study, those areas with the most consistent claims and those that would likely provide cases that included situations, issues or problems pertaining to the phenomenon, were chosen. The predominant discipline areas which emerged from the review were the arts and trades.

Participants were sought from a wide variety of discipline subsets within the arts and trades areas via an unsolicited e-mail request, which outlined the metaphor of ‘academic immigrant’ as well as the nature of the project and the contribution that the individual could make to the research. Self-nominated candidates were contacted by e-mail and supplied with a more detailed participation information sheet that outlined more detail of the project (see appendix 1 for this correspondence material). Participation was determined by individual willingness to take part and the final make-up of the participants disciplines were automotive; electro-technology; journalism, music; performing arts; and plumbing and gas-fitting. While some of the participants were already known to me through my pre-academic professional work activity and also through national forums, the majority were unknown to me prior to the study commencing. It is important to note that in the discipline area that I come from, it is near impossible in a country the size of New Zealand not to be acquainted with a large number of industry professionals.

The following table indicates the order of the interviews, the type of interview, the participants (by pseudonym, gender and age), and their discipline area.
Eleven interviews were undertaken in all with a number of participants electing to be interviewed in pairs (as indicated in column 1 & 2 of table 3.2). Each individual interview was approximately one hour, with each group interview ranging up to two hours in length.

**Table 3.2** Profile of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Interview Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Electrotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Plumbing/Gasfitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Plumbing/Gasfitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Pru</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Dot</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Film &amp; Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Film &amp; Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remenyi (2014) cautions that it is tempting to ‘overdo’ the amount of data collected, which he suggests will slow down the research and can even distort the findings. As I was using an iterative process that involved conducting a small number interviews and then fully analysing that data before moving onto the next set of interviews, I discovered that after interviewing sixteen participants that the data was not revealing any new insights into the phenomenon, therefore I decided to terminate data collection and move onto consolidating the data (Josselson, 2013).

Table 3.2 shows that there were eleven males and five female academic immigrant leaders interviewed, with participant’s ages ranging from 39 to 65 years. Each participant fulfilled the role of an academic leader in a department
within a New Zealand polytechnic and each was responsible for the line management of a number of staff who shared professional discipline backgrounds with themselves. Their discipline backgrounds ranged from media (five), to performing arts (six) and the trades (five). Whilst there is a fairly even spread of male to female in the media and performing arts categories, there is a distinct male dominance in the trades category, which is deemed to be usual for this area across the sector.

The qualitative interview
Data were collected for this study using a range of individual and group qualitative semi-structured interviews.

Interviews are ubiquitous in everyday life. We have all been interviewed… and seen or read interviews with others. We know the format, what to do and how to do it. Modern society has been called the ‘interview’, or even the ‘confessional’ society, the latter calling up a particular type of interview where intimate matters may be revealed. (Edwards & Holland, 2013, p. 1)

Meaning making and interpretation are at the centre of narrative approaches to research. The aim is to build a layered, complex understanding of some aspect of human experience, in which linkages between themes are of interest to a researcher (Chase, 2005). Josselson (2013) considers that the data of interest are “people’s stories of life experience, rather than their decontextualized opinions, attitudes, or facts about life”, and that human life is composed of stories and that these narratives “integrate facts and feelings” and “construct memory, organize time, and create identity” (p. 3). Brinkmann (2015) suggests that all human research, in a philosophical sense, must be understood as conversational, “because humans are linguistic creatures and language is best understood in terms of the figure of conversation” (p. 225). Here he is referring to the Mullhall’s (2007) philosophical work which maintains that “humankind [itself] is a kind of enacted conversation” (p. 58).

Qualitative interviewing features a number of core characteristics:
• Questions asked, or topics raised, are ‘open’ with the interviewee determining their own answers.
• The relationship between researcher and interviewee is responsive or interactive, allowing for a degree of ‘adjustment’: clarification, exploration, for example: Tell me more about that, or I don’t think I quite understand.
• An interactional exchange of dialogue (between two or more participants, in face-to-face or other contexts).
• A thematic, topic-centred, biographical or narrative approach where the researcher has topics, themes or issues they wish to cover, but with a fluid and flexible structure.

A perspective regarding knowledge as situated and contextual, requiring the researcher to ensure that relevant contexts are brought into focus so that the situated knowledge can be produced. Meanings and understandings are created in an interaction, which is effectively a co-production, involving the construction or reconstruction of knowledge. [Adapted from Mason (2002, p. 62) and Gillham (2005, p. 3)]

In the light of this support for conversation as a basis of qualitative research data gathering, I chose to adopt a qualitative interview approach for this study to allow the unfolding stories of the participants to be focused on the exploration of ‘own’ experiences within the frame of becoming/being an academic. A range of individual and group qualitative semi-structured interviews were employed because of their highly individualised and unstructured nature and their ability to elicit unanticipated information and insights by adapting to the interviewee's personality and priorities (Denzin & Giardina, 2015). The qualitative interview format emphasises the role of the participant interviewer in the collection of the data, co-constructing the narrative with the interviewee (Opie, 2003). This type of interview enables participants to report their accounts within the context of their personal values and experiences in a way that a more structured interview format may constrain (Bryant, 2006; Irvine & Gaffikin, 2006). The emphasis in the context
of this study was that interviewing constituted a specific setting for the
dialogical production of personal narratives that negotiate meaning in a social
conversation rather than as a channel for tapping the subject’s own viewpoint
(Tanggaard, 2009).

**Group interviews**
The term group interview can be used generically to describe any interview in
which a group of people take part, but can be differentiated from the focus
group interview (Edwards & Holland, 2013). The general form of group
interview is the joint interview, when one researcher interviews two or more
participants who usually know each other. Advantages of group interviews
have been identified as including the potential for discussions to develop
which may yield a wide range of responses. Powney and Watts (1987)
suggest that group interviews are particularly useful where a group of people
have been working “together for some time or common purpose, or where it is
seen as important that everyone concerned is aware of what others in the
group are saying” (p. 25). Another benefit of group interviews is that having
more than one interviewee present can provide two versions of events, which
may act as a cross-check, and one can complement the other with additional
points, leading to a more complete and reliable record (Cohen et al., 2013). It
must be acknowledged that group interviews may also result in the production
of ‘non-parallel data’, however it was deemed to be unlikely in this case given
the nature of the questions and the approach of the interviewer. Group
interviews in this study comprised no more than two people at a time and
occurred at the behest of the interviewees who chose to be interviewed
together.

An interview question schedule was developed in stages, and continued to
develop throughout the data collection process. Initially, a draft schedule was
drawn up based on the questions raised from the review of the literature (see
table 2.1). Themes for the interviews were developed, based on the study’s
specific research questions, which link to the underlying conceptual
framework developed through the literature review which is based on the
interrelationships of identity and the metaphor of ‘immigrant (see Appendix 3 for a full copy of this schedule).

The interview process
Following the receipt of the agreement to participate from each participant, I arranged interviews with them in locations of their own choosing. The interviews took place over a three month period in geographical location around the country that suited each participant. This allowed each participant to feel comfortable in his or her surroundings during the interview process. Each interview lasted between 1 and 1½ hours, with the group interviews being typically closer to 2 hours. As the interviewer, I guided the direction of the interview using primarily open-ended questions that encouraged the participant to discuss their experiences of academic immigrant identity and their relationships with their colleagues. I undertook the role of the ‘participant interviewer’ in the collection of the data by co-constructing the narrative with the interviewee (Opie, 2003), especially where I was able to share similar experiences or to note observations that I had made in my own experience of being an academic immigrant leader. I allowed the interviewee to follow whatever tangents that they felt compelled to follow, as this enabled them to report their accounts within the context of their personal values and experiences in a way that a more structured interview format might have constrained (Bryant, 2006). I also paid particular attention during group interviews to divide my attention between the participants, ensuring that they each had an opportunity to speak around a particular question (Cohen et al., 2013). It is true to say that the group interviews became more tangential than the individual interviews as each participant ‘riffed’ off each others conversation points.

Prior to each interview, each participant read and signed a consent form, which had been approved by my institutions’ Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix 2 for a copy of this form). All interviews were digitally audio recorded and fully transcribed with the gathered material being considered confidential. Interviewees and the organisations, which they represent, have
been identified in the text that accompanies the publication of the results by a pseudonym.

Internal validity
Throughout this research project I sought to ensure that the explanation of any event, issue or set of data which is a piece of this research could be accurately sustained by the data collected and that the findings accurately described the phenomena that was being researched (Cohen et al., 2013). Efforts to ensure internal validity of the data collected centred on minimising the amount of bias that may have been present in the semi-structured interviews. I intentionally set out to remove any source of bias from the content of the questions and from my attitudes, opinions and expectations as the interviewer. Any potential misunderstandings on the part of the respondent as to what was being asked of them was checked at all times. I also checked with the respondents that I was recording their answers to questions accurately and that I had interpreted their answer correctly before proceeding to the next question. Following the transcription of the each interview, each participant was sent a copy of the interview transcript electronically and asked them to verify the material for accuracy. They were also invited to add any further thoughts they had had since the meeting. It is interesting to note that none of the participants took up the offer to add any further material, however one participant recently requested to meet with me to discuss the progress of the research, which he described as being ‘very interesting’ to him. While the conversation over lunch was stimulating, no new material was uncovered or used in the study.

The following diagram (figure 3.1) illustrates a model overview of the connectivity and flow of the research design, demonstrating the iterative process taken throughout the study where results of data collection and analysis continued to influence the on-going preparation and future data collection.
Limitations

This study has employed a qualitative interview methodology to gather data and it is necessary to reflect on some of the limitations of using this approach. One of the main problems of using interviewing as a form of data collection is the influential role of the researcher in guiding the respondents to answer in a certain way (Gall et al., 2007). In this study, I acknowledged that this was a key feature of this type of research and have tried to highlight the epistemological and ontological positions that have underpinned this work to allow the reader to evaluate the thesis critically. Also, while still recognising that the data from the interviews was co-constructed between the researcher and the interviewer, I tried not to lead the respondent into making certain responses during interviews and used open questioning as much as possible.
Another problem is highlighted by Gillham’s (2001) suggestion that people may be inaccurate in what they tell you about factual events concerning themselves:

What people give as their opinion is one thing; statements about behaviour are quite another. If what people say in an interview is presumed (by the researcher or the interviewer) to bear some sort of direct relation to what the interviewee actually does or would do, then we need to treat that assumption as equally questionable.

The misunderstanding of the relationship between what we say, believe or know and what we do is pervasive – so pervasive, indeed, that it often goes unquestioned. (p. 93)

It is therefore important to note that the relationship between beliefs, opinions, knowledge and actual behaviour is not a straightforward one. As Gillham (2001) has cautioned that ‘what people say in an interview is not necessarily the whole picture’, it is important for quality research and, in particular, quality theorising, to take account of that.

Only one method of data collection was employed in this study, being interviews. While this may be seen by some as limiting the opportunity to utilise both methodological and respondent triangulation, it was deemed to be a low risk given the focus of the research on the personal narratives of each participant.

3.3 Analysis and synthesis

Qualitative hypothesis-generating research involves collecting interview data from research participants concerning a phenomenon of interest, and then using what they say in order to develop hypotheses. It uses the two principles of (1) questioning rather than measuring and (2) generating hypotheses using theoretical coding (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 15).
Qualitative data analysis is not a ‘passive endeavour’ rather it requires active comprehension, synthesising, theorising, and re-contextualising (Cresswell, 2013). This can be achieved by active observation, accurate recall, astute questioning and a relentless search for answers (Cohen et al., 2013). Qualitative research is also often inductive, particularly when small samples of respondents and case studies are used (Yin, 2011). It is imperative to gain as much as possible from the available data through careful analysis techniques. The challenge throughout data collection and analysis is to make sense of large amounts of data, reduce the volume of information, identify significant patterns, and construct a framework.

**Data analysis**

I structured and analysed data using elements of narrative theme analysis, to investigate the inductive themes embedded within the participants’ personal stories (Boje, 2010). Narrative theme analysis was a useful tool in exploring the individual narrative stories as it enabled me to seek out common patterns that occurred across the group of participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The literature suggests that there is a strong connection between using narrative analysis and using inferential analysis when examining the reasoning processes of leaders (Slay & Smith, 2011), where one is looking for antecedents, which have a causal impact on the events that cause things and the states of mind that induce choices and behaviours (Foster, 2012).

Within the interview process, the interview ‘narratives’ were constructed by participants about their personal experiences of academic immigrant identity and their relationships with their academic immigrant colleagues and were often presented in a non-linear and fragmented format. Analysis began from the start of the interview process. During the recorded conversation, I made notes, which highlighted any particular interesting details. Notes were also made about how things were being discussed and recounted. This practice recognises that interview conversation is not only about the topic being researched but is also about the social interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee (Edwards & Holland, 2013). Furthermore, this approach
can help identify some of the wider cultural influences and narratives of the responses (Lincoln & Guba, 2013). Consequently, it was important that these ‘personal stories’ were analysed in a manner that provided a way of bringing meaning to them as a whole (Czarniawska-Joerges, 2004) while preserving the individuality of each participant’s experiences and acknowledging common themes across the interviews. This was especially important for the group interviews where it was important to preserve both the dual and the individual narrative of the participants experience (Cohen et al., 2013). It was important to explore the uniqueness of each participants’ experiences of academic immigrant identity. To this end the coding and notes of the interviews preserved the ‘raw and fragmented material’ as much as possible in an effort to help make greater sense of the participants’ stories (Boje, 2010).

A number of levels of theoretical coding and analysis techniques were employed in line with inductive research conventions. Open coding examined the text for items of interest, with the ultimate aim of accumulating codes into themes and then categories. Close analyses of the interview transcripts occurred on a line-by-line basis employing electronic qualitative research software NVivo, which provided a number of search, query and visualisation tools. Initial codes were drawn from each transcript within the software package. During this analysis I employed the constant comparative approach suggested by Birks and Mills (2011) where I compared each new instance of the theme with those already encountered until the theme had achieved saturation, and no new insights in the theme could be gained from the data (Zhou & Shalley, 2008).

On the completion of open coding, I engaged in an axial coding process to “build up a dense texture of relationships” around the ‘axis’ of each theme (May, 2002, p. 64). Axial coding is the phase where concepts and themes that begin to stand out are refined and relationships among them are pursued systematically. Research which sets out to represent the meanings that academic immigrant leaders construct around their experiences of academic identity and their relationships with their colleagues, contains not only
intimately experienced evidence (Trahar, 2011), but whole sets of reasoned narrative structures with their implied connectivities (general connections), causalities (explicit or implied examples of one thing directly or indirectly causing another) and implications (those logical connections where, as a result of premises, particular conclusions arise, valid or invalid, true or untrue) (Slay & Smith, 2011). Themes represent phenomena such as events, objects, incidents, and actions. As major themes begin to emerge, the researcher is advised to ask questions of the data that concern them in a focused manner (Benaquisto, 2008). To do this, I worked to flesh out the properties of themes and determine how they varied in terms of their dimensions. Themes were pursued in greater depth and modified on the way to the identification of core categories and ultimately to the explanation of the phenomena. Finally, selective coding was employed to identify a central phenomenon and to relate central themes to it using statements of relationships.

Following this process the emergent themes were organised into abstract concepts called theoretical categories, which were related to the research questions. A theoretical category is described by Auerback & Silverstein (2003) an “abstract concept that organises a group of themes by fitting them into a theoretical framework. Theoretical categories move the analysis from the description of subjective experience found in repeating ideas and themes to a more abstract and theoretical level” (p. 56). The development of theoretical categories allowed for a deeper understanding of the emergent themes as they began to fit into a larger theoretical framework. The themes that emerged from this analysis were then grouped into overarching themes with each linked to a specific category as presented in table 3.3 below.
Table 3.3  Relationship of themes to categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>(Sub) Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of Academic Identity</td>
<td>Professional versus academic identity</td>
<td>Professional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disconnections</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The way we teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions – Becoming an academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Induction and socialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple contexts of identity</td>
<td>Leading and managing</td>
<td>Changing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions - Learning to lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions between institutional and discipline priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of sharing identity</td>
<td>Identifying with each other</td>
<td>Sharing identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking the same language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working relationships</td>
<td>Translating and contextualising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demystifying research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making excuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the analysis was nearing completion and categories and their properties were becoming saturated, analysis gave way to exposition. This is linked with the practical issue of selection, that is, selecting examples from the transcripts to illustrate the abstract features of the model (Goulding, 2002). Often, in selective coding, a ‘storyline’ is generated that narrates the categories and their relationships (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This can be described as a series of theoretical narratives that organise the constructs into personal stories that describe the subjective experience of the research participants. It uses the above mentioned theoretical categories to organise people’s subjective experience into a coherent story which has employed the participants own language to make their story vivid and real (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). The expected outcome of this inductive approach will be a series of
propositions that contain a central phenomenon, its causal conditions, its intervening conditions and its consequences (Birks & Mills, 2011).

Issues of trustworthiness

Qualitative research takes the view that reality is socially constructed by each individual and should be interpreted rather than measured, therefore qualitative data cannot be tested for ‘validity’ using assumptions of objective reality and positivist neutrality (Denzin & Giardina, 2015). The challenge for qualitative methods within a constructivist/interpretive paradigm is to be able to evaluate and validate both the quality and the usefulness of findings. As a qualitative researcher I believe that subjectivity, interpretation, and context are inevitably interwoven into every research project. Furthermore, I believe that these elements of research practice are essential and should not be eliminated even if it were possible to do so. However, the work of analysing interpretive data involves managing consistency and continuity; therefore I needed look for internal consistency within the various contributions to the discussion.

Auerback & Silverstein (2003) suggest that in place of the quantitative concepts of ‘reliability and validity’, rather the qualitative concept of ‘justifiability of interpretations’ should be employed. They suggest that in place of the quantitative concept of ‘generalizability’, rather the qualitative concept of ‘transferability of theoretical constructs’ should be employed. With this in mind I acknowledged that this was essential and I paid close attention to the domains of quality assurance. Table 3.4 describes the approach that this research project employed to verify issues of trustworthiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4</th>
<th>Approaches to achieving quality of outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domains of quality</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifiability of interpretations - Internal</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decision-making processes were examined with the aim of either eliminating them or alternatively modifying the cognitive maps (Group interview).

Credibility
Any potential misunderstandings on the part of the respondent as to what was being asked of them was checked at all times.

Truth value
Multiple realities were described as adequately as possible, so that those who live the experience instantly recognised its description and interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justifiability of interpretations - External</th>
<th>Comparability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The typicality of the subject was explored in a multi-site study with comparison groups of participants and settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data was presented as neutrally as possible so that others might reach the same interpretations of meaning and significance as the original researcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transferability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data was clear, detailed and sufficiently rich so that others may decide the extent to which the theoretical constructs have meaning for another situation, and whether transferability is possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A clear pathway of decisions, or ‘audit trail’, taken by the researcher established trustworthiness of the process by which the findings were achieved as well as the end products: data, interpretations and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Dependability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any source of bias from the content of the questions and from the researchers attitudes, opinions and expectations as the interviewer were eliminated;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any variability in the phenomena studied or changes in research design employed because of the iterative process of inquiry were accounted for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant checking with the respondents to ensure the recording of their answers to questions was accurate and that the researcher was interpreting their answer correctly before proceeding to the next question;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each interview participant was sent an electronic copy of the transcript of their interview and asked to comment on any inaccuracies;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Ethical considerations
In order to formally commence this study, ethics approval was gained from the relevant committee. Preparations were made for this study in accordance with ethical guidelines with detailed participant information (appendix 1) and consent forms (see Appendix 2) distributed to each willing participant. When considering this study, not only did I need to consider the ethics and professional standards required by the institution, but I also had to consider
both my personal code of ethics in relation to the above as well as the topic under consideration.

The type of qualitative research being undertaken in this study involved ‘human relationships’ in the form of interviews, and I wanted the participants to come away from them with a sense of having been valued. It is acknowledged that researchers must pay attention to the dynamics of power and emotions in interviews because they are potentially intimate encounters where people may “open up and speak about very private aspects of their lives - perhaps things they have never told anyone else” (Josselson, 2013, p. 103). While the possibility existed that interviews may cause distress, this was minimised by ethical conduct on the part of myself as the interviewer as well as through the participant’s ability to have ‘considerable control’ over the interview process (Edwards & Holland, 2013).

In the case of the participants in this study, there was not only the potential for them to speak openly and honestly about themselves, but also about their colleagues and the organisations in which they are employed. Confidentiality was therefore a serious issue when considering that some of the material was sensitive and the people who agreed to participate might have been risking a great deal by speaking about their situation (Brinkmann, 2015), and as a result I went to considerable lengths to establish trust, protect identities, and maintain the confidentiality that had been agreed upon (Cohen et al., 2013). Participants were identified in the text that accompanies the publication of the results by a pseudonym and any reference to any other person or organisation mentioned in the published participant quotations were disguised or removed.

In this study all recorded and gathered material was considered confidential. Care has been taken to store any recordings and transcripts of the interviews in a secure place, to send transcripts via email marked ‘confidential’, and never to disclose the content of an interview to anybody else (Denzin & Giardina, 2008) without the express consent of the participant. I have employed a multiple stage method of assurance for interviewees of
confidentiality included in the participant information sheet sent as part of the initial invitation communication (e-mail), when confirming the appointment by a follow up communication (e-mail), at the beginning of the interview (verbally) and on the consent form (in writing) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). To avoid any potential conflict of interest, all participants were fully informed in advance of my identity and background, therefore allowing them to choose not to participate if they felt that there might have been any conflict. By employing these basic tenets of ethical research behaviour, where the dignity, privacy and interests of the participants are always respected, I believe that there has been no conflict of interest in this research project.

Summary

This chapter has provided a rationale and justification for choosing a qualitative methodology for data collection and analysis for this study. Key methodological issues linked to answering the study's specific research questions have been discussed. The chapter described the qualitative interview method employed; identified and addressed the participant choice and sampling methods; explained data management procedures and detailed the analytical procedures.

Data were collected through purposive sampled individual and group interviews with data from each being coded and analysed before more data was collected from subsequent interviews. There was a comparative orientation toward the data collection where interview data that was similar on many variables but with different outcomes was compared to see where the key causal differences may lie. Similarly, cases that had the same outcome were examined to see which conditions they all had in common, thereby revealing necessary causes (Johnson et al., 2010). Emergent themes were organised into abstract concepts called theoretical categories, which were related to each of the research questions. These were used to form the structure of presentation of findings in Chapter 5.
The next chapter introduces the participants in more detail through their personal stories of how they made the choice to become academics, as a way of setting the scene for the findings chapter, which follows it.
Chapter 4 Introducing the participants

This research project employed a qualitative interview method with a narrative analysis lens. These narrative forms of interviews are specifically designed to elicit a personal story from the participants in the research. Edwards and Holland (2013) suggest that the narrative interview is based on the idea that:

People produce narratives about the self and identity through time that draw not only on their own experiences and understanding, but on culturally circulating stories that help them interpret and make sense of the world and themselves in it. (p. 35)

Similarly, Lawler (2002) describes narrative interviews in terms of them being “interpretive devices through which people represent themselves, both to themselves and to others” (p. 246). Riessman (2008) draws attention to ‘performative aspects’ of the narratives produced by participants, which Cussins (1998) suggests contain performative features that enable the ‘local achievement of identity’.

The sixteen academic leader participants in this study may be defined as ‘academic immigrants’ - as those who possess a stock of knowledge of a substantive area of expertise or knowledge derived from their professional background in other organisational, industrial or creative cultures (Hotho, 2008) and who have been recruited directly into higher education from relevant discipline industries, with little or no formal background in teaching. The academic leaders were not a very homogenous group and came from diverse professional backgrounds and experiences. Five of the sixteen participants had professional backgrounds in the trades’ areas of automotive, electro-technology or plumbing and gas-fitting; six had professional backgrounds in music and the performing and screen arts; and the remaining five had professional backgrounds in media and journalism.

An initial theme that emerged from the analysis of the collected data highlighted the journey of these academic immigrants towards taking up a
career as an academic in a Polytechnic and then moving into academic leadership. Each of these academic leaders identified with the metaphor of ‘migration’ as representing their personal journeys from industry professional to teacher and then to academic leader. They saw themselves as having effectively ‘migrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’ in the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector of higher education. They each shared work and discipline backgrounds with their respective staff from professional fields other than education. This chapter introduces the participants and presents their personal journeys from their original professions to their new profession as academics and academic leaders and locates their interests in teaching.

4.1 The journey toward academia

When reflecting how the participants and their colleagues experience academic identity the connection between their previous professional career and their current academic career was discussed. Twelve of the sixteen spoke about the interconnectedness of professional experience and informal teaching experience, describing a natural link between teaching and the professions. Mark, Pru, Ralph, Reg, Sally and Sophie each spoke about how they had “always taught” as part of their professional careers, while Andrew, Craig, Gary, John and Wayne discussed how teaching apprentices was a natural part of their past and how “when you take on an apprentice you actually are teaching”. John explained that he “understood the whole idea of teaching” as he had four apprentices in his previous job. The majority of these participants also noted that they always liked the idea of passing on their knowledge and for them it was a natural extension of their professional background.

Chris worked for several years primarily as a trainer in everything but name after he convinced his previous employers that it was a good idea to establish a training department for their broadcast directorate. He explained:

I was actually quite good at being able to articulate things and support people and mentor people and explain. I’ve just fostered that.
(Craig)
Mandy, reflected that she has been teaching from the time she started her own training:

My journey within the educational side of theatre actually started right at the time when I started being a director... Even within my first year I was thrown into having to teach community classes.... I was having to take what I was doing within the company classes and feed them into the community. So it has kind of been a dual path for me all the way through. (Mandy)

For ten participants, taking up teaching was planned as a change of career and for two it was almost accidental. There are, however, a number of similarities and all the participants agreed that there was something about teaching and ‘passing on knowledge’ that appealed to them.

Gary has been teaching longer than he had worked in his industry. His journey began following a number of years working in garages when he was “called in to do some part time teaching at the local Tech”. He then moved to part time tutoring with the Institute as an automotive tutor. For some, it was a decision that was related to what they were going to do when they “came off the tools”. This was the case for Andrew, who spent thirty years in the industry as an electrician. He explained that there was very little for him to progress to in the small town where he lived and worked, so he moved to a larger centre when an opportunity came up at the local Polytechnic to teach. He explained:

I thought that could be interesting mainly because I like to know stuff – I’m a trivia nut! And so I applied [and] they offered me a fixed term position for six months. I thought, that’s a start, lets go.... I had this fixed term role for about four years and then they made me permanent and I cruised in this cool job where you worked 30/40 hours a week if you were lucky.... I was thinking, this is cool. It was the first time in my life that I had more than 2 weeks off and got to spend it in school holidays so I got to spend holidays with my wife and the kids and that was unusual as well. (Andrew)

John joined his institution as a part-time plumbing and gas-fitting tutor and quickly became full time. When he left plumbing he took up some youth work in Auckland for three years, where he discovered that he liked “people a lot more than pipes”. Similarly Craig applied for a role as a manager with the
local institution after trying jobs as a contracts manager for a building company, a police officer and a farmer. Education made sense for him as his wife is a teacher and he thought he was “familiar with the process” and had “an understanding of where and how things fit into place”.

Prior to teaching, Ralph had an active career in the music industry, and also in production for television and had “done a little bit of teaching” before joining his institution. For Will, teaching had an inevitability associated with it. Will worked for 32 years as a journalist and editor. As an editor he worked with graduates, and then with students on either internships or work placements. It was through this that he “actually found I really enjoyed it, teaching them on the first level – straight in, and working with them and helping them”. He enjoyed the experience so much that he decided, “education was going to be for me”.

Andrew enjoyed being a tutor because he was able help people either to become apprentices or through their apprenticeships, because he had not had the same opportunity, “I did all mine [learning] through Open Polytech and I hated it”. He did not like the way that he learned as “there wasn’t really anyone around me that could really explain or help me with it”, so he was determined to give people an opportunity that he did not have. Ultimately he “really just enjoyed helping these kids understand stuff”.

Mandy has been involved in teaching in the community from the time that she was engaged in her own training. However she did not see herself teaching in a formal tertiary environment:

If anything I was anti it because my experience of connections with people who were working in the academic world, as it related to the performing arts, was very much that it was all about critical theory and not about practice. (Mandy)

She described that her attitudes changed dramatically once she started working with the students. However she admits that for herself and her
colleagues it is strange to realise that the students graduate better qualified than most of the teachers.

Pip also did not see herself teaching and started teaching part-time quite by accident after finding an advert for a teaching position “on the page above my crossword”. She “found the crossword and found an ad” and now she is a programme leader. Dot also came to teach by accident. She found herself between jobs and was concerned about where the next job was going to come from when she was contacted by a colleague who worked on the programme and asked if she was interested in teaching part of one of the courses. She started teaching part-time and “then that tutor left so I stepped into where she was”.

Mark worked as a freelance musical director as well as writing and composing. Part of that work involved contracts to work on projects which bought him into the tertiary institution. It was not a planned pathway, “It somehow evolved into a fulltime position… So I got back to teaching… And it payed the bills.”

Several participants described how they were ‘shoulder-tapped’ into thinking about a change of career. Reg began offering songwriter workshops in between touring gigs and eventually started delivering them in schools. He explained how someone put an application form in his letterbox for a programme they wanted him to help develop:

“I was shoulder tapped to help set up the [programme]. So I was directly invited from very much a busy industry focus into the sector. I have sort of stayed there and in my [new] career as an academic. (Reg)

He went onto explain how teaching in the tertiary sector offered significant differences to his previous professional life:

I actually love my life in the tertiary sector because I can have conversations. Where else am I going to have a conversation like this? [referring to the interview for this project]. That is why I come to work. I am looking for this conversation. It is not as though I’m needy, but I can identify maybe three people that I’ve met here that I know I
can go and have a cup of coffee with and I’ll end up in that high order condition. I love being in that space, it is better than sex. To me it is an enlightenment. (Reg)

For Sophie ‘coming to teach’ was something that she always knew that she would do at some stage in her life. She saw it as something that would engage her passion:

Even in my late 30s I had this really strong idea that at around about 50 I would start to teach. And I was given that opportunity when I was 55. I was given that opportunity to go in and teach all the things that I had learned…. I came from the place of ‘I believe that it is your duty as an older person to go into the institutions and pass on your knowledge, plus skills, and bring the next generation forward’. (Sophie)

Sally echoed this sentiment when she described how the opportunity to teach was about providing “something else that was continuing to push me forward and make me grow”. She also made it very clear that there was also a range of practical reasons for making the transition:

I’ve had a really interesting career up to this point, but I have absolutely no intention of getting up at 4 am to be on a film set for an 18 hour day for six months at a time anymore… I want to do something that involves getting up at 7.30. (Sally)

Others also had practical reasons for making a career change. Wayne was just newly arrived to the country and the salary that he was on was abysmal, so for him the decision was a financial one, and “the salary increase of being here was 50% plus, so it was quite a big jump”. Will decided to take up teaching when he found himself in a “blind alley” career wise. He explained:

The nature of where my trajectory had gone, I’d ended up in what I saw at the time as the blind alley in community newspapers… and I was getting frustrated. I thought I’m heading towards 50, I’m in a dead end and what am I going to do? (Will)

Gary spoke enthusiastically about his belief that his staff are “here because they like being here”. He explained that while there may be “a couple of people that might count hours” the majority of his tutors “are here because it is a job and it is not being in the ditch or the dirty water or underneath the car”.
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Some participants shared their understanding that the journey to teaching for some of their colleagues might not be the same as theirs. Wayne commented that a number of his staff were attracted to the “holiday perks” of working at the institution. He explained:

It certainly becomes pretty clear what it is about for them. It is about “I work at [the institution] but I want to be home with my family more and I can be at home with family and supporting them”. (Wayne)

He also noted that those who were not in it for themselves but who were in it for the students were progressing and “climb up through the ranks”, while, “the ones who are here for themselves tend not to last that long” and “tend to get left behind”. Craig presented a similar example when he explained what happens when you start speaking student centric teaching and how it applies, “straight away it is like a red flag over them… for who is here for the teaching and who is here for themselves”. Observations about colleagues such as these were treated as pragmatic by many of the participants. Wayne summed this up when he stated. “if that is their driving factor and that is their driving force then you work within that”.

**Stepping up the ladder**
As with their individual pathways towards becoming an academic, the participants each undertook a different journey toward taking up a leadership role. For Will, he became a leader by design, rather than by accident. “As soon as I walked in the door ‘J’ said I intend to be out of here in about three years and I see you as the sort of person that will take over”. To Will this came as a shock.

Like most of the participants, Gary came up through the ranks. His management experience started as a course supervisor in the automotive area where he had four tutors working under him. He notes, “It was more structure in those days. It was around setting up timetables, somebody else looked after the accounts”. Since then the role has grown along with the number of staff and areas or responsibility, which now include carpentry and
electrical and some other trades. He insists, “I’m not really into a boss situation” rather he prefers to look at people’s skills and capabilities.

Most of the other participants also ‘came up through the ranks’ and applied for the role of leader when that role became vacant, generally when a senior colleague moved on. Andrew also applied for, and was given the position as manager and he related how he felt “somewhat easier taking on the role having been in the position”:

I know the role; I know what they do and how they do it. I know them. Although it’s always difficult becoming leader of people you work with but they were pretty good about that. (Andrew)

Ralph did not plan to become a manager, rather he felt that someone with the knowledge of the culture of the department should step up. As he recalled:

I didn’t move up the management ladder because I’m ambitious, I did it because there was somebody who left above me and I thought that is a shame and I thought if I don’t do that we are going to get someone new coming into the situation. And talking with all my colleagues at the time it was like almost taking one for the team. (Ralph)

He also reflected on his own abilities as a manager and his relations with his staff:

We have a very large staff here, and there would be at least three of us who have been here as long as I have. A lot of the others have been here 10-15 years. I have seen other music areas, I’ve seen the centrifuge flying off at other schools. There is not a lot of agro and we’re a pretty good functional group. There are challenges with it and I’m a pretty hopeless manager, I’ve really made some balls up. (Ralph)

All of the participants try to maintain a small teaching load which they suggest “keeps your feet on the ground” and connected.

Craig, Chris and Reg joined their respective organisations directly as a manager with a small teaching role included. Reg was attracted to the management position because of the opportunity to work across a wide range of disciplines and to support and empower people to explore their potential.
and to see what opportunities there might be for partnering across those disciplines.

**Summary**

The sixteen participants introduced in this chapter were not a very homogeneous group and came from diverse professional backgrounds. Ten participants planned the move to formal teaching in a tertiary institution as part of a career progression; for five it was a chance to ‘get off the tools’; and four ‘fell’ into teaching by accident. Three joined their institution directly as managers; six were shoulder-tapped to come and teach; and the rest joined as teachers.

All of the participants experienced informal teaching in their professional work prior to taking up formal teaching. This experience was either via ad-hoc or conscious teaching as part of their professional work, or more formally by taking on an apprentice. They each maintain a small teaching portfolio alongside their academic leadership duties and spoke about their ‘passion for the students’ with many suggesting that the reason that they remain in their roles is because of the students.

In reflecting about their experiences of their individual journey to become an academic, and the way that these experiences related to their own sense of ‘self’ and identity, the narratives suggest that the journey they each experienced aligns with Jones and Galloway’s (2012) understanding that an experience of transition such as this does not mean that an “old self disappears, to be replaced by a new, unified self, but rather that we can see aspects of previous experience and worldviews lingering” (p. 92). In this sense, there are also connections with Sands and Tennant’s (2010) view that life stories are continually under construction, and where experience is viewed as a story that can be continually revisited, reinterpreted, and reassessed. They emphasise “the indeterminacy of identity, the relativity of meaning, and the generation and exploration of a multiplicity of meanings” (p. 117).
The idea that these academic immigrants should assimilate into the new culture of academia and abandon their culture of origin will be discussed in the next chapter. It is opportune, therefore, at this point to reflect on a conversation held between a colleague of mine with Etienne Wenger (personal communication, February 25, 2010) on the occasion of a workshop that he was running at my place of work. He was asked how to help academic immigrants to abandon their previous professional identity and to regard themselves solely as academics. He answered with the statement, “Why would you want them to change? Surely you would want them to add their new identity to their old to enrich both!”
Chapter 5  Research findings

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the data collected from sixteen semi-structured interviews with academic leaders who identified with the metaphor of ‘migration’ as representing their personal journeys from industry professional to teacher and then to academic leader. They were happy to be known as academic immigrants. The chapter is divided into three sections, each of which represents a category which relate to the research questions. As discussed in Chapter Three, in order to collect the necessary data to answer the research questions, semi-structured interviews were used. The data were then analysed using coding and thematic techniques outlined by a range of qualitative researchers including Birks and Mills (2011), Cohen et al. (2013), (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), and Yin (2011). The themes that emerged from this analysis were then grouped into overarching themes with each linked to a specific category. The categories form the headings for each section of this chapter and themes form sub-sections of each category. These are:

5.1 Experiences of Academic Identity
   • Professional versus academic identity
   • Disconnections
   • Transitions – Becoming an academic

5.2 Multiple contexts of identity
   • Leading and managing
   • Transitions - Learning to lead
   • Tensions between institutional and discipline priorities

5.3 Experiences of sharing identity
   • Identifying with each other
   • Working relationships
5.1 Experiences of academic identity

In relation to the category of how academic immigrants experience identity, data have been grouped into three main themes. Theme one, *Professional versus academic identity*, explores relationships of identity from past professional experiences, including a desire to sustain ‘professional’ connections, and how these relate to being an academic. Theme two, *Disconnections*, presents an overview of the barriers that academic immigrants experience including educational bureaucracy, feelings of “not being understood”, tensions around the teaching of specialist skills, and the engagement with traditional forms of academic research. Finally, Theme three, *Transitions – Becoming an academic*, presents issues relating to a lack of transition processes in the form of induction and socialisation within ITP’s to assist academic immigrants to transition from one profession to another.

The sixteen participants in this study identified as academic leaders, in that they all fulfilled the role of a middle leader in a department/unit within a New Zealand Polytechnic and were each responsible for a number of staff who shared professional discipline backgrounds from beyond the institution with themselves.

**Professional versus academic identity**

The discussion around academic immigrant identity examined the participants’ personal understanding of their identity as it relates to their current role as academic leaders. Each of the sixteen participants held a strong connection with the identity of their previous (outside) profession. They described this professional identity in terms of being ‘who I am’, suggesting that ‘without that anchor’ they would ‘not recognise themselves’. All of the participants also acknowledged that whilst they each held a strong grounding connection with their ‘professional’ identity, they currently maintain an identity that includes elements of both a ‘professional’ identity and an ‘academic’ identity. Mandy recognised herself as possessing both a professional and an academic identity in terms of:
Currently I am teaching and delivering to students fully aware that next year I will either be casting them, directing them or acting on stage with them. (Mandy)

For Reg the link is seamless as he suggests that “the gig informs the classroom and classroom informs the gig”. He promotes conversations in his team about what he terms the “incubator approach to education”. He explains how students have “one foot in their course programme but they always have another in the real world with lots of arts practice”. From his perspective a lot of the work he does is complimentary and involves both teaching and performing. He felt that he was able to “marry these two together” easily. A similar understanding was discussed with Ralph where he explained to his students that:

If you go into a profession, some of it might be teaching, some of it could be administration, some of it could be working somewhere else.
(Ralph)

Sophie noted that she looks at her teaching “through the eyes of a professional”. She explained, “It’s why I am here; that’s who I am”. She also noted that when she started teaching she was there to “teach the students all the skills they needed so that they could work in a workshop and be capable”. Sally, who shared the interview with Sophie, agreed and went further by explaining that “we are not career academics, we’re not there to become researchers and move off into other areas”. Sophie also was not looking to create another career for herself when she became a teacher and admitted that she has never seen herself as an academic. However she reflected that this view might be a result of the timing, rather than any predisposition:

Maybe if when I started we had the opportunity to do degree papers, then I probably would have then, but there wasn’t. By the time it came up I was 63 and I thought oh flick, I just don’t want to do it now. But I certainly would have when I started. And when I’d started if I’d done that it may have changed my focus and my attitude. (Sophie)

All of the participants also discussed their academic immigrant colleagues whom they managed and work alongside, and who, like themselves moved into teaching directly from the industry. The participants noted that these academic immigrant teachers similarly, saw themselves ‘primarily’ in terms of
their professional identity. Andrew described how many of his colleagues “still look at themselves as tradesmen”. Ralph agreed and mentioned that his colleagues see themselves as industry professionals foremost, “we have an identity, we belong to something. You’re a body of professionals.” Gary even admitted that despite many years of teaching he still considers himself as a tradesman, “because that is what I am”.

The participants noted that the majority of their colleague academic immigrant teachers did not identify themselves as ‘academics’, despite, in many cases, quite lengthy terms of service as teachers. This was seen among the participants as primarily a result of their colleagues’ stronger identification with their respective (past) professions. Pru suggested that it is very hard to shift these attitudes and questioned ‘why’ they would need to shift. She has no problem with staff not identifying with being an academic because of “who they are” and “what they can contribute” as a result. She determined that there is not really a problem as “they are also fabulous teachers”.

In trying to unpick the issue of not identifying with ‘academic’ the conversation with the participants centred on a discussion around the use of language and terms. All sixteen of the participants agreed that the nomenclature for teaching is important for themselves, their staff and their relationships with staff. Many recounted that industry professionals coming from industry who had little or no background in teaching rejected the titles ‘academic’ and ‘lecturer’ as they found them confronting and they were confused by the terms ‘teacher’ and ‘tutor’. Ralph admitted that he “could never term myself as an academic”, and suggested that there is a natural aversion to the term. However he offered up an alternative by suggesting he would be comfortable being called “an educationalist... I’m happy with that”. He explained:

> I think if we were to paraphrase what we believe in teaching and giving people skills, a lot of that could be [instruction] and modelling things and the sort of work you do and putting it in an environment, and applied teaching if you like.... not Ivory tower sort of stuff. If we were to use the term educationalist and practitioner, I think they come together very much. (Ralph)
Sally and Sophie explained that they each had contracts with their respective organisations that described them as ‘lecturers’. They believe there is a mismatch between the ‘title’ and the description of “what they actually do”. Sally noted that she found the word inappropriate, commenting, “when I’m in a classroom situation I’m a tutor, not a lecturer”. Both agreed that the word teacher was more appropriate to their understanding of what they did. Wallace offered a response that typifies the confusion around the naming of roles in the institution:

I’m’ not a lecturer, I’m a tutor… I think when I want to I can call myself a lecturer. I think at a formal level I can do that. But that is not what I call myself. (Wallace)

Chris offered that he also employs the title “educationalist” which seemed to provide a level of ‘neutrality’ that all his staff could buy into. Pru suggested that there is less of a problem with industry professionals identifying with being an academic as there is a history of them seeing themselves as teachers, but not necessarily as institutionalised polytechnic teachers or as system teachers. She believes that they see themselves simply as people who “pass on knowledge”. Wayne had similar observations, however he felt that there was a more important problem than agreeing on a name or deciding what a title was. His concern was with trying to get his staff to understand that they were “not tradesmen” any more. He encourages them to consider themselves as people with “trade skills teaching youngsters” and “they are now tutors”.

John observed that some of the problems associated with industry professionals identifying as academics may be related to the messages that ITP’s put out about themselves that might be confusing the conversation. While agreeing that the core business is teaching, he questioned whether ITP’s portray themselves as ‘the academy’.

The rest of the academic stuff that sits around it, people who work through academia or aspire to, I don’t know if that is what polytechs are saying about themselves. (John)
Mandy offered an insight into why herself and her colleagues in her discipline did not identify readily with academia before they started to teach:

I was anti it because my experience of connections with people who were working in the academic world, as it related to the performing arts, was very much that it was all about critical theory and not about practice. So the experiences that I had were generally not very positive in terms of a practitioner interface at all. (Mandy)

Sustaining ‘professional’ connections
Fourteen of the participants highlighted that maintaining connection with their industry was important for them from a credibility point of view. Mandy needed to be seen to be a “practising professional” as a way of maintaining credibility with both her students (to demonstrate currency) and her professional colleagues (to prove that she was “not lost to academia”). She explained that “I am both” as she was teaching them today, and next year she might be directing them or acting on stage with them. Dot explained this as “you need a foot in each camp”. She proposed:

I think you actually do need it because we need to keep in touch with our sectors, that is so important, but we also need to understand what students need and how to construct knowledge itself. (Dot)

Reg’s biggest fear was that he would be subsumed into the institution and suffer from what he calls “death by corduroy”, where he would lose touch with his profession and “die that way”. He believes that the only way to counter this fear is to “go out on the weekends, put yourself on the line as a performer, and really test yourself as an industry practitioner”. Having said that, however, he stated how much he enjoyed being an academic:

I really enjoyed the reflective process of being able to stand there from all of that and write about it and be really academic, and use some high level thinking and get away from practice. (Reg)

The participants also noted that for many of their colleagues who are not career academics, they have the ability to return to their previous occupations at any time. Will proposed that this might be more prevalent for some than for others:
I think journalists struggle with it just because of the identity of a journalist…. One of the things we do as journalists is to be sceptical of everything. I [ask] how far am I in the door [to education] or in the other door between journalism? [for me] It is still one foot in and one foot out. (Will)

Even though Ralph regards himself as “full time institution” for now, he still maintains a back-up plan:

Once this job gets too much I’m going back to what I know… I’ve got an out, but sometimes it feels like that. I’m not scared of that place. (Ralph)

Academic immigrant teachers
All sixteen participants conformed to the view that academic immigrant teachers were generally attracted to teaching in ITP’s because of the applied and practice based nature of the skills learning. The idea being that learning occurred by “touching it, feeling it, doing it and actually learning by doing it”. This was seen as a reason why industry professionals are highly regarded because they bring in important knowledge that is based in the reality of industry practice. Chris described this as not only being “great for the students” but also as providing, “a dynamism” in the “informed stance in that person”. Mark mentioned how important these attributes are for successful graduates:

Your work ethic and your motivational mechanism has to be fully developed before you leave because, just as we won’t make you do some stuff, nor will the employer. (Mark)

Mark also discussed how he felt responsible for nurturing the students into the industry by “talking about language and all that kind of thing”. He suggested, “there has to be enough of a world exposure in what we do”. Reg agreed and admitted his fears:

It scares the living crap out of me that we send students out there who are not resilient. It would scare me if they weren’t resilient, if they hadn’t actually considered all these things that we’ve talked about today and be able to hold their heads up and to argue against a venue or a band member. (Reg)
It was noted by some participants that there were difficulties in attracting industry professionals to come and teach and join the institution. For some discipline areas, such as the trades represented by Andrew, Craig, Gary, John and Wayne, it was suggested that this was particularly difficult when the economy was doing well. Wayne also pointed out how the context of the individual industry may affect the way that industry professionals can engage with teaching:

If you think about the nature of the plumbing and the construction trades, a lot of those guys work out of a van. So for Craig to say to a guy I want to hire you for two hours I’ll pay you $X – he drives in his van, does the business and goes on with his day. Automotive guys you can’t do that, they don’t work out of van. Engineers, fitters and turners, fabricators, welders, they don’t work out of vans. They work in dedicated companies. So for us to go to a company and say I need your process manager or your foremen to come over and teach the kids, it is not going to happen. (Wayne)

The issue of industry professionals capability to teach was also discussed with a general consensus among the participants that it was problematic that industry professionals arrived with varying degrees of capability to teach. Andrew mentioned his concern:

Unfortunately a lot of our tradesmen still treat the kids coming in here as third rate apprentice and they talk down to them. I learnt very early on to treat them as adults. There are things that they don’t know yet but treat them as a person not as an idiot. (Andrew)

Craig expressed similar views and added his concern that many teachers in his environment arrived “cold from industry” and there was a risk that teaching could be missed, “because they have a lack of understanding”. He noted:

Primary and high school [teachers] have to invest themselves into becoming a teacher. Here, nothing, you just get chucked straight in the deep end. (Craig)

Mandy commented that not everyone who is an industry professional was able to walk into a teaching situation and effectively transfer skills within the set of descriptors and the package of delivery that is prescribed by particular institutions and by the requirements of NZQA. For most, “meeting all of those kinds of goal posts [would] be very daunting”. Pru held similar views and
suggested that for some areas there is also a high level of casual industry professional staff who bring their own challenges:

There are different styles. Not everybody is an expert in every genre. Yes, they do struggle with that stuff. (Pru)

In contrast to this, Wallace enthusiastically endorsed the idea that it might be “more advantageous to not be a trained teacher” as he suggested that “you can’t fall back on a teaching exercise to teach something, you have got to nut it out”. He described how he approaches his classes:

I like to think I’m always prepared to respond to what is happening in the real world and go with that. (Wallace)

Disconnections
All sixteen participants highlighted the issue of staff who have come directly from industry into institutional environments not readily identifying with the organisation that they were now part of. A wide variety of barriers were discussed including educational bureaucracy, feelings of “not being understood”, tensions around the teaching of specialist skills, and the nature of academic research. Organisational constructs such as Faculties and Departmental arrangements were also sometimes difficult for academic immigrant teachers to identify with as they had the ability to “change the way you feel about the environment”. Sally offered a possible reason why these disconnects occur so readily when she suggested:

The reason industry professionals come into the institution is not to engage at any other level than the teaching of the students and subjects that we’re teaching. (Sally)

All of the participants noted that for their colleague academic immigrant teachers, there was a greater identification with their team, their subject, their department and their programme, rather than with the institution as a whole. Chris noted that among his staff there wasn’t a great sense of “I work for [the institution]”, it was more “I work for the [department]”. It was suggested by a
number of the participants that this sometimes resulted in ‘siloed’ thinking or ‘feral’ behaviours being displayed within units or departments.

Sophie had similar sentiments and explained that in her experience industry professionals come to teach the subject that they are ‘passionate’ about and that they have a ‘loyalty to’. She sees it as being about the subject and not necessarily the institution:

The institution constantly complain that the staff don’t seem to engage with the institution at certain levels. It is because no one cares. Because actually we might identify with the department, because the department is seen as the enabler for learning. But the institution? – it could be any institution… [If] this programme got moved across to [another institution] the next day, that is where [we] would have gone. Let’s face it, the institutions could amalgamate tomorrow and who cares? Nothing to do with the institutions. (Sophie)

Pru suggested that it was the students that kept her staff teaching rather than the institution, which she described as “just another employer”. Will commented how he encourages his staff to “look after our students” first. He describes the priority as being “students number one and not the institution”. Gary also suggested that it was more about the students and less about the workplace. He spoke enthusiastically about his belief that his staff were “here because they like being here”. He explained:

You look at any of the tutors around here and it is about the students. We might have a couple of people that might count hours, but we’ve got the others that it is just for the enjoyment of it… I don’t think any of my tutors are here because it is a job and it is not being in the ditch or the dirty water or underneath the car. (Gary)

Pru stated similarly that among her staff there was no sense of “I’m just working to get to that break”, but rather what keeps them working there is a passion for the students. Dot shared similar sentiments:

I think you’ll find the only reason that these people have bothered to leave the industry and come and do this – some of them want to get off the tools, but the reason they’ve chosen this is because they actually really like working with the students and they really care for their students. I haven’t heard a single story about a staff member in anyone’s department who is just here because it is a job. Let’s face it, it is not a highly paid job – it is ok. (Dot)
Organisational change activities were also seen to contribute to disconnecting staff from the institution. Many mentioned that in their environments there was a feeling that there was “always another thing on the horizon”, and frustration that “just as you got used to one thing, they changed it to something else”. Mandy discussed the “tinkering” that has gone on in her environment where a faculty was created with departments:

It felt good to belong to. But there is just corporate higher up. It is funny… as soon as you start doing those [changes] it changes the flavour, it changes the feel, it changes your feel of what it is that you’re belonging to. I don’t actually want to belong to a corporate department. (Mandy)

Mark had similar views and suggested that it was a “better model to exist in, in the creative field, than a corporate model that has got a business overlay”. He also explained how this led to confusion around leadership which was also seen to be unsettling as you “wake up one morning and find that you are now a manager, you are not a head of school”.

Several participants also raised the issue of tenure as being a barrier. Wallace explained that he has difficulties with an education industry that “keeps people on these short term part-time contracts”:

I kind of see from their point of view why they would do it, but I don’t understand how it managed to get its grip on the industry. See I would never have stayed teaching if I didn’t get a permanent job, there is no way. And that is actually about pride. (Wallace)

Will agreed that this is a major issue and causes him “constant grief”. He proposed that there are issues beyond the institution that caused some of these problems:

And I know the way they’re doing it because it is their way of fitting into what TEC decides to change its mind on every two years, so they don’t want to be locked in with this staff if they can’t move. But it doesn’t help. (Will)
**Disconnect with bureaucracy**

When examining the reasons that academic immigrant teachers might not identify with their respective organisations, Wallace was forthright in his belief that the difficulty stems from the bureaucratic nature of institutional systems:

> I can’t stand the institution, honestly the biggest issue for someone like me coming here is having this bureaucracy – it is just weird. That was just completely foreign to me. (Wallace)

Chris was more circumspect as he noted that while his background made him feel very comfortable with managing, he felt that the challenges were more around becoming accustomed to the process of the institution and that the biggest challenge was “how they do things on a day to day basis”. Pru also suggested that institutional systems were part of the problem:

> It is still hard for them [Industry Professionals] to buy into the institutionalised systems such as moderation, the NZQA stuff, we’ve got to do lesson plans, we’ve got to fill that box, we’ve got to write this report – that is the stuff I’ve always struggled with, with my colleagues, getting them to buy into that because they don’t see the point. (Pru)

However, Pru discussed that eventually, and with persistence, “a light bulb goes off” and the staff start to get it. She observed:

> We actually have to mitigate the fact that yes it is important for a [professional] to do these things, but it is also important for them in a contemporary society to also learn in this way, and actually it is managing that tension which is harder. (Pru)

Wayne highlighted how his staff who are generally not known for their writing skills, battle to do reports. He notes the kick back that he gets from his staff with the standard reply to his request to complete the reports being, “no! Get the girls down the bottom to do the reports - that is admin work”. John offered another perspective where the trades teachers had difficulty engaging with some of the processes expected by NZQA around evaluation and reflective practice. He explained how staff reacted following a successful moderation exercise where there was an expectation that staff would reflect on the changes that they had made:
Who gives a shit! We’re trades people, if there is a problem in front of it getting in there, get it sorted out and get it fixed up. My reflective practice is ‘there was a problem, it is finished’. (John)

**Disconnect between past and present workplace cultures**

All of the participants noted that there was a perceived disconnect with their institution about the tangible differences between their previous professional life and their current academic one. Some suggested that the difficulty lay with academic immigrant teachers bringing “the culture of the old workplace” with them and sometimes it is “all they know” and they are not prepared to change. Gary’s new manager could not handle the culture of his area and described it as being “very blokey and very sweary and shouty”. Ralph had a similar example but suggested that the “rough bravado” is sometimes a “healthy part of the environment”. He explained:

That might just be the modus operandi – there are things you have to moderate, but there could be elements of it that are part of a healthy workplace environment for some of those people. (Ralph)

The participants also discussed how their institutions did not always understand the type of teaching that is required for their respective disciplines. Sally has people in her institution who are experts in assessment and who know that there are many different ways of assessing, yet the resistance they get from people when they try to get them to shift to try something new is “really difficult”. She suspects that some of the problem stems from the institutions lack of knowledge about the specific teaching needs of each discipline.

Academic immigrant teachers were seen by all of the participants as having an air of ‘credibility’ which was associated with the student perception that these teachers represent the real skills and attributes of the industry toward which they are training. Reg suggested that it is important for students to feel they can ‘respect’ their tutors because of their professional background and knowledge. Sally explained that there are a lot of teaching programmes that don’t understand the rigour of the industry and that “they’re not really doing the students a favour because they’re not actually teaching them all that stuff
that you were talking about before”. She explained how the academic immigrant teacher understood the reality of the industry and was able to advise students of their best course of action when studying:

You are giving them a realistic education that they will be able to go out and flourish. They will be able to hit the ground running and actually be able to succeed. Sometimes that is a bit of tough love for them, but it is tough love in kindness and in friendship and support and at the same time making sure that they know what is going to be expected of them and being able to know that they are going to be strong enough to succeed there. Having the skills as well as the attitude to succeed. (Sally)

It was, however, acknowledged that there is a propensity for some academic immigrant teachers to disregard the proscribed teaching materials or guidelines and to teach what they feel is important based on their own perspectives. Andrew shared that one of the regular arguments that he has had with longer-term tutors is having to remind them that “we are training electricians, not electrical engineers”. He reminds them:

If they want to do electrical engineering they move from here up a level. They don't need to know this to a level 7 depth. This is level 2. Teach them the basics! (Andrew)

The discussion around not being understood also touched on the extent to which industry professionals should adopt the cultures of their new workplace. Sophie highlighted a problem with wholly adopting a new culture when she suggested that “if you have got people who aren’t coming to teach until they’re in their late 30s, it is a little bit late to start changing the person completely”. The general consensus was that both industry professionals and the academic institutions, need to accommodate a “blending of cultures”.

*Disconnect with the way we teach*

Another area of disconnect that was discussed by the participants was a tension with learning and teaching methodologies, and in particular the drive toward on-line learning modes. Gary shared a misunderstanding about teaching in his field:
There is that lack of understanding, our people here think that students will pick up a book and learn from it and I’m going that is not how automotive, and I imagine plumbing guys and carpentry guys learn. They learn in the traditional learning style. That is see, watch, do, touch – get told and are happy to be told and all that sort of stuff. I watch our students and in fact they still learn that way, very, very much so. (Gary)

Andrew related how an ‘outsider’ was trying to suggest a way of using a single project to cover a wide range of assessment that had limitations in his environment:

For instance - the mechanical guys made a go cart and he would say things like, tell me things about this go-cart. If someone can make this they surely must know everything that’s in level 2, but it doesn’t tick all the boxes. It’s not quite that good. And he couldn’t see that. (Andrew)

It was acknowledged that teaching staff were generally concerned with adopting e-learning and other digital technologies. Sally pointed out that “most of [our work] is very practical… you’re trying to tell me that I have to teach sewing on-line is completely ludicrous”. The concern was not only about the ‘need’ to employ digital technologies, but also about their own ‘abilities’ to use the technology and to be able to demonstrate it to their students. Wayne described fears surrounding the pressure to move much of the learning online and to employ more computer based learning in his environment. He suggested that there may be a mismatch in expectation of staff:

Our guys were employed as bulldogs, all of a sudden [the organization] wants them now to be Jack Russell’s and the guys are saying ‘but I’m a tradesman, I’m not a Jack Russell – I’m not on a computer, I don’t know about that stuff’. (Wayne)

He acknowledged that there needs to be a mind shift, and that it cannot simply be seen as “sorry mate, you’re an old sock we don’t need you anymore”. He explained:

We still need the skills on one hand, because they’re still at trade school and we’re still teaching trade schools, but on the other hand we need to have computer skills as well. And to say we’re going to be teaching with a computer but I want you to teach trade skills – and a lot of the guys can’t see the link. (Wayne)
This seeming inability to change and develop was also seen to run over into frustration, as Wayne shared that many of his staff commented to him “If I wanted to work on computers and academia I’d go to University”. He noted:

There are also guys that just don’t have the ability to change. Unfortunately, as our manager said in one of his darker moments, he was wondering if it wouldn’t be better to just disenfranchise everybody – knock them all back and say reapply for your roles. (Wayne)

A number of participants also suggested that some staff simply did not want to change because it was too much hard work. It was seen as a question of how much a teacher “invested in learning and teaching” and “what works and what doesn’t”. Sophie saw people who have “never bothered to engage” and that they simply “do what they do because that is what they’re comfortable with”. Wayne proposed that it was a case of personalities:

Some guys will only deal with one task at a time, there is no point giving him two because he is going to fail at both of them, so you have to learn to manage them. But other guys that can do tasks at a time. Some guys are good with senior apprentices, but not good with the junior apprentices. Other guys love the junior apprentices but can’t really deal with the seniors. So it is all these demographics that you’ve got to manage. (Wayne)

Another point that was raised which follows this discussion were the links between Academic immigrant teachers understanding of teaching and their own experiences of learning. Mark proposed, “we are creatures who will refer back to how we were taught”. He often finds himself in situations where he draws back on what it was like for him as a student. Mandy agreed but added that the process is a complex one:

Of course we do, we deliver from where we learn but we integrate that and we change it and we morph it and we gain our own new understandings of it and we need to develop it, or we should be. (Mandy)

Andrew reflected on his own first days teaching, “I came in to the job knowing all about electrical and by the end of the first week I discovered that I didn’t know anything electrical at all!” He suggested this was because he knew how
to ‘do it’, but not necessarily how to ‘show someone else’ how to do it. When reflecting on how his staff learned to teach he suggested:

I suppose its memories of school and what the teacher did, it’s also watching the guys that were [already] here and how they worked. (Andrew)

Sophie shared her view about the way that she learns:

The way I learn, I am shown how to do things. I learn by watching and I learn by doing. If you give them (students) words on paper they become a bit confused, they can’t follow written instruction, they follow being shown. That is why the environment that I taught them in, where they are in a studio... they are being shown what it is like. That was incredibly important. (Sophie)

John also shared his experience of learning when he was an apprentice:

I remember my apprenticeship and I had this time of really good learning and then you just plateaued. No matter what you tried to do you were stuck on this plateau. (John)

When reflecting on the apprenticeship models in industry Gary suggested that they are flawed and that “you do not get taught everything that is needed simply by learning in the workplace”:

In the industry it is all about making the dollar. You just happen to learn as you go along... You learnt what you got taught. Nowadays it is “there is the job – I learnt about that because I actually did it two or three times”, but you don’t understand how it works or what works. (Gary)

Wayne commented on the conundrum that it was no longer good enough to just have someone who was good at his or her trade:

So I have got to get staff that can engage, who have a good personality who multi-tasks in computers and a trade. In the past as well, back weld these and fill in all these bits of metal to me, or turn to X tolerance and if you can do it you’ve got the job – no you can’t. What is your computer skills like? Couldn’t turn the damn thing on – oh well, sorry mate. You could have the best trade skills in the world but if you can’t multitask in a trade and on a computer, where are you going to go. Either I’ve got to find a computer person who has got no trade skills, where is the knowledge? (Wayne)
Mandy alluded to a tension in her area where some industry professionals have conflicting views of the way that you teach young people for the industry. When responding to a comment from one prominent industry practitioner that “you can teach everything you need to know in two weeks and then all you need to do is to practice”, her response was:

Absolutely bollocks, you can’t, but for me it is about getting down to the nitty gritty about what other really basic tools and craft areas that need to be delivered upon. (Mandy)

Craig went further by suggesting that industry has “no idea”:

It is like we’ve re-developed the carpentry programme and we were talking about soft skills and they went – soft skills, we don’t have soft skills, we’re builders. But when I explained what it was – oh yeah, that is what we need. They just want someone to turn up on time who doesn’t smell. (Craig)

Craig was ‘given stick’ by some of his staff when he asked them to try something new. They would argue that this new way of teaching was not as good as the old tried and true methods. He explained:

In my view they are falling back into old patterns because they don’t know how to [change]. In some cases they have a genuine fear and a good case for that because as an organisation we never help them get or achieve to this new place. So we come along and there is HR, a self-reflection form, no training. It is well founded that fear. But it is a pain in the arse for the management. (Craig)

Andrew pointed out that a major problem for his staff, especially those who have been teaching for many years, is the ingrained nature of unit standards. Many staff held onto unit standards because it was what they understood. They would say that students “don’t need to know that because it’s not a unit standard” and he felt that this resulted in the electrical course being really boring. He explained that unit standards were designed to be an assessment tool but from the beginning they were used as a teaching tool and “it never really made much sense”. He noted that:

Trying to get back into a practical based delivery where they are actually doing things has become a struggle with some of the guys that have been there a while. (Andrew)
Ray wryly described a situation where many of his staff, particularly the older ones, have been complaining about having to teach unit standards ever since they arrived. “Unit standards are crap, they’re badly written, and all the rest of it”. Yet when confronted with having to change, “oh no, no – I couldn’t do that change”. He mused that they simply did not have the confidence to change.

Craig described a similar example of a staff member who had been working in the department for 32 years and had never taken the opportunity to learn how to change:

He doesn’t have that confidence to change initially, but when you put it all back he was turned down 20 years ago [for a promotion]. So that is it and he hasn’t engaged in any [professional development] since then. (Craig)

Craig thought the timidity to try new things was related to the fact that his staff were not trained teachers. He believed that their timidity was based on the fact that they were simply scared of making a mistake - “If they make a mistake and they’re going to get in trouble”. Or worse still, “they might do badly by their students, that is their greatest fear”.

The participants discussed another common tension that was experienced with academic immigrant teachers not valuing the teaching of theory. Pru observed how students have adopted a negative regard for theory in her environment. This attitude was coming from some staff who were quite vocal about not valuing the teaching of theory, and as a result she “feels sorry for the teachers who teach the theory”, explaining:

They get the worse reports because they [the students] adore all their movement and dance and acting tutors but when it comes to the fact... so the teachers cop it. (Pru)

Chris sees a disconnect with the place of theory in the world of work:

I had colleagues who were just total theory buffs and lived it and breathed it – which was great, they were really passionate about it. They instil that in their students and the students would do a practical project and they’d talk about, but they’d talk about it in relation to these theories and I’d kind of go – ok, makes sense. But the work doesn’t necessarily stand up on it’s own merits – it needs accompanying text or argument in order to communicate what the
student wanted to communicate. You do that in industry and you won’t get the job. I’m not advocating that theory isn’t important – it does have an important place – I’m just very conscious of the importance of designing for context – and of instilling that connotation of designing for context in students. (Chris)

Andrew took a different position sharing his frustration about the high level of theory in his discipline:

Electrical is probably the worst because there is a whole lot of absolutely irrelevant theory that you supposedly have to know if you want to become an electrician. Never mind that you never use it in the work place! But you are supposed to have to know. Most of the other trades are still and always have done projects. The builders build houses, the mechanics strip an engine down and put it back together again, the plumbers plumb stuff, the panel beaters beat the hell out of bits of metal. The electricians sit in the class. (Andrew)

**Disconnected with traditional forms of academic research**

The area of academic research is closely identified with traditional academic identity and is noted by all of the participants as presenting a stumbling block for some industry professionals to engage as academics and, as a result, to engage with the institution. Issues were identified such as the inability of polytechnics to allow sufficient time for research and, in many cases, a fundamental misunderstanding of what academic research actually is. The inability of ITP’s to consistently describe research in the contexts of the sector and the actual nature of research in the scope of being an academic in an ITP presented a problem for many of the participants.

John’s noted that his staff often confused research with professional development. He mentioned that staff sees it as “going out and getting back on the tools so that [they] can reconnect with that”. Sally suggested that the reason for this might be that “we are not career academics, we’re not there to become researchers and move off into other areas”. For Mandy one of the big areas that had arisen over the last few years was how creative practice related to research:

The daunting nature or the mystifying nature of what we do as practitioners relates to creative research and you are within a programme that has research aims and staff who are on research
condition and active researchers. TEC did bend over backwards to make sure that there were big improvements, in terms of the way their descriptive constituted creative research but it is still difficult for practitioners from the industry. (Mandy)

Ralph proposed that if a teacher is going to be better as a teacher, and if they are engaged in their practice, then surely that is fulfilling what NZQA are talking about with regards to research, in that there is a “feeding into teaching from outside experiences”. He explained:

Research can be a whole lot of different things and we’re talking about applied research. Practice based research mostly, and you’re doing academic research here but of course it is in a very applied area. If, for instance, we were to look at the researchers who are doing real research writing, articles, thinking, coming up with new ideas – I don’t think many of those processes touch with what we are talking about necessarily, because we are talking more about being in touch with the industry and practice and where it is going and what sort of things, so that we can stay current and fresh for ourselves and teaching, and feel that we have a currency. So I think the NZQA definition more fits the pure research thing. (Ralph)

Reg held similar views that “the vocabulary vernacular of a discipline or a trade or whatever you want to name that, is valuable” however he suggested that he sees a problem that may lay with ITP’s who bring people in to teach who have got limited understanding of research beyond their practice. He explained:

Ten years ago I would have been arguing that your practice is research and that academic immigrant teachers are excellent people to have in there and we should have as much of that as possible. I don’t know whether it is these bloody white haired “I fought hard for these white feathers on the side of my head”. I don’t know if it’s just getting old or what it is, but I do think there is a higher order conversation to be had. (Reg)

Mandy proposed that the problem for her profession may be the very nature of the practice:

We don’t tend to look back. We put everything into the project we’re doing. That project lives in that moment and it might have some documentation around it, but we move on to the next thing. I think it is actually not naturally in our inclination to look and pick everything apart if we have to focus on a research question. (Mandy)
Will similarly observed that in his area there is also not a natural predilection to reflect:

It is one of the things about the area of journalism is that we don’t reflect. If we do, sometimes it is more just out of a moment, or that is how it ends up being. (Will)

By comparison, Chris suggested that one of the best things about working in a tertiary environment was the research culture. As a manager, Chris tried to reframe research for his staff and to talk about the “huge opportunities which come with that”. He reported that some staff “embraced the opportunities and did extraordinary things” while others “took the opportunity for granted”, and produced “questionable” and “very poor outcomes” for what was a significant investment from the organisation. He explained:

I think that that creates huge opportunity for team members, and for students. I was really aware that I had team members who were really engaged with research, and that research culture enabled them to do things that you couldn’t do within the industry, or that it would be very difficult to do in the industry – primarily because there isn’t such a direct link between allocation of resource, and applied financially sustainable outputs. (Chris)

Transitions – Becoming an academic

A key issue for all of the participants when discussing the various problems associated with the way that academic immigrant teachers adapt to the teaching environment was the lack of transition processes in the form of induction and socialisation in their respective institutions. Most experienced being “dumped in front of a class with little or no preparation”. They described this as a “baptism by fire” where staff were “thrown in front of students” within days of arriving to teach, with “no time to learn what to do or how to do it”. The following comments illustrate this:

I arrived at 8 o’clock on a Monday morning and the boss said, here is the workshop book, there is the workshop, there are 16 kids in there, go and teach them! (Andrew)

I did only walk in the door two weeks beforehand. I had spent a bit of time with them weeks earlier than that, and I had a bit of a
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background and done a fair bit of reading but in terms of teaching that was actually a bit of a shock for me. (Will)

The first day I got here, straight in front of the class. That was my induction into teaching. (John)

It is horrific. The night before you are busy trying to teach yourself what the next day is going to be. (Wayne)

Andrew, who has worked in his institution for 16 years joked, “yeh, I’m still waiting for my induction (laughs)”. He believes that his institution should “put the guys through their certificate in adult teaching before putting them in a classroom” but it “doesn’t happen”. He explained:

Occasionally it does where someone whose interested in teaching for a career option comes in and does the courses as an night class and then applies for a job. But usually its they have decided that they wanted to get out of what they are doing... (Andrew)

Gary’s solution to the lack of formal induction was to create an informal structure. He explained what he suggested his new staff do to orient themselves into the teaching environment:

I said every now and again just go and walk into a class which is operating perfectly with perfect students in it, just sit in the back and just watch. [Your] job is going to be dealing with all the little horrible ones maybe. You can get yourself right down into their world, you need to go and hop into their world every now and again just to get your head right, if you like. You can spend a lot of time in this job dealing with horrible students, but you only need an hour with some really good students and you forget about all the horrible. (Gary)

Wayne agreed with this approach but cautioned that when you mentor staff it is another thing you have to be very careful of, “you don’t want to give a new staff member to a person that has got bad old habits”. Craig was quite angry about the lack of induction and he blamed it for a number of problems that he was experiencing with some of his staff. He noted:

There needs to be a long-term scenario where it gets embedded. This is how we do it. If we looked at all the management and said ‘of course we’re in the pickle we are’, it is because we don’t have induction periods, saying this is what we do, we don’t train. We’ve pulled people off the street – you’re out there, you can start. (Craig)
He was also concerned about the lack of rigour that seemed to be in place in ITP’s around the quality of some of the staff they employed to teach. He commented:

To get your teaching registration it is two years of being mentored. So where is our mentoring process? That was one of the things that came up. We have policy but not in practice because we can’t afford it. We want to run a new programme next year and I can’t employ someone for that until it starts. If you are breathing you are in because I’ve got students turning up. (Craig)

Better transition – better connection

The participants discussed the provision of professional development as a way of connecting staff with the institution. Many of the them agreed that academic immigrant teachers tended to view professional development in terms of a chance to return to industry to undertake a professional job, rather that an opportunity to develop new skills. For example, most institutions require their tenured staff to undertake some form of basic teacher training, however the actual compulsion to undertake the training varies between institutions. Generally this training takes the form of a certificate in adult learning, however the participants reported mixed interest from their staff in professional development that was aimed at “learning how to teach”.

Mandy shared her experience of piloting a tailor-made course that addressed a range of these concerns. She began being sceptical, but in the end found it fascinating:

What I found really interesting about it was one of the reasons they are pushing the staff to do these courses, is because a lot of their push is to get staff delivering in a way that is student centred and student driven learning. Of course what it did bring up is that is what we already do, actually we’re the masters of it. So when they talk about Phil Races’ form of feedback and ripples on a pond, our entire delivery system is based around that and all of those kind of theories and models of learning, that what they want people to be aspiring to. There are still lots of things to learn, don’t get me wrong, I got so much useful stuff from doing the course. But it was fascinating in terms of our industry and the way that we work, that I think it can breed really good teachers. (Mandy)
All of the participants recognised, however, that learning how to teach was not the only type of induction that was required, and that a ‘lack of understanding about the functioning of the institution’ can be a considerable challenge for new staff who are already unsure about their role. Ralph noted that “you cannot be expected to assimilate into a new culture if you don’t understand it”. Sophie held similar views and added that ‘there may be a real difficulty in changing the culture of people who come into teaching later in their lives’. There was a general consensus that there should be more focus on ‘how to become’ an academic, rather than the current situation which was seen to be dominated by ‘what you do’ as an academic.

In regard to professional development, Andrew maintained that in his institution professional development does not simply mean to “go off and do a job”. His organisation understands the need to keep staff current in their profession and provides in-house training to assist staff to reconnect with their industries. Other participants were concerned about their institutions “lack of understanding of the importance of trade professional development”. As John explained:

I’ve got to keep my plumbing and gas fitting registration up, so there is that side of it. And in order to do that I have to continue doing professional development that way. I’ve got to do a certain amount of gas fits for that year, so I have to do a certain amount of jobs a year to ensure that I’m still current. You can’t throw it away completely. (John)

Gary, who shared his interview with John, agreed that his staff are very keen to keep up their trade professional development, however his institution did not always see the befits of this:

I need to go and learn how the scanner works and how do I scan a car for its electronics problems and what have you. The guys want to go and do that but the institution… looks at it and goes… (Gary)

John responded that the reason a number of academic immigrant teachers view professional development as an opportunity to return to the industry for a short time is to earn extra income:
The other thing is these places don’t pay enough and depending on how legitimate you want to be with the IRD you’ve either got a good tax benefit on the side, or a tax free benefit on the side. You can work it that way. (John)

Craig had similar views and added another perspective when he suggested that his institution has become so inward focussed that it has pulled back professional development and practical research to the point where it has a “ring fence of identity crisis” that “doesn’t allow us to do what these places are good at, which is discover new things and push them back into industry”. He explained:

We’ve become so inward focussed as an organisation that is doesn’t allow – even though there is a push for [research and development] but a new thing came out just the other day from Dean saying – no research. It doesn’t matter what angle we’re teaching but they deem it only level 6 and above. So as an organisation we are limiting these guys and their ability to grow academia because of policies and processes. (Craig)

Summary
The participants shared their personal narratives of how they experienced being an academic in the New Zealand ITP sector. A key finding in relation to the experience of identity for the participants was that they each held a stronger connection with the identity of their previous (outside) profession than with their current role as an academic. The strength of this connection with their previous professional identity was viewed as defining ‘who I am’ and it was suggested that ‘without that anchor’ they would ‘not recognise themselves’. When reflecting for both themselves and their academic immigrant colleagues whom they manage, there was a firm commitment that they each have feelings of ‘belonging’ as members of ‘bodies of professionals’, which are located outside of the institute in which they are now employed. It is important to note that in the case of some of their academic immigrant colleagues this is despite the fact that many of them had been teaching for many years, with some teaching for longer than they were actively engaged in their outside profession.
A finding related to this was non-identification among academic immigrants with traditional concepts of ‘academia’. The participants recounted that industry professionals coming from industry who had little or no background in teaching generally rejected the titles ‘academic’, ‘lecturer’ and ‘researcher’ as they found them confronting. They explained that these concepts were seen to be distant from their personal experiences of working in an ITP. It was also noted that there was confusion about the terms ‘teacher’ and ‘tutor’, however these were seen to be more comfortable for the majority of academic immigrants as they more closely resembled what they did on a daily basis.

Sustaining professional connections and being seen by their peers as ‘practicing professionals’ and as those who maintain ‘industry credibility’ was also important for the participants. For some this was simply to enable them to continue to interact at a certain level with their respective industry, for others it was a back-up plan for shifting out of teaching and back to the profession. Professional credibility was seen to work both ways as evidenced by ITP’s publically valuing and actively recruiting industry professionals because of their skills and recognised credibility with industry. A number of participants suggested that there was also a desire of not wanting to be ‘lost to academia’. It was also noted that there is an element of ‘credibility’ associated with the student perception that teachers represent the real skills and attributes of the industry toward which they are training which motivated these feelings.

Another key finding which relates to experiences of academic identity was a disconnect that led to non-identification between academic immigrants and the educational institutions in which they work. All sixteen participants suggested that academic immigrants display stronger identification, often in the form of ‘loyalty’, with their subject, team, programme, and/or department, rather than the educational organisation as a whole. A number of cultural and bureaucratic barriers were identified which created tension in their colleagues’ dealings with the institution, while having the side effect of strengthening the relationship between their colleagues internally within their own units. It was suggested by a number of the participants that this sometimes resulted in
‘silied’ thinking or ‘feral’ behaviours being displayed within units or departments. Many of the barriers were suggested to result from ‘clashes’ of culture between previous working identities as professionals and new working identities as academics. The main barriers identified by the participants were the requirement to engage in traditional forms of ‘academic’ research, a universal dislike of organisational bureaucracy (also related to academic processes), and feelings of uncertainty about contemporary learning and teaching methods.

The bureaucratic nature of educational organisations was seen as being a significant barrier by all of the participants. The participants reported that many of their staff had little interest in engaging with any activity that is seen as being bureaucratic. Staff were seen to be generally more interested in engaging in the teaching only. The participants explained that while they had generally adapted to deal with this bureaucracy, their staff colleagues still struggled, with a substantial number simply ‘opting out’ of any engagement, regardless of their contractual obligations to the organisation.

The differences between their previous professional life and their current academic one were discussed as forming a tangible barrier for most academic immigrants. This was both cultural and functional. Some suggested that the difficulty lay with academic immigrants bringing “the culture of the old workplace” with them and sometimes it is “all they know” and they are “not prepared to change”. There was also a strong feeling among the participants that in many cases, Institutions did not understand (or respect) the specific type of teaching that was required for their respective disciplines.

Academic immigrant teachers were seen to experience difficulty with contemporary teaching and learning methodologies and did not value the teaching of theory. There was concern among some of the participants that academic immigrants see themselves primarily as people who ‘pass on knowledge’, following the traditions of learning in their disciplines and ‘the way that they were taught’, rather than as teachers in a contemporary sense. It was suggested that this might result from a perceived belief that institutions
do not understand the specific educational needs of specialised disciplines. The majority of the participants indicated, however, that these issues derive from a lack of formal teacher education prior to entering the classroom.

The requirement to engage in traditional academic research was seen to pose significant barriers for the majority of the participants and their staff. This was related to the understanding (or mis-understanding) and articulation (or non-articulation) of ‘what research actually is’ for each discipline. It was suggested that the reason for this might be that academic immigrants are “not career academics” and therefore are “not there to become researchers”. A number of participants also pointed out that their staff confused research with professional development where it was seen by staff as “going out and getting back on the tools”. For some it was also about a serious lack of sufficient resources in the form of space and time, to be able to undertake research.

A further key finding in this section related to transition processes for academic immigrants entering higher education. It was recognised by the participants that whilst academic immigrants may have learned to adapt to their new working environment, their sense of identity generally resonates more with their past professional experience and socialisation in other employment settings. In order to assist academic immigrants to more easily adopt an academic identity and to gain a sense of belonging to both their ‘old’ and their ‘new’ professions, all of the participants indicated that institutional induction and socialisation processes need to be improved. Most of the participants’ personal experience included a distinct lack of adequate induction with numerous examples provided of being “dumped in front of a class with little or no preparation”. This was variously described as a “baptism by fire” where staff were “thrown in front of students” within days of arriving to teach, with “no time to learn what to do or how to do it”. The participants recognised that learning how to teach is not the only type of induction that is required, and that a ‘lack of understanding about the functioning of the institution’ can be a considerable challenge for new staff who are already unsure about their role. There was consensus among the participants that most current induction and socialisation processes were not adequate to
address all of the issues that lead to academic immigrants feeling disconnected from the institution. There was general consensus that there should be more focus on ‘how to become’ an academic, rather than the current situation which is dominated by ‘what you do’ as an academic.

This summary of section one has highlighted a number of key findings, which will be discussed in the next chapter. They are:

• Academic immigrants hold stronger connection with the identity of their previous (outside) profession than with their current role as an academic
• Academic immigrants do not identify with traditional concepts of ‘academia’ and ‘academic identity’
• Academic immigrants display non-identification and are often disconnected from their respective institutions due to a number of barriers (including traditional forms of academic research, academic processes and bureaucracy, and contemporary learning and teaching methodologies)
• Academic immigrants perceive that there is a cultural and functional disconnect within institutions about the tangible differences between their previous professional life and their current academic one.
• Professional transition processes such as induction and socialisation for academic immigrants entering higher education are seen to be inadequate in many cases and in need of improvement.
5.2 Multiple contexts of identity

In relation to how academic immigrant leaders experience multiple contexts of identity, data have been grouped into three themes. Theme one, **Leading and managing** explores the participants’ perceptions of their role as middle leaders and managers and the relationship with their colleagues and the institution, as well as workload issues. Theme two, **Transitions - Learning to lead**, provides an overview of the participant’s experiences of their induction and socialisation into the leadership role. Finally theme three, **Tensions between institutional and discipline priorities** presents an overview of the leaders role in championing their respective discipline areas within the institution.

**Leading and managing**

When considering the multiple contexts of identity that accompany the leadership (and management) role, all of the participants located the discussion within a frame that acknowledged their multiple roles as industry professional, teacher and academic leader. Each participant demonstrated a personal disposition to undertake the move toward academic leadership and related this to their work histories with all noting how their professional background influenced their leadership style and approach. An example of this was given by Pru who described, “as a script editor you are facilitating and I see my role as a facilitator as well”, to explain how she saw her background contributing to her role as a manager.

The participants also discussed how the professional cultures of their previous profession relate to the cultures of their new environments. Those participants with backgrounds in the creative sector suggested that ‘creatives don’t like having someone above them’ and prefer a collegial structure of management while those participants from the trades area spoke about strictly ‘hierarchical’ structures that were accepted as the norm. Dot commented that managing is a mix of things:

If you do the hierarchy manager thing all the time, I don’t personally want to work like that, I don’t find that interesting. But sometimes you
do have to say this is what we’re doing and there are other times where the collegial thing is absolutely the right way to progress things. (Dot)

Will added that his background influences that thinking:

It is quite funny actually because for me, I suppose I come from a hierarchical thing which is news media... Sometimes I'm reacting hierarchically... Other times I'm waiting to be collegial because that is the way forward, which is probably in that academic way of growing people. (Will)

All sixteen participants described themselves in terms of being a manager, rather than leader. This was determined to be associated with the nature of the activities being undertaken as an academic middle leader, rather than any specific discrepancy with the concept of the leadership role. As Reg noted:

My 22 year old daughter asked me the other day “what do you actually do, Dad?” I said “I sign things”. (Reg)

Ralph suggested the structure of leadership in the ITP sector, which places managers “right in the middle”, contributed to his ability to lead. Andrew explained his role as being ‘in the middle’ where he is “the meat in the sandwich” as he serves the organisations vision while aligning himself with his staff as a kind of ‘translator’. He is regarded “as being basically independent” by his staff, but he suggests that he has little power and is ‘beholden to those above’. His staff sees him “as someone struggling against an impossible position and treading water”. As he noted, “there are days when I think I get pressure from both sides”. For some of the participants, the academic leader role is broader than any agreed categorisation of either ‘leader’ or ‘manager’, with some suggesting that ‘mentor’, ‘problem-solver’, ‘councillor’, ‘referee’ and even ‘nurse-maid’ need also be included.

Chris mentioned a restructure at his institution that established a layer of middle management which was “a half-way point to being a head of school and what used to be called a team leader”. He described the complications of being in the middle:
You just can’t do it – you don’t have time. I’m managing 45 individual modules each semester. And I had 16 direct reports but I was also managing 4 programmes, and those programmes had probably 30 people teaching on them. I would be managing the module which was taught by somebody who I didn’t manage but because I managed the module I sort of essentially managed them as well, so it was a clunky structure. I had active one on one relationships with people who didn’t report to me, and who I had to get a team member performance out of. If I spent time on each of those team members that is all I’d do. (Chris)

Ralph suggested that as a manager “you don’t know everything, you develop into a good manager”. He expressed his desire to achieve “the respect of people in those areas, and my own respect that I enjoy those areas”, but he also acknowledged the difficulties that may arise when “dealing with your mates”. Dot simply felt that her job as a manager was to make sure that her colleagues could get on with their job. Andrew was very clear about his understanding of his role as a manager:

A manager doesn’t actually do things – a manager gets other people to do things and you get them to do that by cajoling and manipulating. You’ve got to get people to want to do things and so it’s about getting them to do things that possibly they don’t want to do but cajoling them and doing it anyway. (Andrew)

Changing relationships
A common theme among the thirteen participants who had progressed to become leaders from inside the institution was the change in relationships that they experienced with their colleagues. Ralph struggled with the identity change:

It is awful. Having a moderate relationship with a whole cohort of people some of whom I worked with for 23 years and trying to maintain that. I really struggled with it last year, I still struggle. I’m getting on with it but…it’s been an identity change for me really. (Ralph)

Wayne shared his experience of being promoted before others who had been in the job for the same (or longer) amount of time as himself:

When I joined [the institution] as a tutor, the guys who are now the [seniors] in the department were my mentors. So I have gone over a lot of them. A lot of guys that joined with me around the same months
are still doing what they’re doing. Now I’m managing these two
departments and all the others with them in it. They still see me as a
friend and a colleague and to try and say I’m not anymore, I’ve now
got a different responsibility, I’ve got a different role – you’ve got to try
and sever that. Some of them play on it, some of them use it to their
advantage, others don’t and those that don’t when you’ve got to say
no to them that is where the issue comes in. (Wayne)

Andrew was clear that “it’s always difficult becoming leader of people you
work with” however he suggested that in his case the staff were pretty good
about it, because none of them wanted to do it. For Wayne, the main thing he
learned when he became a manager of his peers was that he had to have a
“thick skin”:

It is difficult in front of a group of people when you’ve got 20 people
looking back at you and half of that you know are against what you’re
trying to do and trying to say. Once you leave the meeting there is
going to be sniggers and vibes and you can hear them going in
laughter down the passage. You’ve got to have a thick skin to say get
on with it. (Wayne)

When reflecting on how their staff regarded them as leaders, the majority of
the participants were unsure. Will suggested that he has ‘not got the faintest
idea’ how his staff see him:

All I can give you really is my reading of their reactions, I’m great with
the students, that I’m disorganised and still getting my head around
everything, they get frustrated around some of that, and that I
probably get a bit too short too quickly because you can’t manage
everything. I might be better after Christmas. (Will)

Ralph shared that he thought that his staff did not have ‘a particularly high
opinion’ of him as a leader:

I sort of have a bit of grief for various reasons with the [specialist]
area, and I don’t think they’ve got a particularly high opinion on me
for various reasons – a few things went down and some of them were
my fault but nothing terribly serious. I think they’re quite happy to bag
me on the way out. (Ralph)

Ralph acknowledged, however that this situation can change very quickly:

It changes like the wind and the year before that it would have be
dle. A lot of that was because I was trying to do both jobs for a year
and I think I abandoned [them], I just found that enormously difficult – coming to grips with a new job. (Ralph)

Chris’s institution had recently completed a restructure, which established a layer of middle management which they called ‘team managers’, which he described as “a half-way point to being a head of school and what used to be called a team leader”. As Chris had come in directly as a manager into this new structure, rather than as a teacher, he had a slightly different perspective of what his staff perceptions were of him as a new comer. He explained:

There were people who were very supportive of me and embraced the fact that I’m from industry and looked at that as an opportunity and looked at that as providing a credibility and providing an information resource which was going to be of value for them and their areas. There were people who looked at that as being very threatening. I had team members who had been sitting in an institution for 10 years or 20 years, doing the same thing I’ve been doing for 20 years, and now this guy is coming along and asking questions about what they’re doing. Who the @#$% are you! (Chris)

Chris also explained that there were also colleagues who reported to him who had worked in academia for only a few years and who had come directly from industry who looked at him as being very supportive. He explained that he was able to work “incredibly closely with [them] because we had similar reference points”.

**Managing staff**

Managing staff was noted by the majority of the participants as being something that they often “struggled” with and which “caused them grief”. Chris noted that the difficulties of managing staff performance for him related to the organisational structure of his institution:

I’m managing 45 individual modules each semester. And I had 16 direct reports but I was also managing 4 programmes, and those programmes had probably 30 people teaching on them. I would be managing the module which was taught by somebody who I didn’t manage but because I managed the module I sort of essentially managed them as well, so it was a clunky structure. I had active one on one relationships with people who didn’t report to me, and who I had to get a team member performance out of. If I spent time on each of those team members that is all I’d do. (Chris)
Another challenge that he faced was having some team members who were not performing to an acceptable standard, who were “able to hide behind process and hide behind the system and hide behind – dare I say, union process and representation”. He suggested that:

There was dead wood there that you couldn’t get rid of; you had to work with it. I know that within industry the dead wood would be gone because you’ve got to perform, if you don’t perform you’re not there. That acceptance of protected poor performance was very frustrating. (Chris)

Chris went on to suggest that the worst scenario was when a team members’ performance was not great and he was unaware of the situation, and heard about it anecdotally after the fact. To correct this he suggested a a radical solution:

How is this for fighting talk - the Sydney Film School for a long time had a policy where no staff could be there for more than five years… I think it would be great because you get freshness. You avoid that institutionalisation. You get critical views. I think you need to have some roles which might require more longevity because there is some depth of institutional experience that adds value. (Chris)

Wayne shared a different scenario in his area where his automotive team were “totally and utterly dysfunctional”. He explained:

There used to be five managers here and the Dean decided that they were going to re-look at the way the school is run so dis-associated all our positions and we had to reapply and of the five only three of us got the roles. ‘X’, ‘Z’ and myself. Obviously I took over the automotive team.

Even under the old manager it was totally dysfunctional and we battled, and battled. It was all over trying to mediate and get everybody to agree, because they were strong characters. A lot of them were A-grade mechanics who have been foremen in workshops and have been used to dealing with motor mechanics - a spade is a spade, and who could be the bigger dog, bark louder, pee higher. So the whole department went through a huge review. One chap left. There were 9 key points of review that had to be taken into place. Three guys were pulled up on being ring leaders and saboteurs and they were named and put out there, so it was rough. (Wayne)

He noted that as a result of this review there were also some positives:
Now we’ve got through that, all of a sudden we’ve brought some new young blood in, and the young blood are the ones that are picking up the change and saying ‘you sit there’, ‘you teach’, ‘these guys are going to do the development’, but remember at the end of the day you are going to use that. So either you create and own it or it is going to be given to you and you have to take it. (Wayne)

In contrast, Gary took a different approach as he explained:

I have this belief in life, they don’t need bosses. People are big enough and ugly enough that they can get on and know how to do their job and there is a guidance area sort of thing for me. And then get on with it. That is how I see things. You’ve got the skills – use your skills. (Gary)

Workload

The issue of workload associated with leading and managing was a hot topic among the participants. All of them discussed juggling the different aspects of their work which ranged from academic through to bureaucratic. Feelings of being “inundated”, or “drowning” and often “fire fighting problems” were common to all. Andrew noted that the managers role had changed from what he originally signed up for:

When I first took it on it was about organising the crew, the programmes and that was it. The boss still did the budget and a lot of the higher duties, the higher people management stuff. That changed with the change of role… Effectively our role became the full management role so we would do the budgeting, the full gamete of everything a manager should do. (Andrew)

Andrew also pointed out that while his contract provided for a 37.5 hour week, he would do at least 45 hours in “a good week”, and much more in “a bad week”. Wallace suggested that the pace is unrelenting:

You don’t stop running until Christmas. And then you’re so shagged you’ve got to have a holiday, and then you come back and you’re running again. (Wallace)

Administrative and bureaucratic issues associated with the role of academic leader came through strongly in all of the participant narratives around workload with a particular concern related to organisational processes that may not function as well as they might. It was suggested that institutions did
not really know what the role requirements for an ‘academic leaders’ actually were. Chris noted that the ‘compliance’ element of his role took up a significant amount of his time, where he would find himself, “chasing people to do stuff that they don’t always see the value of”. He suggested that many of the tasks that are undertaken by managers could be taken up by administration, and that it, “wasn’t a good use of a managers time”. As he noted:

The degree of what I considered to be administrative things just didn’t seem right. I spent a lot of my time doing stuff that should have been done by someone getting paid half of what I was getting. (Chris)

All of the participants suggested that the bureaucratic nature of many of the tasks that are generally undertaken by them are not consistent with their espoused primary function of ‘leading learning’. This was reported as manifesting itself as ‘any additional job that did not have anyone assigned to it and that needed doing was passed onto the academic leader’. The blame for this was assigned to significant reductions in administration and support staff that have occurred in institutions over recent years.

**Transitions - Learning to lead**

Induction and socialisation processes were discussed as being a major issue, with the majority of the participants citing academic leadership induction and training as being inadequate in their respective environments. Pru’s experience of learning to lead was that “you learn as you go”. She explained:

I was doing a lot of managing, juggling – running. I have learned that I do what I do, and that is a big step. It took me a long time to get to it. I have accepted that I am good at what I’m doing. I just get on with doing the job. I don’t think I can tell you what I do. I think it is partly personality – I think that probably has something to do with it. It is that knowledge that you bring from the industry, definitely. It is being able to listen. You’ve got to listen. They are kinds of things that you pick up. You wouldn’t be an actor if you didn’t listen and respond. (Pru)
Chris was conscious of the fact that often the people who become managers were the people who started as a lower level person where they spent time, developed the relationships, then moved up the ranks and, in his own words, “they may know shit about management”. This often resulted in managers having “appalling people skills, but they go up the ranks”. He suggested that, as with any organisation, “it is not about reporting lines it is about the individuals who hold power and hold influence”. He continued:

My first six months were just kind of negotiating and navigating the waters and sussing out the lay of the land, developing relationships and finding out how to actually get things done. (Chris)

Will noted similar observations about the need for formal training for people in leadership roles. He credits a private training and development programme (not provided by his organisation) that he took ‘off his own bat’, that helped him ‘think outside the square’ and which influenced his thinking about leadership:

One of the big things that I carry forward is finding out what people want, or finding out how the world occurs for them. Out of that you see, Ok, let’s see if we can match that to this. It was like light and dark. When I got interested in other people and what they wanted… (Will)

Chris shared his experience of a formal induction programme that was rolled out across his entire organisation for new managers. The development programme went for a whole year with a half-day workshop on a monthly basis. The programme was created because the institution had recently restructured and had created a new layer of middle managers who were to manage teams of staff and programme offerings. He explained how he felt that he did not get good value out of it because the “skill level of the people who were in that process wasn’t even, so they were playing catch up”. He explained:

They were at times really helpful and at times really annoying. The challenge when you’ve got 35 people with a broad range of backgrounds is that there can be a tendency to be very generalist in the training that’s provided. There were some people amongst that group who had no managerial experience and some who had a lot.
I’d had quite a lot of managerial experience so I engaged in all those sessions, but I was also very critical of some of them. (Chris)

He went on to explain that it took him a year before he felt comfortable taking charge:

Probably after a year I felt pretty confident about how things should happen, how to support the teams, who were the blockers, what were the opportunities, what things might look like structurally in five years and what steps we had to put in place to reach that. (Chris)

Whilst not being specifically targeted at leadership training, many institutions do require staff who wish to progress their careers to undertake various courses and training programmes. Mandy spoke enthusiastically about completing a Certificate in Adult Education as part of her development in this area. She described how it helped her to see the institution and her role as a manager in a different light:

Much as I want in going “grumble, grumble, moan”. It was really fascinating because I went “ok, that is not difficult at all, this jargon actually describes exactly what we do and the way that we deliver it” and I can pick these things out and say this is what we do and it demystifies the whole thing. (Mandy)

**Tensions between institutional and discipline priorities**

Changes in work goals that came with taking up a leadership role were noted by all of the participants and were described as being an “uneasy” experience. These were generally encountered as tensions between institutional and discipline priorities. Dot described her feelings:

As a manager, at the level that I’m at, I still have to behave like an employee. I get instructed to do things, some of them are very unpopular, we do them… Especially when we are asked to do this bean counting or asked for things that take us away from what I consider to be teaching and the students, and we’re asked to do this other crazy shit. Anyway, that aside, it is quite an uneasy relationship. (Dot)

Mark pointed out a similar issue where he was given different sets of goals to meet that were primarily financial “rather than spiritual or cultural”. He felt that
when you move into leadership the goal posts literally shift. Mandy explained her take on this as, “there is a tension when a decision being made by those above is having to be enacted by the manager even when they do not necessarily think that it is the best decision for their environment”. She added:

We know that a decision is being made that is around a financial imperative, rather than genuinely driven by student need and the aim of the graduate profile, that is when it is a bitter pill to swallow and it is difficult to deal with… that is the most difficult thing to try to sell, because actually at heart level you know that it is not being driven by the needs of the students and the needs of industry and other things. (Mandy)

Mark, noted that he bases his role as a manager on trust and understandings between members of staff related to their shared professional histories. He noted that it is “all you’ve got to actually feel that you are still connected”. He suggested that his staff believe and trust him because they know:

… that person has lived in your world, worked in your world, there is a respect and a trust there that they are not going to make a decision that rips the heart out of what you’re trying to achieve. (Mark)

All of the participants did, however, acknowledge that it was their responsibility to work with their staff groups to achieve organisational goals. For them, having the particular role identity of academic leader meant acting to fulfil the expectations of the role; coordinating and negotiating interaction with a wide range of stakeholders; and manipulating the environment to control the resources for which the role has responsibility.

Prioritising and protecting
Another aspect of the tension between institutional views of priorities versus the specialist discipline areas view was the participants describing themselves in terms of being ‘protectors’ of their staff and discipline, who ‘translated’ institutional and educational ideas and language into terms that their colleagues could understand. Dot described herself as a “mediator between”. Ralph described it as being “guardians for our areas of practice” and he had to be a bit “cloak and dagger” about it sometimes:
Yeah, that is again where the back rooms of this area, and we’ve got to filter that stuff and not tell anybody else about it. And sometimes they don’t know what we’ve done to protect things. (Ralph)

Mandy described prioritising as “creative accounting”, whereas Ralph describes it as “working the backrooms” and having to “filter that stuff and not tell anybody else about it”. Mark pointed out that there is a “balance between taking class and being in a production outcome that is unique to the field”. He understands that you need to do both, where “the institution will prioritise the class”, however we “prioritise the [production]”. Gary was unequivocal in his view that, “the people above don’t understand the reality of what happens in our trades areas”. Mark finds himself mediating on behalf of his department when he encounters management decisions from above that do not have a clear understanding of how his area operates:

We have had a similar experience where one management person’s interpretation of what you achieve is dictated entirely by their experience within the institution as opposed to another. You have one person saying you can’t do that, there are reasons for that and it is not allowed. And then you get another person who says that has got to be possible because that is what we want to achieve, therefore we have to find a way to make that work. (Mark)

All of the participants shared instances of how they fought to protect things that they felt were under threat from general institutional goals. Some participants defined themselves as ‘champions’ of their respective disciplines, as Sophie explained:

When everything is good and going along as normal it is easy to tow the party line, but as soon as [the institution] tell us to make a change that we think is anti what we are trying to do with our students for our profession, then the hackles go up and we go into full protection mode. (Sophie)

Ralph spoke about the “constant battle” around staff/student ratios in particular areas, such as one-on-one teaching in music, and how he sees he has “always got to stand in the doorway” to protect the need. He described how he has to continually champion his programmes to his institution, particularly in regard to programme viability and costs:
What we do as managers is filter it for the people above, and I think they look down on performing arts and they look at it and go “what the hell are you guys doing and look how much money you’re costing”. Really, our job is to say “hang on, we know what we’re doing here. We’ve got a market, we have people coming in, we have a qualification and we work hard to make sure that it is relevant and other people think that it is worthy through moderation and all those types of things. I think there is a lot of that – it is like keeping them at bay really. Particularly in the current environment, a lot of creative qualifications probably wouldn’t see the light of day if they were reaccredited. (Ralph)

Mandy and Mark, who shared an interview, discussed a similar situation in terms of their experiences with decreasing funding by suggesting that the staff are very aware of decisions that are made “around a financial imperative, rather than genuinely driven by student need and the needs of industry”. Mandy describes this as “a bitter pill to swallow” and how “it is difficult to deal with”. They both acknowledged that it is difficult for leaders to ‘try to sell’ institutional actions that they do not feel are driven for the right reasons. As a result they described how they make decisions based on intimate knowledge of their discipline and ask the question, “what do you need the most that you won’t let go of?” As Mark explained:

So we have made that decision. Here is the money, this is what we have to do with it. And no one else will understand that. Others will say why doesn’t this place look better or why haven’t you got your own TV advertising or whatever they might think you need. It is because you have already decided what you need. (Mark)

Mark also offered another example of how his department skirts the edges of the institutional norms when he described the fact that his department had its own website:

They hate it. They tolerate it because all our indicators are so high, our retention rate, our ability – all that kind of thing. There are still battles to be fought every day about it, but it is a brand everyone understands. (Mark)

**Connections**

The participants described how their leadership position gave them greater access to the wider institutional community as well as access to institutional
leadership. Chris spent a lot of his time “sussing the lay of the land”, to keep track of “who held the power and how things actually happened, independent of reporting lines”. This relationship was seen as an opportunity to leverage opportunity for their respective units. Chris who discussed the advantage that he felt by being able to develop relationships with senior people in the organisation:

Some of them were really helpful. It was really interesting, you have a conversation with the head of international and you talk about something and you get the ball rolling. That relationship building is really crucial if you want to be an influencer, and to have support. (Chris)

Sally saw opportunities to leverage connection across her institution to achieve changes in the way that students learn and to provide opportunities for collaboration:

I want to be able to have the broad overview. All of my jobs have been that… I want to work on a project and to be able to actually see a project coming together in every department lining up and actually get to that end hour of delivery and everything flows because it is all lined up. That is what I love. As much as I love my teaching and the handing over of knowledge, but to be able to co-ordinate, to be able to actually pull a project together from so many multiple areas and make it come together in the end is enormously satisfying. (Sally)

**Summary**

When considering the multiple contexts of identity that accompany the academic leadership (and management) role, all of the participants described themselves as representing both professional values and organisational values and framed their identity as combining aspects of industry professionals, teachers and academic leaders. The participants all demonstrated a personal disposition to undertake the move toward academic leadership. They also all noted that their professional background influenced their leadership style and approach.

A main finding of this section was that all sixteen of the participants regarded their role of academic leader as being ‘in the middle’ of their organisational
structure. Further to this, they also all described themselves in terms of being a manager, rather than leader. However, this was determined to be associated with the nature of the activities being undertaken as an academic middle leader, rather than any specific discrepancy with the concept of the leadership role. They described themselves as being ‘caught in between’, or ‘sandwiched between’ senior management to whom they were accountable, lecturers whom they described as colleagues or peers, and subordinates for whom they had some functional and often moral responsibility. For some of the participants, the role that they play in their respective organisations is broader than any agreed categorisation of either ‘leader’ or ‘manager’, with some suggesting that ‘mentor’, ‘problem-solver’, ‘councillor’, ‘referee’ and even ‘nurse-maid’ need also be included.

The changes in relationships experienced by the participants when they became leaders of their former colleagues were noted as creating feelings of ‘unease’. There were particular ‘challenges’ experienced when having to manage people who used to be colleagues.

Issues of workload and of feeling ‘overworked’ were discussed and were suggested to be symptomatic of the high level of role activity that needed to be undertaken to sustain academic processes (often bureaucratic) in most institutions. The participants expressed feelings of being “inundated”, or “drowning” and often “fire fighting” as issues that were common to all. It was reported by some that any additional job that did not have anyone assigned to it and that needed doing was “given to us”. This was blamed on significant reductions in administration and support staff that have occurred in institutions over recent years. It was suggested that there is a need for institutions to confirm the exact nature of the role requirements for their ‘middle leaders’ as the bureaucratic nature of many of the tasks that are generally undertaken by them are not consistent with their primary function of leading learning.

Another main finding of this section highlighted the lack of leadership induction and socialisation processes, with the majority of the participants citing academic leadership induction and training as being inadequate in their
respective environments. Eleven described the lack of induction and training that they received when they took up the leadership role. Two spoke of being given training opportunities that were not aligned with the reality of the actual role. A number of participants suggested that the variable nature of the academic leadership role and its expansive brief might result in the posts not attracting the best candidates. There was also commentary from some participants that suggested that one of the dangers of natural selection in educational leadership was that often people who are ‘very good in one position’ are promoted up to a level where they are ‘no longer doing what they are necessarily good at’.

A further main finding of this section was that all of the participants experienced tensions between the institutions view of priorities and their specialist discipline areas view. All of the participants noted that as their focus changed from being a teacher to being an academic leader, ‘feelings of unease’ began to surface as the set of goals to be met changed from ‘cultural’ to ‘financial’. This often resulted in them intervening in a number of areas on behalf of their staff groups and making choices regarding the extent to which they follow institutional practices. The majority of the participants shared instances of how they fought to protect things that they felt were under threat from general institutional goals or where they felt that management decisions from above did not have a clear understanding of how their area operated. As academic leaders the participants acknowledged that it was their responsibility to work with their staff groups to achieve organisational goals. For them, having the particular role identity of academic leader meant acting to fulfil the expectations of the role; coordinating and negotiating interaction with a wide range of stakeholders; and manipulating the environment to control the resources for which the role has responsibility.

This summary of section two has highlighted a number of key findings, which will be discussed in the next chapter. They are

- Academic immigrant leaders experience an identity, which is framed through the lens of their multiple roles as industry professional, teacher and academic leader.
• Academic immigrant leaders identify more closely with managing than with leading and see themselves as located in the ‘middle’ of the organisation.

• Induction and socialisation processes for academic leadership are seen to be inadequate in many cases and in need of improvement.

• Academic immigrant leaders experience tension between institutional and discipline priorities which leads to them intervening in a number of areas on behalf of their staff groups and make choices regarding the extent to which they follow institutional practices.
5.3 Experiences of sharing identity

In relation to the category of how shared identity among academic immigrant leaders and their staff is experienced, data have been grouped into two themes. Theme one, *Identifying with each other* examines the relationship between leader and staff in terms of mutual understanding and trust and sharing common ‘language’ and shared identity. Theme two, *Working relationships* examines the way that leaders work with their staff and how their shared background effects their work activities.

**Identifying with each other**

All sixteen academic immigrant leaders confirmed that sharing the same professional background with their colleagues and understanding the cultures associated with those professional backgrounds was an important feature of their relationships with their staff. Andrew suggested this understanding aided him with his leadership role because, “I know the role; I know what they do and how they do it. I know them”. Chris suggested that this understanding acts in a mutually supportive way and enabled him to work, “incredibly closely with [staff] because we had similar reference points”.

Craig and Wayne, who shared an interview, explained the value of sharing a background with staff and understanding where they are coming from in the following conversation:

Craig: The organisation has pushed to engage really around communication. But it doesn’t work with these guys. If the time is right go out the front and start leading the staff, pulling and pushing them. I’ve been pretty blunt and I’ve said you’re either on the bus or you’re off the bus. Let me know if you don’t want to be on it. That is it really, it is again working with them and understanding where they’re coming. That is why we are lucky being tradesmen, so we can understand how to communicate with them and what level to communicate on and to drive that change.

Q: So that is an advantage having that background?

Wayne: Well you can take the guy for a walk around the back of the shed and have the hard discussion and argue. Maybe try to pull the wool over some peoples eyes but remember where I
came from…. I’m not here because I walked in the front door, I’m here because I’m capable.

Q: So are you a more effective manager of these people because you share the same background as them and you understand them?

Wayne: I think as an effective manager it is not just managing across, managing the day to day, it is knowing the vision of the area and knowing what they do but from my perspective with the guys down there, it is more to know the personality of the people behind the soul. What drives [W]? What drives [X]? What drives [Y]? How does [Z] work? We are going through a big thing now, all the staff at [the institution]. We have a couple of staff members saying… put them in boxes so they could get rid of the ones we don’t want.

Mark suggested that he found it easy to engage with staff he has a professional connection with because of the nature of his industry, which is described as being very small. He noted:

One doesn’t really need reminding of what our colleagues capabilities are because we know and it is good to know they’re still exercising them and able to do them in the real world, because that just goes together with what we know their gifts as an educator are. It is kind of a mutual respect… If that person stops performing for any reason it doesn't signal a getting out of touch or anything like that. (Mark)

Ralph made a direct connection between the organisational structures of the industries represented in his department, which he describes as ‘very flat’, and the way that he had to work with his staff:

You have band leaders and things, but there is no imperious type… there is no telling people what to do. (Ralph)

For Dot, this relationship enhances her ability with her staff to “push their buttons” because she “knows where they’re coming from”. She added, “I feel like I can quite predict how they’re going to react”.

Pru explained that the connection with staff was about enabling “good leading” because the relationship contributed to her success as a manager:

It is about understanding where people come from. It is about understanding having lived the life of a creative. I understand the
dramas. So none of it surprises me. I don't have opinions about it, we just get on with it, we live through those processes. (Pru)

Sally argued that it is essential for a manager to have a good understanding of the reason that staff do what they do. She proposed:

Any manager, anyone who can actually make a decision on your behalf that is going to impact on your work and on how you can work, needs to actually have a working knowledge or some knowledge of what you are doing and why you are doing it the way you are. (Sally)

While this view was not exclusive to sharing a background between manager and staff, Sally was able to contextualise her idea in terms of the need for a deep understanding of the industry background associated with the relationship. She explained what can happen when people try to impose new learning processes without an understanding of the discipline:

… if they don’t have the industry background and understand what it is that we are trying to do and trying to teach, they can actually set you off on an incorrect path and give you parameters that are not relevant to what you know you need to be teaching. (Sally)

**Speaking the same language**

All of the participants confirmed that it is important to speak the same language as their staff, which they suggested is derived from their shared professional backgrounds. Andrew explained how identifying with his staff and being able to speak the same language as them “adds some credibility to the role”:

I think I’ve got a pretty good acceptance with all the guys that I am leading because I understand where they are going and what they are trying to do because I have been in a classroom and I know the subject and I am an electrician. (Andrew)

He went onto suggest that this relationship has helped him move his staff in their thinking. He explained how his colleagues have “pretty much got over the fact that they don’t do what they used to do… they are now educationists and enjoy that”.
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Some participants discussed how talking the same language allowed them to communicate in a direct way that got to the heart of the matter. The following conversation illustrates Gary and John’s understanding of the cultural connections of their trades and how those on the ‘outside’ sometimes misunderstand them:

Gary Just recently I was talking to an electrician and a plumber. You take the frame of a building and you come along – what do electricians do? They drill some holes…

John And leave a mess

Gary And then they thread some wires through it. Plumbers come along and they drill some holes through studs and what have you, and they put some pipes through it. These two guys, somebody drilled the holes and somebody else had to come and feed the wires through – and vice versa. There is this huge argument about it in the staff room. The dean must have seen it or heard it and she goes “we can’t have that”. But what she didn’t see was the two guys walking out the door to go and figure out how they’re going to solve the problem. It had already been solved, but it was just trades guys.

They didn’t sit down and have a meeting and form a committee to talk about it and document it and did all the rest of it. We actually saw the problem, we saw a solution to the problem and we fixed the problem.

John We have this all the time. So do you guys have meeting? Yip, every day. We’ve got a great staff room. We’re all in there laughing and poking fun at each other.

Gary It is very un PC.

John But if there is a problem – you don’t want to say that, it would be a little bit stronger, the language. But everything just gets nutted out on the spot. If you’ve got problems inside your programme…

Gary I guess there are other polys that do it. I walked into [institution] one day, 30 carpenters sitting around a table with a teapot in the middle and there were three of us who walked in from here and they looked and they go “do you want a cup of tea?” “there is the frigging teapot, you know how you make your tea!”. You go, “flip I’m at home. I felt right at home”.

Outside in

The extent to which the culture of the institutional workplace mirrors that of the outside profession was discussed with Craig noting that in his environment the staff generally “come from an alpha male environment in trades” and it is
very hierarchical. He deals with this by taking on the role of the dominant alpha himself. He explained that to solve a behavioural problem with one of his staff members, he had to:

Put him in a box and let him sit in a box for 6 months to a year to understand that I’m not going away at the end. Unfortunately I have to spend some time now getting him back up, so it is still a very alpha male type environment that we’ve got to work with. If I took that same strategy to admin or something like that as an area, it wouldn’t work. (Craig)

John and Gary, who shared an interview, shared how the history of the trades professions influences the culture in their teaching environment:

John: And you’re training apprentices as well, and you are never going to be as hard on them as they’re going to get.

Gary: That banter in an apprenticeship, that never left. In my day being booted up the backside or something like that, or pulled by the ear – that never leaves you. That is just common place.

Craig shared a different situation, but one that was equally frustrating, where a staff member who had been in the institution for 25 years, required constant attention because of his industry background:

He has been here 25 years, can’t do anything with being given authority. He sends me emails just about if he can take smoko, but that is him, so I know I have to lead him where others can be more independent…. I’ve got to control him because that is his personality, but the time served… it makes it hard. (Craig)

Working relationships
When discussing the factors associated with sharing a professional identity that contribute to good working relationships between the participants and their staff, Mandy offered that that her staff are “given all the information” and have “clear communication about the problem” because she knows that in their professional lives, they are used to “working on the smell of an oily rag”. She explained:

If someone says well actually we’ve got XYZ and what we want to achieve is this over here, then we can think creatively about how to
make XYZ fit to this over here and we can do that creative accounting we were talking about because we all come from backgrounds within the industry where we are entrepreneurial and we’ve had to piece our own careers together from ten different jobs at one time and create our own work. (Mandy)

Will commented how he was able to work constructively with staff who have been “very frustrated with the system” because of his professional identification with them. Will and Dot, who shared an interview, explain how they each approached their working relationships with staff:

Will: For me trying to be that person in the middle we will be, and I haven’t got my head around it at the moment about getting moving in that direction, it will be to do the system that I talked about – getting interested in people and why they’re there and what they want to get out of being there.

Dot: I like your idea of finding out what people want. I do kind of half that at performance review time, find out where they want to go and that sort of thing, in terms of professional development and what they’re working on and keeping them informed of the students. But I like the idea of actually finding out why they’re there.

Will: Yeah, and keeping it forefront on a regular basis, or every time you talk to them it is always in your mind, if you really do want to know where they want to go.

Will proposed that it is important to “spend more time making sure that their dream stuff is looked after”. He described this as “looking after their health in that way”. Mandy suggested that her staff did not respond well when they were dictated to with no rationale behind it. She mentioned, “it is when you are dictated to in a vacuum, that is where it is an issue”. Craig, similarly, connects with his staff at an industry professional level even though he has not been in the industry for 16 years. He explained:

I show interests at the personal level. That mitigates their arguments “you don’t know what it is like”, “well tell me what is like”. I just say “what if” and that is how I can get around that. I still associate myself as part of that… I can still communicate with tradesmen [because] that is who you are. (Craig)

For many, they try to build their staff capability by reminding them that as professionals and educators they are the best ones to translate their skills into
the learning. Wayne suggested that to encourage this, the staff have to feel comfortable that their manager is behind them, and supporting them to achieve the outcomes, even when they make mistakes:

They’ve got to realise it doesn’t matter what they do, you’re actually behind them to support them doing what they’ve got to do. You’ve got guys who feel that managers that are on top of them micromanaging XYZ and then they’ve got no time to try and do things on their own because they are toast if they step out of line. You’ve got managers who stand in front of them and they run like a bull in a china shop and everybody sits back and says well I’m not going to do it because he will do it. Just let me know what you need to do your job. That is how I feel is a more effective way of handling things. (Wayne)

Craig noted that the importance of the relationship with staff of similar background is not the only important aspect of managing:

In some ways it is an advantage to know they will be a tradesmen dealing with these people, but it boils down to emotional intelligence. If you don’t have that you may come from...the previous carpentry manger, he was a carpenter, had no emotional intelligence so he couldn’t...he’d create a conflict. If you’re really boiling it down it gives us an advantage coming from the industry, but it is not the whole of it. (Craig)

Translating and contextualising

Another key area for the participants when considering their leadership role and the relationships with their staff was a need to translate academic issues and concepts into language that their staff understood. The participants regularly have to translate concepts of learning and teaching into the language of their colleagues, thus enabling them to “talk to them about were they’re coming from”, and “remind them that they have the skills and the expertise, even if they don’t think they do”. Gary is pragmatic about the problem and suggests that as a manager his job is to work with the staff to achieve the important things:

If you like the walking stick or simply the prop – give it to me, or come and sit down beside me and we’ll walk you quietly through it. (Gary)

Ralph’s focus as a leader is on education. He sees himself as being on the road to calling himself an academic but focuses more on the staff and
encourages them to understand the nature of teaching. He sees teaching as a kind of performance:

Every time you come into a class you have to get up in the same frame of mind you do to a performance. You have the same nerves before it and you have to have a performance, you have to have something to present. (Ralph)

This understanding of performance helped him bridge an understanding gap for his staff. He encourages them to perform and to set up opportunities across the board for themselves and their students. This includes encouraging staff to keep close to “current trends and all those sorts of things that keep us in practice and involved with it”. He suggested that this ‘involvement’ of staff in industry and teaching as well as research is what separates Universities from ITP’s, and he sees this as a strength.

The participants each worked to understand education as it relates to their respective disciplines. This was illustrated by Andrew when he noted that a difficulty for his staff was conceptualising how to get the “student [to do] the learning”, rather than the “tutor standing in front of the class telling everyone what he knows”. He suggested that “the kids come in to class and all they want to know is what’s the answer to the question and how many credits is it worth”. This led to him questioning the future demand of students currently in primary and secondary schools and what they might expect learning to be in a tertiary environment:

A lot of it is Internet based or on-line delivery and that’s the changes that we are trying to influence here. We are trying to get 25% of our courses online, 60% of our course practical based. And the guys who have been here for quite a while, and got ingrained in the unit standard delivery, will be moaning from day one that this is not the way we should be teaching [but] are now saying, ooooh. But that’s what you always wanted! (Andrew)

The conversation touched on the state of education in the compulsory sector and the issues that were faced at tertiary. Ralph suggested that “educational standards [are] slipping”. He noted a change in his students focus on assessment:
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It feels a little bit to me the results of NCEA coming through, very assessment driven and away from teaching. I’ve just had a couple of kids coming through and they’re very focussed on just the assessment. (Ralph)

When discussing the paucity of maths teaching in the secondary system, Gary noted:

My background in the 50s, early 60s, there really wasn’t arithmetic – no calculators, no slide rules. Well, slide rules was a bit later on, but everything was done up here you know, adding numbers, reading books, reading the newspaper in class, that sort of thing. (Gary)

Ralph discussed his approach to working with colleagues who would rather be thinking about their students than about the “mechanisms of the structure”. He suggested that it is “about filtering; you don’t just say some things”. When a red flag goes up over something, then as a manager “you can use your instinct and your experience to think…”. He believes that this is “not setting things back, it is that you are choosing the right time”. In his opinion the information has to be packaged in a form that does not hide the truth from the staff. He explained:

I think the key thing for me there, and I’m still learning about management, I haven’t been doing it that long, and it is a continual challenge – is don’t say “they didn’t’ tell us we had to do this”. I try never to say that. I believe that, I don’t feel it is something I feel I have to do. I think I’m not going to agree on something if I can see the point on it from above, and I’ll rile against it and if it comes down to funding or whatever, because that is how every year I feel like we’ve got to reduce staff. I will say “I’ve done everything”, but I’m not going to say that they made us do it. I think that only disenchants people. (Ralph)

Chris shared his approach of how he inducted new staff coming into teach from industry for the first time:

I have a frank and honest conversation about some things. Don’t get freaked out by the level of compliance. Don’t get freaked out by the slow speed of change or the institutionalisation of some team members. Expect that there will be really passionate supporters and there will be really resistant blockers. (Chris)

He concluded with an observation of his role in the context of his environment:
There is a lot of power and opportunity with these roles and they’re very much what you make of them. They’re very good opportunities, particularly if you’re interested in critically reviewing content, creating opportunities for students and for staff… (Chris)

For Chris it is about embracing the opportunity to “change and do things in new ways”.

**Demystifying research**

Reg described the way that he worked with his staff to demystify research. He suggested that he feels like “a lone wolf” at the moment with regard to championing research but he feels that some staff are “starting to get it”. Reg suggested that this thinking may be new for people who have been teaching in ITP’s for some time and who may have a limited understanding of what research is beyond the ‘practice’. He explained that his thinking has changed over the years:

I wouldn’t have said that 10 years ago, I would have been arguing that your practice is research and that industry practitioners are excellent people to have in there and we should have as much of that as possible. I don’t know whether it is these bloody white haired “I fought hard for these white feathers on the side of my head”. I don’t know if it’s just getting old or what it is, but I do think there is a higher order conversation to be had. I think there are a whole lot of things at play here… I think in practice it is really good, but in terms of being able to articulate and to reflect and to move themselves forward or deeper, it is a long way to the bottom. That is what I say to them, you are skipping stones here. That ideal, like you say, that once you dive in there is so much more to learn and you don’t know what you don’t know. Every door you open there is ten more doors behind it. For me it is a salvation, and your practice can actually dry up. I think that is what I’ve learned from it, your gig could disappear and you would still have this practice you are connected to because you are connected to that discipline, to that art form, in terms of interior life and your ability to reflect on that. And maybe you can motivate others to form a band or to form a touring company or to create pop-up theatre group. (Reg)

In order to achieve the type of change that Reg is attempting it is important for him to have credibility with this staff to enable them to engage with his ideas. There is no doubt that his professional credentials set him in a place to have
conversations about teaching and learning in his discipline, however I asked him how he projected research into this mix. He replied:

I back myself for a start. First of all I’m pretty humble about this stuff, I’m not a bloody trumpet blower when it comes to this stuff but I am kind of passionate about it.

But it is trust, it is about self-esteem. It is about evaluating your own story and to me that is at the base of the whole research experience. Maybe a scientist will have a different take on research, but for us it has got to be about that in your life. If you can’t create a safe container in which these people can step into, I don’t know how else you can get them. But I’m making it a recurring theme in things that I’m saying to the staff just because I think the enrichment of the conversation, if we model that our students will drop in on that conversation and just, by osmosis, they will take it on. I really do. I have a lot of faith in that idea. (Reg)

**Changing environments**

The participants discussed their role in on going change activities in their various institutions that ‘seem to be endless’ and are often ‘disruptive’ and which staff regard as being ‘done to them’ rather than ‘with them’. Gary views his role as relieving the staff of disruption around change agendas to allow them to get on with their job, which is to teach the students. He explained:

That is how I see it. Their job is to teach the students. If I can relieve them of and gradually introduce to changes that are occurring and coming down on top of us. We all need to change, we can’t avoid change, you can’t stay in the past. But if you can do it in a gradual collegial sort of a way. I believe it starts to work that way. (Gary)

For Ralph the great joy of coming into a management position was the ability to create solutions and effect change:

I’ve always said that to people who come into management positions, it is a great chance to effect change. That is the only reason I get into this, apart from maybe a bit more money – let’s be honest. (Ralph)

In relation to the connection between leaders and staff who share a professional background there was discussion around the effectiveness of change managers or leaders who are seen as being ‘inside’ the change, because they have some sort of a relationship with their staff, or whether it was more effective to have an outsider come in, who has no connection with
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the staff. Chris described how in his industry he was known as the ‘artsy guy’, but at the institution he was ‘the corporate industry guy’. He puts this down to his coming directly into a leadership role, rather than ‘rising out of the ranks’. Wayne also described his understanding of inside/outside perceptions:

We had a previous manager, ‘C’. ‘C’ was trying to change it from inside. ‘D’ was an external guy with no connections or ties to anything and he has been here 18 months, I still don’t see him as having much connection and he is still, from a lot of peoples’ perceptions, an outsider. He came in with a label and I think he still carries that label. (Wayne)

Craig, who works with Wayne, agreed:

I’ve lead changes that have come from [C] and it is not a five minute consultancy it is bloody hard work because culture change like that… it has to come from within. (Craig)

Craig mentioned that his concern with outside change managers was that:

Once the authority of that role disappears we’re going to flop back into the old work, we haven’t really changed the culture. There needs to be a long term scenario where it gets embedded. This is how we do it now. (Craig)

Andrew suggested that being on the ‘inside’ does not always guarantee that the staff will “be with you”. He cited the example of his current role as a change agent in a rethink of trades education where his staff accuse him of “being a traitor” because he is leading the change action. He went on to explain how his staff confronted him with statements like “this will never work, why are you taking me in that direction?!?” and “you don’t have the experience, why are you following this line”. He admits that it is a difficult situation and that he has not yet been able to convince all of the staff yet, in particular the “long term tutors” who generally suggest that he has “gone over to the dark side”, which he sees as a direct reference to his now being the manager instead of simply a colleague.

Slow processes
One of the main issues facing the participants when engaging in change was the ‘slow speed’ of academic processes. Chris cites the slow speed of change
of academia as being one of the biggest cultural things that took him time to get accustomed to. He explained:

I came from private industry, from [an employer] which is dynamic. If a mode delivery to a customer became an opportunity then they would jump on it – straight away. They were very proactive rather than being reactive. And you did it, and you did it quickly because you had to. My experience with academic institutions is that they have a much slower speed of working and there are more process to making change. There are people within the institution who embrace change and those who resist change. I found my role as a manager was largely in change management. A lot of time and energy went into the change management. (Chris)

Chris suggested that the difficulty of moving people through was related to some of them becoming ‘institutionalised’. He described that as when “colleagues who come from industries where things were quite fast, quickly became embedded in institutional practices”, which he suggested can be very slow, and who then “slow down” themselves. He observed:

You started getting into the pace of that and that is what it is – that is what you do. Whenever it is then suggested that you do something differently then feathers get ruffled. (Chris)

In Mandy’s environment they were undergoing constant change so she encouraged a team environment and kept a professional industry focus to enable her staff to maintain ownership of the changes. She noted:

We have had a couple of major re-writes but we do it very much as a team and we do do it as considering ourselves working in the industry, which we are. We are all constantly working in the industry in its various forms. (Mandy)

Taking a similar approach, Pru manages the change process that her department is currently going through by explaining the opportunities of the change to the staff in terms that they can easily understand and enabling them to take ownership of the changes. She explained:

I’m putting questions out there and I’m learning to discuss that we have to change from 20 credit papers to 15 credit papers because we lost the battle with [the institution]. I have managed to make them see it as an opportunity and they’ve taken it on board as an opportunity because they’ve discovered holes and it is time to review the degree. Everybody has brought in to do it… And then I always add in an
element of something around teaching and learning and assessment and that sort of thing. I’m hoping that they’re going to be moving from – ‘I’m a guitarist and a teacher, teach guitar and theory’, to ‘I’m an educator’ and the difference and what that means and certain prejudices that some people have around assessment and learning.

(Pru)

Chris described his experience of encountering pockets of support and pockets of resistance:

It was not uncommon that we’d strike difficulties or resistance from individual team members about change. The areas of interest of some particular team members were very narrow. They were very linear. They may have been experts and very good practitioners in what they did, but it was linear and it was singular and it was very difficult for them to engage in change… There were people who had their turf, and they wanted to hold it and it was the same turf they’d held for ten years and that turf was not going to change without a fight. (Chris)

He shared his approach to countering this problem:

You identify the opportunities for change that you can, and you make incremental changes and you find ways to better engage the interests of those blockers, and turn them around, as well as the interests of the students, so they can also advocate for change – these are the things you do as a manager. But the change is at glacial pace. It is a frustratingly glacial pace. (Chris)

Making excuses
As mentioned in an earlier section, there is an understanding that most academic immigrant teacher teachers have little interested in engaging with any activity that is seen as being bureaucratic; “Why do I have to fill this form in?, why do I have to do that?” Will commented:

Whenever I tell them there is another form to fill in or there is another piece of assessment document that you need to fill in. It is the same question – where do I find that?! So I just have to remember to be patient with them. (Will)

All of the participants acknowledged that there was a majority of their staff who were more interested in engaging in teaching only, regardless of their contractual obligations to the organisation. As a result of this there was an acknowledgement that there is often a case where a number of people
undertake work behind the scenes for staff that is not seen, or acknowledged. Pru discovered the extent of this when she became the leader of her unit, as she explained:

We had an interesting scenario where our academic associate, and academic leader – with an education background. We’ve discovered now that I’ve stepped into her role. I sort of suspected that she did it all for everybody. (Pru)

Will admitted that he has a “tendency to do that” and suggested that by continuing to support staff in this way “actually removes the power” from them:

One thing I will say about that though is that asking what problems are there, what don’t you like is great, right? But if you are constantly working on solving the problems then I think you’re always going to be digging deeper and deeper in that hole. (Will)

Most participants acknowledged that at some point they had allowed their staff to “get on with the teaching” and had dealt with the bureaucratic elements in a variety of ways that did not impact on them. Mark suggested that this was a natural occurrence and that he simply had to get on with dealing with it. He commented:

In actual fact, those of us who are in tenured positions or in positions of leadership,.. we have that role with that group of staff members as much as we do with the students. We are dealing with the same thing on two different levels. (Mark)

Pru admitted that she has a staff member who she owns up to “leaving him pretty much alone”. She rationalises how she deals with this diversity of commitment among a number of her staff:

There are some people for who you are just grateful that they are in the building and for what they bring to the programme, for the kudos it offers. (Pru)

Pru highlighted a particular case of a staff member who she does not require any participation other than teaching his discipline:

He is in the major production every year and our students audition like everybody else, like every member of the public. But then that crosses back over; it is a completely synchronistic relationship with his outside commitments and his inside commitments. I don’t expect
anything from him, he is not a programme leader. I do expect him to work at his .8 and he does. He is the lead tutor of that [part of the] programme… [And] the programme functions fine. (Pru)

Pru also has a number of teachers who have been with the institution for a number of years who she describes as being “totally in the system now”, so it is no longer as big an issue. That is why she can maintain a small number of specialists who she admits “I haven’t attempted to bring into the system” because “I’m really happy for them to just keep doing what they do”. She noted:

What is the point? Forcing other kinds of ways of thinking or doing or anything like that on to somebody like X who works his butt off. (Pru)

Summary
A key finding from this section was a unanimous agreement among the participants that sharing the same professional background with their colleagues and understanding the cultures associated with those professional backgrounds was an important feature of their relationships with their staff. All sixteen of the participants acknowledged the understanding of “where their staff had come from” and “what they do and how they do it” as being important in the successful execution of their role as leader. One participant highlighted that she can almost predict how her staff is going to react in any situation because she “knows where they’re coming from”. This shared understanding enabled each participant to work closely with staff in a mutually supportive way because they share ‘similar reference points’.

The ability to communicate in the ‘language’ of their colleagues was linked to this shared understanding and was seen to be a crucial factor in aiding the participants in their ability to lead. The majority of the participants believed that a shared professional background gave them credibility as a leader for their staff groups. All the participants noted that the culture of their department workplace mirrors, in varying degrees, that of their outside professions.
A further key finding was that these academic leaders use their connection with their staff and their associated ‘credibility’ to work directly with staff to demystify academic issues, such as research, and contextualise learning and teaching into language and concepts that their staff can identify with. A number of the participants discussed how the ability to translate academic issues into the language of their colleagues enabled them to connect with their staff on a personal level by allowing them to “talk to them about were they’re coming from”, and “remind them that they have the skills and the expertise, even if they don’t think they do”. However the “institutionalisation” of some longer term staff was seen as a barrier to the participant’s ability to effect change in some situations.

In regard to managing change, a key finding was that the majority saw themselves as being regarded as an ‘insider’ by their staff groups which was shared the same professional backgrounds as their staff whilst two described themselves as being regarded as ‘outsiders’ even though they. These later cases were deemed to be specific to a small number of staff within a particular departmental structure who were aggrieved with the changes that were being made within their work environment.

A further key finding was that the majority of the participants acknowledged that at some point they had allowed their staff to ‘get on with the teaching’ and had ‘dealt with the bureaucratic elements’ on their behalf. They admitted to ‘excusing’ behaviours exhibited by their staff who ‘choose not to engage’ with institutional process. They maintained that this was about reducing the impact of bureaucracy on their colleagues who were ‘not interested’ in becoming involved in institutional processes beyond teaching. There was an acknowledgement that these actions can result in creating dependant behaviours among staff.

This summary of section three has highlighted a number of key findings, which will be discussed in the next chapter. They are:
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- Academic immigrant leaders maintain that having an understanding of “where their staff had come from” and “what they do and how they do it” is an important feature of their relationship with their staff.

- The ability to communicate with staff in “their own language” was also seen as being key, and contributing to gaining credibility as a leader.

- Academic immigrant leaders are generally regarded as being ‘insiders’ by their staff groups because of their shared background and values.

- Academic immigrant leaders employ their shared background knowledge to translate and contextualise institutional and educational ideas and language for their staff.

- Academic immigrant leaders sometimes enable their staff to avoid participating in academic processes.
Consolidation of key findings

This chapter has explored the identity of academic immigrants and the relationships between the multiple identities of industry professional, teacher and academic leader. It did this by presenting the participants personal experiences of their construction of an identity as an academic leader which has been informed by their professional identity adopted from previous (pre-academic) work practices, and an emerging academic identity based on experiences of teaching, leading and new work practices. It also presented the multiple contexts of identity that accompany leadership and a wide range of personal experience and observations that help to explain the significance that a shared professional identity and background between themselves as leaders and their staff has on their relationship and their work.

The chapter was divided into three sections, each representing a category that related to the research questions. Themes, which emerged from the data analysis, were grouped and linked to specific categories. The categories formed the major headings for each section and the themes formed sub-sections for each category. Key findings were drawn from each category and theme and the connections and interpretations of these key findings will be examined in relation to the published literature in the next chapter. The discussion of the key findings will be arranged by theme in the following manner:

Tensions of identity

- Academic immigrants hold stronger connection with the identity of their previous (outside) profession than with their current role as an academic
- Academic immigrants do not identify with traditional concepts of ‘academia’ and ‘academic identity’
- Academic immigrant leaders experience an identity, which is framed through the lens of their multiple roles as industry professional, teacher and academic leader.
• Academic immigrant leaders identify more closely with managing than with leading and see themselves as located in the ‘middle’ of the organisation

**Shared identities**

• Academic immigrant leaders maintain that having an understanding of “where their staff had come from” and “what they do and how they do it” is an important feature of their relationship with their staff

• The ability to communicate with staff in “their own language” was also seen as being key, and contributed to maintaining credibility as a leader

• Academic immigrant leaders are generally regarded as being ‘insiders’ by their staff groups because of their shared background and values

**Divided loyalties**

• Academic immigrants perceive that there is a cultural and functional disconnect within institutions about the tangible differences between their previous professional life and their current academic one.

• Academic immigrants are often disconnected and display non-identification with their respective institutions due to a number of barriers (including traditional forms of academic research, academic processes and bureaucracy, and contemporary learning and teaching methodologies)

• Academic immigrant leaders experience tension between institutional and discipline priorities which leads to them intervening in a number of areas on behalf of their staff groups and make choices regarding the extent to which they follow institutional practices

• Academic immigrant leaders employ their shared background knowledge to translate and contextualise institutional and educational ideas and language for their staff

• Academic immigrant leaders sometimes enable their staff to avoid participating in academic processes
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**Transitions**

- Professional transition processes such as induction and socialisation for academic immigrants entering higher education are seen to be inadequate in many cases and in need of improvement.
- Induction and socialisation processes for academic leadership are seen to be inadequate in many cases and in need of improvement.
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Introduction
This chapter provides a discussion of the findings presented in Chapters Five by examining connections and interpretations of the data in relation to the published literature. The previous chapter presented participant narratives that describe the relationships between the multiple identities of industry professional, teacher and academic leader. It did this by presenting the participants’ personal experiences of their construction of an identity as an academic leader which had been informed by their professional identity adopted from previous (pre-academic) work practices, with an emerging academic identity based on experiences of teaching, leading and new work practices. It also presented the multiple contexts of identity that accompany leadership and a wide range of personal experience and observations that help to explain the significance that a shared professional identity and background between themselves as academic leaders and their staff has on their relationship and their work.

In order to generate new theoretical insights into academic immigrant identity and the significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders and their staff who share professional identity and backgrounds these data are discussed using the study’s conceptual framework, being the interrelationships between identities, and employing the metaphor of ‘immigrant’. Previous Chapters have presented views from a range of theorists that may be useful in understanding the root of academic immigrant epistemologies (how they come to know) and therefore to form understandings related to academic immigrant ontology (how they come to be). The discussion explores concepts such as Giddens (2009), Hotho (2008) and Jenkins (2008) suggestion that organisational, professional and personal social experiences help to form our identity(s), and that this identity, according to Gioia (1998) and Turner (2013), then helps people adopt certain roles within an organisation. The assumption of different roles within an organisation as suggested by Stryker (2007) and Hogg (2008), and the
resulting changes in identity as described by Henkel (2010) are also discussed. Fulcher and Scott’s (2007) discussion of the strength of the identity forming experience (socialisation) and its effect on the depth of incorporation into Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of a ‘permanent disposition’ of the ‘self’ are also explored to make connections with the findings.

This chapter is arranged into four sections based on the key themes that emerged from the categories presented in the Research Findings Chapter. These are:

6.1 Tensions of identity
6.2 Shared identities
6.3 Divided loyalties
6.4 Transitions

A summary of the discussion is located at the end of the chapter.

6.1 Tensions of identity

Whilst the participants in this study each identified as academic immigrant leaders they were not a homogenous group. Each participant fulfilled the role of an academic leader in a department within a New Zealand polytechnic and each was responsible for the line management of a number of staff who shared professional discipline backgrounds with themselves. Their discipline backgrounds were many and varied, ranging from music (Mark, Ralph and Reg) to media (Chris, Dot, Sally, Wallace and Will), and performing arts (Mandy, Pru, and Sophie) to the trades (Andrew, Craig, Gary, John and Wayne).

Social identity theory posits that the groups to which people belong can provide their members with a definition of who they are. The core of an ‘identity’ has been described by theorists such as Hogg (2008), and long time collaborators Stets and Burke (2014), and Stryker and Burke (2000) as being the categorisation of the ‘self’ as a member of a social category or group to which a person belongs, and activation of the ‘self’ through the acceptance
and approval of the group. With this in mind, ‘professional identity’ and ‘academic identity’, as presented in this study, may be seen as multiple social identities that an individual holds.

**Professional identity**

A key finding of this study is that each of the sixteen participants held a strong connection with the identity of their previous (outside) profession, describing themselves as belonging to ‘a group of professionals’, and more directly as ‘I am a professional’. Professional identity refers here to the participants previous professional work experiences in specified discipline work groupings outside of higher education. The association with this ‘professional’ status was described by all sixteen participants in terms of being ‘who I am’, with the suggestion that ‘without that anchor’ they would ‘not recognise themselves’. This association conforms with the work of social identity theorists such as Hall (2000), Hotho (2008) and Winter (2009) who place professional identity as a form of social identity which embodies the enduring beliefs, values, motives and experiences that are characteristic of individuals who see themselves as being part of a professional community and enacting the same professional roles. The participants’ strong connection with their profession also relates to a significant aspect of Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of ‘habitus’ which describes an individual's dispositions, that is, his or her values, attitudes and beliefs, as resulting from a history of accumulated experience, and which become “embodied history, internalised as a second nature and so forgotten as history” (p. 56). In this way, the concept constantly reminds us that this professional identity is enduring and refers to something that is linked to the individuals’ history.

For all of the participants the role identity associated with their ‘profession’ was formed early in their lives during the formative years of professional identity building and is related to their initial career choices upon completing secondary education. Five participants (Andrew, Craig, Gary, John and Wayne) took up trades apprenticeships while three others (Chris, Sally and Sophie) found work directly as junior staff members in their chosen discipline.
workplaces. The eight remaining participants (Dot, Mandy, Mark, Pru, Ralph, Reg, Wallace and Will) undertook additional study at tertiary level before starting their professional career. Socialisation processes associated with Fulcher and Scott's (2007) concepts of moving from 'youth to adulthood' in collaboration with Giddens' (2009) 'entering the profession' may have contributed to positioning this 'professional identity' as a 'core' identity, which represents more fundamental cognitions and feelings that these individuals have about their 'selves'. This proposition is supported by Gibson, Dollarhide, and Moss' (2010) view that the "view of self as a professional plus competence as a professional", can result in "congruence between personal worldview and professional view" (p. 21). Bourdieu’s (1993) ‘habitus’ also describes an acquired identity, such as ‘professional identity’ referred to here, as becoming “durably incorporated in the body” in the form of a “permanent disposition” (p. 86). These factors may account for the strength of the conviction held by all of the participants regarding their primary identification with their 'profession' and may be seen as being linked to their sense of ‘self’ as defined by the ‘professional groups’ to which they belong (having joined as young adults) providing a definition of ‘who they are’.

The sixteen participants’ understanding of academic identity was firmly framed through the lens of their professional identity. As explained by Sophie when she noted that she looks at her teaching “through the eyes of a professional”. For her this was “why I am here” and “that’s who I am”. This was also reported to be the case for most of their academic immigrant colleagues who generally did not regard themselves as ‘academics’, despite the fact that many of them had been teaching in a tertiary institution for many years, with some teaching for longer than they were actively engaged in their former profession. This may be associated with the strength of their association with their professional identity, or as a result of the weakness of connection with their new academic identity.
Academic identity

Each of the sixteen participants acknowledged that they did not identify with traditional concepts of ‘academia’. The participants suggested that there was general confusion with concepts such as ‘academic’ and ‘researcher’ among “people like us”, who have “little or no background in teaching” and who came to teaching “straight from industry”. Many found these concepts at best confusing, and at worst confronting. The participants noted that there was also a level of confusion around the definition of terms such as ‘lecturer’, ‘teacher’ and ‘tutor’, especially among their academic immigrant colleagues.

In trying to unpick the issue of non-identification with ‘academia’ the participants suggested that traditional notions of academic identity did not match their understanding or experience of life in the institutions in which they were employed. They rejected definitions such as those proposed by Archer (2008a) who suggests that an academic embodies “the practices of being intellectual, critical and knowledgeable and committed to scholarship”, and where groups of people “write and review papers and go to conferences” (p. 397). Such concepts were seen by many of the participants to be firmly located in the ‘ivory tower’ of a University, rather than the vocationally focussed ITP sector where they were employed.

The issue of non-identification with traditional academic identity is well documented in the literature for universities, with theorists such as Churchman (2006) suggesting that “the notion of a single ‘academic identity’ may be obsolete in an environment in which the academic role is becoming increasingly diverse” (p. 3). Many theorists, such as Henkel (2010), Morgan & Ogbonna (2008), and Winter (2009) discuss the ‘marginalisation’ and ‘squeezing’ of traditional academic values as universities have shifted toward new forms of governance and managerialism. These issues however, are not necessarily transferrable to the New Zealand ITP sector in which these participants are employed. Polytechnics and Institutes of Technology came from a very different history and set of traditions than universities. Prior to 1990, ITP’s were restricted to providing certificate and diploma level programmes and universities and ITP’s were clearly demarcated – universities were academic institutions and could award degrees, while ITP’s
taught vocational and trade courses (Pollock, 2012). ITP’s were granted the right to deliver higher level qualifications in 1990 and currently operate under a New Zealand Ministry of Education mandate which focuses on the delivery of technical, vocational and professional education and is also charged with promoting research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids development. Beyond this focus, there is no specific differentiation by Government between the ITP sector and Universities.

There is, therefore, an argument that the academic identity of those who teach in ITP’s, such as the participants in this study, have significantly different drivers than their colleagues in the university sector, and this would go some way towards explaining why there is a perceived mismatch with more traditional notions of ‘academia’. Teaching and research still play a part in the work of the ITP academic, yet these are different to the general definitions experienced in a university. Billot’s (2010) contention that there exists “a complex multiplicity of accounts and understandings of being part of academe” (p. 712) is therefore especially poignant here. Winter (2009) also resonates with his proposal that academic identities are “not unitary and fixed but pluralistic and fluid”, and there exists the context for “different expectations and discourses” as determined by the “nature and purpose of the institution” (p. 124). With this in mind it is possible to propose that the participants in this study embody a form of academic identity that is ‘hybridised’ from the context of their particular circumstances as academics in the New Zealand ITP sector.

Clegg (2008) picks up the theme of hybridity when she suggests that academic identity is extremely complex and personal and cannot be discussed in simple terms of teaching, management or research. She has proposed that “academic identities were being actively shaped and developed in response to the changes in university structures and external environments” (p. 340). She describes a situation of hybridity where:

Newer emerging [academic] identities, or ‘hybrids’, were mostly not shaped by a reference to nostalgia for an elitist past, but were based
on different epistemological assumptions derived from other professional and practice based loyalties (p. 340).

Academic identity, in the context of this research, may be seen as an emerging identity that is related to experiences of formalised teaching combined with learning to adapt to the culture and work environment as represented by an educational institution. Clegg’s (2008) identification of academic identity, as a “multiple and shifting term” that “exists alongside other aspects of how people understand their personhood and ways of being in the world” (p. 329), is appropriate as it supports the idea that the participant’s academic identity may be unique to their particular circumstance. Academic immigrant identity situates ‘academic’ in terms of a personal understanding that is an amalgam of personal and professional experiences both within and without of any particular educational institution. Each experience will be different and is related to individual circumstance. This aligns with Clegg’s (2008) observation that there is no longer an ‘homogenisation’ of academic identity, as it is deemed to be extremely complex and personal and can no longer be discussed in simple terms of teaching or research.

**Forming academic identities**

For the sixteen participants in this study, the pathway to becoming an academic was many and varied. None of them planned to become teachers at the start of their professional careers, however all of them experienced informal teaching in their professional work prior to taking up formal teaching. Each of the participants indicated a strong identification with their previous profession, as well as a strong identification with ‘teaching’ that related to experiences which were accumulated while they were engaging in their previous professional work and contributed, in part, to their decision to take up a teaching role in a tertiary environment. For five of the participants (Andrew, Craig, Gary, John and Wayne), who had professional backgrounds in the trades area, this stemmed from taking on apprentices which was deemed to be a natural part of their past professional job. Seven participants (Mandy, Mark, Pru, Ralph, Reg, Sally and Sophie), who had professional backgrounds
in the music and performing arts, saw teaching as naturally integrated into their practice as artists. The remaining four (Chris, Dot, Wallace and Will), who had professional backgrounds in media and journalism, first encountered teaching through working with students as interns on work placement. For these participants, the emerging formation of an academic identity began much later in life with ten of the participants noting that they planned the move to formal teaching in a tertiary institution as part of a career change when they reached their late 30’s or early 40’s. It was reported that this is also the case for the majority of the participants’ academic immigrant colleagues. This is consistent with the literature that suggests that in vocational institutions new entrants typically arrive in midcareer, with significant professional experience but minimal teaching and research experience, whereas many university academics enter academe early in their career, with a completed (or almost completed) PhD (Deem & Lucas, 2007). Sophie suggested that the age differential might contribute to some academic immigrant teachers’ inability to entirely relate to the identity frame of a traditional academic:

If you have got people who aren’t coming to teach until they’re in their mid 40s, it is a little bit late to start changing the person completely.
(Sophie)

The working environments in which these academic immigrants operate are socially constructed realities. The development of their identities align with Fulcher and Scott (2007) and Giddens’ (2009) concepts of being constructed through formative socialisation experiences of family, schooling and education, peer groups, organisations and work experiences, and the associated cultural expectations learned through these experiences. The professional identity of these academic immigrants was formed at a much earlier time than their new academic identity. A strong sense of professional identity was developed through a form of professional and organisational socialisation that involved them learning to be part of a profession (in each case their first) immediately following their secondary or tertiary schooling.

The participants’ initial career choices were firmly rooted in the socially constructed realities of their formative socialisation experiences. This form of
socialisation has been described by Jenkins (2000) as the period of transition from ‘youth to adulthood’ where ‘career choices’ are influenced as much by self-identification and self-determination as through the consequences of categorisation experienced during younger years. The formative years of career identity forming followed a social identity theory model of defining each participant with an understanding of the self that he or she was part of a specific social group who hold common social identification or view themselves as members of the same social category. In this circumstance the ‘discipline profession’ acted as Arnett’s (2006) concept of the ‘agent of socialisation’ providing the learning required for the new member to acquire the knowledge, values and behaviours required to perform a role within the profession. This can be explained through the lens of Bourdieu’s (1990) concepts of individuals’ professional identity becoming unique individual dispositions, where values, attitudes and beliefs, which result from a history of accumulated experience, become “embodied history, internalised as a second nature and so forgotten as history” (p. 56).

Further evidence for this entrenched understanding is presented by all of the participants maintaining a close connection with their respective professions, which allows them to be seen by their peers as ‘practicing professionals’ who maintain ‘industry credibility’. Some suggested that there was also a desire of not wanting to be ‘lost to academia’. For Reg, his biggest fear was that the institution would subsume him and he would suffer from what he calls “death by corduroy”, where he would lose touch with his profession – “It is my biggest fear that I will die that way”. It was also noted that there is an element of ‘credibility’ associated with the student perception that teachers represent the real skills and attributes of the industry toward which they are training which motivated these feelings. This credibility factor works both ways as evidenced by ITP’s publically valuing and actively recruiting industry professionals because of their skills and recognised credibility with industry.
Immigrant identity

The difficulty in constructing an identity as an academic, reported by the participants, may also be related to their ‘metaphoric’ immigrant status. Immigrant identity is linked to an individual’s sense of self in terms of membership within a particular cultural group and becomes important when immigrants come to a new society (or place) that is foreign to them, into which they are expected to integrate. Through a process of acculturation and negotiation each person steers their path along multiple trajectories related to their varying positions of membership of their multiple communities as they form new identities. Burke (2006) describes this as a process where “people successfully bring meanings in the situation into agreement with the meanings in their identity standards” (p. 84), for example their group-, role-, or person-based identity.

When transitioning from one profession to another, academic immigrants are not expected to wholly assimilate into their new culture and abandon their culture of origin. In so far as institutions such as New Zealand ITP’s actively encourage deep connections between their academic staff and their professions of origin as a way of maintaining tangible links to employment sectors. As a consequence, academic immigrants inhabit (at least) two cultures, their previous one, which is associated with their pre-academic working profession, and their newly adopted academic one. An individual’s personal sense of belonging to both their ‘old’ and their ‘new’ professions, therefore, distinguish academic immigrant identity as an amalgam of their former professional identity and their new academic identity. An identity that Whitchurch (2008) suggests may be constructed on a recognition of shared characteristics of some common origin (their original profession) and those of their adopted (academic) culture. However, as Whitchurch (2008) suggests, the difference between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ environments may affect the amount of time that academic immigrants take to achieve any integration. Whilst academic immigrants may have learn to adapt to their new working environment, their sense of identity often resonates more with their past professional experience and socialisation in other employment settings (McInnis, 2010). As academic immigrants learn to adapt to their new
environment they “retain to some degree, their ‘accent,’ that is, their foot in the past” (Prensky, 2001, p. 3), which is guided by the rules and guidelines of an unwritten ‘cultural manual’ which is shared among group members. For people to be able to deal with complex transition, such as that which challenges identity, Smith and Boyd (2012) have suggested that they need to have something to hold on to that is stable, which in this case is the professional identity associated with their previous profession.

An interesting footnote to this is that academic immigrant teachers, regardless of their industrial/professional background were reported as being seen to adopt some aspects of academic cultures, in particular those around academic freedom, consultation and collegiality. Even the most hard-core hierarchical trades person demanded consultation around a wide range of academic issues, where their industrial background would suggest that they would ‘take instruction’ and ‘do what they were told by the boss’. This aligns with Burke’s (2006) suggestion that identity change (or adoption) can, and does arise without conscious thought because of exposure to the values and practices of the new identity constructs. Academic immigrants can, therefore be seen to be adopting aspects of both identities (professional and academic) and forming a duality of identity, rather than a singularity.

It is clear from the interview data that the participants, in all of the represented professions, perceived a clear dichotomy between their professional (practice) role and their academic (teaching) role. This, and the acknowledgement by the participants that traditional forms of academic identity do not match their experiences, align with Churchman’s (2006) suggestion that there may be a disjuncture between “the rhetoric and experiences of academic life” (p. 6) to be considered. Henkel (2005) suggests that it is the “interactions between the institution, the discipline and the individual” (p. 164) that are crucial to understanding how people relate to academic identity. The institution and the discipline thus provide the context within which individuals create an academic identity.
Multiple identities

A key finding for academic immigrant leader identity is that all of the participants experience an identity framed through a multiple lens that is an amalgam of industry professional, emerging academic and the role identity of academic leader. The literature clearly supports the notion that everybody has multiple identities, but not all are actively guiding behaviour at any one time (Côté & Levine, 2002; Stryker, 2007; Thoits, 1983). Burke (2003) claimed that having multiple identities provides different consequences for individuals who occupy different identities. He compared individuals who had managerial identities with individuals without managerial roles, and claimed that the ones with managerial identities were more aware of organisational activities and therefore they became more participating members in the group. On the other hand, the ones without managerial roles still developed a sense of attachment to the group, but their levels of participation were dramatically lower than the former group. For Burke (2003), the nature and/or power of the identities defines the level of group encouragement for the individual’s participation in group’s affairs and any consequent development of a sense of belonging.

Changes in identity are more complex than a single shift from ‘industry professional’ to ‘academic staff member’ to ‘academic leader’. The relationship between organisational structures and professional identities presents as an iterative process. This is described by Floyd (2012) as being when individuals not only enact the roles conferred on them, but also adjust and reconstruct these roles. Serpe and Stryker (2011) add that by taking on a role identity, individuals adopt self-meanings and expectations to accompany the role as it relates to other roles in the group, and then act to represent and preserve these meanings and expectations. They suggest that new forms of leader identity emerge which are contingent not only upon the given frameworks in which the leading takes place, but also upon the agency of the individual in interpreting their roles. This is particularly important when considering the initial move into the educational institution and continued (upward) mobility within the organisation demonstrated by these academic immigrant leaders.
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Taking on the role of leader

Evidence from participant narratives suggests that the shift from academic staff member to academic leader might be described in terms of a greater emphasis on the agency of the individual, rather than on the influence of the organisational structure. As with their individual pathways towards becoming an academic, participants undertook a different journey toward taking up a leadership role. Most took on the role as leader or manager by ‘rising up through the ranks’ with three joining directly as managers. For Will, he became a leader by design, rather than by accident. It came as quite a shock to him to be told on his arrival that his boss intended to be “out of here in about three years and I see you as the sort of person that will take over”. Others suggested that they took up the role of leader to ensure that someone from “outside” did not come in with “other agendas” and “upset things”.

Academic leadership may be categorised within identity theory as a ‘role’, which links self-attitudes, or identities, to the role relationships and role-related behaviour of individuals. Identity theorists such as Stryker (2007), and Stets and Burke (2014) argue that the self consists of a collection of identities, each of which is based on occupying a particular role. It is recognised that many of the ‘answers’ to the question ‘who am I?’ are linked to the roles we occupy, which are often referred to as ‘role identities’. These role identities are said to influence behaviour in that each role has a set of associated meanings and expectations for the self.

The majority of participants became leaders due to a disposition for leadership that was related to their previous profession with all agreeing that their professional background influenced their leadership style and approach. Pru noted how her background as a script editor saw her facilitating and negotiating and she sees her role now as a facilitator and a negotiator. “I was doing a lot of managing at the same time, juggling – running” (Pru). For Sally and Sophie, they had been in charge of teams of workers in high-pressure workrooms and were used to getting ‘the product out on time’. Those participants from the trades area had run private businesses prior to joining the institution, and a number of the participants from the arts were also used
to managing projects in their previous careers. It is also important to note that not all of the participants have found the role as fulfilling as others, as the following comments suggest:

There are challenges with it and I’m a pretty hopeless manager, I’ve really made some balls up. (Ralph)

It’s always difficult becoming leader of people you work with (Andrew)

My 22 year old daughter asked me the other day “what do you actually do, Dad?” I said “I sign things”. (Reg)

Archer (2000) suggests that staff undertaking this shift might be said to have moved from being "members of collectivities who share the same life chances" (p. 11), finding themselves positioned involuntarily within given structures, to those who "acquire their social identities from the way in which they personify the roles they choose to occupy" (p. 261) and therefore through their own contribution to that role.

A common theme among those participants who had progressed to become leaders from inside the institution was the change in relationships that they experienced with their colleagues, which some described as “difficult”. Feelings of ‘unease’ were experienced, often around issues such as managing staff performance. The following comment illustrates the types of concerns:

It is awful. Having a moderate relationship with a whole cohort of people, some of whom I worked with for 23 years. I really struggled with it last year, I still struggle. I’m getting on with it but… it’s been an identity change for me really. (Ralph)

Deaux and Burke (2010) suggest that social identity theory explains how people classify or map the human world and their places in it, as individuals and as members of collectives or groups. By doing this, people try to know “who we are, who others are, them knowing who we are, us knowing who they think we are, and so on” (Jenkins, 2008, p. 6). The change in relationship experienced by the participants left many questioning their role as academic leader. For some there were feelings of self-doubt about their own ability to
lead and a growing sense that there may be a developing position of ‘us’ and ‘them’.

All of the participants agreed that the primary concern of their role as an academic leader was for their people, and their interaction with them was placed at the centre. They were particularly interested in the relationships, attitudes, perceptions, and values of their staff. Three of them offered particular examples of their focus on “knowing what their staff wanted” and “spending time making sure they get it”, and how this advantaged them in their work. This outlook aligns these leaders with general understandings of academic leadership (Bolman & Gallos, 2011; Henkel, 2010), however they also resonate with Greenleaf’s (2002) concepts of servant leadership where a strong desire to serve people may supersede organisational objectives.

Managing, not leading
All the sixteen participants felt more comfortable with using the term ‘manager’, rather than ‘leader’ to explain their role. Leadership and management were, however, seen as complementary to each other when engaging in academic leadership. Most agreed that their staff identified with Demers’s (2007) view of management as an activity more aligned with ‘being on the ground’, ‘inside’ the working environment. Whereas leadership was more aligned with being ‘outside’ of the environment towards upper levels of the organisation. Sophie shared that her colleagues, when presented with a survey asking for feedback on the institutions leadership misinterpreted who the leaders actually were:

So for them the leadership was the head of our department, her assistant and the next one down. No, they didn’t mean that, they meant them over there in the registry who we see once in three months, maybe. He comes in and spends time at a meeting and then goes away. Why would we have a relationship or any other kind of thing with this person over there? (Sophie)

The participants all agreed that leading and managing co-existed because of the nature of the activities that they undertook. In this way the participants demonstrate a firm commitment to Kotter’s (1996) view that people can use a
mix of leading and managing behaviours and Yukl’s (1999) assertion that successful leaders adjust the mix of behaviours as the situation changes. The participants aligned themselves more closely to Sayles (1993) description of ‘working leaders’, who focus as much on the operational aspects of ‘getting things done effectively’ as they do on maintaining the linkages between top management and the shop floor.

There has been a move over the last 10 years in ITP’s to rename roles like programme managers or programme directors as academic leaders. One of the participants cynically suggested that the renaming was in fact a ‘replacing’, which gave their institution the ability to re-define the roles and therefore ask for staff to reapply for ‘new’ positions. Gronn (2003) points to the vast leadership ‘industry’ in which governments, corporations, academics, and school systems have a huge material vested interest, suggesting that the discourse of ‘leadership’ has become ubiquitous. He poses an interesting question: “what changes, if anything, when commentators begin to privilege words such as ‘leader’, ‘leading’ and ‘leadership’ as discursive modes of representing reality, instead of previously favoured terminology such as ‘manager’ and ‘management’?” (p. 269). As a result of the contemporary mythology surrounding leadership a distinction has emerged which “claims a great divide between management/managers and leadership/leaders – between bureaucrats and people of true grit capable of offering strong ideas and a sense of direction with which people choose to comply” (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003, p. 1436). For the participants of this study the role that they play in their respective organisations is broader than any agreed categorisation of either ‘leader’ or ‘manager’, with some suggesting that ‘mentor’, ‘problem-solver’, ‘councillor’, ‘referee’ and even ‘nurse-maid’ needed to be included.

6.2 Shared identities

A key finding regarding the sharing of identities among academic immigrant leaders and their staff was the importance of leaders having an understanding of “where their staff had come from” and “what they do and how they do it”.
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These, along with the ability to communicate with staff in “their own language”, were seen as key features of their relationship and contributed to them maintaining credibility as a leader. As a result of this, the participants confirmed their opinion that they were regarded as ‘insiders’ by their staff because of their shared background and values.

Social identity theorists such as Stets and Burke (2003) maintain that group membership will provide an understanding to the self that he or she is part of a group and should associate himself or herself with that group and needs to act accordingly. Hogg (2005) and Jenkins (Jenkins, 2008) suggest that this may result in the self associating itself with the ones whom he/she thinks similar to him/her, and labelling them as ‘in-group’ [insiders], while the ones who are not members of his/her group will be labelled as “out-group” [outsiders] persons. In the case of academic immigrants, the in-group, or insiders, may be seen as those who share a background and identity from a former profession, while the out-group, or outsiders, may be seen as those who do not.

Understanding each other
The participants were unanimous in agreeing that sharing the same professional background with their colleagues and understanding the cultures associated with those professional backgrounds was an important feature of their relationships with their staff. They all felt that this assisted them in the execution of their role as academic leader. Andrew stated “I know the role; I know what they do and how they do it. I know them”. Chris suggested that this understanding acts in a mutually supportive way and enables him to work “incredibly closely with [staff] because we have similar reference points”. Dot suggested that because she “knows where they’re coming from”, she is more able to get a reaction from her staff because she knows exactly how to “push their buttons” She added “I feel like I can quite predict how they’re going to react”.

Academic immigrant professional groups develop shared assumptions or identity traits in line with social identity theory concepts, such as Hogg’s (2008) theory, which predicts that the groups to which people belong (e.g., profession, professional body, union) can provide their members a definition of who they are. These also provide people with the cues, outlined by Stets and Burke (2003), as to how they should associate themselves with that group and how to act accordingly. They develop assumptions and traits which are determined by Schein’s (2010) ‘relative amount of interaction’ and more importantly in the ‘intensity of the shared experience’ that the members have with each other.

The findings demonstrated that academic immigrants share strong professional identities derived from their work histories and outside disciplines as well as through their emerging academic identities within their discipline work groups. In this sense they may be seen as ‘in-group’ members who share identity and values and enjoy a trustworthy relationship with each other. Sally noted that when her colleagues receive instruction on how to improve their performance they are “more comfortable hearing it from someone who [they] trust because they understand what you’re doing”. Mark also noted:

Because you know that that person has lived in your world, worked in your world, there is a respect and a trust there that they are not going to make a decision that rips the heart out of what you’re trying to achieve. (Mark)

Andrew also has a trusting relationship with his staff which he puts down to “understanding where they are going and what they are trying to do”. He added:

I’m now the manager, I have been a teacher, I have been an electrician, we can talk the same language. I think it helps. It gives some credibility to the role. (Andrew)

This is consistent with Tschannen-Moran’s (2001) recognition that in working environments with a high level of trust, participants are more often comfortable and are able to invest their energies in contributing to shared goals rather than focusing on self-protection. A trusting relationship between
those who share professional backgrounds cannot, however, be taken for
granted and is influenced by the actions of both the leaders and the staff,
especially where the use of power and empowerment is involved.

It is widely understood that higher education organisations tend to rely on
referent and expert power rather than coercive reward, or legitimate power.
Bennett (2003) suggests that referent power results from the willingness to be
influenced by another because of one’s identification with them, while expert
power is reflected when one allows oneself to be influenced because the
other person apparently has some special knowledge. This can be seen in
this study as when members of the same profession or industry discipline
group hold a common social identification or view themselves as members of
the same social category. Each member knows, more or less, what the other
party expects them to do and attend to, as well as what each may expect from
the other. It can be therefore be assumed, that academic immigrant staff are
more likely to be influenced by members of their community whom they trust,
or colleagues who share values with them.

This research has shown that academic immigrant leaders hold multiple
identities as industry professionals, teachers and academic leaders. They are
positioned to closely align with the social identity of their staff groups and
have a strong identification with their previous profession and a trusting
relationship with their colleagues with whom they share this identification.
They also align with Reicher, et, al’s. (2007) proposal that the best leaders not
only appear to belong to the group, but are “prototypical of the characteristics
that make the group distinct from others” (p. 24). Educational institutions may
benefit from paying more attention to the possibilities afforded them for
enacting successful change by recognising academic immigrant leaders
understanding of the negotiated processes and relationships that develop
between the leader and the group which allow them to function successfully in
multiple spaces. In this way the connection between the academic immigrant
leader and their staff, that is values based, may be leveraged to achieve
successful outcomes for change actions.
Working together

Findings confirmed that academic immigrant leaders employ their shared background knowledge to translate and contextualise institutional and educational ideas and language as a support for their staff. As has been discussed in a prior section, academic immigrants hold on to their identity as discipline professionals as they negotiate their way towards academic identity. While they can be seen to be building a new identity trajectory as ‘teacher’, they are also working hard to maintain their existing trajectory as an ‘industry professional’. Academic immigrants may focus on building new identities as teachers, however as suggested by Saito (2012) they do not focus as much on building identities as researchers or as organisational citizens. They feel pressure to build a new identity as a ‘researcher’ or as an ‘organisational player’, and they find it difficult to prioritise these activities within their everyday practice and workload.

In light of this, it is also important to consider how the individual identities of these academic immigrants may be constituted in relation to practice and to teaching. Beckett and Gough’s (2004) analysis of practitioners who teach is based on the construction of a hybrid identity, involving change as practitioners move into teaching. Adams (2007), similarly, notes a change in identity from artist to school teacher as initial teacher training is undertaken, suggesting that being a teacher changes how the self is constituted. In each of these studies, practitioners were seen to be simultaneously novice teachers and expert practitioners, moving towards a new identity or ‘re-forming’ their identities (Adams, 2007). These observations support the concept that transitioning from one role to another requires the construction of a new or different identity.

Academic immigrant leaders assist their colleagues in developing a new identity by acting as ‘influencers’, where they call on their credibility and act as coach, guide and role model. They consider themselves responsible for their staff’s growth, development, harmony, wellbeing and level of achievement. Buller (2013) suggests that they do not undertake these activities to “take credit for the work of others or attribute accomplishments to their “outstanding
management,” but that they see it as their function to create an effective working environment” (p. 133). Ralph’s example of the way that he worked with his staff to de-mystify research is an excellent example of this in action. He ‘walks them into that space’ and tells them ‘it is better than sex’. In this way the academic immigrant leaders align with Wenger’s (1998) description of ‘paradigmatic identities’, where individuals such as leaders position themselves within their social group to demonstrate stronger links between teaching, research and the organisation (Macfarlane & Hughes, 2009).

Academic immigrant leaders can provide a form of legitimacy for their staff to adopt a range of different permissible identities because of the credibility of their value status. They work from ‘inside’ the problem by building their staff capability by reminding them that as professionals and educators they are the best ones to translate their skills into the learning. Many participants commented on how they “talk to their staff about where they’re coming from”, and “remind them that they have the skills and the expertise, even if they don’t think they do”. In this way they align themselves with Cheng’s (2002) description of academic leadership:

Educational leadership provides direction and expert advice on developments of learning, teaching and curriculum, emphasises relevance to education in management, diagnoses educational problems and encourages professional development and teaching improvement. (p. 56)

When being a translator, academic immigrant leaders are actively interpreting academic issues into language that their staff can understand. This may include issues around learning and teaching, assessment, research or organisation issues such as organisational systems, compliance reporting and change actions. They connect with their staff on a personal level, which allows them to “talk to them about were they’re coming from”, and “remind them that they have the skills and the expertise, even if they don’t think they do”. They draw on their knowledge of their discipline, their colleagues’ experiences and their knowledge of organisational culture to assist their staff to contextualise personal meaning around academic issues. However the form that this takes
and the extent to which this translation occurs is linked to, and may determine, the level of capability that is built among academic immigrant staff.

**Making excuses**
The majority of the participants admitted that they often undertook far too much academic work on behalf of their staff. Some did it because they felt that they should ‘spare their staff’, who they felt ‘were not here to be academics’ and who ‘work hard enough on the teaching’, to those who felt they had to do it because their staff simply were ‘not interested’ in engaging and simply ‘would not do the work’. There is a danger here of creating a cycle of dependency as suggested by Boyd (2010) where staff will not increase capability because they are not being encouraged to engage in learning how. There were also some cases where staff took it for granted that they did not have to engage in the work, because they knew that their leader would do it for them.

Another danger of academic immigrant staff not engaging in aspects of academic or organisational work, is that they may be encouraged to preface their professional identity over their academic identity, despite the fact that this is contradictory to the position of their new workplace setting. If there is a continued disconnect with the practice of academia, Wenger (1998) warns us that it is unlikely that a true academic identity will be developed.

A result of these leaders taking on more of the academic work on behalf of their staff, for whatever reasons that they cite, is an increase in workload. This in-turn can lead to dissatisfaction with the role. Evidence also suggests that for some who were dissatisfied with the workload of their leadership role that they were more likely to have taken on additional academic work on behalf of their staff. Generally blame for workload was focussed outward towards the institution, rather than inward to the actions of the leader. A question for these academic leaders to ask themselves is - ‘how much of this problem is of their own making?’
6.3 Divided loyalties

A key finding regarding the relationships between academic immigrant leaders and the institutions in which they are employed is that all of the participants reported that they experience tension between institutional and discipline priorities which leads to them intervening in a number of areas on behalf of their staff groups and make choices regarding the extent to which they follow institutional practices.

Whitchurch (2007) has suggested that academic identity relates to the extent to which individuals define themselves primarily in terms of the institution and the state of being an academic. In the context of these participants, all sixteen suggested that for their academic immigrant colleagues there is a stronger identification, often in the form of ‘loyalty’, to their subject, team, programme, and/or department, rather than the educational organisation as a whole. This is supported by McAleer and McHugh’s (1994) argument that the organisational culture of higher education is customised at the department level, and by Trowler’s (2008) assertion that higher education cultures are "generated and sustained at the level of the workgroup within departments" (p. 15). Chris highlighted this when noting that among his staff there wasn’t a great sense of ‘I work for the institution’, it was more ‘I work for the department’. These sentiments align with other theorists (Henkel, 2010; McInnis, 2010; Morgan & Ogbonna, 2008; Shreeve, 2011) observations that academic faculty are generally divided in their professional loyalties between their disciplines and their institutions, with the latter generally taking second place. Gordon’s (2010) proposition that academic identity is a function of community membership that is grounded in interactions between the individual and two key communities, being “first, the discipline and second, higher education as an institution” (p. 59) also supports this finding. Sophie explained this by suggesting that industry professionals who come to teach have little or no connection with the institution in which they are teaching because they are ‘here to teach the subject or skill’ and not really to ‘become academics’. She maintained that for industry professionals it is “nothing to do with the institutions” and that if the “programme got moved across to [another
institution] the next day, that is where [we] would have gone”. Sophie’s sentiments, while heartfelt, may be exaggerated in a constrained market place such as the New Zealand ITP sector. Most centres in New Zealand with the exception of the major cities have only one ITP therefore there is in effect little or no choice of institution with regard to provision for the disciplines represented in this study.

Morgan and Ogbonna (2008) position those staff who come from occupational cultures and who strongly identify themselves as a distinct group within an organisation as forming organisational subcultures. They emphasised that “professional loyalties of respective subcultures may be stronger than loyalty to the organisation” (p. 43). Schein (2010) also suggests that groups such as these develop shared assumptions or identity traits which are determined by “the relative amount of interaction and the intensity of the shared experience that the members of that level have with each other as contrasted with members of other levels” (p. 287). According to Schein’s (2010) model, a group of staff in small discipline-specific departments or in geographically isolated locations will interact primarily with each other and therefore eventually form a subculture.

The participant narratives suggested that the stronger identification with subject or department often created tension in their colleagues’ dealings with the institution, while having the side effect of strengthening relationship between their colleagues internally within their own units. In effect there was a shared sense of camaraderie that united people who each identified with the other because of their shared background, while enforcing a disconnection with the institution. It was also suggested by a number of the participants that these behaviours sometimes resulted in ‘siload’ thinking or ‘feral’ behaviours being displayed within units or departments. In this way the institution and the discipline provide the context within which individuals are creating an academic identity.

This reality aligns with Becher and Trowler’s (2001) conception of academic ‘tribes and territories’ that reflect and reinforce the complex and overlapping
disciplinary cultures in which academic identities are created. This theory also
signals a potential separation of ‘us’ (colleagues/discipline/department) and
‘them’ (institution/employer) in the perception of academic immigrants. Cilliers
and Greyvenstein (2012) describe these in terms of ‘silos’ which they suggest
not only refer to conscious structures, but also to an unconscious state of
mind and mentality that takes on a life of its own. They suggest that silos
result in the splitting of organisational artefacts and relationships, and impact
negatively on relationship forming between individuals and within teams.
Harvey, et al. (2007) also allude to these disconnections in their study into
circumstances where academic members display ambivalent identification
with the institutions in which they are employed where academic staff simply
focus on the activities that interest them (such as teaching students), rather
than becoming involved in those activities (often regarded as bureaucratic)
that they deem to be of little interest. Contemporary views of the higher
education community describe it less as a collective and more aligned with
constructs such as Chao and Moon’ (2005) ‘mosaic’ or Whitchurch’s (2008)
‘kaleidoscope’, where staff are tied together into a community of practice
rather than a single entity. It is recognised by authors such as Churchman
(2006), Quigley (2011) and Winter (2009) that subject knowledge,
professional backgrounds, disciplinary societies, and other external groups in
which academic staff participate contribute to this.

Gatekeeping
Evidence suggests that academic immigrant leaders, when dealing with their
academic immigrant staff colleagues, are more likely to allow professional
priorities to override academic ones. This is likened to Schein’s (2010)
observation that part of the ideology of professionalism relates to maintaining
characteristics such as autonomy and protection of independence. This
approach may be seen as a form of gatekeeping where academic leaders
gather and understand external information, and subsequently translate this
information into terms that are meaningful and useful to their more locally
oriented colleagues. In extreme cases, academic leaders may also withhold
significant information from either their colleagues or their employer if they
deem it to potentially result in having a negative effect. Mark found himself mediating on behalf of his department when he encountered management decisions from above that did not have a clear understanding of how his area operates. Many described themselves as a “mediator between”. Ralph described it as being “guardians for our areas of practice” and he had to be a bit “cloak and dagger” about it sometimes:

Yeah, that is again where the back rooms of this area, and we’ve got to filter that stuff and not tell anybody else about it. And sometimes they don’t know what we’ve done to protect things. (Ralph)

The participant narratives demonstrate that academic immigrant leaders operate with an identity frame where they represent both core professional values as well as emerging academic and organisational values, and are often perceived, especially by their non-leader colleagues, within Whitchurch’s (2009b) concept of both ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ entirely to either the professional or institutional domain. Larson and Pepper (2003) suggest that this can cause distress for leaders when any parts of these identities are in conflict with, or not compatible with the perceived approved values and ideas of the individuals dominant social (group or individual) identity. As academic leaders the participants were all fully aware that it was their responsibility to work with their staff groups to achieve organisational goals. For them, having the particular role identity of academic leader meant acting to fulfil the expectations of the role; coordinating and negotiating interaction with a wide range of stakeholders; and manipulating the environment to control the resources for which the role has responsibility (Chreim, Williams, & Hinings, 2007).

McEvoy and Richards (2007) suggest that gatekeeping decisions are generally made on a pragmatic basis, rather than for any altruistic motives. They maintain the view that “the need for some form of defensive gatekeeping is inevitable, as the external constraints that impinged upon practice give them relatively little room for maneuver” (p. 393). This presents itself in terms of this research when the relationship between an academic leader who identifies strongly with a distinct professional group comes into conflict with an
action being undertaken by the wider organisation that seems to be in conflict with ‘the way we do things’ or ‘what we value’. As Sophie explained:

When everything is good and going along as normal it is easy to tow the party line, but as soon as [the institution] tell us to make a change that we think is anti what we are trying to do with our students for our profession, then the hackles go up and we go into full protection mode. (Sophie)

Much of this is based on a belief held by academic immigrants that institutions do not really understand the specific needs of the respective disciplines and is also linked to an understanding of discipline specific knowledge. The ownership of discipline knowledge can be seen as a sticking point between industry professionals and academic institutions as professional knowledge is seen to firmly belong in the frame of external professional practice, rather than the locus of the academic institution, regardless of who is paying for the development of the resources at the time. Macdonald and Williams (1993) refer to these circumstances as being when the employee is ‘neither willing nor able’ to distinguish between personal information and that which belongs to the institution.

In these situations the academic leaders may be seen to be exercising intentionality where, as Billot (2010) has suggested, they are choosing whether to appropriate, transform or ignore work practices. While the choices that academic immigrant leaders make may not align directly with standard practices as understood by the institution, they rarely ‘cross the line’ into territory that might compromise institutional standards and values. These actions generally take the form of ‘massaging the system’, ‘working around the edges’ and sometimes employ a bit of ‘cloak and dagger’. They may rather be seen through Sayles (1993) contention of middle leaders “massaging the parts and continuously ‘rejiggling’ and reconfiguring the interfaces to resolve the contradictions and inconsistencies that exist in a large system” (p. 9). The academic leaders are able to balance their responses because they have adapted elements of organisational identity into their own identity as academic leaders, which give them multiple options to choose from. They embody both the professional values of their colleagues.
and the organisational values of their employer. Their staff colleagues see them as insiders (in-group) and will generally respond better to them because of the shared identity and value bonds acquired through their shared professional backgrounds. Positional perceptions such as these are based on the ways that staff identify the leader in relation to their own shared organisational identity and values and are not fixed but constantly changing and context-dependent. Being a member of the ‘in-group’ depends on how that group is defined in relation to a particular context, setting, task, and set of participants. The boundaries are both fluid and contestable (Duszak, 2002).

Thirteen of the participants noted that their focus changed considerably from being a teacher, and some described this as ‘an uneasy feeling’ as the new set of goals to be met were often financial rather than cultural. Mandy explained that “there is a tension when a decision being made by those above is having to be enacted by the manager even when they do not necessarily think that it is the best decision for their environment”. Dot added, “as a manager, at the level that I’m at I still have to behave like an employee. I get instructed to do things, some of them are very unpopular, we do them”. Henkel (2005) suggests that it is the nature of the education sector to provide a complex and contested context and it is therefore accepted that individuals may “be pulled simultaneously in different directions by contradictory identities” (p. 158). Most of the participants agreed that there is often a tension between the institution view of priorities and the specialist discipline areas view. As a result the majority of the participants positioned themselves as ‘champions’ of their respective disciplines with some describing how they fought to protect things that they felt were under threat from general institutional goals.

Robertson (2011) explains how competition between two professional identities can also lead to a paradox, for example where an individual becomes less connected with their ‘discipline’ base and increasingly more integrated into the organisation:
As time is spent on organisational activities and relationships are forged with [other] organisational colleagues, the individual's organisational identity gains salience and becomes more likely to influence behaviour and decision-making—sometimes even to the point that the individual loses sight of professional obligations that may conflict with organisational goal. (p. 611)

A major benefit of occupying a leadership role was seen to be that it gave the participants greater access to the wider institutional community as well as access to institutional leadership. Many saw this relationship as an opportunity to leverage opportunity for their respective units. As Chris noted:

> It was really interesting, you have a conversation with the head of international and you talk about something and you get the ball rolling. That relationship building is really crucial if you want to be an influencer, and to have support. (Chris)

This aligns with Burke's (2003) studies which have compared individuals who had managerial identities with individuals without managerial roles, have made claims that the ones with managerial identities were more aware of organisational activities and therefore became more participating members in the group. Mark described how his department has “adapted the institution to enable us to continue to do what has always happened”. He noted that there is a “balance between taking class and being in a production outcome that is unique to the field”. He understands that you need to do both, “whereas the institution will prioritise the class, [we] actually prioritising the field trip…” When academic leaders ‘find ways around the problem’, Mandy described this approach as “creative accounting” whereas Ralph recognised it as “working the backrooms” and having to “filter that stuff and not tell anybody else about it”.

Academic immigrants align closely with McKenna and Maisters’ (2002) proposition that professional authority is held to be stronger than hierarchical [institutional] authority and that as a result they will either reject or ignore policies which challenge their traditional long-held professional values, beliefs and practices (Drazin et al., 2008). For academic immigrant leaders, this
ability to choose when, and when not to follow institutional authority is linked to their multiple identity profile where the strongest elements of their identity, being their professional affiliation, offers them choice of ‘alternative solutions’ and ‘appropriate behaviours’ (Burke, 2006) which generally favour their dominant identity that shapes or at least influences all other identities (Thoits, 1983).

Disconnections
Key findings in this section uncovered the perception among the participants that there are tangible differences between the previous professional lives of themselves and their colleagues with their current academic one. These manifest as cultural and functional barriers between themselves and their colleagues, and the institutions in which they are now employed. Gary offered an example of this when he explained that the “very blokey and very sweary and shouty” culture of his area is regarded as ‘normal’ within his profession, but is misunderstood within the institution where it is sometimes labelled “toxic” and there is “a lot of energy put in [by the institution] to try to change it”.

The general consensus among those participants whose background was in the trades area suggested that this is something that does not need to be changed and that the institutions were ‘wasting their time’ trying to change it.

A number of the participants suggested that academic immigrants bring “the culture of the old workplace” with them and sometimes it is “all they know” and they are not prepared to change.

Institutional bureaucracy
The bureaucratic nature of educational organisations was seen by all of the participants as a barrier to engagement with institutions. Chris suggested the biggest challenge was simply ‘how they do things on a day to day basis’ while Pru acknowledged that it is hard for her colleagues to “buy into institutional systems”. Wayne noted that his colleagues often struggle because of the amount of reports that had to be written. He suggested that this stems from the background of his colleagues in the trades who are “not known for their writing skills”. The participants each had examples of how a substantial
number of their colleagues not only struggled with bureaucracy, but also simply ‘opted out’ of any engagement. Schultz and Ravitch (2013) describe this in terms of people having a choice about the positions they adopt in relation to the workplace, what they learn and how they identify with it. Wenger and Trayner (2015) discuss this as being where people are subject to cultural influences, and where they are also individual agents with histories of participation formed by unique interactions over time, thus forming ‘individual trajectories’ of participation or non-participation. In this way individual’s can be seen to be exercising intentionality, in that they have some choice in whether they appropriate, transform or ignore the social practices they encounter at work (Billot, 2010). Archer (2000) describes this in terms of exercising academic ‘agency’ where people interpret their environment in the process of developing local practices, both as individuals and as members of departmental groupings. Individual trajectories of participation result in personal ontogenies, which will, in Billet’s (2001) view, effect “how they engage in work activities and interactions”, which he suggests will “not be wholly determined by what the workplace affords them” (p. 22).

Most of the participants noted institutional bureaucracy as being ‘completely foreign’. As a result academic immigrants make salient choices about which role (or parts of roles) they will engage with. Here, ‘salience’ refers to the subjective importance that individuals attach to the various activities or roles, which they view as describing themselves. According to Thoits (2012) it is assumed that highly salient identities are more potent sources of meaning and guidance than those that are perceived by the person as less salient. This concept of salient hierarchy is important because the salience we attach to our identities influences how much effort we put into each role and how well we perform in each role (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Stryker, 2007; Thoits, 2012). This aligns with the earlier proposition that some staff simply prioritise the elements that they find most interesting because they feel no obligation to adopt the institutions requirements, as they do not share a strong identity bond with the organisation.
Learning and teaching
The participants highlighted the area of learning and teaching as also being a point of disconnect with the institution. The problem was presented as academic immigrant teachers experiencing difficulties with contemporary learning and teaching methodologies which tended to result in them falling back on ‘teaching the way that they were taught’. This relates to what Shulman (2005) defined as the fundamental ways in which future practitioners are educated for their new professions. He labelled these as ‘signature pedagogies’, and they consist of:

Concrete, operational acts of teaching and learning, of showing and demonstrating, of questioning and answering, of interacting and withholding, of approaching and withdrawing. Any signature pedagogy also has a deep structure, a set of assumptions about how best to impart a certain body of knowledge and know-how. And it has an implicit structure, a moral dimension that comprises a set of beliefs about professional attitudes, values, and dispositions (p. 52).

In the context of this study signature pedagogies are related to the way that academic immigrant teachers were themselves taught. These concepts are useful in understanding how academic immigrants see themselves as teachers, which Pru suggested is simply as people who “pass on knowledge”. When industry professionals first come into the classroom they draw on their own understanding of teaching through the lens of their own experiences of learning. Mark referred to this as, “we are creatures who will refer back to how we were taught”, and similarly Pru suggested that new industry professional teachers “deliver from where they learned”.

In this way, industry professional teachers may be described in terms of Shreeve’s (2009) conception of them being simultaneously both expert practitioners and novice teachers. They display two working contexts with different associated practices and have to make some kind of transition between the sets of practices. The participants suggested that this transition generally occurred in an ad-hoc way and that as academic immigrants
become more familiar with the formal teaching environment they “integrate and change and morph and gain their own new understandings of it and develop it”. Shreeve (2009) suggests that this transition from one role to another may be achieved through re-socialisation to enable the construction of a new or different identity. The participants commentary suggested, however, that there was a lack of focused development resources and re-socialisation processes aimed specifically at this problem.

*They don’t understand us*

Another associated disconnection regarding learning and teaching was identified as being when there was a perception that the institution ‘simply does not understand the way that we have to teach’. This was seen by all of the participants to be closely related to their colleagues association with the type of learning that they themselves experiences when they were training. Sally explained this in terms of not trusting that the institution understands ‘our specific disciplinary need’. She highlighted a case as being the move to include more on-line learning modes. As Sally pointed out that “most of [our work] is very practical… you’re trying to tell me that I have to teach sewing on-line is completely ludicrous”. Similarly Gary suggested that there is simply a lack of understanding by the institution about the way that students learn. He suggests that his students will not pick up a book and learn from it. He maintains that automotive, plumbing and carpentry students learn by “seeing, touching and doing”. For Ralph it was about the need for each music student to have individual time with a teacher as well as enough rehearsal rooms. Each of the other participants also described how their discipline areas had very specific learning and teaching requirements and each confirmed that there was a sense of frustration generated between ‘us’ (colleagues/ discipline/ department) and ‘them’ (institution/ employer) around a perceived recognition of these differences.

*Research – Practice versus academic*

The participants also saw the role that research plays in the traditional identity of an academic as creating a disconnection point for most academic
immigrants. For most this was related to the understanding (or misunderstanding) and articulation (or non-articulation) of ‘what research actually is’ for each discipline. Archer (2008b) defines the concept of ‘academic’ as being a commitment to scholarship within an ‘academic community’ where people ‘write and review papers’ and ‘go to conferences’. As mentioned earlier the participants were divided over their identification with these definitions. While the majority felt comfortable with ‘scholarship’ and ‘academic community’, many could not identify with the aspects of research being focussed on ‘writing papers’ and ‘presenting at conferences’. In New Zealand, education legislation dictates that all Degree programmes must be taught ‘mainly by people engaged in research’ (“Education Act,” 1989). This is accompanied by definitions of what research might be, which are sufficiently wide to accommodate the large variety of disciplines represented in the system. Despite these definitions, the participants identified that there is a fundamental misunderstanding of what academic research ‘actually is’ among academic immigrant staff who work in the ITP sector. The participants also pointed to conflicts within their own various institutions in regard to a definition of what research should be for the various disciplines and how the effort of research might be supported.

Mandy explained that ‘creative’ research is fairly well understood among her colleagues, however she acknowledged that they get fractious over the requirement to undertake ‘academic’ research, often complaining with “why do I need to do this?”, “for what?”,”I already do this, it is obvious what I do!”, and “why should I care whether or not the institution gets more funding?”. Mark suggested that this situation explains the perceived difference in the staff mind about “an institution level of need and the staff member’s level of need” where staff will simply prioritise one over the other. Billet and Somerville (2004) explain this in terms of the relational construction of the self and subjectivities being socially situated, stressing that individuals can also exercise intentionality.

For some, the disconnect with research was a problem related to specific professions. Both Mandy and Will spoke of the perceived inability of their
respective professions to ‘look back’ or ‘reflect’ as being a problem for their colleagues to embrace academic research. A number of other participants pointed out that their staff often confused research with professional development. John mentioned that it is often seen by staff as “going out and getting back on the tools so that [they] can reconnect with that”. Sally suggested that the reason for this might be that “we are not career academics, we’re not there to become researchers”. One of the participants proposed that the problem lay with ITP’s bringing in people to teach who have limited understanding of research beyond their practice. This situation demonstrates a contrast with studies into academic identity in universities which are generally more concerned with reconciling research with teaching and managerial imperatives, rather than any misunderstanding of the nature and place of research in traditional academic lives (Churchman, 2006; McInnis, 2010; Winter, 2009).

For many of the difficulties and barriers mentioned above, academic immigrants can often be seen to be exercising choice as to whether they appropriate, transform or ignore the practices that they have encountered in their new work environment. Much may rest on quality (and quantity) of the host organisations’ induction and socialisation provision. A question to be asked here is ‘how much do academic immigrants need to change’?

**Work overload**

The issue of workload was also touched upon by most participants and was directly related to the more managerial aspects of the position, in particular administrative processes. Like most middle leaders in higher educational institutions, these leaders are generally overworked expressing feelings of being “inundated”, or “drowning” and often “fire fighting” with problems that were common to all.

According to my contract, I work a 37.5 hour week, but on a good week I do about 45, on a bad week I do more, the more you do the more you get [given to do]. (Andrew)
I was a little bit shocked about the amount of compliance that was required in the institution. I was spending probably a significant amount of my time each week on compliance, chasing people to do stuff that they don't always see the value of (Chris)

You don't stop running until Christmas. And then you're so shagged you've got to have a holiday, and then you come back and you're running again. (Wallace)

Overwork of middle leaders in higher education and in particular ITP’s is symptomatic of the high level of role activity that must be undertaken to sustain academic processes (often bureaucratic) in most institutions. It was reported that any additional job that does not have anyone assigned to it and that needs doing is ‘given to us’. Many of the participants blame this on significant reductions in administration and support staff that have occurred in institutions over recent years. As suggested by Bolman and Gallos (2011), there seems to be a need for institutions to confirm the exact nature of the role requirements for their ‘middle leaders’ as the bureaucratic nature of many of the tasks that are generally undertaken by them are not consistent with their primary function of leading learning.

**Coping with change**

As academic institutions undergo substantial and on-going change, there is a requirement for academic leaders to work with staff groups to achieve often complex and confronting organisational change. Change is often seen by staff as being ‘done to them’ rather than ‘with them’ and there was a discussion around the effect that the positional relationship of change managers or leaders might have on the effectiveness of the change action. It was generally agreed among the participants that being seen on the ‘inside’ would better serve the change, because the leader can leverage their relationship with their staff. However there was also some support for an outsider to come in who had no connection with the staff. For the outsider it was suggested that ‘yes, they can do it’ but there were questions about the ‘effectiveness’ or ability for the change to ‘stick’. Craig noted that “change is not a five minute consultancy” and that “it is bloody hard work because culture change like
that… it has to come from within”. His concern with outside change managers was that “once the authority of that role disappears we’re going to flop back into the old work, we haven’t really changed the culture”. He suggested that a long-term scenario needed to be employed to embed change that was driven by ‘insiders who understand the culture’. This is supported by Halsam, Reicher, and Platow’s (2011) contention that:

Any individual group member will be seen to be more representative of a group (and hence more influential within it) to the extent that, in any given context, his or her characteristics are seen to embody both (1) what “we” have in common and (2) what makes “us” different from “them” (p. 108).

Andrew, however, suggested that being on the ‘inside’ did not always guarantee that the staff would “be with you”. He cited the example of his current role as a change agent in a rethink of trades education where his staff accused him of “being a traitor” because he was leading the change action. This aligns with Kouzes and Posner’s (2005) view which regards change as being ‘intensely personal’ and which can bring up ‘very strong negative emotional responses’, despite Andrews’ connection and usually trusting relation with his staff.

Positional perceptions, such as those mentioned above, are based on the way that staff identify the leader in relation to their own shared identity and values. Kahan (2010) describes insiders being seen as generally trustworthy and sharing identity and values with staff within familiar situations, whereas outsiders are described by Schabracq (2007) as being able to generate suspicion and mistrust and being seen to have little value-based connection. Outsiders can therefore be perceived as being disconnected and more aligned with organisational imperatives than with staff cultures. In this context, the participants suggested that their staff groups identified ‘change management’ as an activity more aligned with being ‘inside’ the staff group because of the shared professional identity and value base of working closely to operationalise change from the inside of the working environment.
The participants spoke of how they worked to achieve change through leveraging their shared connections with staff and engaging them in conversations about how they could determine their own future by adopting to the change rather than having it imposed on them. This aligns with general understandings of successful change leadership (Fullan, 2007; Kotter, 2008; McRoy & Gibbs, 2009). The participants also noted that their staff like to feel that they are being consulted on issues that effect them and do not respond well to being “dictated to”. In Mandy’s environment they were undergoing constant change so she encouraged a team environment and kept a professional industry focus to enable her staff to maintain ownership of the changes. She noted:

We have had a couple of major re-writes but we do it very much as a team and we do do it as considering ourselves working in the industry, which we are. We are all constantly working in the industry in its various forms. (Mandy)

This is in keeping with the notion that change leaders need to position themselves to be closely aligned with the social identity of the group in order to achieve success when undertaking change (Bartunek, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2005).

6.4 Transitions

A key finding for all of the participants was a perceived deficit in socialisation and induction processes within ITP’s where an individual comes to understand the knowledge, values and behaviours needed to perform a particular role within the organisation. One area of transition that was discussed was with regard to academic immigrants ‘becoming an academic’ and their introduction to a new culture, and the second transition discussed was with regard to becoming an academic leader and ‘learning to lead’. By definition, the metaphor used throughout this study of ‘immigration’ involves Deaux’s (2000) concepts of leaving one domain in which identity has been enacted and supported, and coming to a new domain in which identity must be resituated and often redefined. Transitions such as these can be
confronting as they involve separation from the old status (or identity), initiation into the new status and incorporation of the new status into the individuals' self-identity. By looking at instances in which a person is moving from one place to another, as in the case of career migration, institutions may consider what forms of support for this change can be put in place.

Individuals are affected in terms of the context of their introduction and continuing experience of a new environment, as well as the on-going work that they undertake (including their own personal development) and the relationships that they form with their colleagues. There was consensus among the participants that most current induction and socialisation processes were not adequate to address all of the issues that lead to academic immigrants feeling disconnected from the institution. A number of the participants noted that ‘you cannot be expected to assimilate into a new culture if you don’t understand it’. They agreed that there should be more focus on ‘how to become’ an academic, rather than the current situation which is dominated by ‘what you do’ as an academic.

**Becoming an academic**

All of the participants shared personal experience of their own and their colleagues’ introduction to teaching in ITP’s which generally included a distinct lack of adequate induction with the majority recalling that they were “dumped in front of a class with little or no preparation”. They described this as a “baptism by fire” where staff are “thrown in front of students” within days of arriving to teach, with “no time to learn what to do or how to do it”. The participants recognised that learning how to teach is not the only type of induction that is required, and that a ‘lack of understanding about the functioning of the institution’ can be a considerable challenge for new staff who are already unsure about their role.

Higher Education Institutions generally do not have a unitary organisational culture, but are rather characterised according to Trowler’s (2008) notion of ‘multiple cultural configurations’, with disciplinary departments providing an
important locus in developing localised cultures. New academic staff are therefore required to interpret this environment in the process of developing local practices, as both individuals and members of departmental groupings. It is widely recognised among authors such as Henkel (2010), Robertson (2011), and Whitchurch (2012) that people construct professional identities in relation to context and experience and in relation to one another. These identities are not intrinsic or separate from social contexts and interactions; rather they are embodied and enacted in practice. Professional socialisation processes, described by Arnett (2006) as where a new member learns what it is to be part of a new profession, and organisational socialisation, described by Mathieson (2011) as where a person comes to understand the knowledge, values and behaviours needed to perform a particular role within an organisation needs be combined to form the backbone for academic immigrants’ socialisation. From this perspective, new academics’ inductions need to move beyond generic approaches to teaching and learning and the currently dominant focus on a formal introduction to institution-wide structures and processes where new academics are expected simply to receive passively. It is interesting to note that many induction processes described by the participants, where they existed, employ generic learning and teaching approaches which did not match the needs of the particular discipline or student cohorts and were abandoned quickly.

A component of assimilation theory referred to by Portes and Zhou (1993) as ‘the context of reception’ may be relevant here as it describes the importance of immigrants’ encounters upon arrival in their new environment. A ‘context of reception’ shapes how immigrants become “incorporated into the system of stratification in the host society” (Zhou, 1997, p. 975) and contributes to how well they will assimilate into this new society. Gibson and Koyama (2011) suggest that a context of reception is created by the new host’s policies, attitudes, beliefs, stereotypes and prejudices. Other concepts linked to immigration theory, such as acculturation also have relevance as they parallel many features of the process of socialisation (and enculturation). Berry (2006) notes that acculturation may be viewed as a process of re-socialisation
because it takes place after an individual’s initial socialisation into his or her original culture.

With this in mind, a stronger approach to socialisation processes should engage new academics in considering the wider organisational and political contexts in which they are practising, focusing on developing their agency in these complex contexts. Assimilation theory suggests new academics must actively construct an understanding of their new environment by engaging in socially situated practices. From this perspective there is a need to create a coherent support framework that aims to integrate Boyd’s (2010) concept of ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ professional learning, and which includes institutional and departmental elements with, both formal and informal localised processes of organisational socialisation. This approach may also help to address the issue of disconnect with the organisation. As Ruscio (1987) suggests, “Institutional affiliation comes after the training, after the socialisation” (p. 332).

Learning to lead
The second part of the key finding around socialisation and induction processes was a firm message from the participants that improved ‘leadership’ induction and training was necessary. Eleven participants described the lack of induction and training that they received when they took up the leadership role while two spoke of being given training opportunities that they felt were not aligned with the reality of the actual role. Evidence suggests that development and training for middle leadership is not consistent across the sector and in fact is severely lacking in some quarters. Most of this study’s participants ‘fell’ into leadership positions and did not consciously undertake training prior to, or upon taking up the position. Academic immigrant leadership positions tend to echo Dimmock’s (Dimmock, 1999) proposition that the capability often seems to occur through personal predisposition rather than through processes of management development. Bolman and Gallos (2011) subscribe to a leadership epistemology that suggests “when you understand, you know what to do” (p. 29). They have
determined that to ensure the development of ‘good’ leadership, organisations need to identify those who have leadership potential and then to nurture them as they would nurture any other precious resource which, is critical to success. It is, however, surprising to note that few systematic efforts have been undertaken to pinpoint the early markers of leadership (Gewirtz, 2002) and that many organisations still rely on informal, natural selection or happenstance mechanisms of fostering leadership talent (Gronn, 2015).

The participants suggested that one of the dangers of natural selection in educational leadership was that often people who are ‘very good in one position’ are promoted up to a level where they are ‘no longer doing what they are necessarily good at’. Chris highlighted his concern that often the people who become managers were the people who started as a lower level person where they spent time, developed the relationships, then moved up the ranks and, in his own words, “they may know shit about management”. This often resulted in managers having “appalling people skills, but they go up the ranks”.

It has been suggested by Hancock and Hellawell (2003) that the lack of focussed leadership (management) training may be symptomatic of the fact that academic middle manager service posts have varied backwards and forwards between ‘permanent’ and ‘fixed-term’ appointments. Most of the participants agreed that this can result in a lack of certainty and security which may result in the posts not attracting the best candidates. A further difficulty for academic leaders may not only be confined to a lack of leadership and management development, but could be further complicated by a lack of agreement within organisations on just what academic leadership roles entail. As noted earlier, the role title of ‘leader’ being located in the ‘middle’ is a somewhat new concept in most ITP contexts.

As for academic leadership skills and knowledge, all of the participants acknowledged that they called on their previous ‘professional experiences’ when executing their role. Given the majority of the backgrounds of the participants (sole-trader, small business owner, project manager, independent
artist) it can be assumed that general management skills were readily available for them to employ, however only a few proposed that they came to academia complete with fully formed leadership skills. There is an obvious need, as identified above for academic immigrant staff in general, for educational institutions to provide targeted formal and informal leadership and management training for academic middle leaders rather than the current generic approaches. This may allow academic immigrant leaders to exploit their unique position and to utilise all of their skills to better meet organisations needs.

Trowler and Knight (1999) have suggested that the responsibility for induction and socialisation should reside in the hands of local academic leaders, because it is through the values, interests and concerns within the localised academic department where ‘authentic’ socialisation occurs. Given that current institutional induction and socialisation processes, which generally cover the basics of learning and teaching only, were found to be inadequate for identity development, then it is opportune for institutions to engage academic leaders in the creation of coherent support frameworks that integrate both institutional and departmental elements with formal and informal localised processes of organisational socialisation.

**Summary**

This chapter has discussed the findings of the research in the light of literature reviewed in earlier chapters. It has sought to explain how academic immigrants experience and construct identity and how relationships of identity between academic leaders and colleagues, who share the same professional background, affect the work of academic leaders. It has done this by analysing the findings using the conceptual framework of the interrelationships between identities as a heuristic device as well as the metaphor of ‘immigrant’. As has been suggested throughout this chapter identity seems to offer an insight into how individuals see themselves as group members and their relationships to working environments. In this sense
it is the interrelationships between academic immigrant leaders and their staff that form the core of this study. How these interrelationships affect individual experience and what adjustments and reconstructions of a sense of self occur to accommodate them is important work in order to sustain the sense of self (Billett & Somerville, 2004; Parker, 2000). Such identity work takes place in environments where there is a potential separation of ‘us’ and ‘them’, where identities are partly ordered by the way in which people identify themselves with others like them, through the kinds of jobs that they do. Wenger (1998), when discussing communities of practice describes identity as being about negotiation and participation with the social structures that people encounter and although people are subject to cultural influences, they are also individual agents with histories of participation formed by unique interactions over time, thus forming ‘personal trajectories of participation’ (Dreier, 1999) or non-participation (Wenger, 1998). Individual trajectories of participation result in personal ontogenies, which will result in unique dispositions, and ways of knowing and knowledge (Billett, 2001).

The discussion has shown that academic immigrant identity is a complex hybrid identity that is characterised by the adoption of a professional identity from previous (pre-academic) work practices, and an emerging academic identity based on experiences of teaching and socialisation from new work practices. The role identity ‘professional’ was formed early in their lives and socialisation processes have contributed to positioning this identity as a ‘core’ identity, which represents more fundamental cognitions and feelings that they have about themselves. As a consequence, academic immigrants inhabit two cultures, their previous one, which is associated with their pre-academic working profession, and their newly adopted academic one. Evidence also suggests that for some, there is a distinct dichotomy between the two.

While academic immigrant identity comprises a strong identification with a previous profession, there is also present, to varying degrees, a strong identification with ‘teaching’. However academic immigrants do not identify with traditional notions of ‘academic identity’. Academic immigrant identity situates ‘academic’ in terms of a personal understanding that is an amalgam
of personal and professional experiences both within and outside their particular institution.

Academic immigrants display a weak identification with the educational institutions in which they are employed. This may be as a result of a number of cultural and bureaucratic barriers, which were identified, that were seen to contribute to this, including understandings (and misunderstandings) about the practice of academic research and the bureaucratic processes associated with academia.

For academic immigrant leaders, the discussion has shown that they have adopted an additional identity based around their organisational leadership role and hold both institutional and professional identity components. Feelings of ‘unease’ were experienced around this change in status. Narratives around their actions as academic leaders suggest that both academic and organisational identities have developed significantly through their personal understanding of their selves in the roles of academic leader. This was evidenced in their concern for learning and teaching and the welfare of both students and staff. There was also a sense of them wanting to achieve organisational goals while doing their best by their staff and discipline. Evidence suggests that academic immigrant leaders feel more comfortable with using the term ‘manager’, rather than ‘leader’ to explain their role. Leadership and management were seen as complementary to each other when engaging in academic leadership, however most participants felt strongly that their staff identified management as an activity more aligned with ‘being on the ground’, and ‘inside’ the working environment and therefore a part of the group.

Issues of workload and of feeling ‘overworked’ were discussed and were suggested to be symptomatic of the high level of role activity that needed be undertaken to sustain academic processes (often bureaucratic) in most institutions. This was blamed on significant reductions in administration and support staff that have occurred in institutions over recent years. It was agreed that there is a need for institutions to confirm the exact nature of the
role requirements for their ‘middle leaders’ as the bureaucratic nature of many of the tasks that are generally undertaken by them are not consistent with their primary function of leading learning.

This discussion has shown that academic immigrant leaders intervene in a number of areas on behalf of their staff groups and to make choices regarding the extent to which they would follow institutional practices, or by ‘massaging the system’ to get the results that they are looking for. They act as ‘champions’ and ‘connectors’ where they act on behalf of their students and staff by utilising their organisational connections to achieve the best results for their discipline/department. They also act as ‘influencers’ and ‘translators’ where they assist their staff in understanding and adopting institutional and educational constructs. Evidence also suggests that academic immigrant leaders act as gatekeepers between their staff groups/discipline and the institution by exercising intentionality, where they make choices about the extent to which they will appropriate, transform or ignore institutional practices. They often ‘excuse’ behaviours exhibited by their staff who choose not to engage with institutional processes. In this way they can be seen as creating a cycle of dependency where staff will not increase capability because they are not being pushed to engage in learning how. This in turn may lead to academic immigrant staff being inadvertently encouraged to preface their professional identity over their academic identity, despite the fact that this is contradictory to the position of their new workplace setting.

The discussion suggested that there is a significant advantage for academic leaders who share backgrounds and identity with their staff as this relationship assists them in the execution of their role as academic leader. Academic immigrant leaders and academic immigrant staff with shared professional backgrounds share strong identity bonds derived from their work histories in their professional disciplines as well as through emerging academic identities within their discipline work groups. Evidence suggests that a benefit of having a shared professional background was the ability to communicate with staff in ‘their own language’. Factors associated with this that contribute to good working relationships were the understanding of “where their staff had come
from” and “what they do and how they do it”. The sharing of strong professional identities through their work histories with their outside disciplines as well as through their emerging academic identities within their discipline work groups allows the academic immigrant leader to be seen as ‘in-group’ members who share identity and values and enjoy a trustworthy relationship with each other.

Finally, induction and socialisation processes provided by academic institutions, were seen to be inadequate. Academic immigrants, who are deeply socialised in a previous professional identity, require substantive and targeted induction and socialisation processes in their new environment to address the complex issue of identity development, redevlopment or change. Without these, higher education cultures may simply be too different, or too new, from their past experience to enable them to wholly adapt and fit in of their own volition. Evidence suggests that there should be more focus on ‘how to become’ an academic, rather than the current situation which is dominated by ‘what you do’ as an academic. Academic leaders were seen to be key in the successful socialisation of industry professionals into the academic environment. Leadership training for academic leaders was also found to be wanting and suffered from failings that often stem from those mentioned above as well as an inconsistent understanding of what academic leadership actually means in each institution.

The next chapter emphasises the original contribution of this research to new knowledge and draws conclusions regarding the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector. It also draws conclusions about the nature and significance of the relationships between academic immigrant leaders and their staff and the effect that this shared professional background and identity has on their work as academic leaders. In addition, it includes implications and recommendations for practice and future research.
Chapter 7 Conclusions and recommendations

In this study I set out to describe and understand the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand Polytechnic sector. They are defined as industry professionals who have been recruited directly into higher education with little or no background in academia. The study also examined and interpreted the nature and significance of the relationship between these academic immigrant leaders, their staff with whom they share professional backgrounds and identity, and the institutions in which they are now employed. This concluding chapter considers a number of implications regarding the nature of academic immigrant identity and the significance of a shared professional background between the academic immigrant leader and their staff and its effect on their work. These implications begin to define an understanding of academic immigrant identity, which has been built through the research process and results from the combined activities of literature review, data collection and analysis. Together these implications will expand and build upon existing theories of academic identity and academic leadership identity.

In order to generate insights into academic immigrant identity the data were discussed using the study’s analytical framework, namely the interrelationships between identities, and employing the metaphor of ‘immigrant’. These were employed as a means of achieving a more dynamic account of the relationships between academic immigrant staff and academic immigrant leaders with a particular focus on how individuals construct their identities in a variety of ways, and with multiple components. Using this conceptual framework, the analysis and discussion addressed the study’s main and specific research questions. The main research question for this study is:

What is the nature of academic immigrant identity, and what is the significance of the relationship between academic immigrant leaders, their academic immigrant colleagues who share a professional identity and background?
In order to address this main research question the following specific research questions were posed:

Question 1: How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?
Question 2: How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?
Question 3: What influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?

This concluding chapter emphasises the study’s original contribution to knowledge and draws conclusions regarding the identity of academic leaders who may be defined as academic immigrants in the context of the Aotearoa New Zealand ITP sector. Implications are drawn about the nature and significance of the relationships between academic immigrant leaders and their staff with whom they share professional backgrounds and identity, and the institutions in which they are now employed. In addition recommendations for practice and future research are included.

7.1 Defining a new ‘hybrid’ form of academic identity

Sixteen passionate academic middle leaders, all of whom identified with the metaphorical concept of being an academic ‘immigrant’, participated in this study. This was not a large sample by any means, yet their narratives of personal experience of identity as it relates to their role as academic immigrant leaders, and their relationship of shared background and identity with their academic immigrant colleagues, have provided insights and understandings into the phenomenon that will enable readers to transfer these findings to their own contexts or environments. That is not to say that these findings should be generalised, in fact generalising these results would be at odds with the key epistemological tenet of constructivist interpretive research.
as described in Chapter 3. It is simply hoped that academics who recognise themselves in the narratives of the participants of this study may take learnings from the findings to assist them in their future work.

From an analysis of the data collected a number of propositions are presented which together begin to explain academic immigrant identity and augment existing theories of academic identity. These have been built through the research process and result from the combined activities of literature review, data collection and analysis. These propositions are organised below in association with each of the research questions. They are then discussed in terms of their significance, and implications for practice.

**Academic immigrant identity**

In relation to this first research question, ‘How do academic immigrants experience and construct identity?’, a range of propositions emerged which provide theoretical insight into the nature of academic immigrant identity. They are:

---

**Academic immigrant identity** may be defined as a complex hybrid identity that is characterised by the merging of a deeply socialised professional identity from previous (pre-academic) work practices, with an emerging academic identity based on experiences of teaching and socialisation processes from new work practices.

Academic immigrants do not identify with traditional notions of academic identity, rather they frame their understanding of being an academic through the filter of their professional identity. As a result of their deep socialisation in a previous professional identity and a lack of targeted socialisation in the institutions in which they are now employed, their loyalty lies with their discipline, rather than the institution. This socially constructed sense of loyalty, which links strongly to professional values and practices may result in disconnection and tension with the institution and validate behaviours...
that enable academic immigrants to form sub-cultures based around their discipline groupings and to operate in discipline ‘silos’.

Academic immigrants require substantive and targeted induction and socialisation processes in their new environment to address the complex issue of identity development, redevelopment or change. Without these, higher education cultures may simply be too different, or too new, from their past experience to enable them to wholly adapt and fit in of their own volition.

Analysis of the findings has suggested that academic immigrants possess a ‘hybrid’ identity that balances elements of both prior ‘professional’ and emerging ‘academic’ identities. As a result, academic immigrants have two working contexts with different associated practices and must make some kind of transition between them. This results in a dual (or multi) professionalism, which exists in spite of inhabiting a seemingly singular job as an academic. For most, their professional identity, which is representative of their past and from which their ‘accent’ derives, is more highly valued. It sits higher in a hierarchy of salience than the newly adopted (or forming) academic identity. In effect the former is dominating the latter. For academic immigrants this sense of self is undergoing change as a result of finding themselves in a new place, with a new role as an academic. Whilst academic immigrants may have learned to adapt to their new working environment, their sense of identity generally resonates more with their past professional experience in other employment settings, in which they feel more accomplished and familiar.

For all of the participants in this study the role identity as a ‘professional’ was formed early in their lives during the formative years of professional identity building related to their initial career choices upon completing secondary education. Socialisation processes which are concerned with moving from ‘youth to adulthood’ in collaboration with those attributed to ‘entering the profession’ have contributed to positioning this identity as a ‘core’ identity,
which represents more fundamental cognitions and feelings that these individuals have about their ‘selves’. In contrast, academic identity began to form much later in life for all of the participants, ten of whom planned the move to formal teaching in a tertiary institution as part of a career change when they reached their late 30’s or early 40’s. It was reported that this is also the case for the majority of the participants’ academic immigrant colleagues. As a consequence, academic immigrants inhabit two cultures, their previous one, which is associated with their pre-academic working profession, and their newly adopted academic one. An individual’s personal sense of belonging to both their ‘old’ and their ‘new’ professions, therefore, distinguish academic immigrant identity. For some, however, there is a distinct dichotomy between the two.

It is well established that individuals have multiple identities that may be activated at the same time. In this way the academic immigrant may have a professional (industrial/discipline) identity that is aligned with their original profession, as well as an academic identity as a teacher and employee of the institution. If the professional identity is more fully formed than the academic identity, for whatever reason, then identity theory predicts that the identity with the higher level of prominence or the identity with the higher level of commitment will guide behaviour more than an identity with a lower level of prominence or commitment (Burke & Stets, 2009).

Traditional notions of academic identity were rejected as being too far from the reality of the educational work experienced by these participants in the New Zealand ITP sector. Academic immigrant identity situates ‘academic’ in terms of a personal understanding that is an amalgam of personal and professional experiences both within and outside their particular institution. The participants felt that there was general confusion among people like themselves, who have little or no background in academia and who entered the institution direct from industry, with titles such as ‘academic’ and ‘researcher’. Many found it difficult to align these terms with activity within their professional identity frame. At best the terms were seen to be confusing and at worst confronting. It was also noted that there was confusion around
the definition of terms such as ‘lecturer’, ‘teacher’ and ‘tutor’, as employed in educational organisations.

This is an important issue for academic institutions such as New Zealand polytechnics who continue to recruit to academic posts employing traditional notions of teaching and research as built in assumptions, with advertisements and job descriptions still predicated on traditional models of academic identity. The outcome of this may be that institutions may not attract the people with potential to forge new academic identities, because they are unable to recognise a role for themselves in the recruitment literature provided. Another danger is highlighted by Pelias (2004) where academics become disappointed and experience ‘a crisis of faith’ as they discover that their academic life is not what they expected or bargained for.

They were teaching students who seemed more interested in grades than learning. They were working for administrators who seemed more concerned with the bottom line than quality education. They were going to endless meetings that didn't seem to matter, writing meaningless reports that seemed to disappear into the bureaucracy. (p. 10)

An academic, who may have entered the institution with a different set of values from a previous professional, may not easily adapt the identity changes that implied in traditional forms of academic identity, and this may determine whether they stay in academia or not.

Findings also identified a number of cultural and bureaucratic barriers that were seen to contribute to academic immigrants’ weak identification with their employing institutions. Primarily, these were the requirement to undertake ‘academic’ research, feelings of uncertainty about educational processes (and contemporary learning and teaching methods), and a universal dislike of organisational bureaucracy. Many of the barriers seemed to result from ‘clashes’ of culture between previous working identities as professionals and new working identities as academics. There was a general sense that
induction and socialisation experiences (discussed in detail in a later section) within their respective institutions were key to mitigating many of the barriers that were identified.

A perceived deficit in socialisation and induction processes within ITP’s where an individual comes to understand the knowledge, values and behaviours needed to perform a particular role within the organisation was a significant issue for all of the participants. By definition, the metaphor used throughout this study of ‘immigration’ involves leaving one domain in which identity has been enacted and supported, and coming to a new domain in which identity must be resituated and often redefined (Deaux, 2000). Transitions such as these can be confronting as they involve separation from the old status (or role), initiation into the new status and incorporation of the new status into the individuals’ self-identity (Bridges, 2003). By looking at instances in which a person is moving from one place to another, as in the case of career migration, institutions may consider what forms of support for this change can be put in place.

Academic immigrant identity is characterised by the merging of a deeply socialised professional identity from previous (pre-academic) work practices, with an emerging academic identity based on experiences of teaching and socialisation processes from new work practices. This identity frame has direct implication for Aotearoa New Zealand ITP’s where a high proportion of faculty staff, who may be described as academic immigrants, are employed. It can be argued that Higher Education Institutions themselves play a major role in defining and organising the behaviour and work values of their academic staff (Winter, 2009). ITP’s primarily recruit personnel in a range of discipline areas with professional expertise which is not necessarily derived from the academic world, but which more and more reflects the ‘world of work’. Some will have academic qualifications equal to those of other staff; some will bring forms of knowledge, values, and practices from other sectors of societies that may compete for equal legitimacy in contemporary higher education settings (Whitchurch, 2008). Educational organisations cannot assume that academic staff who join the organisation directly from industry will value academic work
in the traditional way.

In light of this, it is understandable to accept that academic immigrants experience a strong connection and identification with their professional identity and do not necessarily identify strongly with traditional notions of academic identity. Institutions need to be cognisant of the changing landscape of academic identity that results from the reframing of what ‘academia’ looks like mentioned above. They need to examine structures, which are generally based on traditional models of academic ‘work’, and provide situational solutions that work best for these ‘new’ breeds of academic staff within the contexts of discipline groups. In this way they may leverage the best of both worlds by legitimising the identity concerns of academic immigrants and gaining a more achievable form of ‘academic’ identity into which an industry professional can easily enter and adopt as their own. This may work somewhat towards addressing the recognised issue of academic immigrants not identifying strongly with the institutions in which they are now employed.

Academic immigrants, who are deeply socialised in a previous professional identity, require substantive and targeted induction and socialisation processes in their new environment to address the complex issue of identity development and change. Targeted socialisation and induction processes may be a way of delivering an enhanced experience of transition for academic immigrants. Evidence suggests that there should be more focus on ‘how to become’ an academic, rather than the current situation which is dominated by ‘what you do’ as an academic. Leadership training for academic leaders was also found to suffer from similar failings. Institutions are therefore challenged to reappraise their induction programmes and socialisation processes to address how new academic staff (especially industry professionals) can be prepared for ‘bridging’ between two different cultures, and how they will address the issues of boundaries, expectations and flexibility of employers and the new teachers themselves. A question to be asked also is how to employ existing staff in the process, especially academic immigrant leaders and staff who share external professional identities? Some commentators have suggested that the responsibility for induction and socialisation should
reside in the hands of local academic leaders, because it is through the values, interests and concerns within the localised academic department where ‘authentic’ socialisation occurs (Trowler & Knight, 1999).

Referring again to the immigration metaphor used as a frame for describing academic immigrants, ITP’s may benefit from embracing concepts such as ‘context of reception’ (Portes & Zhou, 1993), which predict the importance of immigrants’ encounters upon arrival in their new environment. A ‘context of reception’ shapes how immigrants become “incorporated into the system of stratification in the host society” (Zhou, 1997, p. 975) and contributes to how well they will assimilate into this new society. This may then be linked to the concept of ‘re-mooring’ (Deaux, 2000), which employs contextualised formal and informal systems of support in new environments for identity shifts and identity redefinition based on local (discipline) and organisational need.

**Academic immigrant leader identity**

In relation to the second research question, ‘How do academic immigrant leaders describe and understand their experiences of being academic leaders?’, the following proposition provides theoretical insight into the understanding of the nature of the role:

---

Academic immigrant leader identity may be defined as an amalgam of multiple identities, which include industry professionals, teachers and academic leaders. While they see themselves as representing both professional and organisational values, they maintain a stronger association with their professional identity than with their academic (and organisational) identity.

Academic immigrant leaders associate their role as being firmly in the middle of their organisational structures and viewed the work that they undertook in the role as being more management oriented, rather than leadership oriented. Excessive managerial workload was also associated with the role and is regarded as a major concern for
middle leaders in ITP’s. The role of academic leader is ill defined in many institutional environments and requires considered re-evaluation.

Changes in identity are more complex than a single step from an ‘industry professional’ to an ‘academic staff member’ to an ‘academic leader’. The process can be seen as an iterative one in which individuals enact the various roles conferred on them, as they adjust and reconstruct the roles to satisfy their understanding of work. Narratives around the participants’ role as academic leaders suggest that both academic and organisational identities have developed significantly through their personal understanding of their ‘selves’ in the role of academic leader and the actions that they undertake in the role. This was evidenced in their strongly articulated concern for learning and teaching and the welfare of both students and staff. There was also a sense of wanting to achieve organisational goals while doing their best by their staff and discipline.

Feelings of ‘unease’ were experienced around the change in status from colleague to leader. As academic leaders, the participants locate themselves in the middle of their institutions’ management structure where they are required to reconcile both top-level organisational goals, which are generally defined by top management, with lower level expectations and their colleagues’ willingness to engage with these goals. They operate within an identity frame where they see themselves as representing both professional values and organisational values, and experience a sense of both ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ entirely to either domain. Maintaining this dual identity enables them to employ their deep understandings of the professional networks to assist them in achieving the best results for their students, colleagues and their discipline/department.

The participants in this study all demonstrated a personal disposition to undertake the move towards academic leadership and related their individual agency to their work histories. As well as the construction of their identity over
time, the participants were affected in terms of the context of their introduction and continuing experience of their new work environment (including induction), as well as the on-going work that they undertook (including their own personal development) and the relationships that they formed with their colleagues. Evidence suggests that these relationships are key to the ability of the academic immigrant leader to perform their role.

There was also recognition among the participants that there is a conflict in the terminology of the titles that are afforded to academic middle leaders/managers. These academic immigrant leaders tend to position themselves more as managers than leaders because of issues related to workload that is predominantly concerned with bureaucratic and administrative work. This may also be linked to the nature of training and induction that is offered by educational institutions and is supported by the participants’ observations about the relevance of the training that is on offer. It is safe to say that identity shifts do not occur as if by magic, and there is a process of ‘learning’ a new identity that is required if any new identity is to be successfully adopted.

Academic immigrants who have progressed to become academic leaders have adopted an additional role identity based around academic and organisational leadership and hold multiple institutional and professional identity components. While academic immigrant leaders espouse a position of valuing their professional identity above their other adopted academic identities, narratives around their role as academic leaders suggest that both academic and organisational identities play an important part in the role of academic leader and inform the actions that they undertake in the role. This is evidenced in their strongly articulated concern for learning and teaching and for the welfare of both students and staff. There is also a strong sense of wanting to achieve organisational goals while doing their best for their staff and discipline. The advantage for educational organisations is that academic immigrant leaders operate with an identity frame where they see themselves as representing both professional values and organisational values. This enables them to employ their deep understandings of their professional and
academic networks to assist them in achieving the best results for their students, colleagues and their discipline/department.

It is important to note that there was also concern among the participants regarding a perceived conflict in the terminology of the titles that are afforded to academic middle leaders/managers. The participants viewed themselves more as managers than leaders due to the day to day actions associated with their roles.

As for academic leadership skills and knowledge, all of the participants acknowledged that they called on their previous ‘professional experiences’ when executing their role. Given the majority of the backgrounds of the participants (sole-trader, small business owner, project manager, independent artist) it can be assumed that general management skills were readily available for them to employ, however only a few proposed that they came to academia complete with fully formed leadership skills.

**Significant bonds of identity**

In relation to the third research question, ‘What influence does a shared professional identity and background between academic immigrant leaders and their academic immigrant colleagues have on their relationship and how does this contribute to, or impede, their work?’, the following propositions provide theoretical insight into the nature of the relationship:

---

**Academic immigrant leaders and academic immigrant staff with shared professional backgrounds share strong identity bonds derived from their work histories in their professional disciplines as well as through emerging academic identities within their discipline work groups.**

**Academic immigrant leaders are able to communicate with their staff ‘directly’ and in ‘their own language’. They possess a sophisticated understanding of “where their staff had come from” and “what they do**
and how they do it”. This represents a significant advantage as they are recognised by their colleagues as ‘in-group’ members who share identity and values and enjoy a trustworthy relationship with their staff groups. The recognition of shared cultures and assumptions assists academic immigrant leaders in the execution of their role.

Academic immigrant leaders, who have a strong affiliation with their external profession and their staff with whom they share professional backgrounds may display behaviours that can bring them into conflict with their institutional responsibilities. This can contribute to ‘siloed’ behaviour where conscious decisions are made about the extent to which they will appropriate, transform or ignore institutional practices by choosing to prioritise staff and discipline needs over the needs of the institution.

Academic immigrant leaders may act as ‘gatekeepers’ by positioning themselves variously as ‘champions’, ‘connectors’, ‘influencers’ and ‘translators’, where they interpret and filter what will cross the boundary between the institution (outside) and their staff and discipline (inside).

As has been established earlier, academic immigrant leaders hold multiple identities as professionals (past professions), teachers and academic leaders. They are positioned to closely align with the social identity of their staff groups and have a strong identification with their previous profession and have developed a trusting relationship with their colleagues with whom they share this identification. They also align with Reicher et al’s., (2007) proposal that the best leaders not only appear to belong to the group, but are “prototypical of the characteristics that make the group distinct from others” (p. 24). Given these understandings, and the findings of this study there is strong evidence which suggests that academic immigrant leaders who hold strong values bond with their staff based on their shared professional identity and background,
are in a unique position to effectively bridge the divide between the sometimes conflicting cultures within their organisations.

As has been discussed in a prior section, academic immigrants hold on to their identity as discipline professionals as they negotiate their way towards academic identity. While they can be seen to be building a new identity trajectory as ‘teacher’, they are also working hard to maintain their existing trajectory as a ‘discipline professional’. Academic immigrants may focus on building new identities as teachers, however they do not focus as much on building identities as researchers or as organisational citizens. They feel pressure to build a new identity as a ‘researcher’ or as an ‘organisational player’, and they find it difficult to prioritise these activities within their everyday practice and workload. Academic immigrant leaders assist in this development as ‘influencers’ by calling on their credibility and acting as coach, guide and role model. Ralph’s example of the way that he worked with his staff to de-mystify research is an excellent example of this in action. He ‘walks them into that space’ and tells them ‘it is better than sex’. Academic immigrant leaders can provide a form of legitimacy for their staff to adopt a range of different permissible identities because of the credibility of their value status. They work from ‘inside’ the problem by building their staff capability by reminding them that as professionals and educators they are the best ones to translate their skills into the learning and teaching.

When being a translator, academic immigrant leaders are actively interpreting academic issues into language that their staff can understand. This may include issues around learning and teaching, assessment, research or organisation issues such as organisational systems, compliance reporting and change actions. They connect with their staff on a personal level, which allows them to “talk to them about were they’re coming from”, and “remind them that they have the skills and the expertise, even if they don’t think they do”. They draw on their knowledge of their discipline, their colleagues’ experiences and their knowledge of organisational culture to assist their staff to contextualise personal meaning around academic issues. However the form that this takes and the extent to which this translation occurs is linked to, and may
determine, the level of capability that is built among academic immigrant staff.

Evidence suggests that academic immigrant leaders position themselves as gatekeepers between the institution and their discipline and are more likely to allow professional priorities to override academic ones. When dealing with organisational imperatives that effect students, staff and the discipline, academic immigrant leaders will make choices about the extent to which they will appropriate, transform or ignore institutional practices. From the academic leaders point of view, this is based on a firm belief that institutions generally do not really understand the specific needs of the respective disciplines. Institutions may be able to mitigate this situation by engaging in more open and contextual conversations about the ‘real’ needs of disciplines, rather than a compulsion to treat all discipline as if there was a level playing field. As these academic leaders suggest, there is always a way to find a solution that does not compromise the original intention – too much. It is important to note that academic leaders are able to balance their responses in these situations because they have adapted elements of organisational identity into their own identity as academic leaders, which gives them multiple options to choose from. They embody both the professional values of their colleagues and the organisational values of their employer, and for them there is often a conflict between the two.

When taking the position of champion, the academic immigrant leaders make choices for their departments and colleagues that are based on a deep understanding of what is ‘right’ and what is ‘needed’ for their respective disciplines. They act as ‘connectors’ and leverage their connections with their professional discipline, other parts of the organisation, and sometimes with senior leadership, to ‘fight to protect things’ that they feel are ‘under threat’ from more general institutional practices or requirements. They are more likely to ‘find ways around the problem’ and will make choices regarding the extent to which they will follow institutional practices.

The majority of the participants admitted that they often undertook far too much academic work on behalf of their staff. Some did it because they felt
that they should ‘spare their staff’, who they felt ‘were not here to be academics’ and who ‘work hard enough on the teaching’, to those who felt they had to do it because their staff simply were ‘not interested’ in engaging and simply ‘would not do the work’. There is a danger here of creating a cycle of dependency where staff will not increase capability because they are not being encouraged to engage in learning how. There were also some cases where staff took it for granted that they did not have to engage in the work, because they knew that their leader would do it for them. Another danger of academic immigrant staff not engaging in aspects of academic or organisational work, is that they may be encouraged to preface their professional identity over their academic identity, despite the fact that this is contradictory to the position of their new workplace setting. If there is a continued disconnect with the practice of academia, then it is unlikely that a true academic identity will be developed (Wenger, 1998).

A result of these leaders taking on more of the academic work on behalf of their staff, for whatever reasons that they cite, is an increase in workload. This in-turn can lead to dissatisfaction with the role. Evidence also suggests that for some who were dissatisfied with the workload of their leadership role that they were more likely to have taken on additional academic work on behalf of their staff. Generally blame for workload was focussed outward towards the institution, rather than inward to the actions of the leader. A question for these academic leaders to ask themselves is - ‘how much of this problem is of their own making?’

### 7.2 Recommendations for practice

The findings of this research have specific relevance in higher education contexts and in particular for the New Zealand ITP sector, in which academic immigrant staff are highly represented. It is acknowledged that in the ITP sector staff have mainly been recruited directly from a relevant discipline industry with little or no background in teaching and like all immigrants who choose to adopt a new ‘home’, these academic immigrants must make sense of their new social environment and decide how and to what extent they are
going to integrate themselves into the host culture (Leal, 2011). However the
difference between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ environments may affect the amount of
time that academic immigrants take to achieve any integration (Whitchurch,
2008).

Recommendation One

**Senior educational institutional leadership need to understand (and harness) the potential of the academic immigrant leader to assist in mitigating the identity divide, which can exist between academic immigrant staff and the institutions in which they are employed.**

As has been discussed earlier, academic immigrants often display divided
loyalty between their employer organisations and their own professional fields
and form into organisational subcultures or silos which may employ resistant
behaviours that conflict with educational and organisational goals (Gover &
Duxbury, 2012). The power of the academic immigrant leader to leverage a
wide range of relationships and situations is demonstrated by the way that
they position themselves variously as ‘champions’, ‘connectors’, ‘influencers’
and ‘translators’ and leverage their connections within the institution and their
profession to achieve outcomes for their respective discipline and student and
staff groups. For educational institutions this represents an opportunity where
they can work with academic immigrant leaders to employ the strong values
based relationship between themselves and their staff in achieving a wide
range of educational and organisational goals.

Recommendation Two

**Institutions need to engage academic leaders in the creation of coherent support frameworks that integrate both institutional and departmental elements with formal and informal localised processes of organisational socialisation.**

This is important given that current institutional induction and socialisation
processes, which generally cover the basics of learning and teaching only,
have been found to be inadequate for identity development. Trowler (2008) has suggested that the responsibility for induction and socialisation should reside in the hands of local academic leaders, because it is through the values, interests and concerns within the localised academic department where ‘authentic’ socialisation occurs.

As a classic case of in-group, out-group relations, the contact between academic immigrants and their host institution requires us to think in bidirectional terms. We must ask the questions, ‘how do host institutions view their new populations?’, and ‘how do these recent academic immigrants view the dominant academic groups?’ More complexity is added to the equation, however, when several groups enter the arena simultaneously, and when the institution itself is not a homogeneous, single cultural enclave. These and other factors promise to define a set of issues that will require us to expand our existent models and pit our creative skills against the exceedingly complex world of immigration.

It is hoped that senior institution leaders, who recognise their staff in the narratives presented here, employ the outcomes of this research to develop meaningful induction and socialisation processes for academic immigrants that help to bridge the transition between an academic immigrants’ ‘old’ and ‘new’ profession need to be considered. Outcomes may be tailored to meet the unique needs of academic immigrant leaders and staff within specific organisational cultures and contexts. Such processes need to take into account the diversity of the audience (new staff members) and their collective histories; the complexity of institutional processes, language and culture; and the diverse contexts of the discipline grouping that these staff will join. By looking at instances in which a person is moving from one place to another, as in the case of the metaphor of migration, we are in an excellent position to explore what the forms of support for an identity might be required. By definition, immigration involves leaving one domain in which identity has been enacted and supported, and coming to a new domain in which identity must be resituated and often redefined (Deaux, 2000). As far as academic immigrant staff are concerned, it may be safe to say that without actions such
as these, higher education cultures may simply be too different, or too new, from their past experience to enable them to wholly adapt and fit in of their own volition.

**Recommendation Three**

There is an identified need to provide targeted formal and informal leadership and management training for academic immigrant leaders rather than the current generic approaches.

This holds significance for both New Zealand and international contexts where development and training for middle leadership is recognised as not being consistent across the sector and is severely lacking in some quarters (Hancock & Hellawell, 2003). The development of responsive support mechanisms may allow academic immigrant leaders to better exploit their unique position and to utilise all of their skills to better meet organisations needs.

Targeted skills development for academic immigrant leaders may also address some of the identified issues regarding the loyalty conflicts of the academic leaders themselves. It was identified that academic immigrant leaders allow some of their staff to not engage in all aspects of academic or organisational work. This may result in encouraging these staff to preface their professional identity over their academic identity thereby enforcing siloed behaviours. If there is a continued disconnect with the practice of academia, then it is unlikely that a true academic identity will ever be developed. Institutions need to move to assist academic immigrant leaders in overcoming this ‘desire to help their colleagues’, for whatever reason that they give.

Whatever strategies are chosen, it seems logical that any formal and informal induction and socialisation processes that helps academic immigrants to understand the requirements of the academic world and demystifies the various process, will help academic leaders to gain traction in this area. Whilst academic immigrant staff might not joyfully adopt these aspects of their job, they might consider it less of a burden if they understand the reasons why
they are doing it and how it fits into the overall scheme of things. Being reminded that it is part of their contractual obligations might not hurt either.

**Recommendation Four**  
Another recommendation for senior institutional leaders is to acknowledge the high proportion of concern regarding high workload and bureaucratic process associated with the execution of the academic leadership role.

It is suggested that institutions confirm the exact nature of the role requirements for their ‘academic leaders’ to address the bureaucratic nature of many of the tasks that are generally undertaken by them, and which are not consistent with their primary function of leading learning and teaching. This may go some way to achieving more buy-in from their academic leaders and contribute to making the role more attractive to staff to aspire toward.

### 7.3 Further research

As has been established there is little available research into the role that a shared professional background and identity between an academic leader and their staff may have in mitigating the organisational identity divide associated with discipline sub-cultures and silos in higher education organisations. Moreover there is a lack of specific research on this topic within higher educational organisations where there is a high proportion of academic staff with professional backgrounds from fields other than education. Therefore there are a number of areas that could provide future research to help uncover more useful data to enable educational organisations to better understand their staff.

This study is a small scale one and is limited in its relevance to a small number of disciplines, which are represented in New Zealand Polytechnics. One area of research could be to further investigate the identity of academic immigrant leaders across a wider range of participants, institutions and disciplines. This would add more narratives of identity to the conversation and
perhaps determine if the findings from this study are indicative of experiences of other academic immigrants. Further research could also be extended to academic immigrant staff who are not leaders to compare their views with those presented here by academic immigrants who moved to become leaders. Also younger academic immigrants who have joined education at an earlier stage of their life, and who may not be as deeply socialised into their profession, may contribute a different perspective to adopting an academic identity.

A second area of further research might be to extend the study to further clarify the nature of the relationship between industry professionals and academic institutions as a means to explore how better to provide quality learning and teaching by enabling those discipline professionals to contribute to the best of their ability.

And finally, a third area of further research might be to locate and review those induction and socialisation programmes which are seen to be exemplary and effective as a way of providing success case studies for other educational organisations to adopt.

Postscript

By introducing the concept of the ‘academic immigrant’ I was endeavouring to provide a context in which to elicit and test the available evidence pertaining to the relationships that develop between academic leaders and their staff who hold a strong values bond based on their shared professional identity and backgrounds from fields other than education. The metaphor of ‘immigrant’ was a useful tool to describe the breadth of the identity transition from industry professional to academic. It supported my central contention that these industry professionals had effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’ in higher education. The term ‘immigrant’ is laden with meaning and it was important that I clarified its usage in this study. Whilst it may be argued that the majority of staff employed in the ITP sector could be described as ‘immigrants’ due to the various discipline pathways that they
may take prior to joining an institution, it was important for this discussion to
discern between those who had a background in formal teaching and those
who did not. This distinction was important when considering the professional
identity of those who had little or no previous experience or connection with
their new culture. To them, the organisational culture of higher education
could indeed be described as a foreign land and they could be said to have
truly immigrated to somewhere new (Robinson & Aronica, 2009).

The findings of this study offer an insight into the nature and significance of
the relationship between academic immigrant leaders, their staff with whom
they share professional backgrounds and identity, and the institutions in which
they are now employed. This relationship may be described as a balancing
act (Figure 7.1). I conclude with a quote that may help those of us who are
charged with working alongside academic immigrant staff to frame our
thinking and actions:

Organisations, like artists, are more likely to develop something of
value by building on strengths than by attempting to deny their own
history (Bilton, 2007, p. 126).
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Appendix 1  Participant information sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

The academic immigrant in higher education and their identity as leaders of change

My name is Steve Marshall and I am currently enrolled in the Doctor of Philosophy (Education) degree in the Department of Education at Unitec Institute of Technology. I am approaching you with a request to participate in my research project which has sought and gained permission of the Chief Executive of your organisation to take place within your organisation.

I am a Senior Lecturer and Programme Leader in the Department of Performing and Screen Arts at Unitec Institute of Technology. My research interests are guided by my day-to-day experiences of academic middle leadership in a large tertiary organisation. The aim of my project is to contribute to the research of Middle Leadership in the New Zealand Tertiary Education sector with particular focus on those middle leaders who share professional backgrounds from fields other than education and who have effectively ‘emigrated to a new profession as ‘academics’ in tertiary education. My own personal journey in becoming a middle leader in Tertiary Education from a previous career in an unrelated profession has led me to describe myself as an ‘Academic Immigrant’.

I am seeking participants to engage in this study who might identify themselves as academic immigrants and who currently are engaged in either leading change within their specific area, or simply managing people who come from the same industrial background as themselves.

I will be collecting data using a semi-structured interview format that will explore in depth the nature and significance of the relationship between yourself as an academic immigrant leader and your staff. I would very much appreciate being able to interview you at a time that is mutually suitable. I will also be asking you to sign a consent form regarding this event. I have included the following background information to assist you in your decision.
BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH PROJECT

It is acknowledged that in the Institute of Technology and Polytechnic (ITP) sector staff have often been recruited directly from a relevant discipline industry with little or no background in teaching and like all immigrants who choose to adopt a new ‘home’, these ‘academic immigrants’ must make sense of their new social environment and decide how and to what extent they are going to integrate themselves into the host culture.

Academic Immigrants are therefore defined as those who possess a stock of knowledge of a substantive area of expertise or knowledge derived from their background in other organisational, industrial or creative cultures and who have been recruited directly into tertiary education from relevant discipline industries, with little or no background in teaching.

Academic immigrant middle leaders may see themselves as representing both professional values and core organisational values, where they are able to capitalise on the sense of both ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ entirely to either the professional or organisational domain.

The overall aim of this study is therefore, to critique the theoretical construct of ‘academic immigrant’ identity and also to critically examine whether a shared professional identity and background, between academic immigrant leaders and staff groups in the context of the ITP sector, has any significant influence in enabling those leaders to more effectively manage the potential negative impact of organisational change.

Use and security of data:

In this study the identity of all of the participants (Focus Group and Interview) and all recorded and gathered material will be considered confidential. Only myself and my supervisor will have access to any transcripts generated for the purpose of this study.

The individual interview will be approximately one hour in length and will be audio taped and fully transcribed. I will be recording your contribution and will provide a transcript of the interview for you to check before data analysis is undertaken. The transcripts will be electronic and will be kept on a secure computer drive that has password access only. All materials will be kept for a maximum of 5 years and thence deleted.

Participants, and the organisations in which they are employed, will be identified in the text that accompanies the publication of the results by a pseudonym only. No participant or organisations identity will be published in any part of the final work. The data collected from this study will form part of my thesis which will be solely published in the Unitec Library should it be successful.
Right of withdrawal
You may withdraw your participation in this research project at any time and may withdraw any information that you have provided within one month of completion of the data collection.

If you have any queries about the project, you may contact my supervisor at Unitec Institute of Technology.

Professor Carol Cardno (Principal Supervisor)
Unitec Department of Education
Email - ccardno@unitec.ac.nz
Telephone (09) 8154321 extension 8406

Please contact me at your convenience if you wish to participate in this project.

Yours sincerely

Steve Marshall (Researcher)
Email - smarshall@unitec.ac.nz
Telephone (09) 8154321 extension 7187

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2012-1067)
This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from (date) to (date). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Start Date: 27.7.2012
Finish Date: 31.7.2014
Appendix 2  Adult consent form

ADULT CONSENT FORM - INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT

Researcher: Steve Marshall
Programme: Doctor of Philosophy (Education)

THESIS TITLE: The academic immigrant in higher education and their identity as leaders of change

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my organisation will be used in any public reports.

I also understand that I will be provided with a transcript of the interview for checking before data analysis is started.

I am aware that I may withdraw myself or any information that has been provided for this project up to the stage when analysis of data has been completed.

I agree to take part in this project.

Signed: ____________________________

Name: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2012-1067)
This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from (date) to (date). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Start Date: 27.7.2012
Finish Date: 31.7.2014
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Appendix 3 Interview schedule

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The academic immigrant in higher education and their identity as leaders of change

INSTITUTION: ___________________________________________
DATE: _______________________________________________
INTERVIEWEE: __________________________________________
POSITION (AL): __________________________________________
INTERVIEWER: __________________________________________
DIGITAL RECORDING NUMBER __________________________________

1. How do you relate to the concept of the academic immigrant?
   - What is your professional background prior to joining an educational institution?
   - What has been your personal journey towards a career in higher education?
   - What is your sense of connection with your previous profession and your current profession?

2. What is your experience of being an academic?
   - Do you, or any of your staff, consider yourself to be part of the same institutional ‘community’ (‘other than having the same employer’), or do you have more of an affinity with others in a distinct group?
   - How do you, and your staff, demonstrate a sense of belonging to both your ‘old’ and your ‘new’ profession?
   - What is your understanding of titles such as Academic, Lecturer, Teacher, Tutor, Instructor?
   - Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you joined the institution?
3. How do you, as an academic immigrant leader, experience academic identity?
   - What has been your personal journey towards academic leadership?
   - What is your understanding of titles such as Headship, Manager, Leader?
   - To what extent do you experience multiple contexts of identity? ie: both professional and academic.
   - Did you experience a specific induction or socialisation programme when you became an academic leader?

4. In your understanding, what influence, if any, does a shared professional identity and background between your staff and yourself have on your working relationship, and your role as an academic leader?
   - How significant, or not, is a shared professional identity and background in enabling you to effectively lead?
   - Do your staff regard you as an insider or an outsider?

5. What specific factors associated with sharing a professional identity and background with your staff contribute to, or impede, your leadership?

6. What practices or techniques have you used to enable you to effectively manage academic immigrant staff?
   - What attributes, if any, from your previous profession do you call upon to assist in your academic leadership?
   - How do you bridge any perceived divide between an organisations imperatives and those of your staff?

7. Is there anything else you wish to add?
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