

Workplace Bullying and the University: Mergers, Myopia, and Managerialism

Deb J Hill and Greg Lee

Abstract

Drawing on research into the operation of hegemony and how it permeates our liberal, capitalist, psyche we outline how the contemporary ideological reduction of the concept of education within New Zealand teacher education institutions has been reinforced by a lack of criticality about the purpose of education within the university sector more generally. As we reiterate here, a corrosive relationship has developed over recent years between what we refer to as an 'educational myopia' and a more impersonal, managerial, style of leadership associated with neoliberal policy and practice. We offer this analysis in order to alert our colleagues to the ultimate harm that has been done to the field of education in the name of education, and to argue in support of the broader linkage that must be consolidated between education, democracy, and social justice.

Key Words:

Bullying, hegemony, limit-ideas, dialectics, Gramsci, higher education, universities, managerialism, neoliberalism, teacher education.

1. Introduction: The Problem of Limit-Ideas

Most of the work by philosophers throughout the ages has been devoted to unearthing what might be termed 'limit-ideas'.¹ The premise behind this inquiry is that the pursuit of human 'freedom' requires conscious awareness of the source and operation of such limits as a prerequisite to achieving this freedom. Thought and action always operate 'from the inside' of human culture, so that recognition of the social embeddedness of one's reasoning, valuations, and emotional patterns of response is the first step towards any movement beyond one's 'limit-origins'. Understanding oneself and one's environment, and the necessary interconnectedness between this knowledge and self- and social-control, is therefore the purpose of philosophy itself.²

People are generally not conscious of the consequences of embeddedness. This means that they tend to be unaware of the way in which their worldview is circumscribed by their limit-origins expressed through the ideas reflected in the language biases of their worldview. Although the 'cultural' nature of one's ideas is now commonly recognised in research

theory—as the local or ‘located’ perspective that one adopts—the ‘other’ broader dimension that ‘cultural’ implies is largely invisible: that is, a recognition of the role of human agency in the constructed nature of our society. This is the ideological dimension that many philosophers have sought to stress as the key to understanding how to generate social change: what the Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci³ referred to in his attempts to make people aware of the distinction between ‘the permanent’ and ‘the willed’—the latter being what is humanly constructed.

The neglect of thought about this division has led to a conjuring trick where ‘the willed’ has been mistaken for ‘the permanent’. This implies that theories are not viewed—as they should be—as tentative ways in which we might interpret our world. Instead, they are promoted as ‘the way things are’. The non recognition of ‘ideology’ within society has therefore meant the endorsement of a select body of assumptions over others. Over time, such assumptions take on the mantle of ‘common sense’. They no longer draw attention to themselves but begin to function as landmarks of normality over the passage of time. As Hegel’s work has shown, while humans give themselves their own organisation, the prevalence of both an active and passive ahistoricism encourages thought to stagnate in the normativity of the times. An unreflective approach to distinctions between the permanent and the willed ensures the acceptance and consolidation of the status quo.

This paper is an abbreviated attempt to explain the connections between the rise of neoliberal managerialism within the academy and the subsequent reinforcement of a myopic way of thinking about education and its purpose. Both are key ingredients in the sustenance of a culture distinguished by the hallmarks of incivility and bullying. As we have witnessed over the last two decades, both elements reflect a deliberate neglect of ontological considerations (concerns with the type of human being we are encouraging) within the university sector more generally. We contextualise our own experiences of and familiarity with teacher education institutions in the academy against this embrace of neoliberal principles and practices. It is suggested that unless a richer understanding of ‘education’ is adopted consciously by such institutions then we face a serious loss of criticality within educational scholarship in the future.

The link between the personal and the social is drawn by suggesting that the dilemma is essentially part of a broader cognitive-perspectival problem based on a thought and morality that is richly impregnated with capitalist valuations. As argued here, unless educators begin to think consciously about the nature of thinking—of how their reasoning and morality supports capitalist values—educators cannot help but fall victim to the effects that capitalism’s combined economic and extra-economic aspect imposes upon our relational and valuational sensibilities. As our paper explains, this is the operation of hegemony in practice. Unless we return to

first principles—to question contemporary educational endeavour—those working with an anti-normative notion of education in Aotearoa New Zealand will continue to be casualties of the narrow, utilitarian conception of education that has come to dominate their field.

2. Educational Myopia as our Neoliberal Inheritance

There is little doubt that the incidence of bullying among people within the academy has increased significantly with the neoliberal reforms of the 1980s.⁴ The sweeping changes that targeted university governance structures in New Zealand have been shown to have coincided with a growing number of personal grievances being lodged against ‘management’ across the sector.⁵ This culture of competitive ‘performativity’⁶ engineered by the last Labour Government, deliberately as an efficiency incentive within the sector, has provided rich soil for the promotion of a culture of excessive micro-management.⁷ Managerial autocracy, as opposed to time-consuming democratic processes and considered community decision-making, has now become the norm across the sector.⁸

In this regard, Professor Margaret Thornton’s assessment of the Australian situation in her 2004 article ‘Corrosive Leadership (Or Bullying by Another Name)’ provides ample food for thought. As Thornton commented, the focus on greater productivity within the corporate culture of the Australian academy has led to a culture of over-management which has led in turn to a surplus of managers concerned with raising both profit and profile.⁹ Predictably, an inevitable ‘us versus them’ climate has developed, where those who agree with ‘dysfunctional and lacklustre’ management strategies are rewarded while dissenters pay the price for their stance.¹⁰ Unhealthy interpersonal relations marked by a loss of collegiality and the proliferation of negative workplace practices become the norm. Those who can, move on. Those who cannot, are silenced. As Thornton noted, if our most significant sites of intellectual leadership are led unethically then what hope is there for other workplaces?

Here in Aotearoa New Zealand, the entrepreneurial makeover of universities has seriously undermined the traditional role that universities have fulfilled as ‘the critic and conscience of society’.¹¹ The central place that Arts and Humanities offerings used to hold within the liberal arts tradition has been progressively eroded because of the dominance of an applied subject focus across the sector. This has coincided with the introduction of a ‘Student Loan Scheme’ in 1992 by the (right-of-centre) National Government. The net effect of the pressure imposed on the ‘customer’ psyche to treat universities as professional training grounds meant that the number of enrolments in perceived non applied subjects fell dramatically. Because the latter offerings historically have attracted the lowest level of government funding per student, the reticence of Vice

Chancellors (University Presidents in American parlance) to sustain the cross-subsidisation necessary for the continuation of these subject areas has placed the long-term viability of these subjects in serious jeopardy. It is no coincidence that Arts and Humanities faculties throughout New Zealand universities have undergone a process of continuous review and restructuring¹². Like any 'good' business, deficits are no longer sustainable when financial pragmatism is the arbiter of what 'fits' and what doesn't.

This new way of considering the university bears little resemblance to the original 'idea' of the liberal enterprise promoted by scholars such as Newman.¹³ As many writers have argued compellingly,¹⁴ the dominance of an economic rationality within the sector has begun to subvert the traditional agenda of the universities, which was to mentor students in the development of good judgements and to urge the continual interrogation of the prevailing habits of mind and culture. To the extent that debate about ontological concerns—that is, discussion about the type of human beings society needs and the character traits to be cultivated within the succeeding generation—has almost vanished entirely from the horizon of academic discussion, *ipso facto* the university has become yet another bureaucratic, service industry.

The situation is ironic *because* this is a university setting. To put the point another way, a more impersonal, managerial, style of leadership has created a technicist culture marked by the ideological capture of the concept of education which has been transformed into what is essentially an anti-liberal and business-oriented one. This, in turn, has led to the demise of those very fields of inquiry that have traditionally critiqued the reduction of education to purely commercial concerns. As a result, 'education' is now concerned only superficially with democratic citizenship, much less with the idea that learning can be speculative, and that the experience learners undergo on this journey changes them as human beings.¹⁵ Many scholars have argued convincingly that this pragmatic and apolitical reduction of education to a saleable commodity has served to undermine our broader thinking about education's potential role in the making of humanity.¹⁶ Our entire social psyche has become the product of a way of thinking conditioned by the shallow fads and fashions of what is perceived to be marketable ('relevant') and fiscally lucrative ('efficient').

Gramsci's work adds an important dimension to the debate, we wish to argue here. As his work on hegemony has shown, a citizenry that is cognitively and morally submissive to a less-than-ethical status quo will ensure the growth of a less-than-ethical democracy.¹⁷ Only by adopting a non-reverential attitude towards the verities of the present is it possible to detect the multiple forms of ideological governance that constitute our contemporary modes of rationality. In this regard, if 'education' does not engender the possibility of cognitively and morally defiant thought and action then it should not count as education. Moreover, unless 'education' puts

humanity and its ethical and intellectual submissiveness at the centre of the problem of social change and betterment, we will remain forever victims of our personal and societal limit-ideas. This logic signals that our concept of education must acknowledge the presence of the valuational boundaries imposed by economic rationality, otherwise we run the very real risk of seriously undermining our democratic aspirations.

3. Hegemony as the Problem of Power Over ‘Being’

Our specialist interest in the workings of neoliberal theory and the concept of ‘hegemony’ has informed our reading about bullying and incivility in the academy. To explain this conjunction further, hegemony, in an important sense, is a theory that describes how capitalism and its economic valuations inflect our cognitive and moral behaviour. Accordingly, our reasoning and morality supports capitalistic values. As this theory suggests¹⁸, the way in which hegemony operates in such a subterranean manner has important implications for the way in which we develop our own ‘nature’; that is, for how we develop our notion of citizenship and, most significantly, for the way in which our sensitivities towards justice and fairness are fashioned. The problem of countering the power and hold that hegemony has over ‘being’ is essentially part of the broader cognitive-perspectival problem that Gramsci’s concept attempted to expose.

Although this type of insight has often been associated with Marxist thought, such sentiments nonetheless underscore those expressed in more recent contemporary debates about the purpose of the university.¹⁹ As Jackson Lears²⁰ has insightfully argued, the imposition of ideals of the market, corporations, and entrepreneurship upon the ground of higher education amounts to a shackling of the human mindset to the narrow and predetermined valuations of a business worldview. A continual focus on the ‘economic security’ of the institution through ongoing reviews of ‘risk management’ is symptomatic of this shift. So, too, is the mantra of exploiting ‘revenue generating opportunities’, given that the reliance on adequate and ongoing State-sector tertiary funding is now viewed as an institutional ‘risk’. This is hegemony in operation. No longer are our broader human valuations under scrutiny as they must always be in order for society to continually “test” whether its forms of judgement withstand the passage of time. Instead, human valuation becomes subordinate to economic valuation, creating what is often known as a ‘contradictory consciousness’. Whereas humans’ understanding of themselves and their world was once the primary purpose of the lives of scholars, now such energies and focus have been largely suppressed by an ethos of sustained performativity. Publish or perish is the new manifesto.

It is this understanding of hegemony that has influenced our reading of the literature on workplace bullying. With university governance no longer

being impartial to the values of globalised big business, only the thinnest of lines can now be drawn between the much desired efficiency traits sanctioned by a managerialist style of leadership and the psychological violence of the bully in action.²¹ This reduction of leadership to management is intimately connected with the way in which education has been reduced to a commodity and the university relegated to the status of yet another service provider. It is this process of ideological reduction that leads us back to the problem of hegemony, and the problem of the limit-ideas of language that work inevitably to sustain it.

4. Overcoming Hegemony through Dialectical Reasoning

As outlined above, the problem of the boundaries that language maintains—that of protecting contemporary normative valuations from critical interrogation—is very much central to this problem of hegemony. The example of the normativity of a neoliberal discourse within the academy is but one example of the problem which Gramsci's concept of hegemony explains.²² Capitalist logic ensures that monetary valuations are the primary form of value within a society. Activities or practices that cannot provide sufficient evidence of their fiscal worth are likely to be devalued as a consequence. It is for this reason that hegemony must feature as a central concept within any discussion that attempts to explain the rise of a culture of academic incivility and workplace bullying. The problem of hegemony is indeed the problem of the limitations of the capitalist valuation process. It is a problem that reflects a wrong-headed worldview; a worldview that fragments, isolates, and treats as discrete those elements that must be viewed instead as interrelated and connected.

This method of seeing interconnections between supposedly discrete elements is what is called dialectical reasoning. As perhaps the best known theorist of dialectics—Bertell Ollman²³—has observed, dialectics is an attempt to grasp the whole by never losing sight of the interconnected nature of its parts and the complexity and dynamics of the reality we are attempting to describe. Dialectics grasps this problem of the power of limit-ideas while at the same time promoting an epistemological and ontological opposition to such common sense, lop-sided thought. Dialectics is therefore a 'liberating' philosophical stance insofar as its practice liberates the mind from its initial sense of itself and its relationship to the socio-cultural environment, thus enabling practice to be informed differently thereafter. In short, thought reflects on thought itself.

Dialectical thought is an awareness of the limited, static, fragmented, one-sided nature of our representations that have come to colonise our modern mindset. It represents a recognition of the artificial limitations put on lived reality by thought and language, which dialectics names as 'abstraction'. And whilst abstraction is unavoidable—to the extent

that language and thought is always an *abstract representation* of the real—some abstraction is so abbreviated that it begins to stand as ‘myth’. This is the major source of confusion; that we mistake what is in effect a ‘cultural arbitrary’ for the non negotiable and ‘real’.

Dialectics therefore provides the means of detecting the deception that has become commonplace within our society: the separation of the products of human activity from the process of their human manufacture. This is called reification or fetishisation in Marxist thought. It describes how subjects ‘forget’ that they are soaked in ideologies which are the creation of their own production. The result of this forgetting is alienation. Individuals are dispossessed of the motivation for making their world by standing in awe of such interpretations, rather than seeing them for what they are: human interpretations of the world. Just as ‘the market’ has long been lost from consciousness as a socially engineered entity so too has ‘education,’ which is the particular fetish we have been addressing here. In this regard our thesis is that the ideological capture of the concept of education to a more impersonal, managerial, style of leadership has created a pathological culture antithetical to the purpose education should serve: the critique of societal norms and values to ensure that they support a range of human values. As argued below, the existing commodified, utilitarian, view of education privileged by neoliberal thinking has foreclosed vital debate about the nature of education and the ends that it should serve. Nowhere have we seen the embrace of the market-driven mindset so evident as in some of New Zealand’s leading teacher education institutions. It is this environment in which we have worked over the past two decades, and it is in this environment where we have witnessed some of the worst cases of bullying. This paper is not directed to a discussion of the specific nature of these events. Rather, it outlines features of the climate that has engendered such behaviour.

5. Mergers and their Consequences: Bullying at Work

Teacher training colleges—as they were known historically—were first established in New Zealand’s schooling history as stand-alone entities. They were dedicated specifically to the practical enterprise of training teachers to deliver a national curriculum throughout the state schooling sector. Their role continued largely unchallenged until the 1970s when higher rates of unemployment and a sluggish economy put greater pressure on the population to retrain or up-skill at a tertiary education level. As a result of this competitive work environment, various people in positions of influence began to champion the idea of forging closer alliances between the teachers’ colleges and the universities, heralding the move towards actively promoting teaching as a profession by making it a ‘degreed’ vocation.²⁴ The growing perception of the ‘problem’ of a theory/practice split that needed resolving—one which was seen to be equally as the problem of an academic ‘elite’

separated from the ‘real world’ of practice, and vice versa—was a primary motive for a mixing of ‘the two cultures’.²⁵ By the end of 2007 all New Zealand teachers’ training colleges (also known as colleges or schools of education) had merged with a neighbouring university.

Until the time of the mergers, most universities housed a Department of Education Studies and Human Development in their Faculty of Arts and Humanities. Sociologists, psychologists, historians and philosophers of education worked with the conceptual tools offered to them by their parent discipline on an array of ‘educational’ issues. Small in number, it was predictable that this group would lack the critical mass to have their views represented fairly in a merged environment. Unsurprisingly, those scholars whose conception of education differed from the dominant view soon found themselves in the uncomfortable position of having to defend their subject specialisation during a climate of regular degree revisions. Because most staff at the training colleges had a non academic, classroom-based, background (the majority being former teachers), it could not be expected that they would be familiar with any representation of education other than that associated directly with formal teaching and learning processes.

Neoliberal ideology exacerbated this problem with the hegemony of a commodified and vocational interpretation of education all but dominating contemporary educational theory and practice. At least a decade or more of tertiary sector underfunding in New Zealand had led to colleges supplementing their annual budgets by bidding for contestable research (contract) funds through the Ministry of Education. Given that this funding regime has privileged educational research projects that have focused on institutional studies of teaching and learning, a minority of educationists have found themselves all but excluded from the benefits these contracts can provide. The gradual restructuring of ‘teacher-provider’ institutions in response to the demands of an export-led education market could also have been predicted. With this restructuring has come a marked diminution of philosophy, history, and sociology options, and a proliferation of child-centred and curriculum-based offerings. In our experience, these trends have been accompanied by a growing climate of overt intolerance towards anyone whose core activities fall outside the ‘professional’ realm.

What needs to be reiterated at this point is that it is not just the case that the majority of those working in education do not ‘pay enough attention’ to the diversity of educational phenomena, or give them their due. As the concept of hegemony implies, their failure to do so is completely understandable given the normativity of a myopic concept of education. This problem is evident in the nature and scope of the scholarship being generated within education circles. In this regard, an over optimism tends to pervade the research literature about the extent to which the pathologies within our

society are seen to be able to be alleviated by schooling and self-conscious and overt teaching practices. The result of this confidence about the egalitarian potential of formal teaching and learning processes is that most scholars fail to take into account significant influences shaping social relationships; those broader social valuations that are reflected in classroom values and practices. Hence, they neglect the importance of these external ideological sources of domesticating power.

Unless educators are conscious of the harm that capital's combined economic and extra-economic aspect imposes upon our relational and valuational sensibilities—no matter what the site of education is—their own thought about educational practice will remain unduly foreclosed by the valuational limits that capitalism sets. To come full circle, then, the problem we discuss with our students is that people grow up oblivious to the way in which their existing thought patterns restrict their intellectual capacity for open inquiry, thereby seriously undermining their consideration of the parameters of (and the constraints placed upon) the learning of others. Educators invested with the idea that their professional development and research focus should involve only classroom-related practice will wonder what is to be gained by teaching students about seemingly non applied ideas. It is this 'blindspot' about broader educational concerns and contributions that remains in our view *the* most problematic in terms of our theoretical insights. In our view, such an educational myopia has progressively undermined a richer theory of power and possibility in educational thought.

The literature clearly identifies certain personal attributes as catalysts for bullying.²⁶ Because the academy is noted for a significant number of people who display such traits—manic depressive personalities, 'drama queens', 'psychopaths', and others—the recipe for dysfunctionality is already here.²⁷ Exceptionally good leadership therefore is required to harness their creative energies in a positive (rather than negative or destructive) way. However, given that the contemporary focus within universities is directed almost solely towards the exploitation of revenue generating initiatives, the careful oversight of human relationships has taken a noticeable backseat to resource management. This means squeezing 'more' out of 'less' generating work overload and stress. These are perfect catalysts for a decrease in civility.

And this is precisely the linkage between those with a propensity to bully and an organisation that is either not equipped to tackle bullying or, worse still, that condones such behaviour under the guise of 'effective' and 'decisive' management practices. As Crawford and others have argued, tolerance of bullying is a telling symptom of organisation dysfunction and a culture of domination and the abuse of power.²⁸ Without a doubt, the merger between the two separate 'educational' cultures described above has had adverse consequences for those academics seeking to promote an anti-

normative concept of education. For the latter group, it was but a short step from being labelled 'different' to being seen as 'difficult'.²⁹ Historical studies have shown that the majority of colleges of education in Aotearoa New Zealand have been encouraged by both internal and external factors to evolve into entrepreneurial and 'degreed' training enterprises. 'Education' is now a fetish to equal 'the market'. The school has become the 'sun', and all other ways of conceptualising education are relegated to the shadows.

6. Conclusion

A recent article in the *Education Guardian*³⁰ reported that an Oxford church theologian was suing the Bishop of Liverpool for religious discrimination on the grounds that she was being treated unfairly by members of her own Church. The case will set a new legal precedent if won by virtue of the fact that until now legislation protected people against discrimination for their religious beliefs, but only from those *beyond* their faith. Whilst it could be said to have always existed in a covert fashion, discrimination and bullying within a religion has nonetheless never been acknowledged previously by provisions within the law. As this example shows, diversity *within* a group can be as common and as significant as diversity *between* groups. Indeed, the whole point of having alternative views articulated freely and openly—which is, arguably, what democracy defends—is because conformity and uniformity signal a mindset imprisoned by the ideologies in which it is immersed. It is this very simple premise that must be recognised within any university; that a university by definition needs to be the bastion of ideological difference. Those scholars who do not fit neatly into an administrative or academic framework or lucrative research clusters must not be viewed as a 'debit' or 'risk'. There are many examples in our recorded history, and anecdotally, of the lone scholar, often working in isolation, who has changed the course of history.

Fortunately, the authors of many resources on workplace bullying are attempting to take an 'ecological' view of the issue. The solutions are as complex as the issues are also. A common theme throughout many studies has been the need for a cross-organisational commitment, with civility and democratic process being exemplified at all levels of the institution.³¹ Critical to addressing the organizational, cultural and systemic nature of incivility and bullying in the workplace is a commitment on behalf of the organization to begin to map the nature and prevalence of particular behaviours, and to examine broader ideological influences at play within its own discursive practices. A dialectical approach to the issue affirms that a complex nexus of economic, social, cultural, political, institutional, and individual (psychological and behavioural) elements must be examined in relation to the power of dominant ideologies. This is especially crucial in a university

setting, where the distinguishing feature of the institution is its expertise in rejecting simplicity and in researching complexity.

Notes

¹ Antonio Gramsci's writings revealed the power of what he termed the 'limit-ideas' or the 'minimal ideas' of the bourgeoisie. See D. Hill, *Hegemony and Education: Gramsci, Post-Marxism and Radical Democracy Revisited*, Lexington Books, Lexington, US, 2007 especially Chapters 3 and 4.

² The quotation below from W. Dudley's *Hegel, Nietzsche, & Philosophy: Thinking Freedom*, Cambridge University Press, Port Chester, NY, 2002, p. 2, expresses this connection between philosophy and freedom.

If philosophers think about the meaning of freedom, however, they will discover an even deeper connection between freedom and philosophy. Thinking about freedom reveals that its conditions of realization include not only certain social and political developments but also the practice of philosophy itself. In other words, philosophy is directly as well as indirectly liberating: philosophy contributes indirectly to freedom by articulating the social and political conditions of its realization; but philosophy also contributes directly to freedom because freedom is not only something about which philosophers think, but also something that is produced through philosophical thinking.

³ The theory of hegemony has become synonymous with the work of the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937).

⁴ S. Marginson & M. Consedine, *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, and W. Malcolm & N. Tarling, *Crisis of Identity? The Mission and Management of Universities in New Zealand*, Dunmore, Wellington, NZ, 2007.

⁵ G. Hanley, 'Don't Do What I Do—Just Bloody Well Do What I Say! The Workplace Bullying Experiences of Australian Academics'. Working Paper Series 63/03, Monash University Australia, Faculty of Business and Economics, 2003; A. Lipsett, 'The University of Hard Knocks and Heartache', *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 16 September 2005, viewed on 8 October 2009, <<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=198413§ioncode>

=26>; G. Polya, 'Crisis in Our Universities: *Ockham's Razor*', Radio National interview, ABC: Australia, 2001.

⁶ J.F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, c.1984.

⁷ A performance funding regime now requires all academics in New Zealand to submit their publication history to the national tertiary funding body—the Tertiary Education Commission [TEC]—along with a summary of their 'peer esteem' and overall 'contribution to the research environment', has enabled management to identify alleged 'non research active' PBRF-eligible staff. Because 15% of an institution's funding will be won in 2012 through this contestable fund, many institutions have begun to reward research-active staff while singling out the inactive as an institutional liability.

⁸ Marginson & Consedine, op. cit.

⁹ M. Thornton, 'Corrosive Leadership (or Bullying by Another Name): A Corollary of a Corporatized Academy', *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, vol. 17, 2004, p.173.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.174.

¹¹ Education Amendment Act, 1990.

¹² The University of Waikato alone lost 50 staff from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in 2005.

¹³ J.H. Newman, *The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated: In Nine Discourses Delivered to the Catholics of Dublin*, Rinehart, New York, c1960.

¹⁴ J. Lears, 'The Radicalism of the Liberal Traditions'. *Academe*, vol. 89, no. 1, 2003, p.23; D. Peetz, D., *Brave New Workplace. How Individual Contracts are Changing Our Jobs*. Allen & Unwin, Crow's Nest NSW, Australia, 2006; Polya, op. cit.; Thornton, op. cit.

¹⁵ B. Gould, 'The Future of New Zealand Universities', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1999, pp. 28-34.

¹⁶ P. Allman, *Critical Education Against Global Capitalism: Karl Marx and Revolutionary Critical Education*, Bergin & Garvey, Westport, CT and London, 2001; R. G. Oliver, 'The Ideological Reduction of Education', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1998, pp. 299-302.

¹⁷ D.J. Hill, *Hegemony and Education: Gramsci, Post-Marxism and Radical Democracy Revisited*. Lexington Books, Lexington, US, 2007.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ C.W. Anderson, *Prescribing the Life of the Mind: An Essay on the Purpose of the University, the Aims of Liberal Education, the Competence of Citizens, and the Cultivation of Practical Reasoning*. University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1993; B. Davies, M. Gottsche, & P. Bansel, 'The Rise and Fall of the Neo-Liberal University'. *European Journal of Education*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2006, pp. 305-319; R. Deem, 'Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic

Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension Still Important? *Comparative Education*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2001, pp. 7-20; G. Good, *Humanism Betrayed: Theory, Ideology and Culture in the Contemporary University*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal & Kingston, 2001; D.L. Jeffrey & D. Manganiello, D., *Rethinking the Future of the University*. University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa, 1998; M.R. Kadish, *Towards an Ethic of Higher Education*, Stanford University Press, California, 1991; A. Kolodny, *Failing the Future: A Dean Looks at Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1998; Malcolm & Tarling, op. cit.

²⁰ J. Lears, *ibid*.

²¹ D. Kelly, 'Workplace Bullying, Women and WorkChoices'. Unpublished paper, University of Wollongong, Australia, c.2003; B.R. McAvoy & J. Murtagh, 'Workplace Bullying: The Silent Epidemic', *British Medical Journal*, 326(7393), April 12, 2003, pp. 776-778. As McAvoy and Murtagh (p.776) note, 'tough' management has often become a euphemism for bullying.

²² See also the excellent chapter by Daniel Shurgurensky in support of this point: 'Syncretic Discourses, Hegemony Building, and Educational Reform', in *Rethinking Hegemony*. T. Clayton (ed.), James Nicolas Publishers, Australia, 2006, pp.23-43.

²³ B. Ollman, *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* [2nd Edition], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976; 'Putting Dialectics to Work: The Process of Abstraction in Marx's Method', *Rethinking Marxism*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1990, pp. 26-74; *Dialectical Investigations*. Routledge, New York, 1993; *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 2003.

²⁴ W. Richardson, 'Educational Studies in the United Kingdom', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2002, pp. 3-56. Richardson (p.3) emphasised that institutional alliances were encouraged in the United Kingdom both as a means of enhancing the reputation of education in the eyes of the public as well as overcoming the 'poverty' of the colleges. With respect to this last point, there was much criticism of the ad hoc way in which the supply of teachers was overseen by the colleges.

²⁵ R. Openshaw, *Between Two Worlds: A History of Palmerston North College of Education 1956-1996*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 1996.

²⁶ Bullying Online, 'Bullying: What Is It?' viewed on 13 September 2006, <<http://bullyonline.org/workbully/bully.htm>>.2007; E. Seigne, I. Coyne, P. Randall & J. Parker, 'Personality Traits of Bullies as a Contributory Factor in Workplace Bullying: An Exploratory Study'. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2007, pp. 118-132; M.

Hayes, 'Workplace Bullying and Psychopaths', viewed on 19 March 2008, <<http://webdiary.com.au/cms/?q=node/1830>>.

²⁷ Both of us have had a great deal of contact with such personality types in the course of our 35 plus years of combined tertiary research and teaching activities. The theme for this paper arose when Deb became a victim of the vindictiveness of such personalities herself, a situation that led her subsequently to take up the role of President of her previous university union.

²⁸ A. Adams, 'Bullying at Work'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 7, 1992, pp. 177-180; Crawford, N., 'Bullying at Work: A Psychoanalytic Perspective'. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 7, 1997, pp. 219-225.

²⁹ Hayes, op. cit.; H. Leymann, 'Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces', *Violence and Victims*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1990, pp. 119-126; 'The Context and Development of Mobbing at Work'. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1996, pp. 165-184; H. Leymann & A. Gustafsson, 'Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-Traumatic Distress Disorders'. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1996, pp. 251-275.

³⁰ D. MacLeod, 'Unfairly Sacked Oxford College Theologian Sues Bishop', *Education Guardian*, viewed on 9 January 2008, <<http://education.guardian.co.uk/>>.

³¹ K. Aquino, 'Structural and Individual Determinants of Workplace Victimization: The Effects of Hierarchical Status and Management Style'. *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, 2000, pp. 171-193; J. Heames & M. Harvey, 'Workplace Bullying: A Cross-Level Assessment'. *Management Decision*, vol. 44, no. 9, 2006, pp. 1214-1230; R. McKay, D. Huberman, J. Fratzl & R. Thomas, 'Workplace Bullying in Academia: A Canadian Study', *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, vol. 20, 2008, pp. 77-100; M. O'Moore & J. Lynch, 'Leadership, Working Environment and Workplace Bullying', *International Journal of Organisational Theory and Behavior*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2007, pp. 95-117; L.S. Payne, 'Managing for Organisational Integrity', *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 72, no. 2, 1994, pp. 106-117.

Bibliography

Adams, A., 'Bullying at Work'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 7, 1992, pp. 177-180.

Allman, P., *Critical Education Against Global Capitalism: Karl Marx and Revolutionary Critical Education*. Bergin & Garvey, Westport, CT and London, 2001.

Anderson, C. W., *Prescribing the Life of the Mind: An Essay on the Purpose of the University, the Aims of Liberal Education, the Competence of Citizens, and the Cultivation of Practical Reasoning*. University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1993.

Aquino, K., 'Structural and Individual Determinants of Workplace Victimization: The Effects of Hierarchical Status and Management Style'. *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, 2000, pp. 171-193.

Bullying online, 'Bullying: What Is It?' viewed on 13 September 2006, <<http://bullyonline.org/workbully/bully.htm>>.

Crawford, N., 'Bullying at Work: A Psychoanalytic Perspective'. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 7, 1997, pp. 219-225.

Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P., 'The Rise and Fall of the Neo-Liberal University'. *European Journal of Education*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2006, pp. 305-319.

De Luca, M., Twale, D.J., & Gunsalas, C.K., 'Academic Bullies'. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2008, B10-B13.

Deem, R., 'Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension Still Important?' *Comparative Education*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2001, pp. 7-20.

Dudley, W., *Hegel, Nietzsche, and Philosophy: Thinking Freedom*. Cambridge University Press, Port Chester, NY, 2002.

Education Amendment Act. Government Printer, Wellington, NZ, 1990.

Good, G., *Humanism Betrayed: Theory, Ideology and Culture in the Contemporary University*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal & Kingston, 2001.

Gould, B., 'The Future of New Zealand Universities'. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1999, pp. 28-34.

Gramsci, A., *Antonio Gramsci: Prison Notebooks (Volume I)*, trans. J. A. Buttigieg & A. Callari, Columbia University Press, New York, 1992.

Gramsci, A., *Antonio Gramsci: Prison Notebooks (Volume II)*, ed. & trans. J. A. Buttigieg, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996.

Hanley, G., 'Don't Do What I Do—Just Bloody Well Do What I Say! The Workplace Bullying Experiences of Australian Academics'. Working Paper Series 63/03, Monash University Australia, Faculty of Business and Economics, 2003.

Hayes, M., 'Workplace Bullying and Psychopaths', viewed on 19 March 2008, <<http://webdiary.com.au/cms/?q=node/1830>>.

Heames, J., & Harvey, M., 'Workplace Bullying: A Cross-Level Assessment'. *Management Decision*, vol. 44, no. 9, 2006, pp. 1214-1230.

Hill, D. J., *Hegemony and Education: Gramsci, Post-Marxism and Radical Democracy Revisited*. Lexington Books, Lexington, US, 2007.

Hill, D. J., & Lee, G., 'The Ideological Reduction of Education's Potential: Detecting Discursive Constraint Through Dialectical Thinking'. Unpublished paper, 2009.

Jeffrey, D. L., & Manganiello, D., *Rethinking the Future of the University*. University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa, 1998.

Kadish, M. R., *Towards an Ethic of Higher Education*. Stanford University Press, California, 1991.

Kelly, D., 'Workplace Bullying, Women and WorkChoices'. Unpublished paper, University of Wollongong, Australia, c.2003.

Kolodny, A., *Failing the Future: A Dean Looks at Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1998.

Lears, J., 'The Radicalism of the Liberal Traditions'. *Academe*, vol. 89, no. 1, 2003, p. 23.

Lester, J., 'Not Your Child's Playground: Workplace Bullying Among Community College Faculty'. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 33, pp. 444-462.

Leymann, H., 'Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces'. *Violence and Victims*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1990, pp. 119-126.

—, 'The Context and Development of Mobbing at Work'. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1996, pp. 165-184.

Leymann, H., & Gustafsson, A., 'Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-Traumatic Distress Disorders'. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1996, pp. 251-275.

Lipsett, A., 'The University of Hard Knocks and Heartache', *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 16 September 2005, viewed on 8 October 2009, <<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=198413§ioncode=26>>.

Lyotard, J.F., *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, c.1984.

MacLeod, D., 'Unfairly Sacked Oxford College Theologian Sues Bishop', *Education Guardian*, viewed on 9 January 2008, <<http://education.guardian.co.uk/>>.

Malcolm, W., & Tarling, N., *Crisis of Identity? The Mission and Management of Universities in New Zealand*. Dunmore, Wellington, NZ, 2007.

Marginson, S., & Consedine, M., *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

McAvoy, B. R., & Murtagh, J., 'Workplace Bullying: The Silent Epidemic', *British Medical Journal*, 326(7393), April 12, 2003, pp. 776-778.

McKay, R., Huberman, D., Fratzi, J., & Thomas, R., 'Workplace Bullying in Academia: A Canadian Study', *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, 20, 2008, pp. 77-100.

Newman, J.H., *The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated: In Nine Discourses Delivered to the Catholics of Dublin*, Rinehart, New York, c.1960.

Oliver, R. G., 'The Ideological Reduction of Education', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1998, pp. 299-302.

Ollman, B., *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* [2nd Edition], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976.

—, 'Putting Dialectics to Work: The Process of Abstraction in Marx's Method', *Rethinking Marxism*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1990, pp. 26-74.

—, *Dialectical Investigations*. Routledge, New York, 1993.

—, *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 2003.

O'Moore, M., & Lynch, J., 'Leadership, Working Environment and Workplace Bullying', *International Journal of Organisational Theory and Behavior*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2007, pp. 95-117.

Openshaw, R., *Between Two Worlds: A History of Palmerston North College of Education 1956–1996*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 1996.

Payne, L. S., 'Managing for Organisational Integrity', *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 72, no. 2, 1994, pp. 106-117.

Peetz, D., *Brave New Workplace. How Individual Contracts are Changing Our Jobs*. Allen & Unwin, Crow's Nest NSW, Australia, 2006.

Polya, G., 'Crisis in Our Universities: *Ockham's Razor*', Radio National interview, ABC: Australia, 2001.

Richardson, W., 'Educational Studies in the United Kingdom', *British Journal of Education Studies*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2002, pp. 3-56.

Schugurensky, D., 'Syncretic Discourses, Hegemony Building, and Educational Reform', in *Rethinking Hegemony*. T. Clayton (ed.), James Nicolas Publishers, Australia, 2006, pp.23-43.

Seigne, E., Coyne, I., Randall, P., & Parker, J., 'Personality Traits of Bullies as a Contributory Factor in Workplace Bullying: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2007, pp. 118-132.

Thornton, M., 'Corrosive Leadership (or Bullying by Another Name): A Corollary of a Corporatized Academy', *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, vol. 17, 2004, pp. 161-184.

Twale, D. J., & de Luca, D. M., *Faculty Incivility: The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to do About It*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco, 2008.

Deb J Hill is a Political Philosopher of Education at the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. She is the author of *Hegemony and Education: Gramsci, Post-Marxism and Radical Democracy Revisited*, Lanham, Maryland, Lexington Books, 2007. Her interests lie in critical theory and the dialectical thought that underpins it. E-mail: deb.hill@canterbury.ac.nz

Greg Lee is Professor of History of Education and Head of the School of Educational Studies and Human Development at the University of Canterbury, College of Education, Christchurch, New Zealand. E-mail: gregory.lee@canterbury.ac.nz