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Key Information

Registration
The registration desk in R356 of N-Block will be open from 8.00-10.30am on Monday, and 8.00-9.00am on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Conference venue
Conference sessions will be held on the 5th floor of N-Block, Epsom Campus (see map on p.52).

Getting there and around: Public transport
A schedule for buses to and from the City is included in your conference bag. To call a taxi, phone City Cabs on 300 3000 (or Green Cabs on 0508 447 336) and ask them to come to Reception (Gate 3, A Block) at the Epsom campus of The University of Auckland.

Getting there and around: Car parking
Free car parking is available at Gate 2 of Epsom campus, a five-minute walk from the conference venue.

Internet
Wifi is available in the teaching rooms on the 5th floor of N-Block (conference venue) and there is a dedicated computer lab on the floor below (R 431). The wireless network is FOED-teach and the password is <AI conference12>.

Conference dinner
The conference dinner will be held on Tuesday 26th of June at the Fale Pasifika on the City Campus (Bldg 275, Wynyard St – see map on p.53). The Fale is a 15-minute bus or taxi ride from the conference venue.

Tweeting
If you wish to tweet your way through the conference, please make use of the hash tag #ACIDC2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 on</td>
<td>Registration in R356 in N-Block (5-minute walk from powhiri/welcome venue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00-9:55    | Powhiri at Te Aka Matua o Te Pou Hawaiki Marae, Epsom Campus, Gate 1  
Including a welcome from Dean of Education: Associate Professor Graeme Aitken                                                               |
| 9:55-10:20   | Morning tea at Te Piringa (Marae dining room)                                                                                                                                                           |
| 10:20-10:30  | Housekeeping in Wharenui (Marae)                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 10:30-11:45  | **Wharenui (Marae)**  
**Keynote 1:** Dr Melinda Webber, The University of Auckland  
*Edgewalking: The multiple selves and realities of a Māori researcher*  
*Introduised by Cat Mitchell*                                                                                                                 |
| 11:45-12:00  | Moving between Marae & conference seminar rooms in N-Block                                                                                                                                              |
| 12:00-12:30  | **Room N514**  
1. HE research practice  
*(Chair: Ian Brailsford)*  
*Susan Carter & Nicholas Rowe, The University of Auckland (paper)*  
*Broadening the field: Shifting focus from research in the academy to research of the academy*                                    |
|              | Room N3 (ground-level lecture theatre)  
*(Chair: Adisorn Juntrasook)*  
*James Burbford & Elizabeth Anderson, The University of Auckland (performance)*  
*Queer/trans identity ‘shocks’: Performing reflections of the ‘Queers in Tertiary Education’ hui*                                       |
| 12:30-1:00   | **Room N516**  
*Amanda Reilly & Deborah Jones, Victoria University of Wellington (paper)*  
*Biting the hand that feeds us? Dilemmas of researching our own academic workplace*                                                        |
|              | Room N516  
Louisa Allen, The University of Auckland (paper)  
‘Undoing’ the self: Should heterosexual teachers ‘come out’ in the university classroom?                                                      |
| 1:00-2:00    | Lunch (including 30-minute meeting of Trading Zone groups – see p.10) in N561                                                                                                                        |
| 2:00-2:30    | **Room N514**  
1: Playfulness  
*(Chair: Felicity Molloy)*  
*Suzanne Fegan, La Trobe University (paper)*  
*Creating playful space in the academy*                                                                                                    |
|              | Room N516  
2. Transitioning identities  
*(Chair: Susan Carter)*  
*Kate Galloway & Peter Jones, James Cook University (paper)*  
*The transition of identity from discipline scholar to scholar of teaching and learning: Tensions and reflections on the path to a fusion epistemology* |
|              | Room N551  
3. Responses to managerialism  
*(Chair: Jamie Burford)*  
*Julie White, La Trobe University (paper)*  
*Performing academic identity for sociality: Creativity, performativity and opera*                                                       |
| 2:30-3:00    | **Daphne Loads, University of Edinburgh (performance)**  
*Artful etymologies: Exploring and playing with the derivations of the words we use*                                                         |
|              | **Jeannie Daniels, La Trobe University (paper)**  
*Professional identity in academic language and learning (ALL): The struggle for recognition*                                                 |
|              | **Peter Wood, Victoria University of Wellington (paper)**  
*Audit identity: Or how the PBRF turned me into an ambitious zombie*                                                                       |
| 3:00-3:30    | **Claire Coleman, The University of Auckland (paper)**  
*Dabbling with identity: How playfulness can be actively encouraged at an academic event to develop richer research communities*                |
|              | **Liz Beddoe, The University of Auckland (paper)**  
*The transition from practice to university teaching: Expertise and identity*                                                               |
|              | **Paul Sutton, University College Plymouth (paper)**  
*A paradoxical identity: Fate, disenchantment and hope*                                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00</td>
<td>Afternoon tea in N561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30</td>
<td><strong>Room N514</strong>&lt;br&gt;1: Autobiographical accounts&lt;br&gt;(Chair: Tai Peseta)&lt;br&gt;Machi Sato, Tohoku University (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Impact of lived experiences on construction of academic/professional identity: An ethnographic study of Japanese junior academics acting as FDI practitioners</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Room N516</strong>&lt;br&gt;2: Thoughts on the contemporary university&lt;br&gt;(Chair: Fran Kelly)&lt;br&gt;Michelle Webber¹ &amp; Sandra Acker², Brock University &amp; University of Toronto (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Academic frogs in the water: How Canadian academics understand accountability and their work in the contemporary university</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Room N551</strong>&lt;br&gt;3: Negotiating identities&lt;br&gt;(Chair: Ritesh Shah)&lt;br&gt;Meegan Hall, Victoria University of Wellington (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Personal pronouns and ‘flexible minds’: Shaping Māori academic identities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:00</td>
<td><strong>Clinton Golding</strong>, University of Otago &amp; University of Melbourne (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Becoming an academic: Illuminated by intellectual autobiography</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Michel Comte</strong>, University of Lucerne (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>What can we learn from museums?</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Barbara Grant</strong>, The University of Auckland (paper)&lt;br&gt;‘Not all academics can do it’: The haunted spaces of post-colonial supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:30</td>
<td><strong>Alisa Percy</strong>, University of Wollongong (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Through the looking-glass, and what I found there</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Melanie Miller¹ &amp; Raoul Adam²</strong>, ¹Unitec &amp; ²James Cook University (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Conceptualising the relationship between epistemology and pedagogy in the construction of academic identities</em>&lt;br&gt;**Raymond ¹⁵, Wendy Green², Luke Houghton¹, &amp; Aaron Ruutz¹, ¹Griffith University &amp; ²University of Queensland (paper)&lt;br&gt;<em>Transforming teaching identities in a ‘healthy’ community of practice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:00</td>
<td>Trading Zone group meetings (venues on p.10 with group lists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:30</td>
<td>Drinks and canapés in N561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 on</td>
<td>Dinner under own steam (list of options provided)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programme Day 2: Tuesday 26\textsuperscript{th} June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:50-9:00</td>
<td>Housekeeping N505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00-10:15 | **N505** **Keynote 2: Dr Eva Bendix-Petersen, The University of Newcastle**
|            | Monsters astray in the flesh: A layered exploration of the im/possibilities of resistance-work in the neoliberalised university
|            | Introduced by Tai Peseta                                              |
| 10:15-10:45| Morning tea                                                            |
| 10:45-11:15| **N514** 1. Academic developer identities
|            | *(Chair: Tai Peseta)*
|            | Shelley Kinash & Kayleen Wood, Bond University (paper)               |
|            | Academic developer identity: How we know who we are                 |
| 11:15-11:45| **N516** 2. Academic writing
|            | *(Chair: Saba Kiani)*
|            | James Burford, The University of Auckland (paper)
|            | Ugly feelings and doctoral writing: A queer analysis                 |
|            | **N551** 3: E-identities
|            | *(Chair: Barbara Kensington-Miller)*
|            | Agnes Bosanquet, Macquarie University (paper)
|            | Messy corners and swampy places: Negotiating early career academia via social media |
| 11:45-12:15| Deandra Little\textsuperscript{1} & David Green\textsuperscript{2},
|            | University of Virginia & Seattle University (symposium of two linked papers)
|            | Marginal gains: Identity and academic development                    |
|            | Helen Sword, The University of Auckland, Performance Writing otherwise |
|            | Sean Sturm & Susan Carter, The University of Auckland, (paper)
|            | Transforming scholarly identity: E-learning as learning to ‘bE’       |
|            | Hazel Owen\textsuperscript{1}, Diana Ayling\textsuperscript{2}, & Ed Flagg\textsuperscript{2}, Ethos Consultancy & Unitec (paper)
|            | Thinking, researching and living in virtual professional development community of practice |
| 12:15-1:15 | Lunch                                                                  |
| 1:15-1:45  | **N514** 1: Questioning foundational identities
|            | *(Chair: Cat Mitchell)*
|            | Ritesh Shah, The University of Auckland (paper)
|            | Serving the university or serving society? The neglected place of public service in '21st century' academic identity construction |
| 1:45-2:15  | **N516** 2. Narratives of identity
|            | *(Chair: Jamie Burford)*
|            | Adisorn Juntrasook, University of Otago (paper)
|            | 'I’m one of those uppity bitches!’ Narratives of leadership and academic identities |
|            | Satoshi Sanada, James Cook University (paper)
|            | Minding the ‘theory-practice gap’ in education: Researcher reflexivity as a bridge between theory and practice in educational research |
|            | Steve Marshall, Unitec (paper)
<p>|            | The academic immigrant in higher education: A complex dual identity    |
| 2:15-2:45  | Afternoon tea In N561                                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:45</td>
<td><strong>Roundtables</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N514         | Nick Barter & Luke Houghton, Griffith University  
               *Agony of the lecturer*                                                                                                                                                                    |
| N516         | Jan McLean¹, Giedre Kligyte¹ & Tai Peseta², ¹University of New South Wales & ²La Trobe University  
               *Against academic identities*                                                                                                                                                              |
| N551         | Sophie Alcock¹ & Jenny Ritchie², ¹Te Whare Wānanga o Wairaka & ²Unitec  
               *Academics as servants? Playing with realities*                                                                                                                                           |
| N356         | Melinda Lewis, University of Sydney  
               *Together alone with everyone: Academic identity construction and relationships within the practice of insider educational research*                                                     |
| 3:45-4:30    | Trading Zone group meetings (venues as for Day 1)                                                                                                                                             |
| 4:30-7:00    | Break to rest up and travel to Fale Pasifika by bus/taxi (Bldg 275, City Campus, see map)                                                                                                    |
| 7:00 on      | Conference dinner at the Fale Pasifika (Wynyard St, City Campus)                                                                                                                            |
## Programme Day 3: Wednesday 27th June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:15-9:45       | **N514**  
1. Re-enchanting academic identities  
(Chair: Sean Sturm)  
Reem Al-Mahmood, La Trobe University (paper)  
Doctoral writing: Transgressive voicing and choreography – (Re)configurations and (re)enchantments of academic research(ers) identities |
| 9:45-10:15      | **N516**  
2. Postgraduate Identities  
(Chair: Adisorn Juntrasook)  
Frances Kelly & Ian Brailsford, The University of Auckland (paper)  
From ‘student’ to ‘academic’: Doctoral candidates’ transition to understanding academic work and ‘the academic person’ |
| 10:15-10:30     | **Felicity Mollo**, The University of Auckland  
Fit to teach: Traces of embodied performance in academic study |
| 10:30-10:45     | **Zofia Pawlaczek** & **Jacqueline Godman**  
¹Deakin University & ²West Gippsland Arts Centre (pecha kucha, 15 mins)  
Can’t sleep: Capturing a collective imagination as a process of creativity, professional development and academic activity |
| 10:45-11:15     | Morning tea in N561 |
| 11:15-12:30     | **N505**  
Keynote 3: Prof Sandra Acker, University of Toronto  
Academic passion: Thoughts on careers, cultures and change  
Introduced by Barbara Grant |
| 12:30-2:00      | Poroporoaki/farewell followed by lunch in N561 |
Keynote speakers

Professor Emerita Sandra Acker, University of Toronto, Canada

Sandra is Professor Emerita at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. She has worked in the United States, Britain, and Canada as a sociologist of education, with particular interests in gender and education, teachers’ work, and higher education. Sandra has conducted studies of doctoral students, academics and academic administrators. Her current research focuses on the ways in which academics in the contemporary university are being regulated or ‘disciplined’ and the impact on their identities. Her most recent book (as co-editor with Anne Wagner and Kimine Mayuzumi) is Whose university is it, anyway? Power and privilege on gendered terrain (Sumach Press, 2008).

Academic passion: Thoughts on careers, cultures and change
This conference gives me the opportunity to look back on my forty-year career as an academic. The main focus is on three themes, signalled in my title, that typically emerge both in my life and in the research I have done on academic identity, much of which has a gender focus. My earliest preoccupation was ‘career’ and I wrote about careers of (women) postgraduates, teachers and academics in higher education, aiming for a conceptualization that was less of a ladder, more of an experience and sometimes an accident. My work on ‘cultures’ was typically on ‘workplace cultures’, the surroundings that influence our understandings of what is thinkable and possible in our work lives ‘Change’ is a current preoccupation of writers on higher education who ask whether cutbacks and corporatization have drained the academic life of pleasure and autonomy. How can we retain our passion as academics? What research directions will add to what we know and where we might want to go in the future?
Dr Eva Bendix Petersen, The University of Newcastle, Australia

Eva is currently Senior Lecturer in the School of Education at the University of Newcastle, Australia. Previously, she worked in Danish and other Australian universities. She has undertaken poststructural ethnography of university cultures for over a decade and is particularly interested in the formation of academic subjectivities, also as they are traversed by constructions of gender and by neoliberal discourse. She is deeply interested in what post-realist research and scholarship might look like and has experimented with what could be called new forms of representation.

Monsters astray in the flesh: A layered exploration of the im/possibilities of resistance-work in the neoliberalised university

At this point in time we know that universities across the world have been traversed by neoliberal and new managerial discourses and that academic work has changed considerably as a result. A great deal of good work has been undertaken to ascertain the extent and nature of these changes and the impact they have had on all aspects of university life. We know that academics are overworked and stressed and that there is a widespread sense of desperation and malaise. The pressing question now seems to be: how come academics do not engage in more forceful resistance? How does resistance become difficult, and when and where is it achievable? Drawing on ethnographic materials created over 10 years in various Australian universities, this paper offers a layered reading of some of the ‘monsters’ that appear to have ‘gone astray in the flesh’ of academics, that is, the embodied discourses or ‘passionate attachments’ which get in the way of strong and powerful resistance to neoliberal practices. The contention is that we need a much richer understanding of these and other monsters and the work that they do in everyday academic work-life to be able to destabilise and exceed their hold on us, and to enable more potent individual and collective resistance.
Melinda (Ngati Whakaue, Ngapuhi, Pākehā) is currently a full-time researcher on the Starpath Project at the University of Auckland. She is also a lecturer, post-graduate research supervisor, a researcher in the Te Ara a Ihenga, a research consortium that examines Māori student success in her tribal area of Rotorua, and a student of Te Puawananga o Te Arawa. Melinda’s research interests focus on racial-ethnic identity construction, ethnic hybridity and Māori concepts of giftedness. In 2008, Melinda had a book published by NZCER called Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā.

**Edgewalking: The multiple selves and realities of a Māori researcher**

As social beings, we all have available a repertoire of social and personal identities, the salience of which varies with social context. However, researchers who identify as Māori, and who undertake research about or for Māori, often face a unique set of identity challenges. This presentation will critically examine the complex nature of the barriers encountered by Māori researchers working at the nexus of Māori and academic communities. In particular, I will address the role of Māori identity in shaping the research experience and examine the tensions that can exist for Māori social scientists as they mediate complex, and sometimes conflicting, research expectation.
Trading Zone Groups

Each delegate is allocated to a Trading Zone Discussion Group (see below). These groups meet briefly over lunch on Day 1 for introductions, and then at the end of both Days 1 and 2 to trade ideas, impressions and observations of the presentations they have attended. This time for collective exchange is an opportunity to listen, learn from and engage with new colleagues.

Meetings will be held together by a designated Chair whose main role is to facilitate introductions and then ensure everyone has a chance to talk.

We hope you’ll see the Trading Zone Discussion Groups as informal spaces to meet new people, build connections for yourself and your research, and to laugh, think, and fashion the possibilities of new collaborations.

If you have not been assigned to a group, please see James Burford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trading Zone 1 – N514</th>
<th>Trading Zone 2 – N516</th>
<th>Trading Zone 3 – N551</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brailsford, Ian</td>
<td>Flagg, Edward</td>
<td>Daniels, Jeannie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayling, Diana</td>
<td>Jones, Peter</td>
<td>Galloway, Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molloy, Felicity</td>
<td>Golding, Clinton</td>
<td>Sturm, Sean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbins, Raymond</td>
<td>Fegan, Suzanne</td>
<td>Bosanquet, Agnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword, Helen</td>
<td>Pawlaczek, Zofia</td>
<td>Reilly, Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Melanie</td>
<td>Coleman, Claire</td>
<td>Kiani, Saba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machi, Sato</td>
<td>Allen, Louisa</td>
<td>Marshall, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walke, Janet</td>
<td>Webber, Michelle</td>
<td>Barter, Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair: Alisa Percy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Linda Keesing-Styles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Deandra Little</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trading Zone 4 – N356</th>
<th>Trading Zone 5 – N357</th>
<th>Trading Zone 6 – outside N505 (south)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comte, Michel</td>
<td>Burow, Karsten</td>
<td>Mitchell, Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Nicola</td>
<td>Fyffe, Jeanette</td>
<td>Loads, Daphne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah, Ritesh</td>
<td>Evans, Monica</td>
<td>Ritchie, Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, Paul</td>
<td>Beddoe, Liz</td>
<td>Petersen, Lesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acker, Sandra</td>
<td>Sutherland, Kathryn</td>
<td>Wood, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Raoul</td>
<td>Lewis, Melinda</td>
<td>Anderson, Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mahmood, Reem</td>
<td>Marley, Robert</td>
<td>Paurini, Seann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Susan</td>
<td>Hall, Meegan</td>
<td>Petersen, Eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber, Melinda</td>
<td>Burford, James</td>
<td>Rowe, Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair: Adisorn Juntrasook</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Sally Knowles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Tai Peseta</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trading Zone 7 – outside N505 (north)

| Nash, Simon           | Mitchell, Cat         |                                      |
| Ayres, Robert         | Loads, Daphne         |                                      |
| Wood, Kayleen         | Ritchie, Jenny        |                                      |
| Hope, Janet           | Petersen, Lesley      |                                      |
| Satoshi, Sanada       | Wood, Peter           |                                      |
| Kensington-Miller, Barbara | Anderson, Elizabeth |                                      |
| Houghton, Luke        | Paurini, Seann        |                                      |
| Grant, Barbara        | Petersen, Eva         |                                      |
| White, Julie          | Rowe, Nicholas        |                                      |
| **Chair: David Green** | **Chair: Sally Knowles** |                                      |
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Abstracts

Alpha by first author’s family name

Alcock, Sophie & Ritchie, Jenny – Unitec Institute of Technology, New Zealand
salcock@gw.unitec.ac.nz

Academics As Servants? Playing With Realities

This round-table discussion will address the topic of academic identities from social and ethical perspectives that extend beyond institutions with their ‘communities of practice’ (Wenger, 1998). We plan to discuss how an ethic of care (Noddings, 2005, 2007), hermeneutics of trust (Orange, 2011), whanaungatanga (Ritchie & Rau, 2006) and even love (Goldstein and Lake, 2000; Soto, 2005) can re-situate our academic identities beyond collegiality or managerialism by repositioning our teaching and research as ‘service’. While emphasising the academic-servant aspect of our multiple dialogical identities (Hermans, 2001) we intend to also explore the ways our academic selves can slip into playfulness, sociality and creativity in response to the sometimes overly rigid pressures of wider neo-liberalist regimes (Peters, 2001). Our discussion will draw on our personal experiences of shifting from the ‘university’ to the ‘polytechnic’ sector. For us this move has not been a down-sizing; rather it has become a reclaiming of academic autonomy. The field-based teacher education programme we teach in fits with our educational philosophies of prioritising action, practice, praxis (Freire, 1972) and care for self and other(s). Field-based methods can mediate students’ immediate and direct engagement with theory, so that theory is enacted and emerges through and in relation with practice thereby enabling students to live the curriculum. Whilst we recognise that the polytechnic propaganda, in referring to the institution’s preferred ways of teaching as ‘living curriculum’ and ‘real-life learning’, has potential limitations for narrowing critical possibilities for teaching and research, we intend to address this dialectic through open dialogue and questioning. Other questions we will pose to help tease out issues of academic identities include:

- How might an ethics of care blended with a hermeneutics of trust and the philosophy and practice of whanaungatanga transform teaching and research?
- What do we mean by ‘servant’ academic identities?
- What are the implications for shifting academic identities from ‘I’ positions to ‘being-with’?
- How do we maintain professional academic identities as citizens independent of institutional roles?

Key References:

Allen, Louisa – The University of Auckland, New Zealand
le.allen@auckland.ac.nz

‘Undoing’ The Self: Should Heterosexual Teachers ‘Come Out’ In The University Classroom?

The issue of whether to ‘come out’ in class has a poignant history in the literature by gay, lesbian and bisexual educators on this topic. By comparison few heterosexuals have publicly written about whether they explicitly reveal their heterosexuality to tertiary students. This paper contributes to the enduring debate about whether to ‘come out’ in class from the perspective of a heterosexual. It explores the questions: Should heterosexuals come out in class? Can this serve as a pedagogically effective strategy for those striving to achieve anti-heteronormative classrooms? The arguments for and against coming out by lesbian, gay and bisexual writers are canvassed to discern which are relevant for heterosexuals. I argue that the question of whether to come out is as pedagogically relevant to heterosexuals as those who are gay, lesbian and bisexual. Failing to identify explicitly as heterosexual can serve to reinforce the homosexual/heterosexual binary, where silence about heterosexual identity maintains its ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ status. I also contend that coming out as heterosexual necessitates a strategy that undermines the dominance of this identity (which an assertion of this identity can reinforce). To come out by ‘undoing’ the heterosexual self is offered as one approach to this dilemma. This ‘undoing’ strives to denaturalize and decentre heterosexual identity and the heteronormative practices which sustain its privileged position.

Al-Mahmood, Reem – La Trobe University, Australia
R.AlMahmood@latrobe.edu.au

Doctoral Writing: Transgressive Voicings and Choreography — (Re)Configurations and (Re)Enchantments of Academic

All thesis journeys involve (trans)formative identity work. I had come from a scientific and linguistic background with a desire to explore e-learning and e-teaching in higher education and to research the shifting academic identities and university physical and digital spaces in the digital era. To research e-learning and e-teaching more richly in their emergent material, spatial and social complexities, I needed to move beyond traditional humanist boundaries of what we look at, and therefore shift how we look at, and consequently how we write about e-learning and e-teaching. Hence I challenged traditional humanist research boundaries by advocating radical poststructuralist analytical sensibilities to advance analysis of e-learning and e-teaching as sociomaterial and affective practices that emerge through human-material-spatial arrangements. Embracing a relational performative (emergent) understanding of the world, as distinct from a representational view (a world out there), and highlighting the affective and the material, beyond a purely humanist stance, meant that I needed to find ways to write to enact these positionings.

A performative relational stance requires that we rethink theory and practice towards theory—practice. “Practices of knowing are specific material engagements that participate in (re)configuring the world. Making knowledge is not simply about making facts but about making worlds, or rather it is about making specific worldly configurations ...” (Barad 2007: 91, original emphasis). Knowing/knowledge production then is about performing and enacting realities, and therefore about taking on the responsibilities that go with this (Law 2008c). In my making/performing knowledge (performing/writing the thesis), I needed to find an identity/voice with which to write/perform and enact the ontological positionings of the research. Further, I wanted to enact research writing that incites, moves, engages and inspires — conceptually and materially. In embracing a relational sensibility, there were challenges of (re)presenting/performing the data fragments. A solution emerged in the metaphor of choreography to propel and “(re)enchant” (Cole & Knowles 2011) the research writing. As a researcher (choreographer), I was emboldened by Hart and Dadds (2001) amongst many others such as Lather (2007), Lather and Smithies (1997), MacLure (2003), Stronach (2010), and Stronach and MacLure (1997) to break from traditional expositions towards experimenting with data synthesis and structures. To work with traditional linear analytical academic texts, often the “tortured” writing (Goodyear, 2011) of traditional academe, was always going to be problematic as I would silence and translate various actors into ‘reduced’ verbal texts. Like Mol and
Mesman (1996) who wanted to “... unravel and understand how the methods we’re caught up in, make us observe and write” (Mol & Mesman, 1996, p. 419). I too wanted to attend to this concern. I enacted different understandings and performances of the realities of e-learning and e-teaching practices in writing evocatively, sensuously, transgressively and provocatively by dissolving traditional human/material and verbal/visual boundaries. Writing transgressively carries with it risks and a call to audacity in shaking-up traditional academic genres. This paper unfolds the thesis-researcher identity writing tensions of engaging in transgressive writing, and encourages ways to do and write research differently and otherwise.
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The Agony of the Lecturer

This story attempts to capture our internal monologues and the discussions we have had with each other and colleagues about lecturing in universities at the beginning of the 21st century. At the moment a conflation of budgetary requirements, a desire to keep students ‘happy’ (because students are increasingly being seen as consumers) and students’ desires as consumers, for a degree that is utilitarian, has put us believe, lecturers in a difficult position. A position where it can appear that monetary concerns come first and educational concerns second. This commoditisation of education, the view that students are consumers and the omnipotent power of the dollar to de-prioritise all other concerns is, we believe, detrimental to the enabling of an education that facilitates independent, thinking minds – in short, the proverbial cart is being put before the proverbial horse.

While the harsh critic would perhaps challenge the agony of the lecturer as being the whining of the lecturer, we are comfortable in our truth and that this truth is partially echoed by those who share our profession. We accept the story is a caricature, however, we hope it is a caricature that informs; in particular we hope it is challenges students.

Beddoe, Liz – The University of Auckland, New Zealand
e.beddoe@auckland.ac.nz

The transition from practice to university teaching: Expertise and identity

Social work academics most often arrive in the academy after a period of successful clinical practice. Frequently they hold a master’s degree and their arrival in a teaching position in a teaching institution coincides with doctoral study. Many social work academics have come from levels of seniority in practice leadership or middle management in professional social work. They come from work cast in an altruistic or even heroic mould, with confidence based on having ‘done well’. The transition from ‘expert’ practitioner to ‘junior’ academic represents an identity shift. There is limited research on their experience of this transition.
Bourdieu’s conceptual tools of habitus, field and capital have considerable value in attempting to understand complex and subtle shifts of professional identities. I am applying to this topic insights gained in previous research, where the concept of ‘professional capital’ was employed to explore social work practitioners’ perceptions of the value of further education and research (Beddoe, 2010; 2011a). The construct ‘professional capital’, is used here as an extension of Bourdieu’s concepts of cultural and social capital. Professional capital is conceptualized as a form of symbolic capital; where prestige, status and influence in both institutional life and the wider public discourse contribute to individual and collective identities. In my earlier study social workers saw scholarship and research as capital enhancing activities, benefiting their profession, not just them as individuals. They did however often feel deeply a lack of confidence in what was often described as a battle for respect in multidisciplinary settings (2011a; 2011b). There is some evidence that this extends to social workers’ experience in the academy (Green, 2006).

Those practitioners who transition to academia, thus shift to a new field; in Bourdieu’s terms a ‘structured social space, a field of forces’ (Bourdieu, 1998, p.40). In choosing to enter academic life they begin a second professional journey, in a field where hierarchies are visible, and prestige and expertise are measured differently. New expertise must be developed within an altered professional identity. The highly affective, relationship-based habitus of clinical practice is left behind and a new lens applied to personal and collegial estimation of expertise.

Questions for exploration in this conceptual paper include the following: how do new academics experience this transition? How is the symbolic capital associated with academic prestige communicated to academics newly arrived from the field of practice? What conscious actions (by self and others) might be applied to this identity shift?
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**Messy corners and swampy places: negotiating early career academia via social media**

This paper explores the “swampy” places (Schön, 1987) and “messy corners” (King, 2002) of early career academic identity. These phrases evoke something of my transition over the past five years: from PhD student and casual teacher in cultural studies, to academic developer in a central learning and teaching unit and mother. These changes prompt reflection: where do I belong? Am I really committing ‘career suicide’ by becoming an academic developer? What happens to my passion for theory? Is this inner turmoil post-PhD funk, due to the lack of dream-space as a mother, or something more sinister?

Manathunga (2006) uses the term “unhomeliness” to describe her movement into academic development. The politics of the field add intensity: the pressure of change in the higher education sector; institutional positioning between senior management and academic staff (Clegg, 2009); the structurally, operationally, ontologically and epistemologically fragmented nature of academic development (Harland and Staniforth, 2008); and an increasing emphasis on measuring standards and outcomes in teaching and research. Balancing work and motherhood is further dislocating. It is difficult to identify any one fault-line along which my “unhomeliness” erupts: PhD completion, leaving cultural studies, becoming an academic developer and a mother.
Entering the prosaic field of academic development, I have mourned the loss of playfulness and experimentation with text. Similarly Manathunga (2006) feels the lack of critical theory in educational scholarship, and Peseta (2007) identifies a disconnection between the pleasures of textuality and academic development. From cultural studies, I value critical theory, creative methodologies and questions about power relations, discourses and practices of inclusion and exclusion, locations of knowledge and constructions of subjectivity. Finding ways for my scholarly writing to address these domains in academic development has become a part of my broader project as a researcher.

Online social networks offer an opportunity to create an alternate academic identity that negotiates and resists academia’s “privileged discourses, networks, conferences and distinctive forms of practice” (Clegg, 2009, 403). On Twitter, for example, I am by day a Lecturer in Higher Education Development; by night a zombie lover, reader, dreamer; and always curious, mischievous, and mothering. The poetics or oneirism of academic development – which Peseta (2007) refers to as its “artfulness” and Clegg (2009) calls its “soul” – is too rarely acknowledged in everyday practice.
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Ugly Feelings & Doctoral Writing: A Queer Analysis

Doctoral writing is not only text work, but also discipline-specific identity work (Wellington, 2010). As Kamler and Thomson have argued doctoral identity work, “accomplished through thesis writing...can shape tentative and sometimes highly anxious scholar identities” (Kamler & Thomson, 2004, p. 197). Despite these contributions, and the widespread concern expressed in public academic and pedagogic discourses about ‘the current (poor) state of doctoral writing’ there is a marked absence of inquiry into the emotional experiences and identities of doctoral writers (Aitchison & Lee, 2006). Existing literature on the emotional landscape of doctoral writing tends to focus on the ways in which (negative) emotions disturb doctoral student progress. In this paper I intend to problematise this dominant discourse by asking whether negative emotions are inevitably to be avoided or overcome? Might they not be important resources for learning, personal growth - even pleasure? I draw upon queer theories of affect to assist me to answer these questions. This deployment enables me to queer dichotomous portrayals of emotions in higher education, which are often viewed as negative/positive, and/or obstacles for individual students to overcome in order to successfully complete what is assumed to be a routine cognitive process. This paper concludes by considering how queering the emotions of doctoral writers brings to the fore new understandings of doctoral, and perhaps academic identities.
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Queer/Trans Identity ‘Shocks’: Performing Reflections Of The ‘Queers In Tertiary Education’ Hui

In February 2012 the first ever “Queers in Tertiary Education Hui” took place in Auckland. This hui brought together academics, general staff, students and community leaders to talk about their concerns around the place of queer/trans people in higher education (HE) in New Zealand. The hui provided a unique opportunity to advance new models of information and support provision for LGBTTQQIMVPFAFF students, intergenerational dialogue between staff and students and facilitated inter-community networking between educators/students and wider community stakeholders.

Perhaps the most interesting outcome of the hui were a series of intense episodes which challenged the identities of participants at the hui. Borrowing from Virginia Woolf, we have called these identity ‘shocks’ (Woolf, 1978, p. 72), episodes which result in a compulsion to re-(w)r(gh)te. In our case, these shocks manifested as challenges to the assumed homogeneity of the identities of hui participants. The authors observed that through the hui dominant academic identities of white, middle-class, lesbian and gay faculty were forced into contrast with the less privileged trans, bi-sexual, student, working class and people of colour queer identities articulated by other participants. The stability of ‘queer’ academic identities was also troubled by the participation of ‘straight’ allies (Allen, 2010) who expressed an affinity to queer/trans political concerns.

Our performance, informed by arts-informed (re)presentation strategies (see Cole & Knowles, 2008) will explore a series of moments where the authors experienced ‘shocks’ to their queer-academic identities. These identity shocks brought to the surface important debates within feminist and queer studies around the usefulness (or otherwise) of identity politics. We believe that the ‘identity shocks’ that emerged at the hui provide a useful example of how identity-based politics tend to efface the impacts of ‘in-community’ privilege and marginalisation. Yet, this concern sits alongside the reality that identity based organizing is one of the primary ways of addressing social change for queer/trans people in higher education.
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Broadening The Field: Shifting Focus From Research In The Academy To Research Of The Academy

Reasonably commonly, increasingly commonly, academics shift across disciplines, stepping into employment opportunities. To do so, we slough identities like snakes, adapting new patterns and codes. This paper is based on two academics transformations framed within an awareness of academic citizenship. One, Susan, moved from teaching medieval and early modern literature to a higher education placement coordinating a doctoral program, a shift she wrote about as shape-shifting, interested in the process of adapting new ways of being (Carter, 2008). Now subjected to the uneasy identity of learning advisor (Alexander, 2005, Chanock, 2006), she also finds a great deal of pleasure in supporting doctoral students across campus from a generic position. The other, Nicholas, moved from being a practicing dance artist into a dance academic with an ethnography focus on dance in traumatised communities

\(^1\) Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, takataapui, questioning, queer, intersex, mahu, vakasalewalewa, palopa, fa’aafafine, akava’ine, fakaleiti, and fakafifine.
passion for something they do

communities of practice build upon the characteristic in academic settings. In contrast to what is often seen as the isolating and hierarchal world of academia, communities of practice build upon the characteristics of a working team or group who share a concern or passion for something they do (Shacham & Od-Cohen, 2009). These factors highlight how the use of a

Both shifts were serendipitous, but the transformation of identity in each case prompted awareness of the importance of the values that underpinned these academics' work, values that remained constant and developed steadily despite the shedding of ways of working, and ways of talking about their work. What has remained constant and developed is their belief in the social dimension of academia (see Bruffee, 1999; Brookfield, 2006). In some ways their quite radical discipline changes have enabled them to feel more certain of their placement within the curious machinations of academia.
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Dabbling With Identity: How Playfulness Can Be Actively Encouraged At An Academic Event To Develop Richer Research Communities

The best bits of any conference experience are often not the papers presented by the experts in the lecture theatre but the informal conversations held in the pub later that evening. This discussion will examine the question of what dismantling the traditional barriers created by academic identities through playfulness and sociality might offer developing research communities. It will consider academic identity as a combination of lived experiences and self-conception rather than easily defined by teaching, research, or management roles (Clegg, 2008; Macfarlane, 2007). It will also consider whether as Becher (1989) suggests the ability to be playful is a result of being part of the “drama” tribe or whether it might be applied to academic identities more generally. It will examine the Postgraduate Collaboratory day, which was part of The 2011 Pedagogy of Possibilities: The Second Critical Studies in Drama Education International Symposium, December 2011. This provided an opportunity for international postgraduate students to gather and whilst only students and supervisors were required to attend, almost all symposium delegates came to discuss research, the challenges and successes of postgraduate research and reflect upon the wider research community. This unique offering was widely commended by participants for its design, and value to developing research relationships and the future growth of the field of critical studies in drama.

This discussion will consider how this conference enabled the creation of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) between PhD students and experienced researchers and how these can enhance learning in academic settings. In contrast to what is often seen as the isolating and hierarchal world of academia, communities of practice build upon the characteristics of a working team or group who share a concern or passion for something they do (Shacham & Od-Cohen, 2009). These factors highlight how the use of a
collaborative approach at conferences can enhance the experience for both early career researchers and experts dedicated to life long learning and exposure to alternative ideas and ongoing professional dialogue (McMorland, Carroll, Copas, & Pringle, 2003; Shacham & Od-Cohen, 2009).

At the 2011 conference the PhD day began with a clearly drama infused activity which involved immediate and equal involvement from all participants. This enjoyable activity quickly broke down barriers of status and affirmed our sense of community (Hatfield, 2006). Later in the day experienced researchers shared their own research experiences; both positive and negative in collaborative discussions allowing both students and professors to appreciate one another as people rather than their official academic titles. This paper suggests that as a consequence of the PhD day the Drama Education community is well placed to develop and grow together as emerging researchers work alongside our experienced colleagues (Govender & Dhunpaht; Jarvac-Martek, Chen, & McAlphine, 2011). As a PhD student initially intimidated by the titles, works and writings of many of the attendees, I now feel a kinship with them. There generous support for my research and positive encouragement for researchers at all levels of the academy is something, which I think will ultimately benefit the field in the years to come.
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What Can We Learn From Museums?

Introduction
If we had to locate our understanding of teaching and learning at university on a continuum between compulsory schools and museums, where would an academic self-understanding lead us?

Problem
There is political and managerial pressure on faculty to become more professional as teachers (cp. Lee: 19). Despite this, in Europe reform tendencies so far seem to have little effect on how faculty teach and students learn.

The organizational answer is to install faculty developers who should act as “change agents”. This intention however seems to contradict the self-understanding of faculty. Organizational theory can help to describe and partly explain this “culture clash” (cp. Hasse: 240; Stock). Another explanation for this gap might be that faculty development theory draws heavily on research on compulsory school settings.

Question
Assuming that not all demands for a more “progressive” approach to teaching is non-sense, we are left with the question of how to bridge that gap between faculty and faculty developers.
What could be done

1) Trust in the self-reflection and innovative capacities of faculty.
2) Do more empirical research on successful learning and teaching at university.
3) Find new ways of describing teaching and learning at university: rely less on a pedagogy that is mainly derived from compulsory school and rather develop instruments that genuinely fit universities, in order to inspire faculty to rethink teaching.

While the first point reduces “overhead costs”, it also leaves faculty with no support. The second point might be the most appropriate solution, but it is highly cost-intensive and therefore not viable for small universities. As a third point I therefore suggest to try a new conceptualisation of teaching at universities by looking at a kind of continuum on which this “business” lies.

Think for example of curriculum planning as if designing an exhibition: there are hands-on parts and parts that visitors can chose to learn from or not – all this is skilfully and deliberately arranged. With such a picture (which of course has major limits) we gain flexibility and inspiration. We guard the freedom of teaching but we also focus on the task of arranging a learning path and of planning interaction. Because museums have moved on from collecting dust to being places of learning to which target-groups feel emotionally attached, we should no longer ignore that our study programmes must be interactive and attractive.

Discussion

• It would be interesting to learn what position faculty in New Zealand and Australia - leading countries in teaching development - take in this matter.
• Should teaching at university change?
• Do we need “faculty development” at all?
• Has the problem outlined above the same relevance here as it has for continental Europe?
• Can academic identities be inspired by museums?
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Professional Identity in Academic Language and Learning (ALL): The Struggle for Recognition

Academic Language and Learning (ALL) skills provision has become an important feature of higher education delivery with most Australian universities now having staff dedicated to supporting student development of academic skills. A lengthy and ongoing debate in the literature frames both its purpose and relevance (see for example Star & Hammer, 2008), as well as the recognition for, and status of, ALL workers (Stevenson & Kokkin 2007).

Within the ALL community members understand their roles quite differently. ALL is not in itself a discipline, so workers in this field individually negotiate their roles as they aim for credibility and standing within their academic community; however, differences can cause friction, fragmentation and undermining of confidence as members struggle to centre their specialisations as integral to shaping what ALL really is. Thus challenges may face the individual who brings disciplinary skills into her role assuming that these skills will be valued. For this author, being drawn into a struggle for identity has created a personal and professional dilemma, in which I find myself located in a space of outside belonging (Probyn, 1996) unsure of my academic identity either as an ALL lecturer, or as an educator.
In this paper I explore the re-negotiation of my own professional identity as an academic worker in an Australian university, moving from the discipline of Education into ALL. I describe having conceptualised my ideal identity (de Ruyter & Conroy, 2002) in becoming an ALL lecturer, and relate how this construction of my professional self has subsequently been unsettled, challenging both my aspirational ideals, and my sense of academic belonging. Especially confronting has been the struggle for recognition amongst ALL colleagues.

While academics question their professional identity as a result of the corporatisation and managerialism of contemporary higher education (Nixon, Marks, Rowland & Walker, 2001), they at least draw on the common experiences of shared struggles; ALL workers, already searching for a location with academia, struggle for recognition amongst discipline academics, from the university governance, and from their own peers.

In documenting these challenges to identity I seek to add a further dimension to current debates on how ALL workers locate themselves within our universities; in doing so I believe there are implications for all academic workers who, unsettled by the changing face of universities, seek to find or reshape their professional identities.
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**Academic Identity Within Field-Based Early Childhood Initial Teacher Education**

Evidence from my PhD (Education) research indicates that the academic identity of academic staff is interrelated with the academic identity of students. The overall aim of my research is to critically examine the academic identity of students in field-based early childhood initial teacher education (ECITE). In the context of my study, academic identity refers to the appropriation of academic values and practices within a sense of self. Academic identity reflects one’s willingness to take on board academic discourses, practices, and a commitment to membership of the academic community (White & Lowenthal, 2011), and is evidenced through theories of self, disposition, agency and achievement predictors (Rodriguez, 2009; Was, Al-Harthy, Stack-Oden, & Isaacson, 2009). Initial analysis of contextually rich, qualitative data, has identified that the academic identities of students and Teacher Educators in field-based ECITE are interconnected.

Early childhood education has a long socio-political history of being regarded as a feminised occupational field (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009), associated with the attitude of the typical student who is ‘a nice girl but not too bright’, and for whom early childhood is considered ‘an easy option’. Such attitudes continue to exist, and pose a challenge for both students and Teacher Educators as contention surrounding the credential inflation of early childhood teacher education persists (May, 2010). In light of the emerging themes, from initial data analysis of the perspectives of both students and Teacher Educators, it appears that academic identity in field-based ECITE is as much about emerging professional identity within the early childhood community (Dalli, 2008), as it is the identity of field-based Teacher Educators as academics within tertiary institutions.
As field-based ECITE has undergone recent credential inflation, academic practices have been re-negotiated, with fear that the contextualised learning required within field-based ECITE programmes has been compromised. It is not only students who are adjusting to these new academic demands. There has also been adjustment by Teacher Educators, who have been required to raise their own academic profiles in response to their academic capability being questioned. This attention to the wider contextual frames of reference in which educational programmes are situated, is significant in the theorising of academic identity.

Academic identity requires contextualisation at multiple levels: within the academic/educational institution and within its related social/community context. Within New Zealand, field-based programmes of ECITE sit within Institutes of Technology, Polytechnics, National and Private Training providers; pre-service programmes being typically associated with Universities and some private training providers. The academic identity of Teacher Educators is further complicated by the expectations and attitudes held as to the place and value of academic practices within, and across these institutions. This up to date data from within a New Zealand context provides a significant contribution to the theorizing of academic identity. It provides insight into the experiences of academic identity as an evolving, developing construct situated within complex social systems.
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Feeling My Way: Becoming-a-Researcher and the Emotions of Fieldwork

In this presentation I explore the place of emotions and empathy in the process of becoming a researcher-doing-fieldwork, drawing from my experiences doing Masters fieldwork in Geography with young fathers in Valparaiso, Chile. While I knew the topic had the potential to invoke emotional responses from participants, I was unprepared for how these might affect me personally and influence the project as a whole. As it turned out, emotional and empathetic experiences - by turns painful, poignant and exhilarating - were formative for the direction of the research, for participants’ experiences of it, and for my own development as a researcher. They allowed for significant shifts in how participants and I understood ourselves and each other and, in some cases, they also affected the ways we engaged politically in the world beyond the research arena. However, while I was able to process these experiences in a way that contributed positively to my work and to my developing sense of self as a researcher, I am concerned that this is not the case for all new researchers, and I seek here to advocate for more discussion about emotions and what to do with them in the context of academic research.
Creating Play Space @ Uni: Reconceptualising Well-Being in the Modernized University

The prevailing culture of neoliberalism in academic environments has left many staff and students wondering what happened to both their autonomy and their sense of work-life balance (Ball, 2003; Barnett, 2011). Increasing demands on time taken up with performance management, surveillance and administrative duties have impacted negatively on job satisfaction for university staff (Watts & Robertson, 2011; Pick, Teo & Yeung, 2012) and have arguably reconfigured academic identities. From a policy perspective, conflicting messages are to be found; on the one hand creativity is positioned as a graduate quality, aligning with the current discourse of “we are all creative now” (Phipps, 2011), while on the other hand the enabling conditions for creativity development are under duress (Banaji & Burn, 2008).

The notion of play-space in such an environment might seem at odds with increased academic workloads and the accountability culture, yet increases in student and staff well-being and morale may be a sound investment for a higher education culture in which the academic community is fading (Barnett, 2011). Play-space here refers to spaces for staff and students, in which academically marginalized qualities including imagination, emotion, intuition and play are encouraged. Experiential arts activities may be a good avenue for opening up to these elements, and this would require some rethinking about how university space: discursive, social and physical, is prioritized.

This paper also describes an arts project that took place on an Australian university campus, involving 40 student volunteers and an academic staff-member. Over 15 months, participants created 68 separate images related to globalisation. This sustained commitment added many hours to participants’ workloads, yet intrinsic motivation and positive affect remained high. Many commented, in journals kept throughout the project, that the space – playful and relaxed – contributed to their sense of well-being and creative energy. This may have positive implications for the contribution that arts can make to university pedagogy, particularly as it provides resistance to conditions in universities that many find unacceptable. As Mautner asks, “If faculty, students and graduates do not challenge the spread of marketisation, who will?” (Mautner, 2010, p. 72).

The proposed play-space cannot ‘fix’ the problem of oppressive conditions in university space brought about by neoliberal market conditions. However, it may help to provide relief and resistance in small ways, and to bring about a more balanced teaching and learning environment in higher education.
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The Transition Of Identity From Discipline Scholar To Scholar Of Teaching And Learning: Tensions And Reflections On The Path To A Fusion Epistemology

The past decade has seen significantly greater emphasis placed upon teaching and learning, and its associated scholarship (SoTL), in Australian universities and internationally (Vardi, 2011; Hubball, Clarke & Poole, 2010; Brawley, Kelly & Timms, 2009). For many, this shift represents long overdue recognition of the centrality of learning and teaching activities in higher education (Boyer, 1990; Chalmers, 2011). For individual academics however, opportunities to engage more fully in the SoTL may present challenges to their core identities as discipline scholars and practitioners, and involve an epistemological shift towards educational and even managerial orientations (Ramsden, 1998). Such transitions and transformations are seldom easy and often present challenges not only to the academic's own sense of identity, but to their relationships with colleagues and peers within and outside their disciplines.

Academic identity is a complex construct. Becher and Trowler (2001) for example, describe ‘tribes’ within academia, and identify hierarchies based on discipline identities that embody a discipline-based epistemology. Outside a purely discipline context, Boyer (1990) articulates the domains of the academic’s role including research and the SoTL. However, the rapidly changing institutional context is creating pressures and presenting challenges for individual academics, with implications for the formation and nature of identity (Billot, 2010). Clegg (2011) agrees that traditional academic identities are under threat but argues that new ways of constituting and imagining the ‘self’ are emerging as the pressures of neo-liberalism continue to bite. Opportunities for subversion, resilience and creativity in the creation and enactment of academic identities remain (Smith, 2010). For academics working within professional disciplines, tensions between primary identification as a professional or as a discipline academic may be further compounded by the opportunities and challenges associated with engaging in the SoTL. For some academics, discipline epistemologies may merge with the SoTL forging a fused professional identity.

The authors of this paper are both professional practitioners (law and social work) who entered the university as discipline-based scholars. Their respective interests in T&L have lead them both down a path that has involved transitioning from this discipline-based orientation to identities, and to organisational roles, primarily grounded in the SoTL. Appointed for a two-year period as ‘Faculty Curriculum Scholars’ as part of a university-wide refresh of the curriculum, the authors have engaged in a process of personal and professional transition, intended and unintended, that has spoken directly to issues of academic identity. As these roles draw to a close, and they prepare to return to their discipline-based positions, the authors reflect on the lessons that have been learned from this journey. In particular, the paper presents a model for understanding the tension between discipline-based and T&L-based orientations and identifies the professional and personal benefits and costs attached to choosing a pathway that leads away from a discipline focus and towards a more generic orientation to learning and teaching.
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**Becoming An Academic – Illuminated By Intellectual Autobiography**

‘How does one become an academic?’ This paper illuminates this question using reflective autobiography. Previous research has indicated the usefulness of narrative for making sense of academic practice (Jones, 2011), and the importance of good advice for transitioning to academic careers (Sutherland and Peterson, 2009, 3), so the aim is provide meaningful advice for PhD students using a range of autobiographical narratives. In order to better understand how we become academics, the methodology builds on a variety of alternative, creative, research methods – specifically reflective practice and self-ethnography (Bolton, 2010). It also follows a tradition of using intellectual autobiography to define a field of study (Waks, 2008), make sense of a body of work (Richardson, 1997) or create a profession (Boon, Matthew and Sheward, 2010). For the complete study, a range of academics will write intellectual autobiographies about becoming academics. These will be combined with a more traditional research output in the form of an editorial which draws out the themes that emerge, and shows how they relate to previous research findings. This conference paper presents the preliminary study – the rationale and justification, the first intellectual autobiography, and some tentative themes. The complete study will have three main research benefits: The intellectual autobiographies will be a form of reflective practice for the writers – research in its own right; The finished stories will provide a more personal and contextualised way of knowing what it is to become an academic, complementary with the more abstract research; Finally, the stories will provide a model of reflective practice for PhD students making sense of their own transition to academia.
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**‘Not All Academics Can Do It’: The Haunted Spaces Of Post-Colonial Supervision**

In this paper I explore the experiences of non-indigenous academics supervising indigenous (Māori) doctoral students in Aotearoa/New Zealand. There is no doubt about the importance of doctoral-level skills and qualifications for the project of cultural renewal and social redress sought by indigenous communities and recent national governments. Given growing numbers of doctoral students and the current under-representation of Māori academics in the academy, particularly in some disciplines, there is a clear need for non-Māori to take up the work of supervising Māori students. However, in a post-colonial context of sometimes fraught, certainly haunted, relations between settler descendants and indigenous people, this obligation can be difficult to enact.

My presentation draws primarily on data from nine interviews with non-indigenous men and women supervisors from a range of disciplines. Situated within a post-colonial theorisation of the academy, I will explore the distinctive features of these supervisors’ experiences as they recount them, in particular issues of both academic and/or settler identity that loom within their tales of supervising Māori doctoral
students. I will also examine and problematise their advice to others to illuminate some thought-provoking contingencies when supervising across the settler-indigene divide.
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**Personal Pronouns And ‘Flexible Minds’: Shaping Māori Academic Identities**

In the mid-1990’s, sociology professor Eviatar Zerubavel (1995) argued against the “mental rigidity” that forces individuals into academic identities that fit “sharply delineated intellectual enclaves” (p. 1095). A decade later, Professor Mary Henkel (2005) signalled that universities can no longer provide their academics with “dominant or legitimising identities” and instead suggested that for academic identity “gender, race, ethnicity and religion may become more important in the lives of individuals, their definitions of themselves and their epistemologies” (emphasis added) (p. 153). In my recent research with Māori academics from various New Zealand universities and disciplines, I have found that not only is their ethnicity already an “important” component of their identity but that they also demonstrate Zerubavel’s (1995) preferred “flexible mind” approach to forming academic identities that allow academics to “maintain multiple identities simultaneously” (p. 1100). In cultivating their dual identities as both Māori and academics, it appears to not be a question of whether their Māori identity may impact on their identity as academics but, rather, how it does.

To draw these conclusions, I used interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to code interview data collected from Māori academic staff about their academic experiences, aspirations and needs. IPA is a qualitative method that produces theme sets, derived from interview transcripts, which can then be ordered into hierarchies, tables or models and compared for commonalities and divergences within the interviewees’ accounts (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). My research goal was to identify hierarchical categories around the phenomenon of the Māori academic experience. One of the categories to emerge from this IPA process was Māori academic identity and an interesting sub-theme, and a key focus of this paper, relates to patterns of personal pronoun usage amongst the interviewees.

Some literature already exists about the relationship between academic identity and personal pronoun usage, but in the context of academic writing rather than oral expression (Fløttum, Gedde-Dahl, & Kinn, 2006). One author found that the use of first person pronouns in academic writing was part of a strategy used to demonstrate credibility, authority and confidence (Hyland, 2002). Another analysed a multi-disciplinary corpus of journal articles to reveal how the personal pronouns ‘I’ and ‘we’ are often used in academic writing to “create a sense of newsworthiness and novelty” about the research findings, and as “positive politeness” devices to draw the reader in or to critique work by others (Harwood, 2005, pp. 347-348 & 365).

Despite this previous research, little has been written about how personal pronoun usage reflects the intersection between cultural and academic identity, and especially not in the context of verbal articulations by Māori academics. In this presentation, I will guide the session participants through the IPA analysis process, using transcripts from my research, and we will then discuss our findings about expressions of Māori academic identity, including personal pronoun usage. Finally, this presentation will
reflect on whether the “flexible mind” approach comes at any personal or professional cost to the Māori academics involved.
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**Transforming Teaching Identities In A ‘Healthy’ Community Of Practice**

Learning to be an academic teacher involves a painful process of becoming a different kind of person, of reconstructions of identity (Warhurst, 2006, p119). This identity work (Clegg, 2008) occurs – for better or worse – in disciplinary communities of practice (CoP). Disciplinary understandings of learning and teaching, or ‘teaching and learning regimes’ (TLRs) are internalised over time and become inextricably linked to academic identity (Trowler and Cooper, 2002). At their worst, they can block new perspectives and marginalize innovators. At their best they facilitate collegiality, collaborative learning and proactive collective action. In this sense they are situated experiences very different from the more common competitive environment in the academe. What makes for ‘good CoPs’ in academe? According to Wenger (1998, p73), they have three ingredients: mutual engagement, a sense of joint enterprise and a shared repertoire. Others suggest that an effective CoP needs to be more than this. Critically it needs to develop a metacognitive perspective, a kind of self-understanding through having its members reflect on the community’s own activities, values and possible ways of developing (Mathias, 2005, p129). In this paper, we discuss research undertaken in, and by members of a teaching CoP in a business school in an Australian university, including the authors of this paper. Our research focused on how the activities of the CoP influenced all members’ sense of themselves as academics and their attitudes to the scholarship around learning and teaching. Data were collected through questionnaires completed after CoP activities, and semi-structured interviews of experienced and relatively new members. Narrative and thematic analyses were used to interpret the data. Many members reported profound personal change; e.g., they were more prepared to share ideas; felt a greater sense of worth; had more experimental attitudes, increased confidence and competence; enjoyed a greater sense of coherence between their ‘teaching and research selves’; and had begun to focus more on learning than teaching.

Here, we draw out links between the changes individual CoP members reported and their perceptions of what made the CoP work (for them). We found, as have Boud & Middleton (2003) that developing a sense of ‘itself’ as a distinct and stable entity was a key factor in supporting the individuals within it. Other key factors to emerge included the support, rather than interference of the School Executive; an intentionally developed ‘climate’ of mutuality and an absence of hierarchy; the active facilitation by CoP members on a rotating basis; mentoring and apprenticeship of new members and early career academics; and informal links and ‘back channels’ (Wenger 1998) which fostered on-going collaborations in the classroom.

Respondents felt that these characteristics – intentionally, purposefully developed and nurtured by CoP members – were conducive to ‘experiments of identity’ (Warhurst, 2006, p119) and practice in their CoP.
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A new approach called ‘Living Curriculum’ was introduced with a goal to reframe opportunity to reconsider approaches to curriculum. A new strategy was established with four key outcome areas, including ‘innovation in teaching and learning’. This new focus offered a unique opportunity for the institution as a whole to grapple with current conceptions of curriculum, learning and teaching. A new overarching approach called ‘Living Curriculum’ was introduced with a goal to reframe learning as conversation.

Juntrasook, Adisorn – Otago University, New Zealand
adisornjuntrasook@gmail.com

‘I’m one of those uppity bitches!’: Narratives of leadership and academic identities

This paper focuses on narrative identities of academics at one university in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is based on a narrative inquiry into academics’ accounts of their experiences and understandings of leadership within and beyond formal headship/administrative positions. This inquiry is aimed at exposing and problematising our understandings of leadership—one of the most ‘obvious’ managerialist devices in contemporary organizations, including higher education institutions (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008). In this paper, I grapple with two interrelated questions. First, what can narratives of academic leadership tell us about academics’ identities and their lives in academia? To attend to this question, I examine the relationships between personal and cultural narratives of leadership as recounted by academics from different backgrounds and positions. I pay particular attention to the ways these academics (re)authorised their ‘leadership’ identities by taking up, and resisting, competing discourses embedded within their professional context. Following the first question, I ask how narrative analysis can offer us new ways of understanding, imagining and be(com)ing otherwise in a contemporary western university especially under neoliberal regimes, where “there is no alternative” (Davies, Gottschke, & Bansel, 2006, p. 308)? To address this question, I offer reflections on my analytic approach—a discursive-dialogical analysis—aimed at recognising identities as always becoming, shifting, resisting closure, and situated in a matrix of power relations. I conclude this paper with a summary of methodological contributions to an ongoing theorisation of academic identities.
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Thinking Otherwise: Challenges to Academic Identity in the Context of Institutional Curriculum Reform

At a New Zealand Institute of Technology, an organisational restructure and new Leadership Team created the opportunity to reconsider approaches to curriculum. A new strategy was established with four key outcome areas, including ‘innovation in teaching and learning’. This new focus offered a unique opportunity for the institution as a whole to grapple with current conceptions of curriculum, learning and teaching. A new overarching approach called ‘Living Curriculum’ was introduced with a goal to reframe learning as conversation.
For those involved in the conceptualisation and implementation of the initiative, this was a process of engaging in profound pedagogic change with teachers. Senge et al (1999, p. 15) use the term ‘profound change’ to describe change that ‘combines inner shifts in people’s values, aspirations, and behaviours with “outer” shifts in processes, strategies, practices, and systems’. Senge suggests that organisations must build capacity for doing things in a new way. However, this is acknowledged as an institutional perspective and must be balanced by considering teacher perceptions.

Learning is ‘the historical production, transformation, and change of persons’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51) and involves the whole person in both the learning experience and the broader communities in which the learner belongs. ‘Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities’ (p. 53). So, while students are grappling with new ways of knowing, as suggested by the Living Curriculum, it was acknowledged that teachers may also ‘become ontologically insecure’ (Ball, 2003, p. 220) as they reconsidered their own approaches to teaching and learning. The curriculum initiative thus required support not only for students but also for teachers who were themselves learners in this process. Both their identity and their conceptions of knowledge were potentially challenged.

Sarup (1996, p. 73) suggests that ‘every person’s identity is a site of struggle between conflicting discourses’ and that the construction of identity is the product of relations of power. This paper focuses on outcomes of a research project investigating teacher identities in the context of institute-wide curriculum change and the resulting ontological concerns as articulated by teachers. Teachers’ experience of conflicting discourses, potential power relations and both affirmations and disruptions to their sense of identity over time are revealed.
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From ‘Student’ To ‘Academic’: Doctoral Candidates’ Transition To Understanding Academic Work And “The Academic Person”

What are the academic identities that aspiring early-career academics encounter when they participate in professional development preparing them for a future in academia, and how do they engage with them? In November 2011 we interviewed eleven doctoral candidates who voluntarily participated in a year-long doctoral academic career module to gauge the nature of shifts in their understanding of ‘the academic person’ and ‘academic work’ or, as one of the candidates termed it, “the beauties and dangers of academic life”. Two aims of the research are to ascertain the impact of the module on the participants’ understandings of an academic career, and to explore its impact on their sense of themselves as intending academics. We asked if there were significant changes in their knowledge of the three main areas of academic work (teaching, research and service) or if there were significant or challenging concepts that they encountered during the programme. As preliminary analysis of the interviews indicates, there were troubling moments and moments of insight. These were primarily in relation to academic identity (“the whole picture ... the academic person”) and academic work (“what it actually means to be an academic”). As we will discuss, contemplating an academic career through a taught academic development module can also impact on ways in which pre-entry academics begin to understand themselves as soon-to-be academics – “where you are able to become someone and to produce yourself as a teacher, scholar, researcher person”.
Research In Iran: Methodological Concerns And Ethical Dilemmas

In March 2011, a law was passed by Iranian government banning all researchers undertaking research thesis topics related to Iran. This presentation highlights the author’s experience in Iran immediately prior to the ban being imposed, at a time of high tension between Iran and the West. I will discuss the ethical dilemmas that derive from controversies about research within highly politicized field. Also several cross-cultural ethical dilemmas that emerged during the research project will be highlighted to show the irrelevance of the ethical codes emphasized by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC) to the context of fieldwork in Iran.

Academic Developer Identity: How We Know Who We Are

The identity of academic developers adds to the conversation about academic identity, in that the developers are the professionals charged with understanding the academic stance and nurturing their self-concepts. This paper explores academic developer identity through applying self-concept theory and appreciative inquiry to the personal journeys of two academic developers. Self-attribute, social comparison, and reflected appraisals are presented and applied to explain how academic developers form their identities. Sociological principles are incorporated to describe the recursive informing of academic development and developer identities. Presentation of implications positions academic developers as higher education leaders.

In the tertiary environment, the landscape of academic development units has evolved from activist voices articulating what was taught and to whom (Lee, Manathunga, & Kandlbinder, 2010) to a primary focus on how teaching and learning occurs in a climate of professional development (Clegg, 2003). Carew, Lefoe, Bell and Armour (2008) unpacked the contested context of academic development in which academic developers interweave theory and practice, pro-activity and responsiveness, and discipline-specific and university-wide supports. Who we, the authors of this paper, are in our roles as academic developers and how we interpret our selves determines how we work to bring about academic development’s emerging ethos in relation to research and service to the broader university's and societal endeavours (Harland & Staniforth, 2008).

This paper is written by two academic developers, one of whom is also the unit director. Through identification with Land’s (2004) orientations to educational development; the director exhibiting as a romantic researcher and the second author as a managerialist, we purport that identity both confirms and challenges the predominant literature on the identity of academic developers. At once recognising the different paths to the arena and the styles evoked therein, and at the same time seeking ways to include and celebrate these diverse approaches. Through the methodology of appreciative inquiry (Reed, 2003) the commonality we have discovered with one another and most of our academic developer colleagues, is our passion for our field and our opportune entry into the terrain (Fraser, 1999). This combination of self concept and appreciative inquiry adds to the existing scholarly conversation about academic developer identity in that it casts the lenses of theory and optimism to what is traditionally interpreted through a skeptical practitioner model.
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**Together Alone With Everyone: Academic Identity Construction And Relationships Within The Practice Of Insider Educational Research**

My roundtable discussion will explore academic identities, their constructions and impacts on workplace relationships, when undertaking insider/institutional (educational) research. I raise the notion that such contextual (and value laden) positioning of the researcher leverages yet impacts on academic identity when the inquiry is within the university or division in which you are employed. My proposed approach to engage participants will be to inquire, surface and explore views (likewise or otherwise) through a background-scenario-question sequence.

**Identity construction/s**

**Background**

The literature generally suggests that academic identity construction is a hybrid/blend of individual and personal notions, connected to a persons’ sense of being in the world, yet embedded within broader, organizational structures and/or within a disciplinary community (Clegg, 2008; Henkel 2000; Kogan, 2000; Becher & Trowler, 2001 in Jawitz, 2009).

**Scenario**

An academic appointed in a discipline-based Faculty within a large, research-intensive university. She is an academic outsider to the specific healthcare discipline, but insider academic to another health discipline that sits within the broader healthcare industry. She has a contracted role promoting academic development, quality improvement, educational research and the scholarship of learning and teaching. She undertakes a process of re-constructing her identity within a disciplinary group, finding a manner in which to be *together alone with everyone*, within the Faculty teaching/research community.

**Question**

When the inquiry is close-up and personal, what are the dynamics and dilemmas for academic identity construction when researching in-the-known or familiar context (the field), within your academic community and/or discipline, friends (the research population)?

**Relationships – identity likewise or otherwise**

**Background**

Taylor (2011) suggests that such field-based research raises dynamics and dilemmas establishing and managing relationships with colleagues within the researcher-researched paradigm. Lincoln & Guba (1985) argue that inquiry is and cannot be value free, it is inevitably value determined with some value agenda. Much is written on the intimate role and identity of the researcher within the praxis of the research, with participants, their settings, their stories, other authors/researchers etc. See the recent work of Paul Trowler (2012).

**Scenario**

The academic-as-insider participates in a range of activities to enact her role. For example, peer observation of teaching for newly appointed academics in which she provided orientation and academic development; co-designer of a curriculum change evaluation protocol where she was central to the re-
design and implementation of that curriculum; or the design of scholarly activities central to improve a poorly evaluated unit of study. She implicitly holds a lived familiarity with the curriculum frameworks and philosophy, pedagogies, individuals and groups, building a sense of intimacy within the academic/courses development relationship. At the same time, her professional practice and worldview imbues her to consider issues of participant disclosure, maintaining ethics and confidentiality and the mandate to communicate outcomes/findings in an appropriate manner (Mercer, 2007).

**Question**

How does the intimate insider manage workplace relationships when situated *likewise* (with the group) and otherwise (outside the group) and how may this impact her own identity?
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**Marginal Gains: Identity And Academic Development**

In everyday parlance, ‘marginal’ may be interpreted as ‘insignificant’. Academic development scholars invoke this definition when discussing the dangers for academic development units on the periphery (Schroeder, 2011). In contrast, we use ‘marginal’ in the sociological sense of being *between* other cultures or groups (*OED Online*). By this definition, academic developers can often feel caught: between oppositional institutional cultures—managerial versus academic—and between different disciplinary ways of thinking and practising. In this two-part symposium, we address each of these margins in turn.

In a previous theoretical article (Green & Little, 2011), we explored the roles developers take in this ‘between space’ by adapting a framework from *The Marginal Man*—Stonequist’s 1937 study of migrants in the USA—to capture the actions of developers as ‘academic migrants’ (Manathunga, 2006) who have left their disciplinary homelands for a ‘between-position’ on the hierarchical and epistemological margins. To explore whether the model is borne out in practice, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 15 developers in three equal clusters based on their prior disciplines: humanities, STEM, and ‘intramural’ disciplines (those whose research directly informs HE practice). Each cluster included at least two countries and two types of institution (public/private, teaching-/research-focused), and all interviewees were senior enough to experience institutional tensions. Interviewees were working in Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and the USA.

**Part 1: ‘A MARGIN IN THE MIDDLE’: HIERARCHICAL MARGINS**

In this segment, we discuss the roles developers take on when operating within university hierarchies between the upper administration (‘university managers’) and mainstream faculty (teachers, researchers). We explore how marginality might account for academic developers’ ‘hybrid’ academic identities to navigate institutional power dynamics as they adopt roles where they advocate for a subordinate group, interpret for subordinate and dominant groups, or assimilate into the dominant group.

**Part 2: ‘A STRANGER IN MY OWN LAND’: EPistemOLOGICAL MARGINS**

In this segment, we examine how developers respond to the epistemological challenge of shifting from their prior disciplines to academic development. In Macfarlane’s (2011) terms, are developers up-skilled para-academics, de-skilled academics, or neither? Can they use their between-ness to forge productive
relationships and challenge disciplinary assumptions? In both segments, we argue that academic developers can actively choose to occupy the margins—can choose, in essence, to think, research and work ‘otherwise’ in this space between cultures.
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Artful Etymologies: Exploring And Playing With The Derivations Of The Words We Use

As academics, what we write is who we are (Lea and Stierer 2011). Our writings do not stand alone; each word we choose carries its own history within it: where it came from, how its meanings have changed, how it has shaped and been shaped by generations of thinkers. Precise etymologies are largely forgotten. We do not remember that ‘book’ derives from Old High German for ‘beech’ the bark of which was used as a writing surface or that ‘text’ and ‘textile’ share a common origin in the weaving of fabric. Sometimes these hidden past lives of words continue to exert their influence in powerful ways. Wood (2000) has shown that connotations from earlier times of rigidity, harshness, self-denial and death, still cling to present-day concepts of ‘rigour’ and get in the way of flexible, situated and subjective understandings of experience. Bayne (2008) uncovers multiple histories of the word ‘uncanny’ in her exploration of ‘the positive aspects of uncertainty, strangeness, disquietude and troublesomeness in online higher education’ (p197). Often etymologies bring us back to a time when we carried across meanings from our bodily experiences in the material world to form abstract conceptions:

‘the original meaning of cogito is ‘to shake together’ and the proper translation of ‘Cogito ergo sum’ is: I shake things up, therefore I am.’ (Geary, 2011, 16).

Geary’s (2011) playfulness suggests to me a way of thinking otherwise about the concepts and words that matter to us in academic life.

Rationale

By exploring and playing with etymologies we can engage in different ways with our literature(s), tap into powerful sources of creativity and ask questions about our identities. I do not claim that awareness of the historical sources, development and usage of a word will lead us back to one definitive meaning. On the contrary, it is the contradictions, ambiguities and randomness of their histories that make words come alive for us and encourage us to debate their meanings. The practice of artful etymology is like poetry: ‘it questions, it leaves frayed edges and loose wires’ (McBride, 2009, 43).

Performance

In this performance, I will invite participants to take part in a playful exploration of ‘the beautiful histories meshed within the roots of words’ (Tillman, 2011, 95). I will invite them to identify the connotations of particular words and examine them in the light of what we know about their derivation. Together we will create ‘artful etymologies’ that invite thinking otherwise.
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The Academic Immigrant In Higher Education: A Complex Dual Identity.

In the New Zealand Institute of Technology and Polytechnic (ITP) sector there are a high proportion of faculty staff who share professional backgrounds from fields other than education and who could be described as having effectively ‘immigrated’ to a new profession as ‘academics’. Such staff 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 (Hotho, 2008) and who have been recruited directly into higher education from relevant discipline industries, with little or no background in teaching. This distinction is important when considering the professional identity of those who have little or no previous experience with the culture of their new environment. To them, the organisational culture of higher education is a foreign land and they can be said to have truly immigrated to somewhere new (Robinson & Aronica, 2009).

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 (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Academic immigrants are not expected to wholly assimilate into their new culture and abandon their culture of origin; therefore academic immigrant identity may be distinguished by an individual’s personal sense of belonging to both their ‘old’ and their ‘new’ professions (Stryker & Burke, 2000), an identity that is constructed on a recognition of shared characteristics of some common origin (Whitchurch, 2008) and those of their adopted culture (Robinson & Aronica, 2009).

As academic immigrants learn to adapt to their new environment they retain to some degree their foot in the past, which is guided by the rules and guidelines of an unwritten ‘cultural manual’ which is shared among group members. Whilst academic immigrants may have learned to adapt to their new working environment, their sense of identity may resonate more with their past professional experience in other employment settings. Higher education cultures may be too new, or too different from their past experience to allow them to wholly adapt and fit in.

This paper discusses the challenges faced by middle leaders who are responsible for academic immigrant staff groups and how they navigate within organisational cultures that are frequently heterogeneous, comprising multiple layers of identities and several diverse communities.
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Against Academic Identities

...there is an inherent contradiction between a valuing of identity as something so fundamental that it is crucial to personal well-being and collective action, and a theorization of ‘identity’ that sees it as something constructed, fluid, multiple, impermanent and fragmentary. The contemporary crisis of identity thus expresses itself as both a crisis of society, and a crisis of theory. The crisis of identity involves a crisis of ‘identity’ (Bendel, 2002:1)

The literature on academic identities is abundant, with much recent research exploring the ways academics construct the idea of ‘self’ within the context of managerialism incorporating a focus on the stark contrast between the traditional ways of working in academia and the new demands for performativity in our enterprise universities (see Archer, 2008; Henkel, 2005; Davies and Petersen, 2005). The research moves beyond essentialist conceptions of identity as a unified core of an individual ‘continuous and ‘identical’ with itself’ (Hall, 1992: 275) to more sociological views that pose identity as formed in relationship with others and interaction between the self and society (see Archer, 2008; Henkel, 2005; Macfarlane, 2005), and to more post-modern views (see Clegg, 2008; Petersen, 2007), which complicate understandings of identity (or subjectivity) as fractured, contested, uncertain, fluid, unstable and multiple. The construct of ‘identity’ itself, however, remains largely unproblematised in higher education literature.

This sits in contrast with other fields such as literary and cultural studies, policy research and also sociology where identity theories (or the notion of identity itself) are sometimes seen to be ‘in crisis’. For instance, in his critique of identity theories, Bendle (2002:4) cites Gilroy (2000: 98) claiming that ‘the new popularity of identity as an interpretative device is . . . a result of the exceptional plurality of meanings the term can harness’ and argues that ‘identity’ becomes an elastic category that can be made to accommodate whatever requirements the overall argument demands of it’ (Bendle, 2002: 12).

In this roundtable session we’d like to examine the use of the ‘identity’ construct in higher education literature to explore alternative views and imagine other ways of thinking about and theorising ‘being and becoming academics’. The discussion will centre around the questions:

- What does the focus on academic identities produce and what does it erase? What does it prevent us from thinking about?
- Does the notion of ‘identity’ (given it’s etymology in ‘oneness and sameness’) conceptually allow for multiplicity and plurality?
- Given that identity demands certain boundedness and requires the construction of the Other, the ‘constitutive outside’ to the subject (Petersen 2007:478), how do the categories get constituted?
- What are the knowledges we produce through our own questioning of the self?
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Conceptualising The Epistemic Dimension Of Academic Identity In An Age Of Neo-Liberalism.

A growing body of literature acknowledges an ‘epistemic drift’ towards neo-liberalism (Elzinga, 1985; Archer, 2008) in higher education that has a significant impact on academics’ identities (Henkel, 2005). Much commentary (e.g., Bleiklie et al., 2000) depicts this drift as bureaucratisation, economic rationalism and micro-managerialism. This paper explores the epistemic dimension of academic identity in a neo-liberal milieu. It conceptualises the relationship between global ‘epistemic drifts’ (e.g., neoliberalism) and the epistemic identities of tertiary organisations (e.g., universities), disciplines (e.g., education) and individual academics.

The paper offers a conceptual model informed by epistemic theory (e.g., Perry, 1970; Kuhn & Weinstock, 2002) to represent the implicit epistemic tensions manifested in modern higher education. Specifically, the model represents epistemic spectra between (a) relativist and objectivist, (b) autonomous and accountable, (c) holistic and reductive, (d) qualitative and quantitative, (e) pure and strategic, (f) practiced and measured, and (g) domain-specific and domain-general approaches to knowledge and knowing. In this model, neo-liberalism is characterised by its critics as objectivist, accountable, reductive, quantitative, strategic, measured, and domain-general.

The purpose of the model is to further the dialogue between individual academics and their organisations in relation to the global epistemic drift towards a neo-liberal paradigm. The paper acknowledges and affirms the critical commentary on the neo-liberal drift in academia. However, it situates this critique within a broader conceptual framework that is open to neo-liberal assumptions and counter-critiques. The model identifies the potential for conflict and/or complementarity between interdependent approaches to knowledge and knowing that define academic identities. Summarily, this enables a less dualistic and more evaluativistic and reflexive analysis of academic identity in response to the modern neo-liberal drift.
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Curriculum’s of Be(com)ing Academic(s): A Duoethnographic Conversation

This presentation/performance centers on two doctoral students’ sense-making of their journeys into academia. We begin our presentation with an explanation of our method of inquiry, duoethnography. We position duoethnography as an innovative conceptual approach to personal history, seeing it as an informal curriculum whereby life her-stories/hir-stories influence how individuals act, and also how they attribute meaning to these actions. Duoethnography is dialogic, that is generated/constructed through the extended conversations of two researchers. It has a focus on revealing complexity within common experiences.
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Following the discussion of our method of inquiry, our presentation moves into a performance of our duoethnographic script. Our script explores the different (and similar) ways in which the authors (both novice researchers) make sense of their lifetimes of engagement with academia and the idea of the University, attending to experiences that provide snap-shots of the interrelated impacts of class, ethnicity, gender and sexuality. We then explore how these formative understandings contribute to our emerging academic identities as ‘scholars-to-be’ within the context of doctoral study, which itself is an uncertain and anxious space between becoming and being.

We believe that our duoethnographic performance will contribute a nuanced perspective to the literature focused on doctoral student identity construction. It will be of particular value to recent work which re-positions doctoral study as identity work (see Kamler and Thomson 2004, 2006, 2008).
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Fit To Teach: Traces Of Embodied Performance In Academic Study

Significant changes in universities since the 1970s have impacted on the teaching of contemporary dance and contributed to the development of a new professional community (Shapiro, 1999). As well as dance being a new subject in academia, historically, dancers have not been trained through the academic system. Further to this dancers may come into a career of teaching in academic environments without transitioning through higher academic qualifications.

Taking themes from my doctoral thesis (Fit to teach: Tracing embodied methodologies of dancers who teach in academia), and powered by the notion that dance practitioners’ lived-in bodies en-act as a means of communication, the purpose of this paper is to present a subjective approach for re-thinking dance performance knowledge in tertiary contexts. Within an appraisal of “kinetic habitus” (Noland, 2009, p. 90), I focus the content of this discussion on somatic methods that are already incorporated into academic dance programmes. Somatic explanations of the ‘thinking’ body (Olsen, 2002; Sieben, 2007) provide my research and this presentation with important tools for articulating the performance to academic process.

This paper explores ongoing transitions from being a contemporary dance performer to becoming an academic in two ways. Firstly I present a pictorial glance at the transitional complexities of adjusting creative and experiential practice to academic life. As much as Berleant (2007) promotes an artist’s sensibility as a perceptual engagement with their world, mature dance practitioners, like me, are accustomed to creating performances from images, memories and metaphors and for employing these same tools for thinking about teaching. Schopenhauer discusses aesthetic as a notion once conceived, as presence: embodied and material (Pfau, 2001).

Secondly, I present a short report on how, as part of the doctoral process, I am learning to write ‘like’ an academic. The specific questions that my doctoral study addresses are: How do dancers navigate pathways from practitioner to teacher, how do they convey their knowledge in the academy and how do they negotiate the expectations of the academy and shift these expectations to accommodate their discipline specific experience and knowledge. Although my qualitative, ethnographic study focuses on a cohort of professional contemporary dancers, who were interestingly, co-creators in the development of academic programmes and continue to teach in tertiary contexts, in thinking about the reiterative act of writing as though I were rehearsing a new dance, I find new ways to theorise academic identity and surfacing themes that speak to an evolving research methodology. In this way I aim for my doctoral project to contribute as a dance-based method of enquiry that advances an understanding of kinaesthetic, embodied as well as intellectual transitions dancers make to become teachers.

In both parts of the presentation, a standpoint of self in relation to artistic experience provides me with an important contextual framework for discussion. As an experienced performer, educator and researcher of somatics, it is my intention to contribute to a growing understanding that the confluence of doing
“dance” and theorising may make movement sensitivity and experiential awareness more viable in academic dance communities.
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Thinking, Researching And Living In Virtual Professional Development Community Of Practice.

This paper explores effects on education practitioners’ academic identities as they participated in virtual professional development communities. The 3 researchers are community facilitators of 2 online Communities of Practice (CoPs) where over 400 educators and leaders are members. These virtual communities were formed to support educators and help them develop professionally. Members are located over a broad geographical base, working in diverse organisations, and across a variety of educational levels, from primary through to tertiary. The online communities have grown over a 3 year period and become lively, vibrant and safe spaces that encourage conversations around professional practice, identity and student learning, as well as being full of “things” (Ashton, 1999).

While CoPs in education are not new, and online CoPs have been gaining in usage in NZ over the last 5 years (Lai, et al, 2006), there is still discussion around how online CoPs are effectively facilitated to form an integral part of formal PLD. There is a wide range of definitions for online CoPs, but most include notions of knowledge management and growth for a group of people who, via a common space on the Internet, engage in public discussions, interactions, and exchanges (Tilley, Hills, Bruce, & Meyers, 2006). Each group has its own identity, which shapes the experience that members have within that community (Chang et al, 1999). An online CoP includes the notion of ‘situated learning’ (Wenger, 1998), whereby a learner is seen as engaging in a community, as opposed to learning as a finite process which an individual undertakes with little or no reference to the context(s) in which they are involved (Owen, 2011). Human connection and emotion around common interests are identified as key factors for forming relationships within online groups (Tilley, et al, 2006). Participation ranges from legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger, 1991) to regular contributions and co-construction of core community ‘knowledge’ (Flagg & Ayling, 2011). The researchers conducted studies that seek to describe how members were participating in the 2 online CoPs, to identify behaviours, and capture shifts in professional identity, especially those that indicate embedding of practice, co-construction of knowledge, and development of skills and values.

Results reaffirm learning as a social phenomenon, while also indicating that a large proportion of the members of these online communities took the valid role of passive consumers of community cultural artifacts (resources, knowledge, skills and values). Benefits reported by participants include a change in their own role as educators, as well as improvements in student engagement, and increases in the quantity and quality of collaboration and communication. While it would be simplistic to draw a direct relationship of cause and effect with the online CoPs and these reported shifts, there is an indication that an effective approach to PLD provision is one that does not divorce the educator from their context, or add to significantly to their workload, but which does enable them to be professional learners. This paper
provides an overview of the two online CoPs, and discusses some of the broader implications.
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Can’t Sleep: Capturing a Collective Imagination as a Process of Creativity, Professional Development and Academic Activity

Creativity, as a site of academic practice, culminates as a powerful and uniquely individual experience. “Human creativity—the power to invent, to discover profound new truths, to "see" into the future...” has, been thought to be the outcome of an intervention from some sort of deity (Lombardo 2011, p.21). Being visited by a muse (originating from Greek mythology; the Nine Muses) is one of the most common terms used to express this process. Early, and historically significant, pedagogues such as Pestalozzi, Montassori and Dewey (in Sawyer 2011) all argued that creativity was central in teaching and learning contexts, and that teachers were the persons to organize this activity; and so this belief became a central tenet for progressive education. In Rogers’ Towards a Theory of Creativity (1954), explaining creativity as a cognitive process of self-actualization, it was argued that to be truly achieved then complete freedom should be felt to enable its expression. On the contrary, and at the time, Skinner argued that a highly structured and organized environment would elicit creativity. Both however agreed that “love and affection” (Lombardo 2011, p.26) would lead to its expression and that emotions played a significant role in manifesting it. Ideas of democracy also congregate around creativity and post-war critiques emphasized the condition of utmost freedom to create and to be free to express whatever one felt to (Stein 1961). Furthermore, Chomsky (1966) has frequently described that human language is a “highly creative act” (cited in Lombardo 2011, p. 26) and for that reason, the freedom of expression, a core condition of academe, can be argued as a working space for constant creativity. Education reform, in the last 20 years, however, has led to greater levels of accountability for individual educationists, which has resulted in the feeling that there is, in fact, far less freedom (Pawlaczek 2009). In many ways Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed, and in particular the banking Model, can be argued as being a present shadow on the identities of academics.

Through the lens of a critical pedagogy, this pecha kucha attempts exchange ideas on a creative collaboration, in the discipline of arts. Participants in this study academics and artists, reflected upon their identities through devising an original piece of musical theatre funded by the Australian Federal Government (Regional Arts Victoria). Reflections on identity were framed within a professional development context and participants were asked to think about and describe how, through a creative collaboration, they were acquiring new ways of thinking, practicing and therefore, being. Furthermore, they were asked to reflect upon how this process articulated towards a greater sense of being creative and imaginative in both an individual and collaborative context. The opportunity to explore a collective imagination, of a world that exists in the free and emotional space of each others minds, was seen as a
unique location for building upon ideas of playfulness, sociability and creativity within a professional life and more acutely an academic life.
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Through The Looking-Glass, And What I Found There

This paper proposes the theoretical lens of governmentality (Barry, Osborne, & Rose, 1996; Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991; Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999) for making sense of the historical, political and ethical constitution of the learning advisor in Australian higher education. To begin, the paper draws on Lewis Carroll’s *Through the looking glass, and what Alice found there* as a narrative tactic to demonstrate how the space of learning advising can be understood as a most curious place to dwell. Rather than stepping into the looking glass to discover this world of strangeness, I suggest that we must step out of the looking glass to turn and see - clearly, darkly - how strangeness is already part of our professional lifeworld with its spatial contortions, its temporal reversals, and its illogical diversions.

I then suggest that if we venture to examine ourselves through the lens of governmentality we can begin to see how learning advising is merely a figment of the liberal imagination - an effect of the dynamic interaction of power, knowledge and ethics in liberal society. Through this lens, learning advising can be understood as a discursively complex, relational, polysemic and contested space in the academy that is ontologically vulnerable to political thought and action, and epistemologically and axiomatically vulnerable to its ebb and flow.

To elaborate, I suggest that learning advising is a relational space because its intelligibility is an effect of the convergence of historical circumstance, political reasoning, and perceived social and economic crises that reconfigure the university as an apparatus of government, and reconstitute the higher education student as the object of government. I argue that it is in this three way moral relationship with the university and the student that the learning advisor is politically and ethnically constituted. I go on to suggest that the historical proliferation of these configurations and constitutions have layered and folded through this space multiple truths that intersect (polysemic) and compete (contested) for domination causing its inhabitants speak with an ontological stammering (Lather, 2003).

The final part of the paper suggests that agency in this space is not simply a matter of attempting to ground one’s identity, politics and agency in the notion of a foundational subject or teleological notions of progress, but to learn to dwell ethically and tactically in the complexity of the space willed to us by history (de Certeau, 1988; Readings, 1997). Dwelling, I suggest, requires us to live poetically, with a ‘commitment to thought’ (Foucault, 1997; Readings, 1997) and a healthy skepticism for all things that resemble reification (Fendler, 1999), as a provocation to ever more critical and creative practice (Gitlin, 2008).
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Biting The Hand That Feeds Us? Dilemmas Of Researching Our Own Academic Workplace

In this paper we will discuss our reflections on a participatory action project (Levin and Greenwood, 2008) researching equity issues for women in our own Faculty. Our motivations for undertaking the research stemmed from a desire to challenge and change the status quo, and to localise this process in our own working lives. Academics are paradoxically incited to act as the ‘critics and conscience of society’, while at the same time to act as a good colleague and a team player in the managerial university. Our research process encountered this paradox in academic identities. In undertaking the research we set out to metaphorically bite the hand that feeds us; the outcomes we hoped for were a compelling, detailed critique of University management and policies and empowerment of the women in our Faculty. As feminist academics and as individuals with particular experiences and backgrounds we had our own views on how these might be framed. We developed a process that included general/professional (Collinson, 2006) and ‘ivory basement’ (Eveline and Booth, 2004) staff as well as academics. What emerged from the process proved to be murkier, and our preconceptions were challenged. While our intention was to contribute to positive dialogue and change for women we encountered apathy, ambivalence and even a degree of hostility from certain female colleagues. Concerns were expressed regarding confidentiality, which highlighted the sensitivity of the issues to the participants, but also problematised us as researchers. We realised that we had not fully considered that our colleagues might not want to reveal themselves to us. Unsettling divisions were also revealed between general/professional staff and academic staff with women tending to blame other women, or themselves, for systemic, institutional shortcomings (Bird, 2011). We were surprised that the single most important, recurrent theme women in the study identified as problematic and needing improvement in their working lives was a lack of community (Cooper et al., 1999). By sharing our reflexive process in this paper, we hope to encourage colleagues to reflect on their positioning within the university as researchers, colleagues, and employees.
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There are huge changes occurring both within the academy and outside. New technologies are rapidly replacing old technologies and yet we cling to one of the oldest: the lecture. The lecture as a technology was founded in an era when technologies were extremely limited. There were no photocopiers, no computers, and few books. The lecture itself emerged from the need to copy information from one mind to another through reading of a text in an era when the book (or scroll) as a technology had few people who were able to use it (i.e., literate). Fast-forward and we still use this millennium old technology (the lecture) as the very basis of our work, which even defines our identity. We call ourselves ‘lecturers’ or ‘professors’ – we deliver lectures, we profess to expertise.

Our profession is being threatened by an upstart century-old industry that has caused significant legislative shifts - around copying and reproducing. It is no longer a simple thing to share ideas in class or with colleagues, to remix and rethink. We are constrained by laws that may soon outlaw thinking about things that are not our own (and some that are). The recording and movie industries (together with publishers) have wrought a severe shift in the landscape of learning - almost a cataclysmic geological event that has flattened our ability to share while we await the tidal wave of legislative change that may totally wipe us out.

While many industries believe that copyright and associated laws protect from theft (more properly ‘infringement’), it is damaging their identity and ours along with it. The biggest problem for an academic is not being copied, but being ignored! Copyright, however, protects and binds up the ideas that academics want shared in a time when people are openly communicating and sharing information through new technologies. The academy is struggling through these changes wrought by technology. So we must ask (and answer) the question: how can we, a millennium old industry, teach this youngster about sharing before they make criminals of us all?

Definitions
Lecture: a speech read or delivered before an audience or class, especially for instruction or to set forth some subject
Profess: to declare openly; announce or affirm; avow or acknowledge
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Minding The ‘Theory-Practice Gap’ In Education: Researcher Reflexivity As A Bridge Between Theory And Practice In Educational Research

There is a growing attention in educational research about how researcher subjectivities impact on research designs and outcome, and knowledge production. No longer is it plausible for researchers to assume a neutral positionality from which complex social phenomena can be observed, recorded and analysed in a transparent, unbiased manner. This kind of researcher reflexivity compels researchers to consider a range of factors that characterise their conceptualisation of, and encounters with, “the researched”, whether historical, geographical and political. It also necessitates ethical and epistemological consideration on the part of researcher as to how their conducts result in reification of existing social categories and values.

Reflexivity necessitates researchers to address ethical and epistemological responsibilities that underlie their research designs and conducts. Stephen Ball (2006) provides an account on how educational research can reify outmoded conceptualisation of social categories, such as class. This is because of the tendency in educational research to “settle for what is available rather than what is meaningful” (p. 6). What gets lost in the process is the consideration of theories as essential epistemological framework, and the acceptance of work as always “unfinished and necessarily imperfect” (p. 17). Unfortunately, as Luttrell (2010) observes, often in teacher education and in educational research training, critical discussions of theories are fended off as having little to do with educational practice.

This presentation demonstrates some of the ways that researcher reflexivity can be useful in research in education to reconcile the so-called ‘theory / practice gap’. In doing so, I will draw on accounts—as a migrant secondary school teacher resident in Australia who studies ‘race’ in Australian education–of how my current PhD work has had to transform substantially due to considerations on research methodologies and theories. My argument is that the reflexivity necessitates the integration of theory (= abstraction) and practice (= data) in educational research by showing how these two must be considered as mutually constitutive.
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This paper explores the impact of lived experiences on the construction of professional and/or academic identity of Japanese junior academics acting as faculty development practitioners. The field of faculty development has been involved in “a major struggle for self-definition in an environment of tension, growing complexity and competing demands” (Lee and McWillam, 2008). Practitioners use their academic and professional knowledge and skills to craft a genre of ‘faculty development’ that reconcile institutions’ requirement and their personal understandings. This leads to a daily struggle between acting as a faculty development practitioner according to the university’s expectation and one’s own professional values and beliefs especially as an academic. This struggle has never been studied in depth. Through participatory observations and ethnographic interviews, this study offers a thick description of the lived experience of Japanese faculty development practitioners (FD practitioners) and offers insight into new forms of profession at a university.
The Japanese case provides a unique story because many active FD practitioners are in junior academic positions and in their eyes they are yet to establish their academic identity. In my fieldwork, I observed FD practitioners’ efforts to draw a boundary of the practice and responsibilities in order to understand their role and to survive in a complex situation. The personal view had great impact on their decision making such as the individual’s understanding of the institutional condition in which FD practitioners carry out the project, knowledge and value based on the past experiences, and requirements of the funding policy and the regulation. On a day-to-day basis, scholarly discussion about faculty development had little impact on their activities. A sense of busyness, complexities of the situation, and their role to promote faculty development naturally led FD practitioners to focus on their everyday matters.

Under such circumstances, a sense of insecurity with their career prospect pushes FD practitioners to wonder about their professional identity. In Japan, FD practitioner’s positions are often academic ones, however, the activities FD practitioners do, do not contribute to build an academic profile. To make sense of their position and its career prospects, junior academics seem to make efforts to live in different communities at the same time. Those communities include an institutional community, a disciplinary community, and a practitioners’ community. FD practitioners have different experiences in each community, which impact on their understandings and dealings with faculty development and their role. In the end, I argue that Japanese practitioners consciously or unconsciously choose to remain ambiguous about their practices and identity, and the label of ‘FD tantōsha’ creates semantic space. The complexities of their lived experiences and uncertainties with career perspectives as FD practitioner seem to make it difficult for them either to integrate their role as a FD practitioner into an academic profession or to establish FD practitioner as a separate professional identity.
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**Serving The University Or Serving Society? The Neglected Place Of Public Service In ’21st Century’ Academic Identity Construction**

Universities in New Zealand and elsewhere are considering how to address a rapidly changing academic environment, and adequately prepare current PhD students for entry into this setting upon completion of their study. In 2011, I was a participant in a professional development course for doctoral students aimed at addressing this issue. This paper is an attempt for me to critically reflect on this experience and question the particular version of academic identity, which this course promoted. Austin (2003) suggests that government demands for public accountability coupled with successive funding cuts to universities, creates a particular field of play for academics today. In New Zealand this is reflected in the current performance based review process, which was a clear preoccupation of those who were brought in to discuss various dimensions of academic citizenship, identity and responsibility over the course of the module in 2011. Those presenting stressed the importance of developing and marketing ones’ research abilities and appreciations, and establishing a teaching and research portfolio that demonstrates ones’ worth to the university as part of entering and maintaining a role within the academy. Service was largely discussed as an obligation of second priority, and mainly attended to through committee participation and administrative busy work. The implicit message was that service in the 21st century academy takes a back seat to the key task at hand—proving ones’ financial value to the university. In my opinion, this fails to provide an adequate understanding of the importance of engagement and service (and in particular
service to ones’ external community), diminishing the important premise on which public universities have been founded—namely the public conscious of society.

On reflection of this experience, I contend that the module could have provided a forum to discuss, challenge and reinvent the place of service in the university by thinking about how one can relate theory to practice, and conversely how ‘outside’ knowledge and experience can be better incorporated into the academy (Butin, 2010). In the same way that the module promoted moving beyond the traditional research-teaching divide, similar opportunities exist for exploring a new role for community service in and through the academy (Checkoway, 1997). In this paper I hope to provoke and inspire discussion on the important moral responsibility that current and future academics have to the “public good” within the 21st century academy and suggest some ways in which this is possible.
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Transforming Scholarly Identity: E-Learning As Learning To ‘bE’

E-learning is not just a teaching innovation; it also signals a shift in the nexus of communication, cognition and identity, a change in how we talk and think about engagement (inter-activity) and how it shapes us. The lexicon of e-learning borrows from the barren lexicon of information science: of users, usage and usability. Deep e-learning requires a more fecund idiom: of the “digitas” (“civitas, digital acts, habitus, and the digits we call our fingers” [Samuels, 2008, p. 1]), the “digital agora” (Walters et al., 1998), and “e-activity” (“active and interactive online learning” [Salmon, 2002, p. 1]). This lexicon must translate e-learning’s interpassivity and technicism into interactivity and a new “technology of the [digital] self” (Foucault, 1988, p. 18). We aim to catch this digital transition in ourselves — and in ourselves as scholars, in particular: not so much in what we use, but in who we are.

It was the thought-provoking process of talking through and shaping an electronic version of our generic doctoral skills sessions that alerted us to the pedagogical implications of this shift. It occurred to us that, to match the benefits of interactivity in face-to-face teaching and learning and to be truly transformative of academic subjectivity, e-learning must embrace “life on the screen” (Turkle, 1995), in the digitas: it must be truly performative, rather than merely informative. This is learning as “e-tivity,” where learners (and teachers) enact the skills they hope to learn (or teach). As a model for our site as digital agora (Gk “assembly”), we turned to classical and medieval mnemotechnics (a.k.a. the “method of loci” [L “places”]), systems to order and orient knowledge, on the premise that we learn — and learn to be — by bodying forth our understanding (Carruthers, 1990). This is the case in the digital world, no less than in the “real” world: to be a scholar in the digitas, one must thus “learn to bE.”
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A Paradoxical Identity: Fate, Disenchantment and Hope

The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by a ‘disenchantment of the world’ (Weber 1948:155).
My academic identity is that of a progressive social science educator. In my pedagogic praxis I attempt to unveil opportunities for individual and social transformation: possibilities for imagining and acting otherwise (Freire 1994, Giroux 2003), possibilities for hope. Yet my endeavour to achieve this goal is undermined by the colonization of Higher Education by neoliberal corporate barbarism and its concomitant sterile bureaucracy. This has engendered a burgeoning pessimism concerning the very possibility of a progressive Higher Education. My academic identity is therefore characterized by a paradox: disenchantment with the state of Higher Education co-exists with a utopian hope concerning its emancipatory possibilities; a hope which, like Hardy’s (1978) Egdon Heath, is slighted but enduring.

This paper is an attempt to think through this paradox. I will begin charting the topography of this paradox with a brief discussion of Weber’s (1948) notion that disenchantment is the fate of bureaucratized modernity. This will be followed by a consideration of Freire’s (1994) contention that hope is a universal ontological need, which neatly dovetails with Bloch’s (1996) dialectical theorization of the objective and subjective dimensions of hope. Furthermore, both Freire and Bloch emphasis the centrality of dreaming to the process of becoming.

I will next address the way in which hope infuses my pedagogic praxis. Drawing on the work of Ainley and Cannaan (2005), I will develop the conception of a pedagogy of critical hope by arguing that it has a number of key features. Firstly, as Halpin (2003) argues, a utopian imagination is an essential dimension of teaching with hope. Secondly, that such utopianism is of a critical realist character: it acknowledges the structural and biographical obstacles to its realization. Finally, I will suggest that a pedagogy of critical hope can only be interstitial: it exists within the gaps or fissures of neo-liberal bureaucratized higher educational landscape. Such cracks provide the terrain upon which my identity as a progressive educator is enacted, provide the space to dream of ways of teaching, researching and living otherwise.
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Writing Otherwise

In this experimental writing-workshop-cum-participatory-performance, I will use interactive techniques inspired by Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed to explore how academic identities are mediated in, through and by academic writing. In the performance genre that Boal dubs ‘forum theatre’, actors enact a brief scene involving some form of oppression or disempowerment; audience members (aka ‘spect-actors’) are then invited to intervene in the performance and change its outcome, thereby developing the confidence to make such interventions in real life. In a similar vein, I will open the session by reading out a series of provocative statements (some positive, some negative) by academics from across the disciplines who have attempted to challenge disciplinary norms through their writing. Audience members will be asked to respond to these prompts, first through a brief free-writing exercise and then through theatrical roleplay. The session will draw on research findings from my recent book, Stylish Academic Writing, and from my current book project, Writing Habits, in which I investigate the behaviours, attitudes and emotions that typically enable or inhibit academic risk-taking. The goal of the session is to empower participants to find new words, ideas and practices for ‘writing otherwise’.
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Academic Frogs in the Water? How Canadian Academics Understand Accountability and Their Work in the Contemporary University

Our project, ‘The new scholarly subject: Academic work, subjectivities and accountability governance’, explores the relationship between what we call accountability governance in higher education, specifically in the province of Ontario, and the (re)formation of academic subjectivities. The idea for the project came from two directions: first, our previous research on the tenure review process in Canadian universities, in which we found junior academics going to great lengths to make themselves tenure-worthy (for example, by altering their research priorities or postponing teaching improvements in order to make time to produce more publications); and second, the burgeoning critical literature about the corporatization of universities and its many consequences, including increased surveillance and emphasis on accountability and performativity. We draw from interviews with senior academic managers, faculty association personnel and academics in the social sciences. We asked questions about performance, accountability, academic freedom, quality and equity and probed how these concepts were operating in the university and in participants’ lives, as well as looking at changes over time.

While most of the managers, unsurprisingly, had at least some idea of what we were asking about, the academics ‘on the ground’ seemed much less savvy, to judge from our first dozen interviews or so, which belie the notion that Canadian academics are suffering under the unacceptable levels of surveillance described in the literature. These results might be due to: a) a methodological problem, i.e. not asking the right questions; b) the power of the tenure system to create a ‘cocoon’ for those protected by it and to be so synonymous with assessment that other forms fail to register; c) a consequence of Canada’s unusual educational governance (no central department of education, provinces carry almost the entire responsibility, no national educational policies like RAE); d) a heating up of the climate by slow degrees so that people are becoming acclimatized without being aware (the frog in boiling water analogy). While everyone can find something to complain about, these academics are mostly positive about their work, unless they have had struggles around other aspects such as equity issues. Their academic identities are arguably shaped more by privilege and individualism than by managerialism or collegiality.
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Performing Academic Identity For Sociality: Creativity, Performativity And Opera

This paper will outline how disaffected academics might employ sociality and creativity to reconnect with scholarly values in the face of new managerialism in the modernized university. This presentation will outline possibilities for fabricating different versions of scholarly identity that ‘go beyond’ (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi and Gardner, 1994) required and managed workplace performances and contemporary knowledge production processes (Lytotard, 1984). Informed by Britzman’s (2003) study of learning to teach, this paper takes up the idea that the struggle for identity and voice is also a struggle for narrative. The metaphor used by Britzman of ‘an ethnographic opera’ is taken literally in this academic identity project where the operatic form offers the potential to develop a performance where exploration and expression of identity ‘where voices argued, disrupted, and pleaded with one another’ in this struggle for scholarly voice. Building on previous investigations of tensions between creativity and performativity and how these are negotiated (White, 2006; Burnard and White, 2008) and the shaping of scholarly identities (White, 2012), this presentation reports on a work-in-progress with a group of academics from several Australian universities developing an opera about contemporary scholarly identity that will be performed in August 2012.
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Audit Identity: Or, How The PBRF Turned Me Into An Ambitious Zombie

The opening scene of the zombie comedy film Shaun of the Dead (2004) depicts a bleak streetscape in which deathly figures stagger aimlessly. The joke is that these people are not zombies but ordinary citizens leading repetitive, mundane lives. More recently the notion of such ‘zombiedom’ has been extended to encompass academic life. I hope it goes too far to say that academics have become actual zombies but nonetheless the very comparison of academics to zombies (by academics) indicates some profound change in how we view our vocational responsibilities. In popular fictional accounts of zombies people are infected with a virus when bitten. In the first part of this paper I suggest that academia has its own form of ‘viral bite’ in the form of an auditing culture that has inserted itself into our daily practices. In particular I will focus on the Performance Based Research Fund as an active agent in transforming the nature of academic work and with it the experiences of academics. However I am careful to not attribute academic malaise to the PBRF. As with Shaun of the Dead it may be that we had been in a state of complacency well before obvious external changes occurred. Consequently, in the second part, I will speculate on some of the internal mechanisms that have come to define the identity of the modern academic in New Zealand. Central to this discussion is the place of ambition and its relationship to that other prominent audit procedure in university life – promotion. This one, unlike PBRF, is an accountability process academics generally endorse as rightful. Yet, in many ways, it is far more insidious for this same
reason as motivation and validation are externalised through remuneration and nomenclature. By way of mediation I conclude by countering the image of the ‘academic zombie’ with one of ‘scholar cultism’ as not only a positive model for academia but as the historically prevailing model for all academic life.
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Top Ten Things to do in Auckland

1. **New Auckland Art Gallery** Enjoy exploring the newly revamped Auckland Art Gallery’s collection of more than 15,000 artworks. Friendly, knowledgeable volunteer guides will introduce you to the art, artists, stories and histories that make up our Gallery. For more information, visit: http://www.aucklandartgallery.com/

2. **Take a boat to Devonport to eat, drink and wander** Devonport is just a 12-minute ferry ride from downtown Auckland. (This is one of the best ways to see the Auckland skyline by the way – keep your camera in hand!) When you step off the ferry, you can immediately see that this quaint suburb has a very village-like feel to it with bars, cafes and restaurants filling the streets – and a cinema. For more information, visit http://www.devonport.co.nz/ferry.htm

3. **War Memorial Museum** Three expansive levels tell the story of New Zealand’s history, from our emergence as a nation through the loss and suffering of war, to our uniquely ancient natural history and our priceless Maori and Pacific treasures. Significant decorative arts and pictorial collections supplement one of New Zealand’s major heritage libraries. For more information, visit: http://www.aucklandmuseum.com/

4. **Walk up Mount Eden, close by the Epsom Campus** Mt Eden is the highest natural point in Auckland, and provides good views in all directions over the city. In pre-European times, Mount Eden was a fortified hill for various Māori tribes. You can get there via a 5-minute walk from the Epsom Campus.

5. **Zoo/Motat/Western Springs park** Auckland Zoo is recognised as one of the most progressive zoos in the world. A winner of national and international environmental-related awards, it is home to 138 different species and over 860 animals. The Museum of Transport and Technology (Motat) and Western Springs park are both within walking distance of the Zoo. For more information, visit: http://www.aucklandzoo.co.nz/plan-your-visit/visitor-information.aspx

6. **West Coast beaches** Just a half hour’s drive from central Auckland, you’d find yourself in the middle of an 18,000 hectare sanctuary of native rainforest, beaches, streams and a stunning wild coastline. For more information, visit: http://www.aatravel.co.nz/101/info/Aucklands-West-Coast.htm

7. **Stroll (eat and drink) in the Viaduct Basin and the adjacent Wynyard Quarter** Apart from the lovely waterfront location, there are heaps of places to eat and drink in the Viaduct Basin and the newly established Wynyard Quarte. Head downtown to the harbour and walk left for about 5 minutes. For more information, visit: http://www.waterfrontauckland.co.nz/Areas/Wynyard-Quarter.aspx

8. **Mission Bay: cycle on bike from downtown (Fergs)** Mission Bay is close to the middle of the city and provides you with a great opportunity to cycle around the beautiful Eastern beaches. Going for a ride on a tandem cycle followed by a picnic on the beach, or a drink/meal in one of the many bars and cafes, could be just what you are looking for after sitting in a conference for three days. For more information on bike hire, visit: http://www.missionbaybikehire.co.nz/

9. **Walk Karangahape and/or Ponsonby Rds** Walk through the streets of what was labeled Auckland’s largest residential subdivision in 1883. The landscape of this historic district showcases the grandest of buildings and their reflections of feminism, hospitality, pioneering philosophies and great social reform. Nowadays, both streets are bustling with cafes, bars and clothing shops, from recycled to designer. (NZ has great local designers!)

10. **Markets Galore** Every Friday and Saturday, there are markets in the centrally located Aotea Square. For more information, visit http://www.auckland-life.com/guide/Central_City/aotea_square.php. On Saturday mornings, there is the City Farmers’ Market downtown in Britomart Square, while on Saturday and Sunday mornings, there is La Cigale French Market in Parnell, an energizing 15-20 minute walk from downtown. For the more adventurous, there are the Saturday morning Otara Markets, a 30-minute ride on the Waka Pacific bus that leaves from the Downtown Britomart Transport Centre.

And then there’s the bookshops – a sample:

- Time Out Bookstore, 432 Mt Eden Rd (5 minutes from the conference venue)
- The Women’s Bookshop, 105 Ponsonby Rd
- Unity Books, 19 High St (Central City)
- Paradox, 26 Victoria St, Devonport
- Evergreen (secondhand) Books, 15 Victoria St, Devonport