



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**Thesis Title:** Neoliberalism, New Managerialism and the New Professionalism  
in Community Development

Gary Fraser

PhD Education

University of Edinburgh, Moray House School of Education

August 2017

**Declaration**

This is to certify that that the work contained within has been composed by me and is entirely my own work. No part of this thesis has been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signed:

Date:

| <b>Contents Page</b>   | <b>Page Number</b> |
|--|--------------------|
| Acknowledgements   |                    |
| Abstract   | 1-2                |
| Chapter 1: Introduction  | 3-17               |
| Chapter 2: Foucault, Governmentality Theory and the 'Neoliberal Thought Collective'  | 18-38              |
| Chapter 3: New Managerialism and the Neoliberalisation of the State  | 39-57              |
| Chapter 4: A Brief History of Professional Community Development from the Social Democratic Consensus to the Era of Neoliberalism                  | 58-80              |
| Chapter 5: Methodology and Research Design   | 81-102             |
| Chapter 6: De-Professionalisation and Re-professionalisation – the Unmaking and Remaking of Professional Community Development in Local Government | 103-123            |
| Chapter 7: The New Public Manager in Community Development and Relations between Managers and Practitioners in the Managerial State                | 124-144            |
| Chapter 8: Technologies of Performance Management and the New Professionalism  | 145-165            |
| Chapter 9: Towards a Neoliberal Model of Community Development?  | 166-185            |
| Chapter 10: The New Professionalism and the Enterprise Society   | 186-205            |
| Chapter 11: Conclusion – The New Professionalism and Community Development   | 206-214            |
| Appendix 1: Extract from Semi-Structured Interview   | 215-221            |
| Appendix 2: Extract from Fieldwork Journal   | 222-225            |
| Appendix 3: Preliminary Data Analysis  | 226-231            |
| References   | 232-272            |

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Ken McCulloch and Mae Shaw for all of the support, guidance and encouragement which they provided me with during the preparation and writing up of this thesis.

In addition, I would like to thank all of those involved in community development who participated in this research.

I would also like to thank my wife Anthea and my parents Myra and Jack who provided me with much needed support throughout the course of my research and the completion of this thesis.

## Abstract

This thesis explores the ways in which community development in the context of local government in Scotland has been transformed by new managerialism and neoliberalisation. Community development has traditionally been understood in Scottish local authorities as an approach to working within those sections of local government responsible for Community Education (CE) and Community Learning and Development (CLD) and consequently this thesis also considers the impact of new managerialism and neoliberalisation on CE/CLD. Methodologically, this work is informed by ethnographic research undertaken in three local authorities. In addition, it draws upon a theoretical approach to neoliberalism and new managerialism influenced by Michel Foucault (1926-1984) and governmentality theory. The concept of neoliberalism is at the heart of this work and in the context of local government neoliberalism is based upon a number of themes; first it is interconnected with an economic policy of austerity which has resulted in unprecedented cuts to local government budgets. In addition, private sector and civil society organisations take on a greater role in providing public goods and services and in this context the role of local government becomes that of purchaser rather than provider of services. Neoliberalisation also involves the introduction of techniques and practices associated with new public management or new managerialism. Moreover, these techniques are influenced by practices and values drawn from the world of business and they have been introduced in local government in order to make local authorities more entrepreneurial and competitive.

I argue that the impact of neoliberalisation and new managerialism on community development has been transformative. In particular, reforms related to austerity have hollowed out community development as an 'approach to working' within integrated CE/CLD services. In this changing context practice is increasingly defined by the priorities of government and new fields of work have emerged with youth work and adult education shaped by employability and community development framed as an approach to working within those sections of local government responsible for Community Planning and Economic Regeneration. Community development emerges in this new environment as a way of working which can (in theory) reduce public expenditure and this has resulted in its methodologies – participation and community engagement, being used by local states as a means to involve communities in the everyday management of local austerity programmes. In addition, community development approaches are also drawn upon to encourage community based organisations to acquire public assets and become new players in the burgeoning public services delivery market. New public management techniques have been introduced across the field which

include computerised management information systems, workplans and team plans with quantifiable targets and measurable outcomes, audits and appraisals. The introduction of these techniques correlate well with austerity and I suggest that their aim is twofold; decrease public expenditure whilst making professionals more productive in terms of delivering government policy. I argue that traditional professionals are being de-professionalised especially as their roles become bureaucratised as a consequence of new managerialism. Yet, rather than the death of a profession I suggest that professional practices have also been reconfigured and adapted to meet the requirements of the new times. From this perspective professionals are re-professionalised by new managerialism and neoliberalisation and one of the main propositions I put forward is that a neoliberal model of community development has emerged which has produced a new professional subject who has learned to think and acts in ways shaped by neoliberalisation. This analysis is indebted to Foucault who saw in neoliberalism not only an economic policy but also a new rationality for governing human beings.

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

Chapter 1 introduces the reader to the key themes which inform this research - neoliberalism, new managerialism, professional identity and community development. I also include a discussion on terminology, especially in relation to the terms 'Community Development', 'Community Education' and 'Community Learning and Development', which are used throughout this work. The first section of the chapter considers the ways in which the research was shaped by personal experience. In addition I discuss the contribution the research makes to knowledge and I focus on how the research creates new understandings of community development whilst adding to existing knowledge in the literature; the limitations of the research are also considered. I also discuss local government in Scotland in order to provide the reader with an understanding of the social context in which the research occurred. In the second section of the chapter, I provide the reader with an understanding of how the terms community development, professional identity, new managerialism and neoliberalism, are understood in this thesis. The chapter ends with a short summary of each of the chapters which follow.

### *Introducing the Research*

This research is based on a critical study into neoliberalism and new managerialism and their impact on professional community development in the context of local government in Scotland. The thesis is divided into two sections with the first providing a review of the literature followed by a discussion on methodology (Chapters 1-5), whilst the second section is devoted to data analysis and a conclusion (Chapters 6-11). The empirical research occurred across three local authorities between September 2014 and June 2015 including one where I was employed as a community development practitioner at the time of research. A note on terminology is useful at this juncture. The term 'professional' refers to the two principal actors in this thesis, community development practitioners and their managers. Although community development is the focus of the study two other terms are used throughout this work, Community Education (CE) and Community Learning and Development (CLD) which I refer to as CE/CLD. The appearance of CE/CLD is reflective of a number of factors: first, community development, alongside adult education and youth work has evolved historically in Scotland as an approach to working within designated CE/CLD services in local government. In addition, those who took part in the research were formally trained in Community Education. CE/CLD are framed in this work as both organisational and administrative concepts but also as philosophical discourses which I argue in Chapter 4 have played a critical role in constructing

professional identity in community development. In general terms I deploy 'CE/CLD' in order to refer to the profession or the service in local government, whilst 'community development' refers to the practice.

Readers should note that I did not approach neoliberalism or new managerialism as a dispassionate researcher who merely found these topics interesting but rather as a critical practitioner with political and ethical concerns about their impact on the field. Moreover, these concerns were grounded in personal experience and from this perspective I see this work as following in the sociological tradition of C Wright Mills who argued that 'personal problems of milieu' should be related to 'public issues of social structure' (see Mills, 2000, p. 8). My 'personal problems of milieu' were shaped by working in a context which involved the biggest cuts in local government expenditure witnessed in a generation. I discuss austerity later in the chapter but in relation to my own experience austerity related reforms included a programme of job losses, attacks on terms and conditions, cuts in local services and the closure of the Community Centre where I was based. The services that survived austerities cull – including community development, were the subject of substantial organisational reform and I noted that the changes were significant. Most significantly - integrated CE/CLD services which included community development, youth work and adult education, were fragmented and consequently a model of practice with roots in Scotland dating back to the 1970s started to disappear from local government.

Yet, rather than the death of a profession I was interested in the appearance of new sets of professional practices, which included a phenomenal growth in practices associated with new public management. I argue that a new professionalism has emerged which is shaped by a rationality informed by neoliberalism. Exploring neoliberalism as a rationality draws its theoretical inspiration from ideas associated with Michel Foucault (1926-1984) and in particular a series of lectures he gave in the late 1970s at the College De France which have become known as the Governmentality Lectures (see Foucault, 2008; 2009). I also draw upon governmentality theorists who have followed in Foucault's path in order to better understand neoliberalism and consequently this work is also an attempt at applying Foucault and governmentality theory to the study of community development in local government. In the next section I consider the research contribution to knowledge and discuss the limitations of this work.

#### *Research Contribution to Knowledge and Research Limitations*

The research makes a number of empirical, methodological and theoretical contributions to knowledge. The research is centred on community development in the context of local government, a site which Mowbray argued is often neglected in studies of community development<sup>1</sup> (Mowbray, 2010, p. 144). Furthermore, although the relationship between community development and the local state is well documented (see Craig, 1989; Cockburn, 1977; Emejulu 2015; Ledwith, 2011; Shaw, 2009), I suggest that research informed by an ‘insider’s perspective’ has the potential to offer a fresh account of the relationship between community development and the state and how this is played out in terms of everyday practices in the field. Moreover, an ethnographic approach offers new empirical insights into a field of practice which is often studied conceptually and from a distance. The case study approach which I use captures in depth everyday practices in the field, whilst a methodology influenced by grounded theory – which I discuss in Chapter 5, offers a way of situating everyday practices within a wider theoretical framework shaped by Foucault and governmentality theory.

As noted, the wider theoretical framework which shapes this work is informed by ideas associated with Foucault and other governmentality theorists (see Burchell, et al, 1991; Dardot and Laval, 2013; Dean, 2010). The thesis draws from and adds to literature which has applied governmentality in a range of contexts; for example, governmentality in the context of work (see Barrett, 2001; 2003); governmentality in the context of the state and civil society (see Darcy, 2002; Kenny, 2016; Ling, 2000; McGrath, 2016); and governmentality in the context of professional community development (see Crowther and Moir; 2014; Meade, 2012; Shaw, 2009). Moreover, the research is indebted to work which has applied governmentality theory to the concept of neoliberalism (see Cahill, 2015; Dardot and Laval, 2013; Gane, 2014; Peck, 2008) especially literature which constructs neoliberalism as a productive as opposed to a repressive power (see Fraser, 2003; Gordon, cited in Foucault, 2000; May, 2012; Newman, 2003). I argue that approaching neoliberalism (and new managerialism) as productive powers creates new theoretical contributions to knowledge, especially in terms of understanding the relationship between professionals in community development and the power of the state.

The concept of professional identity, which I describe as a problematic concept in community development is also at the heart of this work. The main theoretical proposition to emerge in the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Mowbray a search of titles and abstracts in the ‘Community Development Journal’ since 1966 suggested that only about one per cent of articles entailed more than passing interest in local government (Mowbray, 2010, p. 145).

thesis, namely the idea that a 'new professionalism' has appeared in the field is indebted to arguments that traditional professionals in the UK's welfare state are being de-professionalised and re-professionalised as a consequence of new managerialism and neoliberalisation (see Clarke and Newman, 1997; Evans, 2010; Evetts 2009; Fournier, 2000; Noordegraaf, 2007). In particular, the ways in which re-professionalisation was framed in sites such as social work (see Causer and Exworthy; 1999; Banks, 2004; Harris, 2009), influenced not only my understanding of re-professionalisation but also how this concept could be applied to community development. Consequently, by applying re-professionalisation to community development (and CE/CLD), this work offers new theoretical perspectives and adds to literature which has discussed the problematic relationship between community development and professionalisation (see Emejulu, 2015; Meade, 2012), the ways in which professionalism is changing in the field as a consequence of new public management (see McCulloch and Tett, 1996) and how professionals have been de-professionalised by new managerialism and neoliberalism (see Crowther and Moir, 2014; Mackie, et al, 2013; Shaw, 2008; 2009; Tett, 2010).

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of this research. The research is limited to three local authorities (Scotland has 32 in total) and it was beyond the scope of this work to consider community development practices on a national scale. This led to significant gaps in knowledge regarding the national effects of austerity on community development and CE/CLD and consequently the research offers an original yet contextually specific account of community development within a particular institutional setting. In addition, the data is reliant on the accounts of professionals working in the field, which meant that the perspectives of those who work in partnership with community development or the voices of 'real people' in communities were not included in this work. It was also beyond the scope of the research to consider community development in other settings, especially the third sector. Furthermore, although I argue that the findings are generalisable, an approach informed by 'insider research' and 'participatory observation' is by its nature limited to a case study.

As noted, the research is shaped by personal experience and as a reflexively aware researcher I am aware that this creates particular limitations; for example, this work offers only one interpretation of practice, which although grounded in data, is also shaped by personal considerations. The research is also framed in terms of a philosophical enquiry and does not advocate practical reforms with regards to new managerialism or the field in general, which some readers might find limits the scope of the research. Moreover, the research context - which I discuss in a moment, was characterised by

organisational change and across the three local authorities, community development and CE/CLD were the subject of controversial reforms some of which were happening during the actual research. Consequently, this created limitations in the sense that I was attempting to capture a practice which was in a process of constant transition. In the next section I situate the research within a context shaped by neoliberal austerity.

### *Situating the Research: the Research Context and the Era of Austerity*

Local government in Scotland (and across the UK) is undergoing a period of transformation caused by austerity (see Audit Scotland, 2016; National Audit Office, 2014) and the period in question has been described as the 'era of austerity' (see Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012). Austerity involves a programme of reducing public expenditure across the UK which is said to have caused the biggest transformation in the welfare state since the end of the Second World War (see Taylor-Gooby and Stoker, 2010; Taylor-Gooby, 2011). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to consider the origins of austerity – or to analyse different interpretations of the concept, but it is important to note that austerity can be understood in relation to the 2008 global financial crisis which Skidelsky argues caused one of the 'most violent collapses in economic life seen in the last hundred years' (Skidelsky, 2010, p.5). Similarly, Borges et al, note that the financial crisis caused a 'profound shock to the global economic system' and created the most serious economic downturn in Western countries since the Great Depression of the 1930s (see Borges, et al, 2013). In relation to neoliberalism, the 2008 crisis has been referred to as 'neoliberalism's first economic crisis' (see Hall, 2013; Harvey 2011) - yet, despite the 'crisis', Newman argues that austerity has 'amplified neoliberalism' (see Newman, 2014, p. 3291).

The UK's first austerity budget occurred in 2010/11 and involved a reduction in public spending by £83 billion, which is said to have amounted to a 25% reduction in overall government expenditure (see Borges, et al, 2013, p. 397; Mellet, 2012, p. 114). The cuts or savings – the latter is the UK governments preferred term, have been achieved mainly by a programme of job losses in the public sector and curtailing benefits (see Borges, et al, 2013, p. 397; Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012, p. 23). In particular, local government has been disproportionately affected by cuts, especially when compared with other areas of the welfare state (see Bailey, et al, 2015; Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012). From this perspective, austerity measures are said to have caused a 'crisis in local government' (see Taylor-Gooby, 2013), 'public sector decay' (see Stoker, 2012) and created a situation where some local authority services are at risk of either reduction or complete

disappearance (see Levitas, 2012). In Scotland, the reductions in local government finance have been described as ‘unprecedented’ (see Mellet, 2012) and according to the Accounts Commission of Audit Scotland, which is an independent public spending watchdog, the revenue received by local authorities from the Scottish Government has been reduced in real terms by 11% in the period since 2010/11 (see Audit Scotland, 2016). Audit Scotland also notes that local authorities are having to survive amidst the biggest spending cuts in the post war period.

Interestingly, despite the emphasis on ‘crisis’, ‘decay’ and the ‘disappearance’ of services (see Levitas, 2012; Taylor-Gooby, 2013), others have framed the impact of austerity in terms of a ‘survival narrative’ whereby Councils are said to be ‘weathering the storm’ (Lowndes and McCaughie, 2013). From this perspective, John argues that local government has weathered successive crises which demonstrates its persistence, resilience and instinct for survival rather than vulnerability to external sources (John, 2014). Moreover, it is argued that austerity facilitates innovation and creativity (see Bunt, Harris and Westlake, 2010) and affords new freedoms, powers and responsibilities to local government (see Wilks-Heeg, 2011). This analysis interested me, especially in relation to one of the main propositions of this thesis, namely that a neoliberal model of community development is emerging in the field which frames community development as an innovative method for reducing public expenditure.

In the next section I introduce the reader to the key concepts which inform this work - community development, professional identity, new managerialism and neoliberalism and although these concepts are the subject of a literature review (see Chapters 2-4), they are introduced at this stage in order to introduce the reader to how they are deployed in this work. I begin with a brief discussion on community development and the concept of professionalism.

#### *Key Concepts in the Research: Community Development and Professionalism*

I am wary of offering categorical one size fits all definitions of community development, which according to Emejulu, is a concept which lacks consensus from practitioners, activists, policy makers and academics on what it might actually be (see Emejulu, 2015). Similarly, Shaw argues that ‘what constitutes community work at any time is inevitably the rather messy outcome of contestation between all those interests which seek to frame, deploy or regulate it’ (Shaw, 2013, p. 1). Yet, a working understanding of the term is important and community development has traditionally been understood in Scotland as:

‘The process by which those who live in a community (defined in either geographical or social terms) are helped or encouraged to act together in tackling the problems which affect their lives has come to be called community development’ (Scottish Education Department, 1975, p. 31).

Community development can also be framed as an ‘approach to working’ within adult education and youth work (see Crowther and Shaw, 2013), hence the reason why this work also refers to practices in these spheres. Craig offers a more expansive and contemporary definition of community development:

‘Community development is a way of strengthening civil society by prioritising the actions of communities, and their perspectives in the development of social, economic and environmental policy. It seeks the empowerment of local communities, taken to mean both geographical communities, communities of interest or identity and communities organising around specific themes or policy initiatives. It strengthens the capacity of people as active citizens through their community groups, organisations and networks; and the capacity of institutions and agencies (public, private and non-governmental) to work in dialogue with citizens to shape and determine change in their communities. It plays a crucial role in supporting active democratic life by promoting the autonomous voice of the disadvantaged and vulnerable communities. It has a set of core values/social principles covering human rights, social inclusion, equality and respect for diversity; and a specific skills and knowledge base’ (see Craig, 2011).

Craig’s definition can be understood in relation to a number of themes in this research, especially the relationship between community development, the state and civil society. The common themes I have found in definitions of community development are that good practice should be ‘grounded in the social interests generated within communities’ (see Ledwith, 2011) and that community development should ‘grow out of the lived experiences of people and communities’ (see Tett, 2010). Although I recognise Ledwith and Tett’s definitions this work frames community development as a problematic concept and draws from a tradition which views practice as contradictory and contentious (see Mayo, 1998; Emejulu and Shaw, 2010; Ledwith, 2011). In particular, I am influenced by the idea that community development is informed by ‘continuous argument’ (Shaw, 2008) and is a ‘contested political practice within the wider politics of the state’ (see Mayo and Shaw, 2016, p. 4).

In addition, Barr's approach is also similar to my own, with Barr arguing that whilst 'myths and confusion abound', 'it is vital to know what community development practitioners actually do' (see Barr, 1991, p. 25).

'Professionalism' is at heart of this thesis, especially how the concept is applied to community development, which I discuss in Chapter 4. I start from the premise that professionalism is a problematic concept and from this perspective, professionalism is framed not in terms of a social scientific absolute, but rather as a contextually variable and contested subject (see Holroyd, 2000, p. 39; Exworthy and Halford, 1999, p. 15; McCulloch and Tett, 2010, p. 39; Troman, 1996, p. 476). Moreover this work draws from critical analyses of professionalism which focus on the relationship between the professions and the state and why professions are of value to those in power (see, Freidson, 1970; MacDonald, 1995, p. 20; Ozga, 1995, p. 35). Wittgenstein's dictum, 'don't ask for the meaning, ask for the use' (see Wittgenstein, cited in MacDonald, 1995, p. 35) was useful in terms of how professionalism is understood in relation to the field. According to Freidson:

'If a profession may be defined as a folk concept then the research strategy appropriate to it is phenomenological in character. One does not attempt to determine what a profession is in an absolute sense so much as how people in a society determine who is a professional and who is not, how they 'make' or 'accomplish' professions by their activities' (Freidson, 1983, p. 7).

Similarly, Hughes, argued:

'In my own studies I passed from the false question 'is this occupation a profession' to the more fundamental one, 'what are the circumstances in which people in an occupation attempt to turn it into a profession and themselves into professional people' (Hughes, 1963, cited in MacDonald, 1995, p. 6).

Following in the tradition of Freidson and Hughes this work explores the ways in which different actors in community development including practitioners, managers, inspectors, academics and policy makers have different and at times competing interpretations regarding the meaning of professionalism. In the next section I consider how new managerialism and neoliberalism are deployed in this work.

### *Key Concepts in the Research: New Managerialism and Neoliberalism*

New managerialism involves the application of private sector management systems and managerial techniques to the public sector (see Clarke, et al, 2000; Clarke and Newman, 1997; Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Farnham and Horton, 1993; Pollitt, 1993). In the field practices associated with new managerialism include workplans and team plans with quantifiable and measureable outcomes, audits, inspections, devolution of budgetary control, the introduction of computerised management information systems and appraisals. The history of new managerialism or New Public Management (NPM) is considered in Chapter 3, but it is important to note that NPM is framed in this work not in terms of neutral systems of administration but rather as ‘practices of government’ (see Halford and Leonard, 1999, p. 103), which are linked with the wider structure of the state (see Pollitt, 1993), and importantly neoliberalisation (see Abramov, 2012, pp. 65-66; see Barratt, 2003; Gane, 2012, pp. 628-629; Harris, 1998, p. 854; Newman, 2000, p. 45). This understanding of bureaucracy was influenced by the structuralist argument that administrative systems owe their social basis to those power groups which control the organisation of society (Beetham, 1985, p. 66).

The concept of ‘neoliberalism’ is the centrepiece of this work and requires considerable attention in order to understand how this problematic concept is used in the thesis. Categorical definitions of neoliberalism are best avoided, especially on the grounds that it has been described as an ‘ill-defined concept’ (see Mudge, 2008, p. 703) and a ‘messy hybrid’ of a term (Peck, 2008, p. 3) which has been the subject of ‘flabby usage’ (Jones, 2012). Moreover, others note that neoliberalism is ‘heavily contested’, ‘vague’ and subject to ‘competing definitions’ (see Biebricher, 2014, p. 194; Hilgers, 2011, p. 352). According to Clarke, neoliberalism is a ‘promiscuous term’ (Clarke, 2008) and similarly Newman describes it as being the subject of ‘epochal analysis that reads all particularities as instances of a general phenomenon’ (Newman, 2014, p. 3291). Yet as with community development it is important to have some grasp of the concept and Harvey’s definition is useful in terms of my understanding of neoliberalism:

‘Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices’ (Harvey, 2007, p. 2).

In addition, Whitfield's conceptualisation influenced how the term could be applied in relation to local government; according to Whitfield, neoliberalism involves 'reducing state intervention in the economy, opening up new markets in public services and deepening business involvement in the public policy making process' (see Whitfield, 2012). Similarly, Davies definition is also helpful with neoliberalism defined as the 'elevation of market-based principles and techniques of evaluation to the level of state-sponsored norms' (see, Davies, 2017). Davies adds that neoliberalism can also be framed as 'the disenchantment of politics by economics' (Ibid, p. xiv).

Neoliberalism is often framed in the literature as a pejorative term (see Mirowski and Plehwe, 2009), which is used by those who are critical of it (see Biebricher, 2014, p. 194). From this perspective, it has been described not in terms of a 'descriptive concept' but rather as a 'political swear word' (Gane, 2014b, p. 1104), and it is argued that no one would 'willingly identify as a neoliberal' (Biebricher, 2014, p. 194). According to Davidson, neoliberals are reluctant to embrace the term 'neoliberalism' (see Davidson, 2010, p. 20), which is unsurprising given that neoliberalism has been described as an 'extremist' and 'totalising' philosophy (see Hilgers, 2011, p. 352; Lauerma and Davidson, 2013, p. 278) and one which according to Giroux is one of the 'most dangerous ideologies of the twenty first century' (Giroux, 2004, p. 495). Others have described it in terms of a 'destructive ideology' which is based on a set of practices which form part of a ruthless war waged against the poor on behalf of finance capital (see Bourdieu, 1998; 2003; Harvey, 2005; 2011). According to Klein, neoliberalism is a form of 'disaster capitalism', which takes the form of a 'shock doctrine' that is inflicted on the world's poorest (Klein, 2007), whilst Callinicos compares it to a 'disease' or 'virus' and 'crazy way to run the world' (Callinicos, 2003, p. 26).

As a result of the above narratives it common on the political left to frame neoliberalism primarily in terms of its destructive capacities and consequently researchers influenced by this perspective frame their work as being 'against neoliberalism'. Yet, for me these analyses were too simplistic and theoretically unsatisfying because they did not account for the ways in which neoliberalism created 'new subjectivities' amongst its subjects (see Hall, 2013, p. 17) and how it won the consent of the governed to its agenda (see Allman, 2001, p. xiv). They also failed to explain the broad popularity of neoliberal ideas during key stages of its development (see Desai, 2002, p. 275; Hobsbawm, 1994, p. 308; Jones, 2012, p. 15). I suggest that a more sophisticated understanding of neoliberalism is required and one which acknowledges not only its destructive tendencies but also its productive capacities and how it is re-produced creating new practices and new forms of human conduct based

on the market. Foucault's conceptualisation of power is important at this juncture and according to Foucault, 'if power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it?' (Foucault, 2000, p. 120). This understanding of power is foundational in this work especially in relation to the argument that a new professionalism has appeared in community development.

Foucault once argued that researchers should 'never engage in polemics' (see Foucault, 2009, p. 4) and this interested me because I wanted to write in a tone which sought to understand how a rationality shaped by neoliberalism was re-produced in everyday practice settings such as community development in local government. In addition, Plant's argument that researchers should 'explore a meaning before espousing a cause' was noted (see Plant, 1974, p. 4). Yet, the absence of a polemical tone is not intended to read as if I were sympathetic with the neoliberal creed – an accusation which as we shall see in Chapter 2 was made against Foucault. Moreover, my focus on how neoliberalism is re-produced in everyday practice settings – which Mirowski calls 'everyday neoliberalism' (Mirowski, 2014) should not imply that I was disinterested in how neoliberalism can be resisted – an issue I address in Chapter 11. Rather I want to put forward an argument which is indebted to Foucault, that neoliberalism 'penetrates much more deeply into our existence' than the left has traditionally acknowledged (see Foucault, 2000, p. 86). In addition I argue that governmentality theory can create an account of neoliberalism which is more 'intellectually nuanced' than many Marxist analyses (see Dean, 2016, p. 89).

Readers should note that although this work refers to theorists critical of neoliberalism, I have also chosen to draw upon the ideas of the original neoliberals, especially Friedrich Hayek (1899-1992), Ludwig Von Mises (1881-1973) and Gary Becker (1930-2014) who are discussed in Chapter 2 as the 'Neoliberal Thought Collective'. I argue that engagement with the ideas of these theorists enables us to better understand the sheer scale and depth of the neoliberal ideational project and how it involved a project to create a new human subject. Engaging with neoliberalism at source also draws from Foucault's genealogical approach to knowledge whereby 'we need a historical awareness of our present circumstance' (Foucault, 2000, p. 327).

Foucault's approach is also useful in terms of understanding the ways in which neoliberalism transformed the political left (see Mudge, 2008, pp. 722-723) or as Bourdieu argued, the strength of neoliberalism is to be put into application...by people who call themselves socialists (Bourdieu, cited

in Darcy, 2002). Discussing the impact of neoliberalism on the political left and social democracy, Dardot and Laval argue:

‘What is sometimes inaccurately called the neoliberal conversion of the left is therefore not explained exclusively by the ideological campaigns of the right...it is more fundamentally explained by the diffusion of a global rationality that operates as a widely shared self-evident verity, pertaining not to a party logic, but to a technique which is supposedly ideologically neutral, of governing human beings’ (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 190).

The above analysis is also important when situating this research in the context of Scottish local government because Scotland is often referred to as a ‘social democratic’ and ‘left of centre’ country and one which has supposedly resisted neoliberalisation by pursuing a different policy agenda from the rest of the UK (see Keating, 2010; McGarvey, 2012; Stewart, 2004). Yet, the idea that neoliberalism has been resisted in Scotland is problematic and this work draws upon a political perspective which argues that neoliberalism has made a significant and lasting impact in Scotland (see Davidson, 2010; Gall, 2005; McAfferty and Mooney, 2010; Mooney and Scott, 2012) and that it has influenced the policies of Scotland’s dominant political parties in the shape of Scottish Labour (see Gall, 2005; Hassan, 2009) and at the time of writing, the Scottish National Party (see Cuthbert and Cuthbert, 2009, p. 105; McGarvey, 2017, p. 63; Patterson, 2015). Moreover, neoliberal austerity in Scotland – to paraphrase Bourdieu, is often put into practice by Labour and SNP politicians who are opposed to it, and this suggests that an analysis of austerity (and neoliberalism) informed by governmentality theory can offer useful insights into neoliberalism in Scotland.

In the final section of this chapter I provide the reader with a short summary of the chapters which follow – as noted, Chapter’s 2-4 are focused on the literature review, Chapter 5 addresses methodology, Chapter’s 6-10 are focused on data analysis and Chapter 11 offers a conclusion.

### *Chapter Outline*

Chapter 2: this chapter introduces the reader to Foucault and governmentality theory and drawing upon Foucault’s genealogical method, I explore the origins of neoliberalism and consider the key ideas of the Neoliberal Thought Collective. I focus specifically on the relationship between neoliberalism and the state and introduce the reader to the concept of governmentality. The

chapter discusses the impact of Foucault on the study of neoliberalism and also considers literature which presents a critique of Foucault's analysis. The chapter argues that neoliberalism is a practice or 'art of government' which has created a new human subject.

Chapter 3: this chapter explores 'actually existing neoliberalism' and introduces the concept of New Public Management or new managerialism. I argue that the turn towards new managerialism is a product of the marketisation of the state in the UK. The key features of marketisation are considered including privatisation, the contracting out of public services, and a new emphasis on values and practices drawn from the world of business. I discuss the origins of new managerialism in the UK with particular attention given to the locus of this study, local government. The chapter explores the impact of new managerialism on those professions situated inside the welfare state, especially teaching and social work, and introduces the reader to the principal concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation.

Chapter 4: this chapter focuses on professional community development and why professionalism is a problematic concept in the field. The chapter is centred primarily on the Scottish context and I argue that the professional subject in community development is a product of the discourses of Community Education and latterly Community Learning and Development. Community Education is considered in relation to the social democratic state, whilst CLD is discussed as a profession which from inception was influenced by neoliberalisation and new managerialism. The chapter also provides a review of the literature on community development in relation to professionalism, new managerialism and neoliberalism.

Chapter 5: this chapter discusses the methodological approaches and the research design and introduces the reader to the research questions. I note the ways in which my approach to knowledge was shaped by critical social research and also interpretivism and phenomenology. The chapter discusses grounded theory which was used as a method to analyse data and I discuss some of the criticisms of grounded theory from within the qualitative tradition, especially critical social research. In the second section, I discuss the research design and introduce the reader to the three local authorities which took part in this research.

Chapter 6: this chapter marks the beginning of the data analysis section of the thesis. The chapter begins by situating the primary concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation in data. I suggest that de-professionalisation is a product of austerity driven reforms and note the ways in

which a series of internal reviews and re-organisations have radically changed CE/CLD. The main features of re-professionalisation are also considered, including the ways in which work is increasingly determined by government policy and controlled in everyday settings by managers and inspectors. I argue that a 'new professionalism' is being constructed and the chapter concludes with a discussion on the extent to which the new professionalism is resisted by actors in the field.

Chapter 7: this chapter explores the ways in which encounters between the two principal actors in this work, managers and practitioners, are transformed by austerity driven reforms, neoliberalisation and new managerialism. The chapter also explores the organisational context in which work occurs. Managerial styles are considered and I note that participatory approaches to management – which have long been a hallmark of management in community education, are being replaced with a new 'authoritarian management'. I argue that new managerialism, especially the focus on performance management is qualitatively changing the managerial role in CE/CLD and I suggest that the traditional bureaucratic manager of old has been transformed into a 'new public manager'.

Chapter 8: this chapter explores everyday practices and systems associated with new public management and drawing upon Foucault I frame new managerial systems as 'technologies of performance'. I discuss the ways in which the work is becoming bureaucratised and professionals deskilled by new public management but I also argue that a new process of upskilling or reskilling – especially in relation to performance management, is emerging. The chapter concludes by relating the 'work related objectives' of professionals with the governmental objective of reducing public expenditure and in this context I argue that new managerialism is linked with a neoliberal model of community development which has emerged in the field.

Chapter 9: this chapter situates neoliberal community development within empirical research and explores how community development techniques are deployed by local states as a means of facilitating cuts to public expenditure. The chapter considers the main characteristics of neoliberal community development and proposes that communities are emerging in this discourse not as geographical places where people live and work or communities of interest but rather as players in a new social economy. The chapter argues that new managerialism and neoliberalisation are changing the very competencies required of practitioners and managers in the current context.

Chapter 10: this chapter argues that neoliberalism and new managerialism are productive practices which create new forms of work based on measurement. I argue that professionals are involved in the cultivation of a new society, which Foucault described in the Governmentality Lectures as the society of enterprise. Professionals are also transformed by the enterprise society and I suggest that a new culture shaped by business values and practices has appeared in the field. The new professional is framed as an 'entrepreneurial professional' and I argue that managerialism and neoliberalisation are producing new subjectivities which I explore via Foucault as 'new regimes of truth'. I argue that the ideational origins of the 'new truths' can be found in the ideas associated with the Neoliberal Thought Collective and I suggest the production of new truths is one of the key characteristics of the new professionalism.

Chapter 11: this chapter concludes the thesis and returns to the research questions and the research contribution to knowledge. A summary of the thesis is provided alongside a discussion on the new professionalism and community development.

Appendices: 3 appendices are included at the end of the thesis which include extracts from an interview, a recording from a fieldwork journal and a document which offers insight into how data analysis was conducted.

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 1 has introduced the reader to the main concepts and how they are deployed in this thesis. The literature review chapters which follow consider these concepts in greater detail and provide the theoretical foundation upon which this research is based. In Chapter 2 I discuss how the framing of 'neoliberalism' was indebted to the analysis of Michel Foucault and also the works of a group of intellectuals who were later described as the Neoliberal Thought Collective. Chapter 2 also serves to introduce the reader to the concept of governmentality theory.

## **Chapter 2: Foucault, Governmentality Theory and the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 2 introduces the reader to the theoretical thinking behind the key concepts in this work, especially neoliberalism and governmentality theory. The chapter is divided into two parts and in the first section I explain how my understanding of neoliberalism was indebted to ideas associated with Foucault’s ‘Governmentality Lectures’. Foucault’s approach was based on theoretical engagement with neoliberal ideas at the point of inception and following his path I introduce the reader to the ideas of the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’, especially Friedrich Hayek, Ludwig Von Mises and Gary Becker. I discuss the ways in which these intellectuals shaped ideas in the ‘Governmentality Lectures’ with particular attention given to the relationship between the state and the market economy and also how the human subject was framed in neoliberal discourse. The second section provides a review of the literature which considers the impact of Foucault’s analysis on the study of neoliberalism and it focuses specifically on two sets of literature, that which praises Foucault for his prescience and originality and the Marxist critique of governmentality which posited Foucault as an apologist for neoliberalism. I also consider Foucault’s critique of Marx which provides me with an opportunity to compare and contrast different arguments and also to explore my own interpretation of these debates. I argue that Foucault’s proposition that neoliberalism was a productive power was one of the great contributions he made to neoliberal studies which shaped how the concept is deployed in this research.

### *Foucault and Neoliberalism*

In a series of lectures delivered at the College De France in 1978 and 1979 Michel Foucault addressed philosophically what was then a nascent concept, neoliberalism. In an account which was highly original – especially by the standards of 1978/79, Foucault argued that neoliberalism should be viewed as something more than just a set of economic policies based on monetarism, privatisation, competition, and so forth, which is how it was discussed in that period. Interestingly, he saw in neoliberalism a new rationality for governing human beings which he referred to as the ‘neoliberal art of government’ (see Foucault, 2008) and he suggested that neoliberal societies of the future would create not only a new economy but also a new society and importantly a new human subject, which he discussed in relation to the concept of ‘governmentality’. According to Gane, Foucault believed that neoliberalism involved the irruption of a new form of governmental reason

and a form of governance that aimed to inject marketised principles of competition into all aspects of society and culture (Gane, 2014, p. 1092).

Foucault described his method for investigating the origins of neoliberalism in terms of 'genealogy' which was a term originally associated with Nietzsche. For Foucault genealogy was a method of philosophical enquiry which could provide a 'history of the present' (see Foucault, 2002; 2002b) and before applying genealogy to neoliberalism he had used it to investigate penal reform (see Foucault, 1995) and sexuality (see Foucault, 1998). According to Gordon, genealogy is best understood as a historical narrative which explains an aspect of human life by showing how it came into being (see Gordon, 1991), whilst Dean notes that it is characterised as a diagnostic of the present by problematising taken for granted assumptions (see Dean, 2010, p. 3). It is also important to note that genealogy differed from other approaches to the study of history – especially historical materialism, because it was based on a rejection of the teleological narratives of developmental historicism, including those that are widely associated with Marxism (see Gordon, 1991). According to Dean, the genealogical method rejects any notions of transcendental truths and principles of unity or progress in history (see Dean, 2010).

I noted that genealogy has been described as lacking philosophical rigor (Besley and Peters, 2006, p. 2); yet I was interested in genealogy because it provided me with a way of thinking about contemporary ideas and taken for granted assumptions in community development – Foucault described these as contemporary 'truths' (see Foucault, 2008) and how these could be understood in ways which highlighted a theoretical consistency with neoliberalism. I was also interested in how the genealogical approach, which focused on the history of ideas, enabled Foucault to anticipate the major neoliberal reforms which would not happen until after his death in 1984. From this perspective it is important to note that the 'Governmentality Lectures' occurred prior to the three events which later defined the 'neoliberal revolution' (see Harvey, 2005, p. 2), namely the electoral victories of Ronald Regan in the US and Margaret Thatcher in the UK and the liberalisation of China's economy.

Foucault has been described as one of the first theorists of neoliberalism (see Davies, 2013, p. 2; Dean, 2010, p. 261) and it was argued that he provided an account of neoliberalism that was 'spectacularly prescient' (Mirowski, 2014). The reason for his 'spectacular prescience' was because he investigated neoliberalism at the point of philosophical inception and to do this he discussed the

ideas of a group of intellectuals who were later described as the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’<sup>2</sup> (see Mirowski and Plehwe, 2009); according to Gane, any attempt at writing a critical sociology of neoliberalism or neoliberal reason must return to, and ultimately, engage with the works of the Collective’ (see Gane, 2014). In the next section I introduce the reader to the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’ and the aim of this section is twofold - first, I want to situate the origins of neoliberalism historically and also introduce the reader to the ways in which my own understanding of neoliberalism was indebted to both Foucault and ideas associated with the ‘Collective’.

### *The ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’*

In the UK, the age of neoliberalism is often said to have begun in the late 1970s (see Klein, 2007; Harvey, 2005; Whitfield, 2012), yet neoliberal ideas can be traced to the 1930s and two important events are important in terms of understanding neoliberalism historically. The first refers to a gathering of intellectuals known as the Walter Lippmann Colloquium in 1938 and this meeting was important because it constituted the beginnings of ‘organised neoliberalism’ (see Dardot and Laval, 2013) and it was at this inaugural meeting that the term ‘neoliberalism’ was used for the first time (see Bonefeld, 2012; Dardot and Laval, 2013; Foucault, 2008; Gane, 2012). According to Jones, other terms were considered to describe the ‘new philosophy’, including ‘individualism’, ‘positive liberalism’ and even ‘left wing liberalism’ (Jones, 2012, p. 31).

In order to understand the origins of neoliberalism, which was referred to in the 1930s as a ‘new liberalism’, it is important to situate the concept within historical debates about traditional liberalism, especially ‘Laissez-faire’ which meant minimum state involvement in the economy. The Lippmann Colloquium met amidst the shadows of Communism and Fascism and its aim was to ‘recast liberalism in order to combat the imposing rise of totalitarianism’ (see Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 52). According to the Colloquium’s organiser – Walter Lippmann, ‘liberalism was not identical with laissez-faire’ and in a paper submitted to the Colloquium he argued that, ‘we seek responsibility for the decline in liberalism in liberalism itself; and as a result, we seek the solution in a fundamental renewal of liberalism’ (Lippmann, cited in Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 56).

---

<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, Foucault’s discussions on the ‘Thought Collective’ marked his ‘sole incursion into the field of contemporary history throughout his teaching at the College De France’ (see Senellart, cited in Foucault, 2009, p. 385).

Yet the 'fundamental renewal of liberalism' would have to wait because the Second World War disrupted any future meetings of the Lippmann Colloquium and it was not until 1947 that the group met again, this time at Mont Pelerin in Switzerland; the place was significant because the second gathering became known as the 'Mont Pelerin Society'. Members of the new Society included philosophers, economists, sociologists, historians, political theorists, business leaders and journalists and prominent names of the period included Friedrich Hayek, Ludwig Von Mises and Karl Popper and in later years Gary Becker and Milton Friedman. Political historians agree that these two events, the Walter Lippmann Colloquium meeting in 1938 and the Mont Pelerin Society gathering in 1947, especially the latter, marked the birth of neoliberalism as a political movement (Cahill, 2014, p. 203; Gane, 2012b; Jones, 2012, p. 7; Rodrigues, 2013, p. 1002). Furthermore, the Mont Pelerin Society would become the pre-eminent space for calculation, exchange, and compromise for what was later characterised as a 'transnational thought collective' (see Feulner, 1999; Mirowski and Plehwe, 2008; Peck, 2008, p. 5).

Friedrich Hayek was perhaps the most influential member of the 'Thought Collective' and has been described as the 'intellectual organiser of the neoliberal movement' (Jones, 2012, p. 82). Hayek's work was based on a critique of government and the state and he argued that collectivism and planning led to an unprecedented growth in state power, which he suggested was responsible for both Fascism and Communism and ultimately the Second World War (Hayek, 2001, p. 10).

Influenced by Hayek's analysis, the early neoliberals saw Communism and Fascism as interrelated and in a similar vein to the philosopher Hannah Arendt they argued that both were 'totalitarian' (see Arendt, 1976; Hayek, 2001; Mises, 2009). Hayek also argued that the seeds of totalitarianism could be found in Roosevelt's New Deal in the US and the post-war welfare state then emerging in the UK (see Jones, 2012) and consequently Hayek offered not only a political critique of Communism and Fascism but also of Social Democracy, Keynesianism and in general terms state involvement in the economy (see Gamble, 2001, p. 128). According to Harvey, the early neoliberals were engaged in a battle of ideas against Marxism, socialism, state planning and Keynesian interventionism (Harvey, 2005, p. 21).

We see in Hayek's work and neoliberal analysis in general a scepticism of government and the state which Foucault later described as the neoliberal 'phobia of the state' (see Foucault, 2009). 'State phobia' is significant and is best understood when situated historically and Foucault thought it was interesting that Hayek and other members of the Collective who gathered at Mont Pelerin in 1947 were political exiles many of whom had fled Nazi Germany (Gane, 2012, p. 627; Jones, 2012, p. 35).

According to Foucault, ‘an entire political history of exile could be written, or a history of political exile and its ideological, theoretical, and practical effects’ (Foucault, 2008, p. 76). The early neoliberals were motivated by a fear that an interventionist state would lead to totalitarianism and Berenson provided an insight into this fear, writing: ‘God knows I fear the destruction of the world by the atomic bomb, but there is at least one thing I fear as much, and that is the invasion of humanity by the state’ (Berenson, cited in Foucault, 2008, p. 76). Yet, despite state phobia – which was a justifiable response to events in history, it is a theoretical error to assume as many on the left did that neoliberalism was anti-state or against the state and in the next section I argue that Hayek’s important contribution to political philosophy concerned his analysis of the state in capitalist society. Furthermore, I explore the ways in which Hayek’s analysis of the state influenced the theoretical development of Foucault’s concept of governmentality.

### *Hayek, Foucault and the Neoliberal State*

In contrast with traditional liberals who believed in minimum state involvement in the economy, Hayek argued for a strong and interventionist state which would act as the protector of the market order (see Hayek, 1948). Yet, the role for the state which he envisaged would be qualitatively different from a Socialist or Social Democratic state in the sense that the state would plan for but not against competition (Hayek, 2001, p. 43). This is an important conceptual point and in Hayek’s philosophy the state does not control the market, rather it is the market which controls the state and sets limitations on government (see Peck, 2008, p. 15; Rodriguez, 2013, p. 1009). According to Hayek, the market was the ‘system’s organising principle’ (see Hayek, 2001, 2006) and similarly, Friedman argued that the market should be understood as an ‘effective mechanism for regulating the extent, purpose and reach of government’ (see Friedman, 2002).

The market order would be protected by the ‘rule of law’ which Hayek believed was one of the ‘greatest human inventions’ (see Hayek, 2006, p. 130). In addition he argued that respect for the rule of law – which also meant respect for a designed market order, would keep government, especially those with socialistic instincts in check and limit the scope of their actions (see Hayek, 2006).

According to Hayek, the state which planned for competition rather than against it, would ultimately protect society against Communism and Fascism and in general terms guard against totalitarianism. Discussing the role of the state in Hayek’s philosophy Bidet argued that its purpose would be to ‘fix the rules of the game, allowing economic actors to play it out amongst themselves’ (Bidet, 2015, p. 45).

Hayek's original analysis of the state marked the moment when neoliberalism emerged as a distinctive political philosophy in its own right providing a critique of Socialism and Social Democracy and also Classical Liberalism. Hayek's analysis influenced how the state would be conceptualised in the 'Governmentality Lectures' and Foucault viewed the neoliberal state, which made its first appearance in the West at the time of the 'Lectures', as a significant moment in history (see Dean, 2014, p. 434; Garland, 1997, p. 175). Moreover, he saw in Hayek's analysis a new role for the state in governing human beings based on the reproduction of a designed market order (see Foucault, 2008). Discussing his theoretical approach to the state Foucault wrote that:

'The state does not have an essence. The state is not a universal nor in itself an autonomous source of power. The state is nothing but the effect, the profile, the mobile shape of a perpetual stratification or stratifications, in the sense of incessant transactions which modify, or move, or drastically change, or insidiously shift sources of finance, modes of investment, decision making centres, forms and types of control, relationships between local powers, the central authority...the state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities' (Foucault, 2008, p. 77).

By focusing on 'regimes of multiple governmentalities', Foucault was developing themes outlined in previous works and in the period before the 'Lectures' he had considered how 'local and definite institutions' (prisons, hospitals, asylums) – were governed by various regimes of governmentalities (Foucault, 1995; 2001), and this method would be applied to the question of the state:

'Is there an encompassing point of view with the regard to the state, as there was with regard to local and definite institutions...can we talk of something like a governmentality, that would be to the state what the techniques of segregation were for psychiatry, what techniques of discipline were to the penal system, and what Biopolitics was to the medical institutions' (Foucault, 2008, p. 78).

He wrote in relation to his methodology that:

'Instead of deducing concrete phenomena from universals, or instead of starting with universals as an obligatory grid of intelligibility for certain concrete practices, I would like to start with these concrete practices, and, as it were, pass the universals through the grid of these practices' (Ibid, p. 3).

Foucault found – via Hayek, his ‘specific form of governmentality’ in the concept of ‘the market’ and he argued that the market was a ‘regime of truth’ and that ‘this site of truth is not in the heads of economists...but is the market’ (Ibid, p. 30). Moreover:

‘The problem of neoliberalism is rather how the overall exercise of political power can be modelled on the principles of the market economy. So it is not a question of freeing an empty space, but of taking the formal principles of a market economy and referring and relating them to, of projecting them onto a general art of government’ (Ibid, p. 131).

According to Foucault, ‘government must accompany the market from start to finish’, and he noted that ‘one must govern for the market rather than because of the market’ (Ibid, p. 120). Governing for the market required a new ‘art of government’, which Foucault termed ‘governmentality’ and echoing Hayek’s call for an interventionist state he wrote, ‘the new governmentality of neoliberalism is not Laissez-faire but rather permanent vigilance, activity and intervention’ (Ibid, p. 132).

By drawing upon Hayek, Foucault was able to argue that neoliberalism was neither anti-statist or anti-government but rather a political project to create a ‘new government of society’ or ‘sociological government’ and he argued – presciently, that the neoliberals wanted to ‘create a new society, not just a market society, but an enterprise society’ (Ibid, p. 147). Foucault insisted that the creation of an ‘enterprise society’ would require the careful construction of a new human subject whom he described as Homo Economicus – the subject of enterprise and in the next section I argue that Homo Economicus was at the epicentre of what Foucault conceptualised as governmentality theory.

### *Introducing Governmentality Theory*

Governmentality theory was Foucault’s attempt at theorising the relationship between the state and the individual subject. Foucault described governmentality as an ‘ugly word’ (Foucault, 2009, p.115) and he interchangeably used it with terms such as the ‘analytics of government’, the ‘art of government’ and ‘regimes of practice’. According to Foucault, governmentality was concerned with the ‘conduct of conduct’ or those techniques and procedures which were involved in ‘directing human behaviour’ (see Foucault, 1997; 2009). Moreover, governmentality was ‘an activity that undertakes to conduct individuals throughout their lives by placing them under the authority of a

guide responsible for what they do and for what happens to them' (Foucault, 1997, p. 68). According to Gordon and Rose, it was a form of activity aimed at shaping, guiding or effecting the conduct of some person or persons (Gordon, 1991, p. 2; Rose, 1999, p. xx).

The 'game of governmentality' as Foucault described it, would only be successful on the grounds that it produced a self-governing subject who 'conformed to certain norms of their own accord' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 5) and it was at this juncture that 'Homo Economicus', the subject of enterprise entered the narrative. Homo Economicus was an individual subject who would be 'self-regulating', adept at the 'art of self-government' and 'government of the self' (see Foucault, 2008; Dean, 2010, p. 19; Fraser, 2003, p. 194; Kopecky, 2011, p. 252; Rose, et al, 2006, p. 90). Yet, Homo Economicus was contradictory and in addition to being self-governing and 'someone who obeys their interest' (see Audier, 2015, p. 415), they were also framed in the 'Lectures' as a subject that was 'endlessly adaptable, flexible and rootless' (Allen and Goddard, 2014, p. 43). According to Foucault, Homo Economicus was;

'....someone manageable, someone who responds systematically to systematic modifications artificially introduced into the environment. Homo Economicus is someone who is eminently governable. From being the intangible partner of Laissez-faire, Homo Economicus now becomes the correlate of a governmentality which will act on the environment and systematically modify its variables' (Foucault, 2009).

In the 'Lectures' Foucault argued that the state, especially those parts responsible for education, would play a strategically important role in creating Homo Economicus. From this perspective, the purpose of education – as the neoliberals viewed it, was not to encourage individuals to change society or question the rules of the neoliberal game but to equip individuals with the skills required to play the game effectively. According to Rose, governmentality and in particular Homo Economicus, highlighted the ways in which personalities, subjectivities and relationships 'are not private matters...they are intensively governed' (Rose, 1999, p. 1).

Foucault's concept of Homo Economicus was theoretically indebted to two members of the 'Thought Collective' - Ludwig von Mises and Gary Becker, and in the next section I explore how their ideas can be seen as primary sources in the theoretical evolution of governmentality theory.

*Mises, Becker and Homo Economicus*

Mises like Hayek, was an Austrian born economist (and political emigre) and his work was described by Foucault as 'highly significant' and a 'turning point' in the development of neoliberal theory (see Foucault, 2008). According to Mises, 'man' was fundamentally an economic actor whose behaviour was best understood in terms of the pursuit of his own economic self-interest (see Gane, 2014, p. 1095) and this analysis of 'man' shaped Homo Economicus. Moreover, Foucault's prescient proposition that neoliberalism created a market society or enterprise society was theoretically indebted to Mises who argued that the market was 'first and foremost a social body', which could be understood in terms of an 'economic democracy' (see Mises, 2007 p. 10). Mises also argued for designed market order in moral terms and believed that the act of consumption in a market place was fundamentally a democratic act (Mises, cited in Jones, 2012, p. 83); he also viewed it as something more meaningful than merely taking part in elections every few years (see Frank, 2000, p. xiv). In addition, Mises argued that humanity faced a stark choice between socialism and capitalism (Mises, cited in Gane, 2014, p. 10) – and according to Gane, he believed that the epistemological and political primacy of the individual should be defended against the more collectivist positions of those on the political left (Ibid, p. 21).

Mises criticised 'the socialists' for what he thought was their mistaken belief in human nature and socialism he argued, required a 'miraculous' change in human nature from 'mean egotism' to 'lofty altruism' (see Mises, 2005; 2007). Interestingly, he anticipated the rise of the consumer society and the retreat of the Marxist idea of 'proletarian revolution', which he argued (correctly) would recede amidst the material advances created by consumerism. According to Mises, 'capitalism de-proletarianises the 'common man' and elevates him to the rank of the bourgeois' (Mises, 2009, p. 1). Mises was an important figure in the evolution of governmentality theory because he was one of the first economists to recognise the impact of neoliberalism on human subjectivity and how neoliberal societies would require the cultivation of a new human subject. He also influenced the concept of 'Public Choice Theory' and in the next Chapter I discuss how this shaped the neoliberal analysis of the welfare state and local government.

Becker is the second intellectual who influenced the development of governmentality theory and Foucault's understanding of Homo Economicus. Becker was an American economist whom Milton Friedman described as the most important social scientist of the 20th century (Friedman, cited in Lazear, 2015, p. 80). Foucault thought that Becker's work was highly significant and described him as the most 'radical' of the neoliberals (Foucault, cited in Dean, 2016). Foucault was especially interested in how Becker applied economic theory to areas that few social scientists thought

feasible; for example, Becker argued that economic theory could be applied to sites such as education, health, addiction, altruism, crime and the family (Becker, 1995). Becker framed education and looking after one's health in terms of an 'economic investment', the benefits of which took some time to become visible (Becker, 1976). He also applied a similar approach to the study of crime and in Becker's analysis 'the criminal' was not someone who should be morally condemned but was rather a social entrepreneur who traded off gains made from crime against the expected costs; yet Becker was not soft on crime and he argued that tougher laws were required in order to reduce the economic incentives which encouraged people to commit crime (Ibid, 1976). In addition, he argued that human behaviours motivated by 'love, dependence and aesthetic taste' could also be explained economically (Becker, cited in Newheiser, 2016, p. 3) and he suggested that it was possible to economically measure the choice of whether and whom to marry and argued in relation to 'romantic affection', that 'caring can strikingly modify the market allocation between married persons' (see Becker, 1973; 1976).

In Becker's economistic discourse, society operated according to market processes and in a similar vein to Mises, he believed that given the right conditions a new human subject would be created by neoliberal society, an argument which was 'enormously rich in policy implications' (see Lazear, 2015, p.82). Becker's work centred on a fusion between human beings and capital and Becker is credited with having coined the term 'human capital' which he described as the 'economic approach to human behaviour' (Becker, cited in, Teixeira, 2014). Becker argued that neoliberalism – or 'economic liberalism' as he described it, contained within its narrative a 'liberating point of view' (Becker, et al, 2012, pp.11-18) and the idea that neoliberalism was 'liberating' fascinated Foucault. According to Foucault, neoliberalism 'displaces an exhaustively disciplinary society in favour of a society in which the mechanism of general normalisation and the exclusion of non-normaliseable are no longer needed' (Foucault, 2008, p. 265). This was a significant statement and for Foucault, Becker's concept of 'human capital' was potentially a way of thinking about power without discipline (see Dean, 2014, p. 434). Influenced by Becker, Foucault considered if neoliberalism had the potential to create a post-disciplinary society or what Hayek described as the 'coercion free' society (see Hayek, 2006). Moreover, Homo Economicus could be described as the 'living embodiment of human capital' (Munro, 2012, p. 348).

Foucault believed that the appearance of Homo Economicus was a significant event in human history (Foucault, 2008) and he argued that the new subject marked the arrival of 'new forms of individual conduct' shaped by neoliberal reason (see Cahill, 2015, p. 205; Foucault, 2008).

Importantly, Homo Economicus had to be created and this required an active and interventionist form of government - according to Foucault:

‘Government must not form a counterpoint or a screen, as it were, between society and economic processes. It has to intervene on society as such, in its fabric and depth. Basically, it has to intervene on society so that competitive mechanisms can play a regulatory role at every moment and every point in society and by intervening this way its objective will become possible, that is to say, a general regulation of society by the market’ (Foucault, 2008, p. 145).

The new form of government would also make sure that ‘everything, including life itself, becomes open to marketised forms of choice’ (Gane, 2014, p. 1095). As noted, Foucault’s account of neoliberalism was highly original and in the second section of this chapter I consider the impact of the Governmentality Lectures on the study of neoliberalism.

#### *Foucault’s Impact on the Study of Neoliberalism*

Foucault’s work on neoliberalism has been praised for its originality and extraordinary prescience (see Gordon, 2015; Mirowski, 2013). In addition, Zamora argues that through his ability to conceptualise and even anticipate the central questions of his time, Foucault always seemed to interrogate major contemporary issues in exciting and innovative ways (Zamora, 2016, p. 1). According to Mirowski:

‘Foucault drew out a range of stunning implications that ventured far beyond the exoteric knowledge then being broadcast by the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’. Accomplishing this back in 1979, he was the first to appreciate the vaunting ambition of neoliberals to recast not just markets and government, but the totality of human existence into a novel modality, to be disciplined and punished by structures of power/knowledge’ (Mirowski, 2014, p. 94).

In Mirowski’s analysis, Foucault identified in neoliberalism a discourse and a set of practices which were capable of producing transformative effects on human subjectivity which in turn reshaped social, political and economic reality in the West. Peck notes that the ‘neoliberal ideational project’, which Foucault examined genealogically, was ‘designed – one might say planned – for this encounter

with reality' (Peck, 2008, p. 30). Discussing genealogy, Cahill argues that Foucault's retrospective method was not based on 'ideational causation' (Cahill, 2015, p. 207), whilst Peck notes that a genealogical approach was not a 'celebration of moments of apparent premonition', nor an exercise in 'retrospective functionalism' (Peck, 2008, p. 4). Moreover, Rose argued in relation to the genealogical method that Foucault's work shows that 'we can question our present certainties – by confronting them with their histories' (Rose, 1999, p. x). Similarly May suggests that 'Foucault's history concerns the present we find ourselves inhabiting' (May, 2012, p. 45). The genealogical method was best described by Foucault who referred to it as a 'history that can be used to question the lines of descent that lead to the present' (Foucault, 2002).

By focusing on historical perspectives, Foucault's 'Lectures' also provided for a longer and more detailed history of neoliberal reason than was commonly found in the sociological literature on the subject (see Gane, 2012, p. 629; 2014, p. 22). Moreover, Jones argued that Foucault made an important contribution to the study of neoliberalism because hitherto the 'histiography of neoliberalism was patchy', whilst its 'ideological infrastructure' was not fully explored by historians (Jones, 2012, pp. 14-20). According to Cahill, Foucault equips contemporary researchers with an understanding of neoliberalism's 'intellectual lineage' (Cahill, 2015, p. 201) or what Peck describes as its 'prehistories' (Peck, 2008, p. 3). On this note Dardot and Laval argued that:

'Foucault saw the reorganisation of ways of governing individuals in various sections of society, and that reactions to social and cultural struggles, were in the process of discovering a potential consistency, theoretical and practical, with neoliberalism' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 11).

Foucault's work was also highly original on the grounds that he anticipated via Hayek the nature of the state under neoliberal conditions and in doing so he highlighted the 'interventionist nature of neoliberalism' (see Mirowski, 2014; Newheiser, 2016, p. 12).

The spectre of Marx (or Marxian analysis) looms large in discussions on Foucault and neoliberalism and in this context, Dardot and Laval argued that Foucault's approach to neoliberalism was:

...'far more radical than that of Marxism', because 'it eschews the standard, reductive gestures of ideology critique that finds the process of capital accumulation, and the

material interests of capital or one its fractions lurking behind its anti-statism and pro-individual freedom claims' (Dardot and Laval, 2013).

In a similar vein, Dean suggests that Foucault's account of neoliberalism was more 'intellectually nuanced' than many Marxist analyses (see Dean, 2016, p. 89), whilst Gordon states that Foucault presented neoliberalism as a considerably more original and challenging phenomenon than the Left's critical culture has had the courage to acknowledge (Gordon, 2015).

Yet, the most substantial criticisms of Foucault were made by those writing within the Marxian tradition and viewed through the prism of his Marxist critics the 'Governmentality Lectures' have been described as Foucault's 'neoliberal moment' (see Zamora, 2016) with some even suggesting that Foucault was sympathetic and attracted to neoliberalism (see Behrent, 2009). The extent to which Foucault had a neoliberal moment is an issue I consider in the next section which considers Foucault's problematic relationship with Marx. I begin with a discussion on the Marxian critique of governmentality.

#### *The Marxian Critique of Governmentality*

Throughout his lifetime Foucault was involved in a series of public disagreements with Marxist intellectuals with Jean Paul Sartre famously describing Foucault as the 'the last barrier that the bourgeoisie can still raise against Marx' (Sartre, cited in Behrent, 2009). His Marxist critics responded to the concept of governmentality by arguing that Foucault had neglected to find a subject capable of resisting neoliberalism (see Rose, et al, 2006, p. 100) and according to Amselle, Foucault's work was based on a denial of both agency and the possibility of human liberty (Amselle, 2016, p. 160). There is truth in these criticisms and as we have seen instead of providing us with a subject capable of resistance Foucault chose to present his audience with Homo Economicus – a subject so incorporated into a rationale determined by neoliberal reason that he argued that a new human subject had been created by neoliberalism.

Foucault's Marxian critics claimed that governmentality theory was informed by a pessimistic analysis which made capitalist social relations seem unalterable and consequently governmentality inevitably led to 'determinism and fatalism' (see Barratt, 2003, p. 1075) and 'nihilism and despair' (see Gordon, 1991, p. 4). According to Rehmann:

‘Foucault’s concept of power includes aspects of self-conduct and techniques of the self, but it does so in an individualistic manner, which fails to grasp the potentials of collective agency and self-determination’ (Rehmann, 2016, p. 136).

Moreover, Rehmann argues that governmentality was ‘theoretically flimsy’ – in essence a vacuous idea – Foucault, Rehmann claims, ‘delivers glossy menus announcing delicious dishes, but the readers never get anything to eat’ (Rehmann, 2016, p. 143). On the question of resistance Rehmann notes:

‘Resistance is thus necessarily restricted to small tactical displacements within the framework of domination and its hegemonic ideologies...It very much looks as if governmentality studies tries to provide the existing dispersion and helplessness of social movements and the Left vis-à-vis neoliberal hegemony with a theoretical justification. Instead of looking for strategies to overcome its weaknesses, it confirms and naturalises them’ (Rehmann, 2016, p. 150).

Foucault was also accused of being an apologist for neoliberalism and intellectually sympathetic with some of its key ideas. According to Behrent, ‘the same Foucault whom academic radicals have lionized flirted with an outlook anchored on the political Right: the free market creed known as neoliberalism’ (Behrent, 2009). Zamora draws a similar conclusion, describing Foucault’s relationship with neoliberalism as ‘ambiguous’, even arguing that Foucault was ‘seduced and enamoured’ by some of neoliberalism’s key ideas (Zamora, 2016, pp. 1-5). In an interview with Gary Becker, Becker was asked his thoughts on Foucault’s reading of his work and apparently he stated - ‘I cannot tell whether Foucault is disagreeing with me’ (Becker, cited in Dean, 2016, p. 92). Moreover, Ewald who many regard as a trustworthy source on Foucault<sup>3</sup>, described the Governmentality Lectures as Foucault’s ‘apology’ for neoliberalism (Ewald, cited in Dean, 2016).

Foucault’s Marxist critics also argued (correctly) that Foucault’s critique of the state was similar with that offered by the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’ especially Hayek’s, and according to Behrent:

---

<sup>3</sup> Francois Ewald completed his Doctorate on the Welfare State under the supervision of Foucault and Ewald’s doctoral thesis was cited in ‘Lectures’. Ewald was also Foucault’s personal assistant at the College De France (see Dean, 2014, p. 434).

‘Foucault’s interest in neoliberalism harmonised with his anti-statism, which was both theoretical (the belief that political theory must emancipate itself from its focus on the problem of sovereignty) and practical (his view that political action must encompass broader goals than seeking transformation through control of the state’ (Behrent, 2016, p. 181).

Foucault also shared with Hayek and the early neoliberals a strong hatred of Communism which informed his anti-statism (see Christofferson, 2016, p. 17). In order to better understand Foucault’s anti-statism it is important to situate the ‘Governmentality Lectures’ historically and it has been argued that the ‘Lectures’ were informed by a context which involved the historical retreat of the left and the hollowing out in France of the social militancy associated with the post-1968 period (see Callinicos, 1998; Gordon, 1991, p. 5). Foucault’s hostility towards Communism was also a product of events in the 1970s most notably his public support for Eastern European dissidents and his critique of the Soviet Union whose practices he believed challenged the intellectual prestige of Marxism (see Gordon, 1991).

Behrent and Zamora argued that there were ‘many Foucault’s’ throughout the course of his intellectual life and that the ‘Governmentality Lectures’ were representative of the ‘last Foucault’ (see Behrent; Zamora, 2016) whereby Foucault was said to be critical of transformative political programmes associated with the left. According to Dean, Foucault believed that his own political and economic context was fundamentally ‘post-revolutionary’ (Dean, 2016) and in this context Ewald argued that Foucault diagnosed the end of proletarian revolution (Ewald, 1999, p. 81). Ewald also suggested that Foucault anticipated Fukuyama’s ‘end of history’ thesis (see Fukuyama, 1992) and that for Foucault the end of history and the end of socialist revolution represented the same event in history. According to Ewald the end of revolution (or history) ‘is an event in our consciousness of time... what is left belongs to the order of administration, of management’ (Ewald, cited in Dean, 2016, p. 94).

Foucault’s rejection of the Marxian concept of proletarian revolution was an argument which Foucault articulated in his own lifetime (see Foucault 2002; 2002b) and according to Allen and Goddard, Foucault always displayed ‘analytic caution’ when considering the question of social transformation (Allen and Goddard, 2014, p. 32). Yet, despite his analytic caution it has often been argued that Foucault was sympathetic with the proposition that ‘new combatants’ had emerged

who could replace the proletariat as the agent of social transformation (see Bidet, 2015, p. 169). Discussing the emergence of these new combatants or new social movements Zamora noted that:

‘A broad conception of identity thus came to replace the problem of exploitation. As the concept of social class disappeared from philosophical analysis, the struggle against capitalism was gradually being replaced by a struggle against normalisation of behaviours and identities imposed on subjects’ (Zamora, 2016, p. 64).

New social movement theorists have often been inspired by Foucault’s ideas, however the extent to which Foucault was sympathetic with the idea that new social movements possessed the agency to transform neoliberalism were rendered problematic with the publication of the ‘Governmentality Lectures’. For example, we find evidence in the ‘Lectures’ that Foucault saw in neoliberalism a way of organising society which was capable of advancing the social, political and economic rights of those groups hitherto marginalised by capitalist societies. In a discussion on the new (neoliberal) society of enterprise Foucault argued that:

‘One has on the contrary...the image or the idea or a programmatic theme of a society in which there would be an optimisation of the system of differences, in which the field would be open to oscillating processes, in which there would be a tolerance accorded to individuals and to minority practices, and in which not the players of the game, but the rules of the game would be acted upon’ (Foucault, 2008).

As a consequence of his focus on ‘optimising differences’ and ‘minority practices’ - terms not normally associated with Foucault’s analysis of late modernity, it is logical to argue that the ‘last Foucault’ was as his Marxian critics argued, sympathetic with neoliberalism. According to Dean:

‘Thus Foucault here distinguishes the neoliberal programme from those forms of regulation and power, such as discipline, that subjugate individuals through the production of subjectivity – that is through tying individuals to the truth of their identity, e.g. the occasional criminal, the recidivist, the dangerous individual, the invert, etc. For Foucault...neoliberalism does not subjectify in this sense. By not doing so, it opens up the space for tolerating minority individuals and practices and optimising systems of difference’ (Dean, 2016, p. 100).

Behrent is also sympathetic with the argument that Foucault was an apologist for neoliberalism and argues that the 'last Foucault' was a remarkably 'different Foucault' who was considerably at odds with the one who has been vehemently debated by the American academy:

'Rather than a philosopher who explores the marginalised and excluded in order to challenge the pretences of dominant epistemological and discursive systems, we find a Foucault intrigued with the ways in which a particular discursive framework – one that at the time was aspiring to hegemony – might accommodate difference and minority practices' (Behrent, 2009).

I would argue that any sympathy Foucault had with neoliberalism was also understandable and entirely logical especially if one is familiar with his work. According to Audier – who adopts a similar position to my own, Foucault wove his investigation of neoliberalism into the texture of his earlier concerns, which were philosophical as well as political (Audier, 2015, p. 405). Moreover in the 'Lectures', Foucault was interested in the ways in which neoliberal society created subjects that were self-regulating and self-governing and according to Dardot and Laval he saw in neoliberalism a new rationality whose principal characteristic was the 'generalisation of competition as a behavioural norm and of the enterprise as a model of subjectivation' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 4).

Becker's argument that neoliberalism was liberating and potentially post-disciplinary interested Foucault in the sense that it corresponded with one of the central themes of governmentality theory, namely that 'one governs best by governing least' (Foucault, 2008; 2009). In addition, Foucault saw in neoliberalism a 'liberalism without humanism' (see Behrent, 2009) and as a philosopher who had previously written that 'our task is to emancipate ourselves definitively from humanism' (see Foucault 2002b) – we can see why he was intellectually stimulated by ideas associated with Hayek, Mises and Becker. According to Behrent, the 'Governmentality Lectures' revealed just how deep Foucault's anti-humanism ran (Behrent, 2009), whilst Lemke has described Foucault's neoliberal moment in terms of a practical anti-humanism (Lemke, 2010, p. 54).

In the next section I argue that despite the Marxian critique of his work – which raised legitimate criticisms of governmentality, Foucault's own relationship with Marx was problematic. Furthermore, I argue that Foucault's work offered fundamental criticisms of Marxian analysis whilst his notion that neoliberal power was productive offered an important contribution to neoliberal studies.

## *Foucault's Critique of Marx*

Foucault's relationship with Marx or Marxian analysis has been described as ambiguous (see Apperley, 1997, p. 10; Kopecky, 2011, p. 249; Simons, 1995, p. 5) and this ambiguity has enabled some researchers and theorists to see the potential for a possible synthesis between his work and Marx (see Bidet, 2015; Biebricher, 2014; Fraser, 2003; Hardt and Negri, 2000). According to Balibar, Foucault's work was based on a genuine struggle with Marx (Balibar, cited in Lemke, 2010, p. 49), whilst Foucault himself claimed that Marx or a certain spirit of Marx was at work in his methodology (Foucault, cited in Olssen, 2004, p. 454). From this perspective, Foucault's work belongs to a tradition in sociology and social science theoretically engaged in a 'frequently unacknowledged debate with the work of Marx' (see Mills, 2000, p. 82).

I was interested in Foucault's relationship with Marx and once planned to develop a Marxian-Foucauldian synthesis in order to research neoliberalism and community development; yet although there were common grounds between the two philosophers I ultimately rendered this approach as problematic and increasingly I came to the view that Foucault's work offered fundamental criticisms of the Marxist method. In particular, Foucault argued that Marx (and Marxists) had strategically underestimated the extent to which capitalism or neoliberalism created a new human subjectivity and a central theme in the 'Governmentality Lectures' – especially the parts which discussed Homo Economicus, centred on how neoliberalism or capitalist social relations were re-produced rather than resisted. Discussing the limitations in the Marxist method, Foucault argued that:

'So I don't think we can simply accept the traditional Marxist analysis, which assumes that, labour, being man's concrete essence, the capitalist system is what transforms labor power into profit, into hyper-profit or surplus value. The fact is, capitalism penetrates much more deeply into our existence' (Foucault, 2000, p. 86).

Foucault acknowledged that his theoretical analysis was 'pessimistic' and wrote in a critique of Marxian analysis that, 'man is disappearing in philosophy not as an object of knowledge, but as the subject of liberty' (Foucault, 2002b). Furthermore, his approach to knowledge could be described as explicitly anti-Marxian, hence the reason why Foucauldian-Marxian syntheses were likely to encounter numerous theoretical obstacles. Discussing his critique of the Marxist method Foucault argued that:

‘My aim is most decidedly not to use the categories of cultural totality (whether world views, ideal types, and the particular spirit of an age) in order to impose on history, despite itself, the forms of structural analysis. The series described, the limits fixed, the comparisons and correlations made are based not on the old philosophies of history, but are intended to question teleologies and totalisations’ (Foucault, 2002, p. 17).

Moreover, in contrast with the grand narratives of historical materialism and class struggle, Foucault’s genealogical method was based on the avoidance of proposing a global principle for analysing society (see Foucault, 1991, p. 84) and in this context he was particularly keen to avoid the role of ideological traffic policeman (Gordon, cited in Foucault, 2000, p. xiv). Bidet argued that Foucault rejected the idea of putting forward an overall strategy in the name of emancipation (Bidet, 2015, p. 241) and it is equally important to note that Foucault was critical of Marxian intellectuals who preached revolution or social transformation from the position of academia. For example, he argued that:

‘The imperative discourse that consists in saying ‘strike against this and do so in this way’ seems to me to be very flimsy when delivered from a teaching institution or even just on a piece of paper’ (Foucault, cited in Newheiser, 2016, p. 13).

Gordon makes a similar point in relation to Foucault’s views on academia and noted:

‘He rejects the use of an academic discourse as a vehicle of practical injunction (‘love this; hate this; do this; refuse that...’), and he dismisses the notion that practical political choices can be determined within the space of a theoretical text as trivialising the act of moral decision to the level of a merely aesthetic preference’ (Gordon, 1991, p. 6).

Foucault’s reluctance to put forward an alternative political programme led Isaiah Berlin to argue that Foucault was not a left intellectual at all, ‘if by that one means a thinker with a political manifesto to put forward’ (Berlin, cited in Foucault, 2000). Yet, Berlin’s assertion is problematic because Foucault could also be ambiguous on the question of resistance; for example he argued that ‘wherever there is power, there is resistance’ and that ‘no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remains possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings’ (Foucault, 2000, p.354). According to Ball, Foucault’s interest in resistance did not concern mass struggles against capitalism but rather ‘micro critical practices’ and ‘strategic skirmishes’ (Ball, 2016,

p. 1131). Ball's point about 'micro critical practices' interested me and consequently I explore the various 'strategic skirmishes' which occurred in the field against neoliberalism and new managerialism.

In concluding this discussion on Foucault and Marx I want to note that my own approach is sympathetic with Dean's argument that Foucault's account of neoliberalism was more 'intellectually nuanced' than many Marxist analyses (see Dean, 2016, p. 89). Moreover, the aim of this work is illustrate how social relations in everyday practice settings are reproduced in a way that is consistent with neoliberalism. As noted, Foucault wrote that 'if power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? (Foucault, 2000, p. 120). This analysis shaped how neoliberal power would be understood in relation to the field of community development and readers should note that neoliberal power is framed not only in terms of a set of economic policies but also as a new rationality for governing human beings. From this perspective, Dardot and Laval argued that:

'Neoliberalism is not merely destructive of rules, institutions and rights. It is also productive of certain kinds of social relations, certain ways of thinking, and certain subjectivities. It shapes the form of our existence. Neoliberalism defines a certain existential norm in western societies and, far beyond them, in all those societies that follow them on the path of modernity...For more than a third of a century this existential norm has presided over public policy, governed global relations, transformed society, and reshaped subjectivity' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 3).

Similarly, Ball and Olmedo captured they ways in which neoliberal power shapes the subjectivity of the governed:

'Neoliberalism is therefore 'out there' and 'in here', it is realised and constituted within mundane and immediate practices of everyday life...it does us – speaks and acts through our language, purposes, decisions and social relations' (Ball and Olmedo, 2013, p. 88).

### *Concluding Remarks*

This chapter has focused on Foucault's original and prescient account of neoliberalism, which he outlined in the 'Governmentality Lectures' at the College De France, 1978-79. The purpose of the chapter has been twofold; first to introduce the reader to the theoretical thinking behind some of the key concepts in this work, especially neoliberalism and governmentality theory. In addition, the chapter has served to introduce the reader to how the state was conceptualised by Foucault and Hayek and I argue in the next chapter that reforms of local government which happened in the neoliberal era have been designed to create a state which functioned in the image of the market. I argue that it is within this context that techniques and practices associated with New Public Management or new managerialism make their first appearance in history and I frame new managerialism as a specific form of governmentality.

## Chapter 3: New Managerialism and the Neoliberalisation of the State

### Introduction

The 'Governmentality Lectures' addressed neoliberalism as a theory and anticipated what future neoliberal societies might look like. In this chapter I explore 'actually existing neoliberalism' and I argue that new managerialism emerged as a set of techniques and practices during the first wave of neoliberalism in the UK. The first section of Chapter 3 explores the origins of new managerialism in the context of the UK's welfare state with particular attention given to the locus of this study, local government. I discuss the neoliberalisation of local government and introduce the reader to the key features of new managerialism or New Public Management. I also consider the ways in which new managerialism was informed by a view of the world shaped by neoliberal reason and specifically 'public choice theory'. The second section discusses the impact of new managerialism on those professions situated inside welfare states and at this juncture the concept of professionalism enters the narrative. The main argument I explore concerns the origins in the literature of two principal concepts which shaped this thesis, namely the ways in which the professions are de-professionalised and re-professionalised by new managerialism and in a broader sense neoliberalism. The chapter draws upon literature and previous research from a variety of professional fields most notably education and social work. Although community development is not the focus of this chapter I note the ways in which the literature review created areas of enquiry for empirical work and the development of research questions.

#### *'Actually Existing Neoliberalism'*

Practices and ideas associated with new managerialism were a product of 'actually existing neoliberalism' (see Davies, 2017) and a series of neoliberal reforms which occurred from the mid-1970s onwards. According to Harvey the period from the late 1970s until the early 1980s marked a 'revolutionary turning point in the world's socio-economic history' (see Harvey, 2005) and constituted the moment when the theoretical ideas which Foucault discussed in the 'Governmentality Lectures', became empirical practices throughout most of the West. In the UK, the birth of neoliberalism is commonly associated with the election of Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Government in 1979, although it should be noted that what Foucault described as the 'new politics' of the period (see Foucault, 2008) had also penetrated the traditional parties of social democracy on

both sides of the Atlantic<sup>4</sup> (see Jones, 2012; Desai, 2002). This is an important point and one which corresponds with the analysis I discussed in Chapter 1, namely that neoliberalism is not just as an ideology of the political right but rather a rationality and set of practices which have influenced governments on both the left and right of the political spectrum.

It could also be argued that social democratic governments turned to neoliberalism not out of ideological conviction but rather as a means of responding to and managing the consequences of the various political and economic crises which engulfed the capitalist economies of the West in the 1970s. In the US, these crises included the fiscal deficit caused by subsidising the Vietnam War, whilst in the UK the neoliberal turn was a response to the near collapse of industrial relations coupled with a crisis of capital accumulation (Harvey, 2005, p.14; Jones, 2012, p. 1). Moreover, structural crises were exacerbated by the first oil shock of 1973 which was followed by rising inflation (Desai, 2002, p. 261). According to Harvey, it was in a context of sustained crises that neoliberal ideas were plucked from the 'shadows of obscurity' (Harvey, 2005, p. 2).

The 'social democratic crisis' (see Brenner and Theodore, 2002, p. 350; Mudge, 2008, p. 709) created the opportunity for neoliberalism to morph from a speculative theory into what Foucault referred to as a practice or art of government (Foucault, 2008, p. 32) and by the end of the 1980s these practices were ideologically dominant in the UK. According to Gamble, what surprised critics was the speed with which neo-liberal ideas jumped the barrier into practical politics, establishing themselves as the leading ideas both in the national politics of particular states, and perhaps more crucially in the international agencies of the global order (Gamble, 2001, p.128). The ideas of Hayek outlined in Chapter 2 – and also the later neoliberals such as Milton Friedman, became part of the theoretical infrastructure upon which the UK's neoliberal experiment was founded. Margaret Thatcher in particular paid homage to Hayek, writing in her memoirs that he 'provided crisp, clear analytical arguments against socialism' - 'Hayek' she wrote, 'gave us a feeling that the other side could not win in the end' (Thatcher, 1993, p. 12). Moreover, Hayek's intellectual resuscitation by the 'New Right'

---

<sup>4</sup> The Democratic Party in the US and the British Labour Party in the UK introduced monetarist or neoliberal reforms in the mid-1970s; for example, the transportation and banking sectors in the US were deregulated by a Democratic President (Jones, 2012, p. 13), whilst in the UK deep spending cuts and the abandonment of full employment in favour of controlling inflation was overseen by a Labour Government (Desai, 2002, p. 261). Jones argues that the success of neoliberal ideas should not be thought of in terms of a straightforward by-product of the rise of the New Right or the triumph of Thatcherism...neoliberal policies had broken through on the left (Jones, 2012, p. 13).

was remarkable especially given the fact that during the post-War consensus his ideas were often dismissed as 'unworkable' and greeted with an 'embarrassed silence' by Keynesians (Desai, 2002, p. 202; Gamble, 2001, pp. 129-132) – in fact Keynes himself once dismissed Hayek as an 'obscure critic' (see Peck, 2008 p. 11). Yet, under the direction of radical Conservative government's, the market became just as Hayek argued the organising principle for macro-economic reform, especially through the mass privatisation of nationalised industries (see Davies, 2013, p. 8; Jones, 2012, p. 82).

By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it was argued that neoliberal ideas were hegemonic in the UK and constituted the 'common sense' of the era (see Hall, 2013) and writing triumphantly (and accurately), Milton Friedman said the following in relation to neoliberalism's success - 'to judge from the climate of opinion we have won the war of ideas. Everyone – left or right, talks about the virtues of markets, private property and limited government' (Friedman and Freidman, 1998, p. 583). Thatcher argued that her political mission was to transform three institutions associated with British Socialism - the Trade's Union movement, the British Labour Party and local government (see Thatcher, 1993, p.339) and in the next section I discuss how local government was subjected to a series of reforms which the Conservatives believed would result in the death of municipal socialism (Ibid, 1993).

### *The Neoliberalisation of Local Government*

Foucault's analysis in the 'Governmentality Lectures' anticipated the ways in which the state would be transformed by the market and in the period of 'actually existing neoliberalism', practices associated with neoliberalism - privatisation, competition, entrepreneurialism and so forth were introduced into 'hitherto untouched arenas of politics, regulation, and government' (see Jones, 2012, p. 88). Foucault wrote with the concept of marketisation in mind that:

'The problem is not whether there are things that you cannot touch and others that you are entitled to touch. The problem is how you touch them' (Foucault, 2008, p. 117).

According to Harvey, the principle in this period was, 'if markets do not exist they should be created' (Harvey, 2005, p. 2), whilst Fournier connected the spread of marketisation with the coming together of various trends of change in the 1980s – technological, economic, ideological and political, which Fournier argues 'facilitated and legitimised the intensification and spreading of the logic of the market to new domains' (Fournier, 2000, p. 77). Similarly, Gane argues that nothing was

sacred from the logic of marketisation (Gane, 2012) and Massey noted that the marketisation of 'untouched' arenas removed the 'economic' from the sphere of political and ideological contestation, leaving the economic realm as a matter for 'experts and technocrats' (Massey, 2013, p. 35). Yet, neoliberalisation constituted something radically different from the mere erosion or hollowing out of the state by the market and according to Bourdieu, a 'state nobility, which preaches a withering away of the state has in fact kidnapped the state, turning a public good into a private good' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 25).

Whitfield argued that neoliberalisation in the UK could be understood in relation to three stages (see Whitfield, 2012, p. 39) and I noted that these stages were useful in terms of thinking about the historical development of British neoliberalism. According to Whitfield, Phase 1 (described as the 'rolling back of state') involved the privatisation in the 1980s and early 1990s of industries previously under state control most notably gas, electricity, telecommunications and the railways. Phase 1 also saw the deregulation of labour markets and the fracturing of the powers of the British trade's union movement with the UK wide defeat of the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) regarded as a pivotal moment in the history of British neoliberalism (see Cavalier, 2005, p.65; Cooke, 1996, p. 13; Craig, et, al, 2011, p. 113; Darlington, 2005, p.79; Jones, 2011). The defeat of the NUM and that of other organised workers paved the way for a new society which has been described as the 'post-industrial' society (see Gall, 2005; Stephenson and Wray, 2005, p. 180; Taylor, 2011, p. 101) or what Foucault referred to in the 'Lectures' as the new society of enterprise (Foucault, 2008; 2009).

Phase 2 began in the 1990s and was centred on reforming or modernising the welfare state (see Whitfield, 2012). The financial autonomy of local government was curbed in this period through a series of budget cuts and a policy of 'rate capping' (see Frost and North, 2013, p. 14) and it has been argued that local government lost many of its political and economic powers (see Massey and Rustin, 2013, p. 216). Local government was radically transformed in the image of the market and reforms based on competition, commercialisation and the introduction of quasi-markets were introduced with the local state becoming a purchaser as opposed to a provider of services (see Cochrane, 2000, p. 129; Cutler and Waine, 2000, p. 319; Newman, 2003, p. 13). Dardot and Laval argue that public services were divided into independent agencies, given specific objectives, governed by norms fixed by the control centre, exposed to competition, and subjected to the sovereign decisions of consumers (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 229). Similarly, Whitfield notes the ways in which market mechanisms were introduced across local government including the pricing of tasks and activities and the introduction of a system of payment by results (Whitfield, 2012, p. 29).

According to Whitfield, 'client' and 'contractor' roles were separated as local authorities became 'commissioning' agents rather than direct providers of services.

Phase 3 started in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century and is considered as the current phase of neoliberalisation (see Whitfield, 2012). It involves themes I investigate in this research most notably the furthering of the project to create markets in local government. In addition, neoliberalism's third phase is informed by an economic context shaped by austerity (see Chapter 1) which Whitfield argues has accelerated privatisation and the contracting out of public service to cheaper providers. In this context the voluntary sector or third sector has become an important player in the provision of public goods and services (see, Cunningham, 2000, p. 226; Gordon, 1991, p. 36; Newman, 2003, p. 83; Poole, 2007).

Dunleavy and Hood provided an important summary of the changes which occurred in local government during the era of neoliberalism and they argued that the changes involved the following key features:

- Reworking budgets to be transparent in accounting terms, with costs attributed to outputs not inputs and outputs measured by quantitative performance indicators.
- Viewing organisations as a chain of low cost principal/agent relationships (rather than fiduciary or trustee-beneficial ones), networks of contracts linking incentives to performance.
- Disaggregating separable functions into quasi-contractual or quasi market forms, particularly by introducing purchaser/provider distinctions, replacing previously unified functional planning and provision structures.
- Opening up provider roles to competition between agencies or between public agencies, firms, and not-for-profit bodies.

(Dunleavy and Hood, 1994, p. 9).

In addition, Osborne and Gaebler argued that a new set of principles had emerged which they conceptualised in terms of local government:

- Steering not Rowing.

- Empowering rather than serving communities.
- Funding outcomes, not inputs.
- Meeting the needs of the customer, not the bureaucracy.
- Earning rather than spending.
- Prevention rather than cure.
- From hierarchy to participation and teamwork.

(Osborne and Gaebler, 1992).

The new principles were based on a conceptual shift away from the idea of government to that of governance with local states, 'orchestrating rather than commanding' (Davies, 2013, p. 4). The neoliberalisation of local government also created a new material landscape and as we shall see it produced a new culture shaped by business values and practices. It was in this context that techniques associated with New Public Management (NPM) or new managerialism made their first appearance in history and in the next section I consider the key features of new managerialism in local government.

#### *New Managerialism and Local Government*

New Public Management (NPM) techniques were introduced in local government in the mid-1980s and involved a series of administrative and bureaucratic practices which included performance indicators, audits, the devolution of budgetary control to junior managers and a new focus on outcomes and outputs as opposed to processes. According to Pollitt, NPM was informed by the broader political agenda of reducing the size and scope of government by decreasing public expenditure and also by improving the productivity of the workforce (see Pollitt, 1993). Pollitt's account interested me because it established NPM techniques not as politically neutral but connected with wider structures of power. Similarly, Clarke and Newman described NPM as forming part of a 'permanent revolution' occurring in local government (see Clarke and Newman, 1997) and it was noted that the 'revolutionaries' (or 'modernisers' as they saw themselves) increasingly looked towards the private sector for influence and inspiration. According to Teelken, public organisations 'copying techniques from the private sector is one of the earliest features of new public managerialism' (Teelken, 2012, p. 271).

The first reforms associated with NPM – especially the introduction of performance indicators across local government in 1985, were overseen by the UK Treasury and according to Carter, et al, the perspective of the Treasury was simple; ‘where is the money going and what are we getting for it’ (see Carter, et al, 1995). According to Pollitt, NPM was concerned with ‘results, performance and outcomes’ (Pollitt, 1996, p. 48). An important text from the period was the document, the ‘Financial Management Initiative’ (FMI, 1985), which was published in the same year as the Audit Commission was formed. The FMI highlighted the political nature of new public management and according to the FMI, techniques such as PI’s and audits should be used to address the growth in both the scale and the scope of ‘unprecedented state activity since the end of the Second World War’ (see FMI, 1985). Furthermore, the FMI called for a ‘managerial revolution’ and consequently management was given new procedural powers based on the measurement of performance. According to the FMI, ‘managers at all levels of government should have a clear view of their objectives, and assess, and wherever possible measure, outputs or performance in relation to these objectives’ (Ibid, 1985).

‘Performance Indicators’ (PI’s) were a significant part of NPM and I mention them because their introduction marked the moment when central government took on a greater strategic role in controlling the outputs of local government. According to the FMI, PI’s were an ‘essential tool’ if central government was to maintain control over the implementation of policies at the local level (Ibid, 1985). Carter, et al, suggested that PI’s were based on three mutually dependent components; first, the specification of objectives, not only for government policies but for individual units within the government machine; second - precise and accurate allocation of costs to particular units and third - PIs should assess success in achieving objectives (Carter, et al, 1995, p. 5). According to the FMI, PI’s involved a ‘standardisation of work tasks’ (FMI, 1985) and in this context Carter et al argued that ‘the greater the standardisation of work tasks, the more effectively the centre can measure and control performance’ (Carter, et al, 1995).

Walsh argued in relation to education that PI’s – coupled with the increased powers of management, led to many professionals feeling that they were being ‘micro-managed’ (Walsh, 2006, p. 106). Similarly, Chan framed PI’s as part of a ‘new accountability’ narrative which reflected a commitment to push control further into organisational structures, inscribing it with systems which could then be audited (Chan, 2001, p. 255). PI’s were also introduced across Community Education in 1993 which I discuss in the next chapter, but in relation to this discussion they were greeted with ‘strong resistance’ from some sections of the workforce (see McCulloch and Tett, 1996, p. 21). These accounts interested me because they suggested that PI’s created new sites of conflict between

managers and professionals especially in relation to issues around trust and autonomy. In addition, we also see in the first critiques of PI's the idea – discussed in depth in a moment, that new managerialism led to the de-professionalisation of the traditional professional subject. It is also important to note – and this is a theme I investigate in community development, that the introduction of New Public Management techniques were made possible by a revolution in information technology across the public sector (see Goldstein, 2012, p. 268; Correia, 2013, p. 255 Pollitt, 1986, p. 160) which resulted in the appearance of 'computerised bureaucracies' (Casey, 1995, p. 86). According to Carter, et al, PI's were 'the children of information technology' (Carter, et al, 1995, p. 180).

One of the distinguishing features of New Public Management is that it was informed by a view of local government as a market and in a discussion on performance indicators it was noted that:

'Public sector organisations are also involved in another market – the competition for shares of the public purse. One might speculate that the pressure to secure government finance will act as a spur to develop PI's that can be used to support the case for extra resources' (Carter, et al, 1995, p. 30).

The idea that the public sector was a market and that professionals were competitive actors derived from a view of the world shaped by ideas associated with the 'Neoliberal Thought Collective' discussed in Chapter 2. By the 1970s/1980s, this view of the world was referred to as 'Public Choice Theory' (PCT) and in the next section I discuss how PCT influenced how social relations were conceptualised in local government.

### *Public Choice Theory*

Public Choice Theory is based on applying theories associated with economic liberalism (or neoliberalism) to the study of collective institutions (see Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 235). The intellectual origins of PCT can be traced to ideas associated with Hayek, Becker and Mises: for example, the idea that the public sector was a market derived from Hayek (see Chapter 2). In addition, Becker, argued that economics, which he described as a 'unified framework for understanding all human behaviour' (see Becker, 1976) could be applied to any type of setting or institution (see Davies, 2017, p. 91). Similarly, Mises – who was perhaps the founding father of PCT, argued that collectivist or socialist planning inevitably led to mass bureaucracy or what he described

as 'bureacratism' (see Mises, 1944). He also claimed that bureaucratic management, 'was unaccountable and generative of its own internal impulses, which were removed from people's real needs and wants' (see Mises, 1944). Influenced by a way of thinking shaped by neoliberalism, the Public Choice Theorists constructed the professional subject as a rational actor motivated by self-interest (see Lane, 1993, p. 155). According to the narrative, professionals formed 'self-serving producer monopolies' (see Flynn, 1999) which resulted in welfare states and local government becoming 'unnecessary costly', 'deeply inadequate' and responsible for the growth of 'salaried bureaucrats' (Pollitt, 1996, p. 44). Professionals or 'salaried bureaucrats' were described as 'privileged public sector elites' motivated by the 'pursuit of power' (Lane, 1993, p. 55). Furthermore, they created vast bureaucracies and had a tendency to overproduce services relative to the real needs of the population (see Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 236).

According to PCT's, professionals' socially manufactured dependency in order to further their own self-interest and this view of professionals shaped how the proponents of new managerialism viewed the public sector; in particular they came to believe that professionals had a vested interest in growing the public sector bureaucracy and increasing public expenditure. PCT's also viewed the behaviour of professionals, especially management as mirroring the behaviour of actors in the private sector and according to Dardot and Laval, 'while a private enterprise seeks to maximise profit, the department seeks to maximise its budget' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 235). Similarly, Tullock argued that:

'As a general rule, a bureaucrat will find that his possibilities for promotion increase, his power, influence, and public respect improve, and even the physical conditions of his office improve, if the bureaucracy in which he works expands...almost any bureaucrat gains at least something if the whole bureaucracy expands. He gains more, however, if his ministry expands, and more yet if the sub-division in which he is employed expands' (Tullock, 2006, p. 64).

Buchanan believed that the behaviour of self-interested professionals caused 'big government' and 'ever spiralling public expenditure' (Buchanan, 1975, cited in Lane, 1993).

From the perspective of PCT, performance indicators, audits, the devolution of budgetary control and the increasing use of inspections – these can be seen as the administrative means through which privileged professionals would be subjected to 'the sharpness of private sector disciplines'

(Pollitt, 1996, p. 57). New Public Management techniques emerged in Public Choice Theory as a set of political practices explicitly linked with neoliberalisation and consequently I argue that new managerialism constitutes what Foucault referred to as a specific form of governmentality (see Foucault, 2008). According to Dardot and Laval:

‘The technical and tactical aspect of NPM made it possible to conceal the fact that the main point was precisely to introduce private sector disciplines and categories, to increase political control throughout the public sector, to reduce budgets and civil service, to restrict the autonomy of professions, and to weaken public sector trade unions – to rationalise in practice the neoliberal restructuring of the state’ (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 231).

In the next section I discuss the impact of new managerialism on the professions. I begin by introducing the reader to the idea of de-professionalisation, which emerged as one of the principal concepts in this work.

#### *New Managerialism and De-professionalisation*

The main feature of de-professionalisation in relation to new managerialism rests on a number of claims most notably the argument that professionals were being de-skilled, especially by the rise in bureaucratic work which was associated with computerisation and routine administrative procedures. Flynn suggested that there was a ‘deliberate and systematic managerial strategy to de-professionalise expert labour, to proletarianise it, subject it to increased fragmentation and de-skilling, more bureaucratic monitoring and performance evaluation’ (Flynn, 1999, p. 31). Similarly, Firth describes a ‘proliferation of paperwork - forms filled in and stored away, data inputted into a computer - the results managed by a ‘virtual bureaucracy’ that comes into being only during inspection visits’ (see Firth, 2012, p. 60). According to Firth the implications for the professions were profound and the era of professional independence had given way to one of scrutiny, regulation, guidelines and policies to be implemented (Ibid p. 60). In addition, Flynn associated the ‘shrinkage of professional’s work autonomy’ caused by bureaucratisation with an ‘expansion of power in line managers’ (Flynn, 1999 p. 30). From this perspective, Exworthy and Halford argue that new managerialism is a ‘secret weapon with which to curb the powers of overly independent professionals’ (Exworthy and Halford, 1999, p. 1). According to Fournier, ‘bureaucratisation’ involves a process of rationalisation and codification of professional knowledge that erodes professional

labour' – Fournier concludes that bureaucratisation challenges the 'legitimacy and foundations of the professions' (Fournier, 2000, pp. 67-68). Noordegraaf argued that in the era of new managerialism, 'professional autonomies are hard to maintain' (Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 763).

The focus on performance management – sometimes referred to as 'performativity', is cited as one of the biggest causes of de-professionalisation. In education, the pressures generated by performance management are said to have contributed towards social anxiety amongst professionals, a process which has caused the 'terrors of performativity' (see Lyotard, 1984).

According to Ball:

'Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as a means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on regards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgment' (Ball, 2003, p. 216).

In Ball's analysis, which influenced my own understanding of how 'performativity' could be applied in community development, the 'field of judgment' was defined, controlled, regulated, scrutinised and monitored by an alliance which included management, governmental inspectors and officials within the top levels of the hierarchy in local government.

Meng, drawing upon Ball's analysis, argued that 'performativity' is linked with the neoliberal economy on the grounds that it privileged 'measurable outcome goals, often in the service of the economy' (Meng, 2009, p. 160). Biesta argued that the demand for measurement presents a dilemma for professionals and managers: do we measure what we value, or value what we measure – and Biesta suggested that in education the obsession with performativity produced a culture in which 'means becomes ends in themselves so that targets and indicators of quality become mistaken for quality itself' (Biesta, 2008, p. 35). Biesta concluded that a normative validity is being replaced by a technical validity. Similarly, Walsh suggests that performativity has left the system 'empty of educational discourse and replaced it with an instrumentalism whose very jargon exposes its lack of human value' (Walsh, 2006, p. 113).

In a theme which I explored in community development, Walsh argued that performance cultures produced, 'strategically manipulated evidence and outcomes as an end in itself' (Walsh, 2006, p. 109). In addition, the 'terrors of performativity' were said to be one of the biggest contributory factors in accounting for the low morale of teacher staff (see Ball, 2003; Locke, et al, 2005; Walsh, 2006). In one study of almost 11,000 teachers by the National Union of Teachers, teaching staff complained of 'undermining duties' such as 'low level administrative tasks and the paperwork for Ofsted inspections'; teachers also identified 'bureaucracy and paperwork' as two out of the top three pressures facing them (see Walsh, 2006, pp. 101-102). In another study by Locke, et al, 'bureaucratic paperwork' was said to be the 'most tiresome' aspect of teaching' whilst a 'rigorous inspection culture' was leading to teachers 'losing confidence, feeling inadequate, de-professionalisation, increased workplace stress and anxiety' (Locke, et al, 2005, p. 566). According to the School Teachers Review Body, increased bureaucratic demands were said to be responsible for stress, even low morale:

'Teachers of all levels, and in all schools, had perceived a change in their workload. The working day was thought to be longer and more intensive than in previous years...teachers were uncomfortable with their workload, both in terms of the number of hours they were working and intensity of their working day. They commented that this often left them feeling exhausted, stressed and low in morale' (School Teachers Review Body, 2000, cited in Walsh, 2006, p. 103).

In higher education - where professional autonomy is assumed to be greater than in other sectors, managerialism has been described in terms of an 'externally imposed' set of practices (see Deem and Brehony, 2005, p. 225). These practices are discussed in terms of 'marketisation' and the imposition of an 'audit culture' in the universities (see Beck and Young, 2005, p. 183) and according to Teelken, the autonomy of academic staff is challenged by new managerialism in the sense that the 'target culture' has transformed universities from 'communities of scholars' into 'workplaces'<sup>5</sup> (Teelken, 2012, p. 272). According to Bernstein, the impact of performance management regimes on the universities has profound implications for the ways in which education is constructed as a concept:

---

<sup>5</sup> Teelken's research suggests that the performance of researchers is continually measured through counting the number of times staff are published in journals (Teelken, 2012, p. 279). According to one informant, 'if you were a junior member of staff, and you started on a short term contract for three years, and didn't do any research in those three years and didn't perform well, the contract wouldn't be renewed' (Ibid, p. 281).

'Of fundamental importance, there is a new concept of knowledge and its relation to those who create and use it...Knowledge, after nearly a thousand years, is divorced from inwardness and literally dehumanised...what is at stake is the very concept of education itself' (Bernstein, 2000, p. 86).

Moreover, academics, like their educational counterparts in schools were also said to experience 'performance anxiety' as a consequence of the terrors of performativity (see Lees, et al, 2011, p. 547).

It is important to note that research findings in higher education are mixed and some researchers have highlighted the positive effects of new public management. For example, Teelken suggests that 'transparency and accountability can help institutions to improve the quality of their teaching and research' (Teelken, 2012, p. 272). Moreover, far from being subjugated to the terrors of performativity, some 'employees adapt their activities to the simplifying tendencies of the quantification of outputs' (Ibid p. 272). Similar conclusions were also drawn from a study of social workers which found that many found 'reassurance and relief from anxiety through the performance of 'ritual tasks' required by assessment procedures and court documentation' (Lees, et al, 2011, p. 550). In another social work study, 'ritual tasks' and the completion of 'tick box forms' were said to make the work 'safer and less challenging' whilst at the same time as creating a culture of busyness, of 'running madly and getting nowhere' (Irvine, 2012, p. 393).

The dominant theme in de-professionalisation narratives is that the privileged status of professional workers, especially around issues relating to autonomy, closure and trust, was challenged by new public management (see Walsh, 2006, p. 96). The professional subject is defined by Exworthy and Halford as some committed to the provision of expert services and advice and who depends for their power and authority on specialist knowledge which supersedes the confines of any single organisation (Exworthy and Halford, 1999, p. 1). I would suggest that Exworthy and Halford's proposition that professional knowledge 'supersedes the confines of any single organisation', creates an inherent conflict between professionalism and new managerialism because the latter is primarily the product of organisational power, especially the power of the state. In addition, Dardot and Laval argue that NPM's 'quantitative obsession with measuring the social world' brings it into conflict with the 'qualitative dimensions of the professional project' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 250). Moreover they note that:

‘Management is based on an illusion of quantitative mastery of the effects of action. The purely quantitative interpretation of the results of an activity which is dictated by use of ‘performance indicators’ guiding the control of these services comes into contradiction with the experience of the profession and its non-quantifiable dimensions’ (Ibid p. 250).

The de-professionalisation thesis also raised new sociological concerns about the status of professionals in society and according to those influenced by the Marxist analysis of class, traditional professionals who once belonged to the ‘middle class’ (see Casey, 1995; Perkin, 2006, p. 3), were now said to have been ‘proletarianised’ by new managerialism and neoliberalisation (see Elston, 1991; see MacDonald, 1995, p. 23; Smith, et al, 1991). According to Derber, the use of the term ‘proletarianisation’ implies that professionals are exploited subjects (see Derber, 1982).

Pollitt argues - in relation to the ‘proletarianisation’ thesis, that the concept of a lifetime career in public service become less common during the neoliberal era (Pollitt, 1986, p. 155) and in a similar vein Sennett suggested that the very notion of jobs or jobs for life have been replaced by the temporal notion of ‘projects’ or ‘fields of work’ (Sennett, 1998, p. 22). Modern professionals were also said to face constant ‘ambiguity – persistent uncertainty, confusion and contradiction’, regarding not only their professional roles but also their status in society (Karreman, et al, 2002, cited in, Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 769). Casey situates de-professionalisation within a wider context of ‘post-industrialism’ and argues that the conditions of the post-industrial economy are such that the middle class is now at risk of losing its relatively stable position, especially as many middle class jobs, particularly in middle management become redundant (Casey, 1995, p. 19).

Yet, de-professionalisation is a problematic concept and I found myself increasingly interested in literature which considered the ways in which the professions were also reinvented and reconfigured by new managerialism. As noted, this struck a theoretical chord with Foucault’s proposition that neoliberalism was a productive power and viewed this way, rather than causing the death of the professions, it is argued that the professions were simultaneously (and dialectically) re-professionalised by new managerialism and neoliberalism. In the next section I introduce the reader to the concept of re-professionalisation.

### *Managerialism and Re-professionalisation*

The key word in re-professionalisation narratives is 'adaptation'. According to Noordegraaf, professions are forced to adapt to social changes, capitalist pressures, and consumerist tendencies which resist autonomous, closed off spheres (Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 763). Moreover, re-professionalisation is shaped by Freidson's analysis that any attempts at producing a 'fixed position' on professionalism is futile (see Freidson, 1994). In a similar vein, Flynn argues that simple dichotomies of either professional autonomy or bureaucratic and managerial control are inadequate tools for describing relations which are complex and dynamic (Flynn, 1999, p. 22). From this perspective, Noordegraaf notes that modern professions necessarily combine bureaucratic and professional control (Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 769). Moreover, Exworthy and Halford argue that professionals adapt and incorporate new managerial skills into their repertoires as part of a career strategy, which often involves moving into management (Exworthy and Halford, 1999).

According to Evans, the fusion between managerialism and professionalism creates a 'new professionalism' (Evans, 2010, p. 29), a term which I deployed in relation to community development and one I consider in the next chapter. At the heart of the 'new professionalism' is a blurring of the grounds between 'professional work' and 'managerial work' (Ibid, 2010) and consequently Flynn and Hoggett have argued that rather than try and control professionals by managers a better strategy is to convert professionals into managers (see Flynn, 1999, p. 21; Hoggett, 1991). Causer and Exworthy made a similar point in relation to social work arguing that in the post-NPM era, the managerial component of established managerial professional roles has increased whilst social workers will experience greater accountability to managers for their use of resources; they also noted that the social work role would become increasingly managerial in nature (Causer and Exworthy 1999, p. 97).

Causer and Exworthy argued that impact of new managerialism on social work was transformative and that a 'radical re-structuring of social work' and the appearance of the 'the quasi-managerial practitioner' had occurred (Ibid, 1999). Causer and Exworthy's argument interested me because it highlighted the ways in which a profession born in the era of Social Democracy could be remade and re-configured and re-adapted for the neoliberal times. The idea that the professions were reinvented challenged those Marxian positions discussed earlier, which suggested that professional labour was 'proletarianised' by new managerialism and neoliberalisation. Jones argues in relation to social work, that rather than 'proletarianisation' the managerialist agenda has enhanced the professional status of social workers whereby, 'being embedded in local authority structures' has

increased salaries and resulted in better 'career progression' (see Jones, 1999, p. 44). Simpkin and Bolger suggested that many social workers viewed their identity in the post-NPM era not just in terms of being 'professional social workers' but also as 'employees of the local authority' (Simpkin, 1979 and Bolger, 1981, cited in Jones, 1999, p. 45).

The concept of re-professionalisation has wider implications for the theorising of the professions, especially those professions situated in welfare states. Noordegraaf argues that traditional 'situated professions' which once possessed a degree of occupational control and regulation have metamorphosed into 'hybridised professions' which are embedded within organisation systems (Noordegraaf, 2007, pp. 771-773). Moreover, 'hybridised professions' are said to incorporate business-like and market driven managerialism into their professional practices (see Clarke and Newman, 1997; Duyvendak, Knijn and Kremer, 2006; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000) and according to Fournier, 'some professions may be better equipped than others (in terms of discursive and material resources) to remake themselves and to align their field of knowledge with the logic of the market' (Fournier, 2000, p. 84). Rather than causing de-professionalisation, Noordegraaf and Schinkel argued that new managerialism can also help enhance and maintain the 'symbolic capital' that is associated with professionalism (Noordegraaf and Schinkel, 2011, p. 100).

In concluding this section on re-professionalisation it is important to note that 'true professionalism' in Noordegraaf's terms is 'flawed' and 'suspect' because the definition of 'profession' is restricted to time and space and also because 'strong professionalism' is hard to attain' (Noordegraaf, 2007, pp. 763-773). Moreover, ideas associated with 'hybridised professionalism' or the 'new professionalism', suggested that the professions were reinvented and highlighted the complex interaction which occurs in practice between professional, bureaucratic and managerial regimes (Newman, 2003, p. 17). The concept of a 'new professionalism' (see Evans, 2010) which I explore in the next Chapter, was conceptually important in terms of thinking about community development in relation to the argument that a paradigm shift has occurred in the professions as a consequence of new managerialism and neoliberalism.

The term 'professional' is used in this work to refer to both practitioners and managers and in the next section I explore literature which specifically considers the ways in which new managerialism has transformed public sector management.

### *New Managerialism and Public Sector Management*

The traditional public sector manager is often constructed in the literature as someone who is a 'conformist', 'self-interested' and 'career motivated' (see Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Halford and Leonard, 1999, p. 104). In addition, they are seen as 'organisational assets' (Exworthy and Halford, 1999) and although these representations are based on 'ideal types', they are important on the grounds that they provide characterological insights into the behavioural traits of the 'managerial cadre' called upon by the state to implement new managerialism (see Exworthy and Halford, 1999). Furthermore, the 'managerial cadre' are often the official advocates of new ways of thinking about the provision of public goods and services shaped by new managerialism. This analysis suggests that techniques and technologies associated with new managerialism are not enforced on the professions from the outside but are enacted by managers from within the professions and consequently management played a strategically important role in the transformation of the professions.

In the post NPM era management has become a profession in and of itself (see Bottery, 2006, p. 181) and an important development in this process has been the rise of certificated management training. This is linked with new managerialism and according to Reichard, 'public managers should be trained and educated for New Public Management' (Reichard, 1998, cited in Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 776). Similarly, Shanks et al, argue that 'managerial training may be attributed to the influence of managerialism' (Shanks, et al, 2014, p. 14). Discussing the history of management training, Clarke and Newman argue that the first wave of new managerialism brought with it an 'explosion' in managerial courses and certification, especially MBA's and Diplomas, accompanied by a rise in both inspirational and technical management books (see Clarke and Newman, 1997, p. 35). Thrupp and Willmott have described management training as 'hands on' and they argue that 'despite a few notable exceptions', the literature on management training has been 'unreflective and tends towards uncritical acceptance of the status quo' (Thrupp and Willmott, 2003, pp. 202-206).

Newman and Clarke argue that management training is informed by an 'ideological project' to win 'hearts and minds' to the new public management agenda (Newman and Clarke, 1997). In addition the new ideology owed its intellectual origins to ideas derived from Public Choice Theory, especially, those which claimed that professionals could not be trusted and that the best way to organise public services is by imitating techniques, practices and discursive repertoires drawn from the private sector. In this context, managers have become the official advocates of a 'new language' which is transforming the public sector with work discussed in terms of 'outcomes', 'outputs', 'baselines' and

so forth (see Pollitt, 1996, p. 57). I argue that these discursive changes are best understood when situated in relation to new practices associated with privatisation, contracting out and commissioning and in this context values and practices drawn from the world of business are increasingly promoted by management. Pollock, discussing research into managers in the health service described the 'new management cadre' as 'capable administrators' but argued that 'all of them' - 'including those with substantial experience in the service – are now obliged to conform to an essentially business culture' (Pollock, 2004, p. 1). Similarly, Walsh, argues in relation to teaching that, educational staff are 'managed within an environment that draws freely on the terminology of business, commerce and industrial practice' (Walsh, 2006, p. 97). In a similar vein, Firth claims that in the health service, those who do not engage with the programme were cast aside as 'dinosaurs' (Firth, 2012).

New managerialism is also said to encourage managers to think of themselves as business leaders and entrepreneurs, especially through the introduction of new practices such as the devolution and de-centralisation of budgetary control (see Newman, 2000, p 50; Langan, 2000, p. 159). Although devolving budgetary control to the level of operational or junior managers is welcomed by some (see Shanks, Lundstrom and Wiklund, 2014, pp. 1-17), others have greeted it with scepticism. For example, Hoggett argues that administrative decentralisation and managerial devolution coincided with a reinforcement of centralised budgetary and strategic control (Hoggett, 1987; 1991). Similarly, Taylor-Gooby and Lawson note that 'power over the essentials was retained centrally while management of the inessentials was decentralised' (Taylor-Gooby and Lawson, cited in Clarke and Newman, 1997, p. 23). Viewed this way, Newman argues that despite the apparent focus on 'de-centring outwards', it is also possible to characterise NPM techniques as highly prescriptive and state centred (Newman, 2003, p. 56).

The psychological effects of decentralisation of budgets on managers is potentially transformative and in social work, Harris argued that decentralisation produced a 'budget consciousness' whereby operational managers behaved as if they personally 'owned' the budget and the fiscal responsibilities which accompanied it (see Harris, 1998, p. 855). Consequently, it was argued that the traditional social worker had been hollowed out and replaced with a professional worker better understood as a 'care manager' who was responsible for administering 'packages of care' (see Harris, 1998, pp. 839-862; Jones, 1999, p. 47; Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 776). Arguments such as these suggested that new managerialism (and neoliberalisation) were remaking professions and producing new professional subjects. In addition, the concept of 'budget consciousness' (see Harris, 1998) or

fiscal consciousness provided me with a theme to investigate with professionals in community development.

The turn to new managerialism has also brought with it new procedural powers for public sector managers and a narrative was established in the post-NPM era of management's 'right to manage' (see Marsh and McAlpine, 2008, p. 116). Flynn notes that management is an 'authority relation and embodiment of organisational power' (Flynn, 1999, p. 25), whilst Reed argues that, 'managers must construct a control apparatus to ensure that the productive potential inherent within labour power is translated into actual performance' (Reed, 1992, p. 8). According to Pollitt the 'right to manage' narrative is a challenge to the 'privileges of public sector professionals', especially around issues such as 'autonomy and self-regulation' (Pollitt, 1996, p. 130). Similarly, Clarke and Newman suggest that managers have discovered new powers in relation to 'regulation, contracting, monitoring and surveillance' (Clarke and Newman, 1997, p. 26). Exworthy and Halford argue that managerial 'modernisers' have used different techniques - some authoritative and others based on winning hearts and minds in order to encourage staff to 'love change' and even 'thrive on chaos' (Exworthy and Halford, 1999). Some of these themes are explored in later chapters, especially in relation to changing managerial styles in community development and the ways in which relations between managers and professionals are mediated by new managerialism.

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 3 has explored the origins of new managerialism in local government and I argued that the turn towards New Public Management was a product of neoliberalisation. I also considered the impact of new managerialism on the professions situated inside welfare states and I argued that the impact of new managerialism has been transformative. Two principal concepts emerged in this chapter which I draw upon throughout the rest of this thesis, namely de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. The main conceptual point to emerge in this chapter is that new managerialism and neoliberalisation are interlinked and from this perspective I frame new managerialism as an example of a very 'specific form of governmentality' and a site for the dissemination of 'new tactics and techniques' associated with neoliberalism (see Foucault, 2009, p. 106). In the next chapter I turn my attention to professional community development and I discuss literature which considers the impact of new managerialism and neoliberalisation in relation to the field. The chapter also provides a history of professional community development in the UK exploring why professionalism is a contested and ambiguous concept in the field.

## **Chapter 4: A Brief History of Professional Community Development from the Social Democratic Consensus to the Era of Neoliberalism**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 4 introduces the reader to the concept of professional community development and I discuss the changing nature of professionalism in the UK. I argue that community development's relationship with professionalism is problematic and characterised by ambiguity and ambivalence which I explore historically via two traditions in community development which have been described as the 'technicist' and 'radical' traditions. The bulk of the chapter is focused on the Scottish context and I consider the ways in which professional community development in Scotland has been shaped by the discourses of Community Education (CE) and latterly Community Learning and Development (CLD). I explore key texts in the evolution of CE/CLD and in particular I focus on the ways in which professional identity was shaped by wider historical factors relating to the social democratic consensus and the neoliberalisation of the state, discussed in the previous Chapter. This chapter is also intended to read as a review of the literature on professionalism and community development and the impact of new managerialism and neoliberalism on the field. In addition the chapter draws upon Evett's concept of 'occupational' and 'organisational' professionalism (see Evetts, 2009) as a means of theoretically conceptualising the changing nature of professionalism in community development.

### *Professional Community Development: an Analysis of Key Debates*

The origins of professional community development in the UK can be traced to the social democratic consensus and the growth of the welfare state during the social democratic era (see Popple, 1995). Moreover, professional community development was a concept (and practice) intrinsically bound up with the wider politics of the state (see Craig, 1989; Meade, 2011; Mayo, 2011; Mowbray, 2010) and according to Emejulu 'the state has always been the key protagonist in British community development' where it was constructed as an 'official institutional practice of the welfare state' (Emejulu, 2015, pp. 41-44).

Professional community development first appeared in local government in the 1950s and was referred to as an 'approach to working' within social work where it was seen as social works 'third strand' (see Ledwith, 2011) or as a 'slightly exotic version of social work' (see Craig, et al, 2011, p.

12). Yet, by the late 1960s and early 1970s community development was recognised as a distinct practice in its own right within the welfare state, especially following the introduction of the Community Development Projects (CDP's) which as we shall see constituted an important moment in the history of British community development. Although defining community development is problematic (see Chapter 1), the UN has described it in the following terms:

‘A movement to promote better living for the whole community, with active participation and if possible on the initiative of the community ... by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it’ (United Nations, cited in Craig, et al 2011).

Taylor and Presley's understanding of professional community development is also useful, especially with the ways in which it framed CD in the era of social democracy and according to Taylor and Presley:

‘Community work is not a profession like any other. It is a profession dedicated to increasing the expertise of non-professionals; to increasing the capacity of people in difficult and disadvantaged situations, getting more control over their collective circumstances. Community workers stimulate and support groups of people working to improve conditions and opportunities in their own neighbourhoods. The immediate aims are often concrete – better amenities, housing, job opportunities; the underlying aim is an increase in confidence, skill and community self-organising power which will enable the participants to continue to use and spread these abilities long after the community worker has gone’ (Taylor and Presley, 1987).

In the above definition CD is presented as a profession but interestingly one ‘not like any other’ which suggests that the authors were uncomfortable with framing community development as a traditional profession. This hesitation is reflective of a wider theme in the literature namely that community development has historically had a problematic relationship with professionalism and in this context others have described that relationship as ‘ambiguous’ (see Craig, 2011; Mackie, et al, 2013) and ‘ambivalent’ (see Barr, 1991, p. 113) and according to Barr, community development's ambivalence towards professionalism sets it apart from most other occupational groups (Ibid, p. 113).

Ambiguity regarding professionalism is a product of two traditions which have existed throughout the history of community development; the first has viewed CD as a profession in the welfare state, comparable with say teaching or social work and Popple described this tradition as 'the technical school' (see Popple, cited in Shaw, 2008). Yet, community development has also been conceptualised as a social movement from below linked with social change and this idea has its origins in two discourses; the first is that of voluntarism and is based on voluntary organisations and volunteer work and the desire to work close to those in need of poverty (see Banks, 2004) and the second refers to an influential 'radical tradition' which has historically resisted professionalisation (see Alvarez, 1999; Cooke and Shaw, 1996; Craig, et al, 2011; Henderson, et al, 2011, p. 128; Miller and Bryant, 1990; Radford, 1978). According to Banks, the radical tradition was concerned with forming alliances with the poor and the working class and it characterised professionals as elitist, self-serving and distant from the people with whom they work (Banks, 2004, pp. 36-37).

The radical tradition produced an interesting critique of professionalism and raised an important question – in whose interests does professional community development serve. The radical critique was grounded in empirical analysis and in particular the intellectual works of a group of overtly left wing practitioners involved in the Community Development Project's (CDP's) of the late 1960s and early 1970s (see Community Development Project, 1977). As noted, the CDP's were an important development in the history of British CD and were introduced by the Home Office as a means of combatting inner-city poverty; however many of those involved in the CDP's criticised the Home Office's understanding of poverty which they argued was based on 'blaming the poor' and promoting the idea that poverty was a product of the dysfunctional lifestyle of a minority of the population (Ibid, 1977). Rather than 'blame the poor', which was referred to as the 'social pathology' model of poverty, those involved in the CDP's produced an analysis which became known as the 'structural analysis of poverty' (see Craig, et al, 2011, p. 6; Curno, et al, 1978; Popple, 1995, p. 13) and this analysis formed the theoretical basis of a radical critique of government policy and also professional community development.

According to Popple and Redmond, the structural analysis of poverty was based on the premise that it was the nature of capitalism and the resultant poverty which stemmed from capitalism which was the root causes of problems in communities (Popple and Redmond, 2000, p. 395). The structural analysis also centred on the theoretical premise that the state, despite being the main funder of community development, was also a site which reproduced capitalist social relations, which those involved in the CDP's believed was the cause of poverty and deprivation (see Craig, et al, 2011;

Popple, 1995). This analysis was influenced by a Marxian critique of capitalism and in particular Miliband's influential analysis of the role played by the state in maintaining capitalist conditions (see Miliband, 2009). The state appeared in this analysis not as a neutral agent concerned with the welfare of its citizens but rather as an entity which according to Shaw, often reinforced the very problem which community development was deployed to resolve (Shaw 2011, 139). This analysis led to the influential text 'In and Against the State' (see London Weekend Return Group, 1980) which focused on a theme which has re-appeared throughout the radical critique of professional CD, namely the tension that Marxist or radical practitioners have experienced between the type of politics they believe in and their actual practices as employees of the state.

As noted, the radical tradition viewed professionalism with scepticism and according to Emejulu, professionalism was part of a 'realist discourse', which 'marginalised and silenced radicalism' and sought to prove to the state that 'community development was legitimate, viable and effective without socialist theories' (Emejulu, 2015, p. 107). Corkey and Craig argued that professionalisation was based on 'maintaining the status quo' and that it undermined community activism and social movements (see Corkey and Craig, 1978; Mayo, 1998) and according to Cockburn, community workers should fight against professionalisation on the grounds that it neutralised the 'radical potential' of community work and prevented workers from developing a 'class consciousness' (Cockburn, 1977, pp. 168-176).

The radical critique of professionalism was also the subject of debate, especially by those sceptical of radical and socialist theories and practice that was overly political (see Smith, 1978). Furthermore, community development was framed in this technicist analysis as a profession rather than a social movement and according to Specht:

'Community work, as an enterprise, is closer to a profession than a social movement...A social movement ideology will simply not provide community workers with the range of knowledge and skill required to carry out these tasks. If they function with a narrow ideology, community workers will face continuing disappointment and frustration and – in the long run demonstrate incompetence' (Specht, 1975).

Specht's definition is useful and although written in 1975 it is relevant to contemporary discussions on practice, especially that which is situated in the context of local government. In addition, Thomas criticised the 'doctrinaire style' of many of those involved in the CDP's arguing that their critique

alienated practitioners and led to the devaluation of neighbourhood work (see Thomas, 1983). Similarly, Waddington argued that many practitioners found it difficult to apply radical theory to their own practice, partly because the material produced by the CDP's tended to be longer on analysis than applications (Waddington, cited in Popple, 1995, p. 36).

The technical and radical traditions were informed by two different interpretations of community development, one which viewed it as a profession and the other which saw it as a social movement from below. According to Shaw, the distinction between radicalism and technicism should be understood as a conceptual tool for analytical purposes rather than a dichotomy in which one has to take sides (see Shaw, 2008). Shaw's point is important because it influenced the ways in which professional community development would be framed in this work. Moreover, community development emerges in this analysis as a contradictory and ambiguous concept with roots in both welfare paternalism and autonomous working class struggle (Baldrick, 1980, cited in Shaw, 2008) and I argue that CD's ambiguity has made it an area of interest for policy makers during the era of both the social democratic consensus and neoliberalism which I consider later. Despite the radical critique of practice, which shaped my own analysis the general trajectory of community development in the UK has been shaped by the technicist paradigm and by the pursuit of a strategy of professionalisation. From this perspective, Crowther and Shaw argued that although 'critical of the orthodox professional wisdom, radical ideas never managed to challenge the dominant ideology of practice' (see Crowther and Shaw, 1995, p. 204).

In the next section I discuss professional community development in the context of Scotland where community development's professionalisation trajectory has differed from the rest of the UK. I argue that professionalism in Scotland is a product of two discourses, Community Education and latterly Community Learning and Development. I begin with a discussion on Community Education (CE) which I situate within the context of Scotland's social democratic state and drawing upon key texts from the period I explore the ways in which Community Education can be framed as an example of what Evetts refers to as 'occupational professionalism' (see Evetts, 2009).

### *Community Education: the Makings of a New Profession*

Community Education emerged in Scotland as a new profession in the mid-1970s following the publication of the landmark report, 'Adult Education: the Challenge of Change', a report better known as the 'Alexander Report'. This report laid the foundations for community development being

understood as an approach to working alongside adult education and youth work (see Scottish Education Department, 1975) and this model influenced how CD would be viewed in Scotland for the best part of four decades. The new profession – Community Education, was best understood when situated within the context of Scotland’s social democratic state and according to the prominent Scottish historian T.S Smout, the social democratic state had qualitatively improved social welfare in Scotland:

‘The coming of the collectivist state and its determination to turn over decision making to the experts once it had been agreed that a combination of economic growth and welfare was to be the main arm of government, bears much of the credit for the improved state of Scottish welfare since 1945’ (Smout, 1986, p. 275).

Smout’s proposition that experts or professionals played an important role in the welfare of Scotland is an important point and highlighted one of the distinguishing characteristics of professionalism in the era of social democracy, namely that professionals were regarded by government – and wider society, as motivated by the common good and through their collective endeavour were involved in the creation of a democratic and fairer society. I argue that this conceptualisation of professionalism which has also been described in terms of the ‘professional project’ (see Hassan and Shaw, 2011) and ‘professional frame’ (see Le Grand, 2003; 2007), influenced the ways in which the architects of Community Education conceived the new profession.

The ‘Alexander Report’ provided insights into the thinking behind the new profession and has been described as a ‘foundational text’ in the history of CE (see Mackie, et al, 2013). The concept of Community Education is approached by ‘Alexander’ in two ways: first, it refers to an organisational and administrative term – that is a way of administering adult education, youth work and community development services in local government: yet, importantly – especially in relation to professional identity, Community Education was also framed as a philosophical concept with an educative role to play in creating what ‘Alexander’ referred to as the ‘pluralist society’ or ‘democratic society’ and readers should note that this conceptualisation of CE influenced how the term was approached in this research.

‘Alexander’ was also important in terms of shaping my own understanding of community development and as noted in Chapter 1, CD was described in the report as follows:

‘The process by which those who live in a community (defined in either geographical or social terms) are helped or encouraged to act together in tackling the problems which affect their lives has come to be called community development’ (Scottish Education Department, 1975, p. 31).

‘Alexander’ also highlighted the ‘educational character’ of CD and in theory the ‘community development approach’ was said to provide ‘new opportunities for reaching those sections of the population hitherto untouched by adult education’ (Ibid, p. 31). Crowther and Shaw argued that community development was constructed in ‘Alexander’ as an ‘approach to working’ which informed both adult education and youth work (see Crowther and Shaw, 2013, p. 392) – and consequently the ‘generic community education worker’ emerged. This understanding of community development also allowed me to interview professionals drawn from youth work and adult education backgrounds.

The new generic professional had a role to play in equipping young people, adults and communities to participate in the democratic society and according to ‘Alexander’:

‘Citizen-participation in influencing the decisions of local government agencies can be effective only if the public understand the machinery of government and the legislative framework within which it operates. Without this knowledge increased participation leads to increased frustration and disillusionment’ (Scottish Education Department, 1975, p. 47).

Miller argues that the role of Community Education in promoting a pluralist or democratic society was unique for a profession (see Miller, 2004 cited in Shaw, 2008). Furthermore, ‘Alexander’ also contained within its narrative – and again this was unique for a profession, the idea that Community Education was a political vocation linked with social change. In this context, ‘Alexander’ encouraged professionals to ‘question the value of established practices and institutions and to propose new forms’ (Ibid, p. 27) and in an often quoted passage the report stated that:

‘The right to form groups, along with the right of opposition to and criticism of the government of the day and other forms of authority, is fundamental to a pluralist society...the very existence of such dissenting groups entitles us to describe our society as pluralist and to consider ourselves as living in a free community in which individuals

have the right to unite with likeminded people and give expression to their opinions’  
(Ibid, p. 27).

The architects of Community Education were guided by a democratic ethos whereby the professional worker was said to be answerable and accountable to local communities and a concern with promoting democracy has shaped the discursive history of the profession. For example, Tett argues that practice should ‘grow out of people’s experiences and the social interests that are generated within communities’ (see Tett, 2010, p. 18) and similarly, McCulloch and Tett claimed that in its many manifestations, community education kept before it ‘the commitment to focus on the issues and concerns of local communities’ (McCulloch and Tett, 1996, p. 18). The democratically minded practitioner was described by Martin as someone who, ‘works with people – not for them, let alone on them’ (Martin, 1987, p. 17). It is also important to note that the ‘Alexander Report’ also assigned a strategically important role to local government and suggested that ‘local states should have a statutory role in providing community education’ (Scottish Education Department, 1975, pp. 55-56); consequently, local government emerged as one of the key players in CE’s professionalisation strategy<sup>6</sup> (see Milburn, 1994; Milburn and Wallace, 2003).

In the next section I draw upon Evetts concept of ‘occupational professionalism’ (see Evetts, 2009) in order to theoretically consider the nature of professionalism in Community Education and I argue that occupational professionalism can be understood as one of the key features of professionalism in the era of social democracy.

### *Community Education and Occupational Professionalism*

According to Evetts, occupational professionalism is based on professions being ‘subject to internal regulation and control by ethical standards that are occupationally defined’ (see Evetts, 2009). From this perspective, the ‘Alexander Report’ was an important text on the grounds that it defined the nature of the Community Education and also the professional remit which proceeded it – that is community development was interlinked with adult education and youth work. Moreover,

---

<sup>6</sup> Martin argued that the establishment of Community Education as a local authority service, created a new set of challenges for the local state. According to Martin, ‘Community Education challenges established bureaucratic and professional demarcation lines...the question is whether employers are prepared to follow through the logic of this and accept that if local workers get their professional hands dirty, they cannot always keep their political noses clean’ (Martin, 1980, p. 103).

'Alexander' also recommended the establishment of a regulatory body which would define and regulate the new profession (see Scottish Education Department, 1975 pp. 56-57). Two regulatory bodies appeared, the Scottish Community Education Council (SCEC) and Community Education Validation and Endorsement (CEVE) and as we shall see, both played important roles in occupationally defining the profession. In addition, the claims that Community Education was an 'empowering profession' or 'dissenting vocation' (see Tett, 2010) and tasked with promoting what 'Alexander' referred to as the democratic society can also be interpreted from the perspective of professionalisation, as attempts by the CE 'community' to frame the new profession in terms of a 'moral endeavour situated outside the commercial logic of the market' (see Steeman, 1975, p 178).

The narrative that CE promoted the democratic society was a product of the social democratic times, especially ideas associated with the 'professional project' and 'professional frame' (see Hassan and Shaw, 2011; Le Grand, 2003; 2007) whereby as noted professionals were trusted social actors with important roles to play in promoting social welfare and democracy. Discussing the 'professional frame', Le Grand argued that 'the best way to ensure the delivery of efficient, responsive and equitable public services was by reposing trust in the judgment of public sector professionals' (Le Grand, 2003; 2007). In addition, CE's claims that it specialised in working with young people, adults, and communities can also be interpreted with professionalisation in mind, as a strategic attempt at establishing discrete areas of jurisdiction within the local state and in this context the professional practitioner emerged as a specialist who was said to possess 'exclusive competence' over a 'particular chunk of the world' (see Abbot, 1988).

In addition to 'Alexander', the next important text in the history of professional Community Education was the influential report, 'Professional Education and Training for Community Education', which was better known as the 'Carnegie Report'. 'Carnegie' was important on the grounds that it established Community Education and community development in Scotland, as a graduate profession and according to the report, the 'professional status of the community education worker' was dependent upon formal training – furthermore 'Carnegie' argued that 'entry to the career of community education should be limited to graduates or their equivalents' (Scottish Education Department, 1977, p. 7). Interestingly, 'Carnegie' viewed CE as a 'different type' of graduate profession:

'We would wish therefore to see arrangements made which would ensure that no candidate who was otherwise suitable and was judged to be capable of reaching degree

standard would be prevented from training to be a community education worker solely because his or her certified educational qualifications were below the normal standard for entry to a degree course' (Scottish Education Department 1977, p. 7).

Professional Community Education was also constructed in 'Carnegie' as a means through which working class students could become university graduates, a theme which I consider in relation to contemporary discussions on de-professionalisation in Chapter 6.

The advent of formal training was an important development in the professionalisation of CE and community development with professionalism codified through 'a discrete set of technical accomplishments' (see Shaw, cited in Rothe, 2011, p. 2), and these technical accomplishments were legitimised by the state (see Meade, 2012, p. 901). Kenny argues that professional training is often based on a view of CD which sees 'professional practice' as requiring particular skills and expert knowledge that are not necessarily found in communities (see Kenny, 2016, p. 49). Moreover, by establishing itself as a 'graduate profession', CE's professionalisation strategy involved 'boundary construction' (see Fournier, 2000) and 'social closure (see Flynn, 1999), both of which are important from the perspective of occupational professionalism in the sense that the profession internally decided the criteria for membership.

As noted, the 'Alexander Report' recommended the establishment of a body which could regulate the field (see Scottish Education Department, 1975, pp. 56-57) and SCEC and CEVE played important roles in defining, regulating and to some extent speaking 'the truth' about what constituted professional community development. In this context, SCEC argued that community education and community development were united by common values:

'Despite the differing traditions of adult education, youth and community work, there is common ground. They have, as a common aim, the building of a healthy democracy in a pluralist society...founded...on a belief in the individual as an active participant in a shared process of personal and group development through education' (SCEC, cited in, McConnell, 2002, p. 311).

Furthermore, CEVE had the power to produce a set of 'professional values' and to construct the 'professional worker' as someone who:

- Respects the individual and right for self-determination.
- Respects and values pluralism.
- Values equality and develops anti-discriminatory practice.
- Encourages collective action and collaborative working relationships.
- Promotes life-long learning.
- Encourages a participatory democracy.

(Ibid, 2002, p. 311).

From the perspective of occupational professionalism, the establishment of bodies such as SCEC and CEVE were important developments because both organisations contained many of the characteristics of professional associations. Moreover, as professional associations they ‘defined appropriate professional conduct’ (see Larson, 1977; Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 766) and provided the field with ‘occupationally defined principles and norms’ (see Banks, 2004). The official professional values were also a means of ‘guarding normative value systems in the field of practice’ (see Evetts, 2009) which further enhanced occupational control over the profession. According to Banks, the key feature of professional ethics traditionally are adherence to a set of principles and norms defined by a professional body, as opposed to an employer or auditing agency (Banks, 2004, p. 8).

It is also important to note that the trajectory of Community Education’s professionalisation strategy was influenced by forces outside of the profession, especially the local state. Consequently, CE also contained elements of what Evetts referred to as ‘organisational professionalism’ (see Evetts, 2009) that is a profession controlled by the employer or in this case the state – something I consider later in the chapter. Moreover, Noordegraaf’s concept of ‘situated professionalism’ is also useful in understanding CE and according to Noordegraaf a ‘situated profession’ refers to a professional area of practice situated within the welfare state (see Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 769). Although tensions exist in Evetts model between occupational and organisational professionalism I would argue that in the era of the social democratic consensus these tensions were minimal on the grounds that control by the profession (occupational professionalism) and control by the state (organisational professionalism) were mutually compatible in a context whereby the social democratic state was influenced by ideas drawn from the professional project and ‘professional frame’ (see Hassan and Shaw, 2012; Le Grand, 2007).

It is also important to note that the concept of Community Education has been the subject of a rich body of critique which featured many of the arguments which I described earlier in terms of the technician and radical traditions. As an organisational term, the idea that Community Education unified adult education, youth work and community development is considered problematic with Mackie et al, arguing that a culture of 'persistent competition' existed between the three strands leading to 'long term confusion between community education as a way of working and community education as an amalgamation of the three fields' (Mackie, et al, 2013, pp. 401-402). Moreover, as a philosophical concept, Community Education was criticised on the grounds that it was an 'all things to all men' concept (see Kirkwood, 1990; Martin, 1987), whilst Tett argued that the new profession suffered from 'inflated hype' (see Tett, 2010).

Crowther and Shaw provided a radical critique of the 'Alexander Report' and argued that it was 'riddled with pluralistic assumptions about society' which they found problematic, and claimed that it was 'flawed by the absence of any theoretical discussion of the purposes of community education' (Crowther and Shaw, 1995 p. 206). Similarly, Martin argued that Community Education lacked 'conceptual clarity and theoretical coherence' and described much of the literature on the subject as 'descriptive and uncritical' (see Martin, 1987, pp. 10-11). Martin also argued in relation to local government that, Community Education was 'presented as a consumer service, discussed entirely in market terms – provision that is prepared, packaged and peddled by professionals trained to perceive and interpret 'educational need' in the community' (Martin, 1980, p. 100).

We also find in the literature arguments that professional Community Education was 'bureaucratised' (see Nisbet and Watt, 1994) and two areas were of interest to me: first, the introduction of 'national competencies' across CE in the late 1980s and early 1990s (see Blacke, 1992; Crowther and Shaw, 1995; Jeffs and Smith, 1993) and also the introduction of performance indicators in 1993 whereby professional Community Education first encountered New Public Management (see McCulloch and Tett, 1996). The national competencies were introduced by CEVE and included competencies such as 'Engage with the Community', 'Develop Relevant Learning and Educational Opportunities', 'Empower the Participants', 'Organise and Manage Resources' and 'Practice Community Education within Different Settings' (CEVE, cited in Bamber, 2010). The introduction of these competencies sparked debate within the field and McCulloch and Martin argued that they were too reliant upon an instrumental view of competence (the ability to do/perform) as opposed to critical understanding (see McCulloch and Martin, 1997). Crowther and Shaw provided an interesting and prescient critique in which they argued that the competencies

were dominated by the agenda of government and in a pre-cursor of concerns regarding de-professionalisation which were to follow, they claimed that practitioners were in danger of being turned into technicians and clerks (Crowther and Shaw, 1995, p. 209).

The competency debate of the 1990s was a forerunner of discussions about new managerialism which would occur in the new century. I would argue that professional bodies such as CEVE and SCEC had the power to determine what constituted 'competency' and from this perspective Community Education's 'distinctive epistemology and methodology' (see Tett, 2010) remained occupationally defined. Yet, their introduction – and also that of performance indicators, were indicative of wider trends happening across the public sector which I discuss in the previous chapter in relation to New Public Management and neoliberalism. In the following sections of this chapter I consider the impact of new managerialism and neoliberalism on Community Education (and community development) and I argue that the effects were transformative. I begin by introducing the reader to the concept of Community Learning and Development (CLD), which in the late 1990s became the new term for Community Education in local government.

#### *From Community Education to Community Learning and Development*

The New Labour government which came to power in 1997 issued for the first time since the Alexander Report a governmental report into Community Education and the report entitled 'Communities Change through Learning' (see Scottish Office, 1999) – also known as the 'Osler Report', became another foundational text in the evolution of the profession. The 'Osler Report' challenged many of the ideas inherent in 'Alexander', especially the legitimacy of the term 'Community Education'. According to 'Osler', community education was a 'confusing term', especially with regards to whether or not it referred to an 'educational process, a local authority service, an educational method or an aggregation of services' (Ibid, p. 17). 'Osler' drew the conclusion that Community Education had become a 'territorial concept' and stated that it was 'essential to convey the message that community education was not a 'territorial' concept but a pervasive approach to education' (Ibid, p. 9).

According to 'Osler', CE was better understood as a 'way of working than a sector of education' (Ibid, p. 15) and the idea that CE was a service or specific place within local government, which was one of the key recommendations of 'Alexander', was rendered problematic. The framing of CLD as an 'approach to working' rather than a service should be situated within a context which involved the

growth of the voluntary sector and community based organisations in the delivery of public services (see, Cunningham, 2000, p. 226; see Gordon, 1991, p. 36; Newman, 2003, p. 83; Poole, 2007) and according to 'Osler', many voluntary organisations were not convinced that 'Community Education' was an appropriate title for them (Scottish Office, 1999, p. 16).

The emphasis on 'approach to working' also created a new organisational context for practice and according to Mackie et al:

'The central structural mechanism for the practice is no longer a CE service, but local and regional CLD 'partnerships'...their work would be governed through the increasingly universal planning and audit techniques of managerialism and quality assurance: the establishment of plans, strategies, performance indicators and evaluative mechanisms to evaluate performance against objectives' (Mackie, et al, 2013, p. 403).

In this context, the profession was increasingly influenced by practices associated with New Public Management and the new managerial turn was reflected in the language of 'Osler' and also the influential report which preceded it, 'Working and Learning Together' - known in the field as 'WALT' (see Scottish Executive, 2004b). Both reports were littered with new managerial terms such as 'quality assurance frameworks', 'outcomes', 'outputs', 'performance', 'productivity' and 'measurement' and so forth (see Scottish Executive, 2004b; Scottish Office, 1999).

It is also important to note that whilst NPM techniques had been introduced before 'Osler', their emphasis was significantly different – for example, McCulloch and Tett's research into performance indicators suggested that the focus was on 'qualitative measures, with a strong emphasis on process' (McCulloch and Tett, 1996, p. 19). Similar points were made regarding process by CEVE in relation to the competency debate discussed earlier (see CEVE, 1990). 'Osler' however was critical of process and argued that 'the past concern with process and the lack of easily counted outputs, has led to suggestions that community education is unproductive' (see Scottish Office, 1999, p. 25). This was an important statement and was reflective of a conceptual shift in how the work of CE would be perceived with process giving way to a new focus on measurement and outcomes.

According to 'Osler', 'liberating Community Education from the limitations which past interpretations have imposed is a matter of urgency as there is an opportunity now, to make a major contribution to Government policies' (1999 p. 17). This was yet another significant statement and

was reflective of the realignment of the field with the priorities of government and consequently in the post-‘Osler’ era, Community Education’s three strands – youth work, adult education and community development, were re-configured as ‘governmental priorities’ and framed in terms of ‘work with young people, work with adults and work with communities’ (see Scottish Executive, 2004b).

The transformation from CE to CLD occurred in the midst of neoliberalism’s second phase which concerned the modernisation of local government and a turn towards new managerialism (see Whitfield, 2012). As noted in the previous chapter, professions in the welfare state were simultaneously de-professionalised and re-professionalised by new managerialism and neoliberalism and in the next section I explore these themes in relation to literature on community development and CE/CLD. I also discuss the extent to which my framing of Community Education as an occupationally defined profession remained relevant in the post-‘Osler’/new managerial era.

#### *De-professionalisation and Re-professionalisation in CE/CLD*

The literature is rich in arguments that CE/CLD professionals were de-professionalised by new managerialism. According to Mackie, a ‘Taylorisation of the practice’ occurred (Mackie, et al, 2013, p. 407), whilst Tett, argued that the work of CLD was narrower than Community Education and increasingly individualistic, especially in relation to the conceptual shift away from education towards learning (see Tett, 2010). The focus on ‘learning and development’ as opposed to education is a significant development and was accompanied by a new focus on ‘targeted work’ especially with the ‘deprived’, the ‘disadvantaged’, the ‘socially excluded’ and so forth. This can be seen as a return to the ‘social pathology model of poverty’ discussed earlier, whereby the dysfunctional lifestyles of the poor were said to be the primary cause of poverty<sup>7</sup> (see Community Development Project’s,

---

<sup>7</sup> It has been argued that a paternalistic view of local people and communities re-appeared in this period; for example, Thompson claimed that local people were often framed as ‘hapless victims’ (see Thompson, 2011, p. 236). Similarly, Fournier argues that communities were socialised into ‘problematizing their lives in terms that open them up to professional scrutiny’ (Fournier, 2000, p. 82). According to Cooke, targeted work drew artificial boundaries around communities and subsequently internalised ‘the issues and problems so that solutions were sought from within those hard pressed communities, obscuring the structural nature of these problems’ (Cooke, 1996, p. 9). In the current context, research has suggested that ‘targeted work’ is a product of austerity (see Bailey, et al, 2015, p. 617). The general rise of targeted work and the focus on ‘deprived areas’ can also be understood with regards to wider sociological changes caused by neoliberalism, which resulted in

1977). Shaw highlighted the ways in which community development work was being 'bureaucratised' as the work became shaped by 'facilitating partnership working...and managing the audit and management culture' (Shaw, 2009). According to Shaw:

'There is growing evidence of a lack of time or priority for engaging directly with groups of people on any basis: constrained by the straightjacket of performativity, the real work is increasingly left to casualised, low paid, sessional workers or external consultants. In this process, many practitioners are becoming, and are feeling themselves to be seriously deskilled' (Ibid, 2009).

Interestingly, Shaw framed the professional worker not as a passive victim but rather as an active agent in the modernisation agenda and noted that many professionals colluded in their own de-professionalisation:

'Many practitioners are beginning to understand that not only have they been compromised by their role as agents of modernisation, but that their own sense of professional identity and social purpose is simultaneously being dismantled – along with their capacity to challenge it' (Ibid, 2009).

According to Tett, new managerialism was producing a new culture in the field concerned with 'compliance rather than commitment' (Tett, 2010). Moreover, new managerial techniques concerned with measuring performance were said to be 'ineffective when policy problems are complex and require a strong value base and organisational culture' (Ibid, pp. 25-26). Tett's research into 'Early and Mid-Career' professionals raised concerns that practitioners were spending too much time on administration and bureaucracy and many reported that they were 'dissatisfied' with their work (see Tett, 2007, p. 15). These findings corresponded with research into the effects of new managerialism in teaching and social work which I discussed in the previous chapter.

Tett also argued that a price was paid by shifting the focus from the needs of communities towards the agenda of government:

---

the appearance of a group in society referred to as the 'underclass' (see Devine, 2012, p. 653; MacGregor, 1999, p. 98).

‘CLD was identified as a major contributor to the government’s strategic priorities, but at the same time its practices were more constrained because the focus on outcomes and other inspection regimes meant that there was less space for negotiation with communities about their priorities’ (Tett, 2010, p. 28).

Crowther and Moir’s analysis of professionalism and new managerialism made explicit reference to Foucault and governmentality theory – albeit within a Marxian analysis. According to Crowther and Moir:

‘Practitioners are being shaped and disciplined by these neoliberal times and accompanying technical rationality, potentially resulting in the contradictory situation in which practitioners become answerable to two masters, one representing the logic of the market, and the other, the values and ethics of the profession’ (Crowther and Moir, 2014).

In Crowther and Moir’s analysis, ‘the market’ is framed as something inimical to the ‘values and ethics of the profession’ and similarly, Shaw argued that a narrow focus on performance management or ‘performativity’ led to a ‘colonisation of the social and political dimensions of democratic life by market mechanisms’ (Shaw, 2008).

Yet, rather than professionals being torn between the logic of the market and the values of the profession, I would argue that a process of re-professionalisation was also occurring in CE/CLD during the new managerial era. As noted in Chapter 3, re-professionalisation is centred on the ways in which the professions adapt and reinvent themselves in a context shaped by new managerialism and neoliberalisation. From this perspective, a ‘new professionalism’ (see Banks, 2004; Evans, 2010; Noordegraaf, 2011) was also emerging and Banks claimed that gestures towards the new professionalism could be found in various codes of practice produced by professions such as social work and community development; Banks argues that the new codes of practice were linked with social justice, anti-discriminatory practice and client/user participation’ (Ibid p. 123). In relation to CLD, elements of the new professionalism could be found in the new set of professional values produced by the CLD Standards Council which were based on:

- Self-determination – respecting the individual and valuing the right of people to make their own choices.

- Inclusion – valuing equality of both opportunity and outcome, and challenging discriminatory practice.
- Empowerment – increasing the ability of individuals and groups to influence issues that affect them and their communities through individual and/ or collective action.
- Working collaboratively – maximising collaborative working relationships with the many agencies which contribute to CLD and/or which CLD contributes to, including collaborative work with participants, learners and communities.
- Promotion of learning as a lifelong activity – ensuring that individuals are aware of a range of learning opportunities and are able to access relevant options at any stage of their life.

(CLD Standards Council, 2009).

Furthermore, owing to their ambiguous nature, the official values of the profession provided a space for different interpretations of practice which suggested that even within tightly controlled managerial regimes, the spaces for creativity and flexibility also existed.

The concept of re-professionalisation also helped to explain a contradiction which occurred during the era of new managerialism, namely that professionals reported feeling de-professionalised at a time when their professional status was being enhanced. From this perspective, although professionals were legitimately de-professionalised by new managerialism, the new managerial state also provided practitioners with new opportunities to play a corporate role at strategic level (see Banks and Orton, 2005, p. 108). Research by Mayo et al, suggested that public sector modernisation was creating new career opportunities for community development trained practitioners and although the work was more bureaucratic it was also focused on ‘highly rewarded’ managerial tasks (see Mayo, et al, 2007, p. 677). In addition, research by Tett suggested that practitioners were ‘learning to operate within a much more competitive environment and competitive culture’ (see Tett, 2007, p. 31) and in a similar vein, Meade argued that ‘surveillance cultures are becoming normalised’ (Meade, et al, 2016, p. 11).

The ways in which the profession was realigned with the priorities of government should not be viewed as something imposed on CE/CLD against its will; for example, Tett argues that the advocates of CLD ‘were anxious to demonstrate its relevance to the government’s priorities’ (Tett, 2010, p. 27).

Similarly, McConnell stated in relation to renewed governmental interest in the profession - 'we have a seat at the top table of policy making' – adding, 'we should be holding our heads high. We are needed! If we did not exist they would have to invent us' (2002, p. 515). Hassan captured the contradictory nature of professionalisation in this period and wrote that:

'Community education at the outset was influenced by a critique and understanding of the limits of professionalism, but quickly aspired to being one itself, shifting from empowerment to gatekeeping' (Hassan, 2014, p. 188).

The concept of re-professionalisation became an area to pursue in my own research because as noted it highlighted the productive capacities inherent in new managerialism and neoliberalism.

I argued that Community Education in the era of social democracy was informed by occupational professionalism, yet given the impact of new managerialism and neoliberalism on the profession I was interested in the extent to which occupational professionalism remained relevant in the post-'Osler' era. Read one way, the shift from Community Education towards Community Learning and Development and the broader historical journey from 'Alexander' to 'Osler' could be described in terms of professionalism as a case of old wine in new bottles. From this perspective, a range of factors existed which suggested that CLD has remained an example of occupational professionalism. In particular, the quasi-professional association that is the CLD Standards Council has played a role in recent times similar to that of SCEC and CEVE in previous years. Moreover, the official values – as prescribed by the Standards Council, could be interpreted as an example of how the field continues to be occupationally defined. In addition, despite references in 'Osler' that it was an 'approach to working', CLD also functioned throughout most of the post-'Osler' era as a distinctive service within local government with its organisational roots in the social democratic consensus - as we shall see this created in the minds of its local government practitioners a mentality that CE was a profession similar to teaching and social work. In addition, a professional qualification recognised by the professional association remained a pre-requisite for practising CLD, especially in local government settings (see Lifelong Learning UK, 2008). I would argue that the qualification remained a significant boundary which protected the profession and guarded the professional status of its practitioners. Furthermore, the universities in the post-'Osler' era continued to use the term 'Community Education' (see Mackie, et al, 2013), which meant that CE and CLD were often used interchangeably – hence the reason I use the term 'CE/CLD' throughout this work.

Yet, whilst elements of occupational professionalism remained, the impact of new managerialism and in a broader sense neoliberalisation has been significant, especially with regards to the ways in which CE/CLD was realigned with the priorities of the state and government. In this context, 'Osler' and 'WALT' can be read as foundational texts in the transformation of the field from an occupational profession into a 'state sponsored profession' (see Miller and Ahmed, 2001) whereby the state provided the profession with legitimacy (see Clarke and Newman, 1997, p. 7). Evetts' concept of organisational professionalism is important at this juncture and according to Evetts, organisational professionalism is shaped by 'new managerialism, hierarchal control, a free market rationality, technical/rational forms of regulation and accountability and management rather than practitioners define practice' (Evetts, 2009, p. 23). From Evetts' perspective, both Community Education and CLD can be understood as containing elements of occupational and organisational professionalism although in the era of new managerialism and neoliberalism the pull has been towards the organisational model. The extent to which this constitutes a paradigm shift for thinking about practice is one of the themes I investigate in Chapters 6-10.

The new managerial reforms which transformed CE/CLD are best understood when situated within the context of the wider neoliberalisation of the state considered in Chapter 3 and in the final section of this chapter I explore the broader impact of neoliberalism on professional community development. In addition, I make the argument that community development as a theory and as a practice can be framed as compatible with neoliberalisation.

### *Neoliberalism and Professional Community Development*

The ambiguous nature of community development has ensured its survival as a professional area of practice throughout different political eras - from social democracy to the neoliberal times. Moreover, in the era of neoliberalism, community development's 'inherent anti-statism' (see Popple, 1995), has made it an area of interest – and site of potential investment, to various governments wishing to reduce public expenditure and re-configure the state in the image of the market. From this perspective, community development can be seen as a practice complimentary with the neoliberalisation of the state discussed in Chapter 3. According to Mayer and Rankin:

'After years of cuts in traditional welfare state programmes, community development has flourished with the support of government and international bodies such as the

World Bank, the Ford Foundation, the European Union – aided by the neoliberal friendly policy of social capital’ (Mayer and Rankin 2002).

Similarly, Shaw and Martin argued that ‘growing concern over the rising costs of welfare have made the self-help ethic, institutionalised in the profession of community work, very attractive – yet again, to policy makers’ (Shaw and Martin, 2000, p. 301).

In order to understand why community development has been an attractive proposition to neoliberal policy makers, it is important to understand the ways in which the concept of ‘community’ has been deployed in neoliberal discourse. For example, in contrast with the state, which is often portrayed as ‘centralising, impersonal and ineffective’ (see Wiggan, 2012), community has appeared in policy as a space which in the words of Bauman ‘conjures certain feelings’ (see, Bauman, 2002, p. 3). Interestingly, Hobsbawm argued that the indiscriminate and empty use of community in public policy occurred at a time when ‘communities in the sociological sense of the term became too hard to find in real life’ (Hobsbawm, 1994). From this perspective, the increasing use of community across different policy agendas – Community Care, Community Planning, Community Safety, Community Regeneration and so forth, correlates well with the reconfiguration of the state under neoliberalism. Consequently, I argue that community is constructed in neoliberal discourse, not as a geographical space where people live and work or community of interest but rather as a potential player in the emerging public sector delivery market. This vision of community views it in terms of a market or social economy which can supposedly plug the gap at a time of state retrenchment (see Craig, et al, 2011, p. 194; Taylor, 2011, p. 4).

According to Hancock et al, the warm feelings associated with community have made the concept attractive to policy makers in the sense that it can neutralise political dissent and it is argued that ‘community provides no opposition to, and can be employed to facilitate, neoliberal imaginaries of an alternative to state provided welfare’ (see Hancock, Mooney and Neal, 2012). Similarly, community is also said to unite different sets of social and political actors behind a common vision and Taylor argues that it has provided the context for the consolidation of strategic alliances that operate across political and ideological demarcation lines (see Taylor, 2011, p. 32).

In Scotland and across the rest of the UK community development has been shaped throughout the neoliberal era by a policy referred to as ‘Capacity Building’ (see Craig, 2011, p. 273) and in the post-‘Osler’ era there was a time when practitioners in Scottish local government were referred to as

‘Community Capacity Builders’ (see Lifelong Learning UK, 2008). I argue that Capacity Building is constructed in primarily economic terms and has frequently implied ‘building the capacity’ of community groups to provide services previously provided ‘in house’ by the state. In recent times ‘Capacity Building’ has been conceptualised at UK level in relation to a policy agenda described as the ‘Big Society’, which was said to be one of the core intellectual ideas of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government, 2010-2015 (see, Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012; Holman, 2014). According to the narrative, ‘Big Society’ is a replacement for ‘big government’ (see Lowndes, 2006) and also a means to address the ways in which state activity has allegedly crowded out civil society (Fukuyama, 2001, p. 18). Readers should note that the term ‘Big Society’ is seldom used by the CD community in Scotland – mainly because of its connotations with Conservative Party policy, but I would argue that elements of its narrative can be found in the policy context of ‘Community Empowerment’ which is currently being promoted by the Scottish Government. In this context, the methodologies associated with community development – community engagement, group work, participation, have been deployed to build the capacity of groups to provide services and own assets and also ‘deliver the public to various neoliberal policy processes’ (see Emejulu, 2015, pp. 139-145).

Community development, in its neoliberal variant emerges as a set of practices which are deliberately stimulated by local states (see Craig, et al, 2008, p. 16; Croft and Beresford, 2011, p. 163; Geoghegan and Powell, 2008; Hickley and Holman, 2005; Holman, 2014; Koch, 2013). The aim of deploying CD’s methodologies is twofold; first, involve publics in the delivery of public services and second, encourage publics to identify where cuts in public expenditure could take place (see Cooke and Kothari, 2004; DeFilippis, 2008; Emejulu, 2015, p. 133). Professional community development emerges in this analysis not as a practice grounded in the everyday experiences of communities – which is how it was conceived in Community Education but as an ‘agent of modernisation’ (see Shaw, 2011) or in explicitly Foucauldian terms, as a technique or technology of neoliberalisation (see Meade, 2011, p. 891). Consequently it is claimed that a new model of practice is appearing which has been described as ‘neoliberal community development’ (see Emejulu, 2015, p. 141) or ‘neoliberalism with a community face’ (see MacLeod and Emejulu, 2014, pp. 2-8).

Governmentality theory has also been applied to community development and I noted that the bulk of literature focused on the relationship between CD, the state and civil society. In this context governmentality theory has enabled writers in CD to better understand the ways in which the state has extended its disciplinary reach into civil society (see Ling, 2000). Moreover, new public management techniques are understood through the prism of governmentality as technologies for

governing communities (see Darcy, 2002, p. 36; Keevers, et al, 2008, p. 464; Kenny, 2016, p. 54; McGrath, 2016, p. 191) and according to Shaw, 'community groups are becoming so incorporated as to be almost indistinguishable from the state in their objectives' (Shaw, 2009). Shaw also argues that the role of community development is reduced in this context to 'feeding the system and disciplining community groups into a disempowering logic' (Shaw, 2008). Similarly, Darcy argues that 'small groups of people, whose primary common characteristic is the nature of their disadvantage, are called upon to account for the efficient application of public funds to government determined objectives' (Darcy, 2002, p. 36). Governmentality theory is used to shed light on the ways in which the state has not retreated or hollowed out – as the left once argued, but is reconfigured by neoliberalism in a new project of government (see Taylor, 2007).

### *Concluding Remarks*

This chapter has reviewed the literature on community development (and CE/CLD) in relation to the themes of professionalism, new managerialism and neoliberalisation. I argued that community development's relationship with professionalism is a problematic concept which is both ambiguous and ambivalent. The chapter also explored the ways in which contemporary professional identity in Scotland was a product of the discourses of Community Education and latterly Community Learning and Development and consequently the designation 'CE/CLD' is used throughout this thesis. I argued that professionalism was produced by key 'texts' such as the 'Alexander', 'Carnegie' and 'Osler' reports and also in a series of regulatory frameworks and codes of professional ethics. These texts provided professional community development with what Foucault referred to as a 'field of conceptual or theoretical coherence' (Foucault, 1986, p. 107) – a point which Foucault argued was critical in the construction of professional mentalities. In the chapters which follow, I explore the ways in which this 'field of conceptual and theoretical coherence' is being disrupted and reconfigured by neoliberalisation and new managerialism. This chapter has concluded the literature review and in the next chapter I explore the methodology and research design which shaped this research. I begin with a discussion on how my research questions were shaped by themes in the literature review.

## Chapter 5: Methodology and Research Design

### Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the methodological approaches and the research design which inform this research. The chapter is divided into two sections and I begin the first with a discussion on the research questions before considering the ways in which a theoretical approach shaped by Foucault and governmentality theory was influenced by qualitative social research, especially critical social research. I also make reference to two other approaches which influenced me, interpretivism and phenomenology. I introduce the reader to the concept of grounded theory which was used as method for collecting and analysing data and I consider some of the criticisms of grounded theory from within the qualitative tradition, especially critical social research. Theoretical engagement with these criticisms was deemed necessary because grounded theory might seem like an unusual method of choice for a researcher influenced by pre-conceived theoretical frameworks especially ideas drawn from Foucault and governmentality theory. The second section discusses the research design and considers the case study approach, participant observation, insider research and the semi-structured interview. I provide an outline of the three local authorities and include a discussion on the research participants and issues relating to access, gatekeepers and ethics. The chapter concludes with an outline of the ways in which methods associated with grounded theory were applied to data analysis.

### *Introducing the Research Questions*

I begin this section by introducing the reader to the research questions and readers should note that the questions continually evolved as ideas I wanted to investigate in the field interacted with the literature I was reading. From this perspective, the literature review considered in Chapters 2-4 influenced and provided justification for the research questions and also the topic, design and methodology (see Hart, 1998). The research questions which emerged from this process were as follows:

What impact does new managerialism and neoliberalisation have on community development in relation to the following:

- Professional identities.

- Professional relationships.
- Professional practices.

The questions were also shaped by the concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation, which emerged in the literature review and these concepts became the principal means through which data was interpreted and analysed. The concept of de-professionalisation has been considered in relation to CE/CLD and community development by other writers and researchers (see Chapter 4) and rather than tread familiar ground I found myself increasingly drawn to the idea of re-professionalisation and how it could be applied to the field. As noted, re-professionalisation was centred on the ways in which professions adapt to change and this understanding was crucial in terms of developing the argument that a new professionalism had appeared in community development.

Re-professionalisation also interested me because the idea that the professions adapt and were reconfigured by new managerialism and neoliberalism struck a theoretical chord with Foucault's proposition that neoliberalism was not only destructive of certain social relations but also productive of new ones (Foucault, 2008). As noted in Chapter 2 Foucault's view that neoliberal power was productive was one of the key contributions he made to neoliberal studies and in relation to this research, I argue that practices associated with neoliberalism - austerity, privatisation and the contracting out of public services coupled with practices associated with new managerialism – audits, performance management, devolution of budgetary control and so forth – these are productive of new regimes of practice and new mentalities for thinking about practice in community development settings.

My interest in everyday practices was also indebted to ideas in the Governmentality Lectures and Foucault argued in relation to neoliberalism that 'the target of analysis wasn't institutions, theories or ideology, but practices, with the aim of grasping the conditions which make these acceptable at any given moment', (Foucault, 1991, p. 74). He also wrote that researchers should be constantly asking the following questions in terms of their milieu - 'what is my present? what is the meaning of this present? And what am I doing when I speak of this present?' (Foucault, 1986, cited in Dean, 2010, p. 15) - and as an insider researcher I found myself adopting similar lines of questions when thinking about the field and the research questions I wanted to investigate. It is also important to note that whilst governmentality was presented by Foucault as an abstract theory it has been applied in the years following the Lectures to empirical research (see Gordon, 1991) and from this

perspective governmentality theory is approached in this work not as a 'closed doctrine but rather a research programme' (Bidet, 2015, p. 67). Discussing how governmentality could be applied to social research Rose et al argue that:

'Governmentality theory exemplified a style of analysis that would prove very attractive to many others because of its apparent ability to generate detailed empirical studies, both historical and contemporary, of practices of government...It could be useful in order to analyse macro spaces of national economies and also confined locales of factories or workplaces...creating an empirical mapping of governmental rationalities and techniques' (Rose, et al, 2006, pp. 94-98).

An approach influenced by Foucault and governmentality theory draws upon qualitative approaches to knowledge especially critical social research and in the next section I discuss critical social research and two other qualitative approaches which shaped this work, phenomenology and interpretivism.

#### *Qualitative Approaches to Social Research*

Qualitative social research involves exploratory research which aims to provide an understanding of the social world and according to Cohen et al, qualitative research works from the premise that the social reality is multi-layered and not easily susceptible to the atomisation process inherent in numerical research (see Cohen, et al, 2011). The following framework provides an outline of the key characteristics of the qualitative paradigm which shaped my thinking about the field:

- Humans actively construct their own meanings and situations.
- Meaning arises out of social situations and is handled through interpretive processes.
- To understand a situation researchers need to understand the context because situations affect behaviour and perspectives and vice versa.
- History and biography intersect – we create our own futures but not necessarily in situations of our own choosing.
- Social research needs to examine situations through the eyes of the participants.

- Social reality, experiences and social phenomena are capable of multiple, sometimes contradictory interpretations and are available to us through social interaction.

(Ibid, 2011, 219-220)

An approach which draws upon Foucault and governmentality theory in order to analyse and interpret the social world is influenced by ideas drawn from critical social research (see Besley and Peters, 2006) and according to Ball governmentality theorists are 'critical empiricists' (see Ball, 2015, p. 824). Carspecken notes that critical social researchers acknowledge various 'facts' about the social world especially the ways in which research and thinking are mediated by power relations and how these relations are socially and historically located (Carspecken, 1996, cited in Cohen, et al, 2011 p. 243). From this perspective, one of the purposes of Chapters 2 and 3 has been to explore the historical origins of neoliberalism and new managerialism with the aim of providing what Foucault described as a 'history of the present' (see Foucault, 2002) in relation to community development.

As noted in Chapter 1 I did not approach neoliberalism and new managerialism as a detached or neutral researcher and according to Cohen et al, critical social researchers acknowledge the political and ideological context in which research occurs whilst rejecting positivistic claims that researchers should be detached and neutral (see Cohen et al, 2011 p. 31). Viewed this way, my understanding of new managerialism was explicitly political and in Foucauldian terms new managerial techniques are framed in this work as 'technologies of power' and 'specific forms of governmentality' (see Foucault, 2008) linked with neoliberalisation. Furthermore, the aim of the research was not merely to understand neoliberalism and new managerialism but also to highlight how these and the knowledge they produced were representative of the interests of ruling groups within society (see O' Donoghue, 2007, p. 10). It is argued that critical research is based on 'uncovering the interests at work in particular situations and interrogating the legitimacy of those interests' (Cohen, et al 2011, p. 34) and from this perspective I see this research as offering a critical enquiry into the legitimacy of neoliberalism and new managerialism in the context of community development and local government.

Yet a word of caution is necessary at this juncture. This work is critical in the sense that it interrogates the legitimacy of neoliberalism and new managerialism but as noted in Chapter 1, I am sympathetic with Foucault's proposition that researchers should 'never engage in polemics' and that

by doing so they could escape being held in a system of truth (see Foucault, 2009, p. 4). In addition, he argued that researchers should have the intellectual freedom to criticise a phenomenon without necessarily being forced into positing an alternative, whether a workable reform or a societal transformation. According to Foucault:

‘Under no circumstances should one pay attention to those who tell one: “don’t criticise, since you’re not capable of carrying out a reform”. That’s ministerial cabinet talk. Critique doesn’t have to be the premise of a deduction which concludes: this then is what needs to be done. It should be an instrument for those who fight, those who resist and refuse what is....it is a challenge directed to what is’ (Foucault, 1991, p. 84).

The lack of alternative programmes of reform or my argument that neoliberalism and new managerialism have produced a new professionalism in the field might result in some readers finding this work pessimistic; yet on this note I was reminded of Mills’ argument that social scientists often struggled to play the role of ‘sunshine moralists’ (see Mills, 2000). Moreover, Mills argued that, ‘the world we are trying to understand does not always make all of us politically hopeful and morally complacent, which is to say, that social scientists sometimes find it difficult to play the cheerful idiot’ (Ibid, p. 78). Readers should also note that the reluctance on my part to be a ‘sunshine moralist’ was born out of a research context shaped by austerity and the biggest programme of job losses and cuts to public services since the end of the Second World War (see Chapter 1).

An approach which avoids polemicising and framing neoliberalism only as a wicked thing (see Chapter 1) was informed by my desire as a researcher to have a degree of critical empathy with professionals working inside local government and viewed this way I do not argue that professionals have been duped by neoliberalism or that they suffer false consciousness. Instead I was interested in how professionals made sense of their social world and I noted Foucault’s argument that ‘real life isn’t always the same thing as the theoretician’s schemas’ (Foucault, 1991, p. 81). Furthermore, I wanted the voices of professionals to appear in this research and my thinking at this juncture was influenced by a research ethics informed by phenomenology and interpretivism. Laing described social phenomenology as ‘the science of my own and other’s experience’ (Laing, 1990, p. 16) and noted:

‘But just as Kierkegaard remarked that one will never find consciousness by looking down a microscope at brain cells or anything else, so one will never find persons by studying persons as though they were only objects’ (Laing, 1990, p. 20).

Avoiding treating professionals as objects meant ‘taking people seriously as competent interpreters of their own lives’ (Sennett, 2006, cited in Paulsen, 2014). Similarly, the interpretivist tradition in qualitative research sets out to investigate how individuals make sense of their social world and Hammersley describes this approach as attempting to understand human beings ‘from the inside’ (Hammersley, 2013, p. 26). According to Griffiths, interpretivism works from the premise that ‘human beings construct meanings for the events in which they participate’ (Griffiths, 1998, p. 36) and understands people ‘in their own terms’ (Hammersley, 2013, p. 29).

A research ethics influenced by phenomenology and interpretivism shaped my view that ideas drawn from Foucault and governmentality theory should be tested against the lived realities of people working in the field and grounded in data and on this note I was influenced by Sennett’s argument that ‘an idea has to bear the weight of concrete experience or else it becomes a mere abstraction’ (Sennett, 1998, p. 11). Phenomenological and interpretivist sensitivities also shaped the research design, especially participant observation and semi-structured interviews and my aim was to find a design that would allow the multiple voices of practitioners to emerge hopefully allowing both myself and the reader to momentarily enter the subjective world of participants (see Hycner, 1985).

Yet interpretivism and phenomenology are problematic for a researcher influenced from the outset by the critical social theories of Foucault and governmentality theory and relying on them alone would have limited the theoretical scope of the thesis. I argue that both approaches are vulnerable to metaphysical notions that reality is a social construction of the mind (see Alvesson, 2002; McLellan, 1995, p. 10-11) - and from this perspective my research starts from the philosophical premise that ‘there is a world which exists independently of me which is made up of ‘objects’ interacting with each other’ (Pring, 2000, p. 49). Interpretivist and phenomenological approaches also neglect the ways in which the social world is shaped by power and specifically neoliberal power (Foucault, 2008). According to Cohen et al;

‘The danger of interactionist and interpretative approaches is their relative neglect of the power of external – structural forces to shape behaviour and events. Interpretative

approaches become hermetically sealed from the world outside the participant's theatre of reality' (Cohen, et al, 2011).

I was also aware of the fact that the interpretations people gave of their lived realities would always be subjected to my own interpretation of these accounts and subsequently I continually reflected on the role played by 'me' in this research which led to an acute awareness of reflexivity (Denscombe, 2008; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2004; Hammersley, 2013; MacLure and Stronach, 1997). According to Pring, reflexively aware researchers should always be asking themselves the following questions:

'Is this the real world that I am observing – or one that is interpreted through my own personal (and subjective?) scheme of things? What is the connection between the language through which I choose to describe the world and the world itself, existing independently of me?' (Pring, 2000, p. 35).

In addition, it is argued that social research cannot be carried out in some autonomous realm that is insulated from the wider society and from the particular biography of the researcher (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2006, p. 13) and that research which is political should acknowledge the researchers subjectivity (see Hammersley, 2013, p. 13). As a critically reflexive researcher I reflected on my relationship with Foucault's ideas and also why they were intellectually seductive. On this note, Foucault's analysis chimed with my experience of working in the field and provided a theoretical substance to my own dissatisfaction with traditional leftist analyses of neoliberalism especially Marxism (see Chapter 2).

In order to make sure that theory was related to data I drew upon an approach to data analysis influenced by grounded theory. Grounded theory refers to a system of gathering and ordering data and then interpreting that data to generate theory and according to Charmaz, 'grounded theorists collect data to develop theoretical analyses' (Charmaz, 2014, p. 3). Yet, grounded theory is often viewed with scepticism by critical social theorists and therefore I begin the next section by addressing some of these criticisms before explaining why grounded theory was selected as a method for data analysis

### *Why Grounded Theory?*

The biggest criticism of grounded theory by critical social researchers concerns the charge of positivism (see Bryman, 2001; Charmaz, 2014; Cohen, et al, 2011). From this perspective, it is claimed that grounded theorists must abandon pre-conceived theoretical frameworks and that they should follow strict rules whereby theory is derived solely from data (see Denscombe, 2008; Seale, 1999). Denscombe in a discussion on Glaser and Strauss – who were the original proponents of grounded theory, argued that their work was based on the assumption that the ‘researcher should approach the topic without being influenced by other theories’ (Denscombe, 2008, p. 94). Glaser argued that researchers should be ‘distant and independent from the data’ (Glaser, 1978, cited in Denscombe, 2008) and given the fact that my research was influenced by Foucault and governmentality theory, a grounded theory approach might seem like an unusual choice of method for this project. Yet my readings of the literature especially Charmaz’s work on ‘Constructed Grounded Theory’ which I discuss in a moment, suggested that grounded theory was an ambiguous concept and that some researchers might have ‘misunderstood grounded theory’ (see Charmaz, 2014).

According to Charmaz, grounded theory ‘offers a set of general principles, guidelines, strategies and heuristic devices rather than formulaic prescriptions’ (Charmaz, 2014, pp. 1 - 3) and read this way Charmaz argues that it is possible to use its methods not without pre-conceived frameworks – which is said to be theoretically impossible (see Bulmer, cited in Bryman, 2001, p. 84; Hammersley, 2013, p. 33) but rather to establish those frameworks in data. Moreover, grounded theory’s critics have also failed to situate Glaser and Strauss’ arguments for grounded theory within historical debates regarding qualitative research (see Seale, 1999). For example, Glaser and Strauss were writing at a time when social research was dominated by quantitative research methods heavily influenced by positivism and as qualitative researchers they were sensitive to the positivist critique that qualitative research was ‘impressionistic, anecdotal, unsystematic and biased’ (Charmaz, 2014, p. 6; Glaser and Strauss, 1999). Glaser and Strauss shared some of these criticism’s especially in relation to ethnography which they argued had a tendency to offer ‘lengthy, detailed descriptions which resulted in very small amounts of theory’ (Glaser and Strauss, cited in Seale, 1999, p. 95). Yet, their criticisms were made with the purpose of strengthening ethnographic research methods and according to Charmaz they devised grounded theory as a method for shifting qualitative inquiry beyond descriptive studies into the realm of ‘explanatory theoretical frameworks’ (see Charmaz, 2014, pp. 7-8).

Grounded theory emerged in Charmaz's analysis not as an inflexible method but rather as a theory of research open to several readings and one capable of addressing some of the structural weaknesses within qualitative research. Moreover, it was developed as an approach that would challenge arbitrary divisions between theory and research, whilst at the same time as challenging prevailing orthodoxies that qualitative research should be judged by the canons for quantitative research (Glaser and Strauss, 1999). Viewed this way, I argue that grounded theory or what Charmaz refers to as 'Constructed Grounded Theory' (see Charmaz, 2014) is compatible with a research agenda shaped by ideas drawn from Foucault and governmentality theory. According to Charmaz, 'constructed grounded theory' provides systematic yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing qualitative data and enables researchers to systematically generate theory from data (Charmaz, 2014, p. 1). Charmaz likens her interpretation of grounded theory to a container in which different contents can be poured and notes that the flexibility of the method resists mechanical applications of it (Ibid, p. 13). Similarly, Seale notes that if applied rigorously grounded theory can aid in taking researchers beyond common sense reporting of particular categories so that a study becomes genuinely relevant at a theoretical level (Seale, 1999, p. 96).

According to Denscombe grounded theory is:

- Fairly adaptable to different settings.
- Focused on practice.
- Provides a systemic way of analysing qualitative data.
- Approach includes the means for developing theoretical propositions from data.
- Explanations are grounded in reality: concepts and themes developed with constant reference to the empirical data.

(Denscombe, 2008, pp. 104-106)

In addition, Hammersley argues in relation to the generation of theory that grounded theory involves the building of theory through an iterative process of collecting data (Hammersley, 2013, p. 68) - however, this should not be seen in terms of 'letting the data speak for itself', but rather as involving a concentrated effort by the researcher to analyse data and generate theories, which Denscombe likens to a 'trail of discovery' (Denscombe, 2008, p. 89). The idea of research as a 'trail of discovery' shaped my evolving research questions and in particular led to the emergence of 'professional identity' as an important concept in the research.

I return to grounded theory at the end of the chapter where I discuss how its methods influenced data analysis. In the next section I introduce the reader to the research design and also the three local authorities featured in this work. I begin with a discussion on why the research was informed by a case study approach.

### *Research Design: the Case Study Approach and the Three Local Authorities*

The research was undertaken in three local authorities, including one where I was employed for some of the research as a 'Community Learning and Development Worker'. In addition I interviewed representatives from the CLD Standards Council and Education Scotland and participants from these bodies were selected because many in the field viewed the Standards Council as an emergent professional association and consequently relevant to discussions on professional identity, whilst Education Scotland is the body responsible for inspections and a key player in CE/CLD. I discuss the three local authorities in a moment but first it is important to note that the unit of analysis was not the three authorities but community development in the context of local government. Moreover, a case study approach was deemed appropriate for investigating new managerial practices because case studies typically involve focusing on one (or just a few) instances of a particular phenomenon and owing to their small scale nature they can provide an in-depth account of events, relationships, experiences or processes occurring in that particular instance (see Denscombe, 2008, p. 35).

By focusing on relationships and processes, case studies are said to have the potential to unravel complexity whilst explaining the 'causes of events, processes or relationships, and how a particular theory applies in a real life setting' (Denscombe, 2008, p. 40). Case studies are also complimentary to research approaches influenced by interpretivism and phenomenology on the grounds that:

'Such a study would start from the premise that any unit of investigation in which persons were involved could only be understood if the perspectives of those involved (and the interactions of those perspectives) were taken into account' (Pring, 2000, pp. 39-43).

Bryman raises an important question which often emerges in case study research; 'how do we know how representative case study findings are of all members of the population from which the case study was selected?' (Bryman, 1988, cited in Silverman, 2010). Bryman's question encouraged me to

think about the 'representativeness of the sample' which Silverman argues is a perennial problem for case study researchers (Silverman, 2010, p. 139). With Bryman and Silverman's points in mind, I initially planned to conduct research in only one authority but decided against this approach on the grounds that an additional two might broaden the representativeness of my research. In addition, the fact that I was a representative on regional and national bodies responsible for overseeing community development provided me with opportunities to talk with many more people in the community development 'community' and these encounters were recorded in a fieldwork journal and are also featured in the research. I noted that concerns with 'reliability' are not uncommon and that qualitative researchers often worry about the size of their research sample or whether or not they have done enough interviews – in my case I thought I did too many interviews. In addition to interviews, fieldwork journals and other artefacts allowed me to triangulate data (see Cohen, 2011) and according to Charmaz, 'sometimes researchers do not give themselves credit for observational, archived and documented research that they have done' adding that mixed qualitative methods can strengthen a study with a small number of interviews (Charmaz, 2014, p. 107).

Research occurred in three local authorities (LA) and each Council is referred to throughout the research chapters as LA1, LA2 and LA3 and readers should note that I was employed in LA1 at the time of the research. In order to protect anonymity the authorities have not been named but it is important for readers to have some background information on each of the authorities especially in relation to understanding the type of geographical areas where community development work occurs. The information which follows is based on my own observations coupled with data obtained from Community Profiles undertaken in 2015-2016 - I have not included references for these profiles in order to protect anonymity and confidentiality.

LA1 is a rural authority made up of towns and villages and historically it has been associated with coal mining and other traditional industries. In terms of politics, LA1 is an authority with strong links to the Labour Party, although in recent years the Scottish National Party has also emerged as a dominant player in the governance of the Council. The CLD team in LA1 was based in what Council officials described as 'areas of deprivation'; although LA1 had lower levels of poverty when compared against the national average, I noted that these figures were deceiving because pockets of deprivation existed through the Council area with some towns and villages experiencing higher levels of poverty than the national average. CLD was in a period of transition in LA1 and at the time of research youth work and adult education were being located into a new employability section whilst proposals were being considered to move community development into a new 'Communities'

section alongside Economic Development and Community Planning. One of the striking features about LA1 was the lack of community centres run by the Council and I noted that the bulk of the CLD workforce was based in either schools or Council headquarters.

The second authority - LA2, was also a rural authority which consisted of various towns and villages with a population similar to LA1. LA2 is described as a commuter belt with the majority of its workforce travelling into the nearby city for work and similar to LA1 the local authority was the biggest employer in the county. LA2 is seen from the outside as an affluent county and has a more mixed group of political parties than LA1 – most notably the Conservative and Unionist Party were in office. Yet based on official ‘poverty indicators’ I noted that pockets of deprivation existed throughout LA2 and these were described as ‘priority areas’ for the CLD team. CLD Workers in LA2 were located in each of the towns but unlike LA1 the Council boasted a large number of community centres. CLD in LA2 was also in a process of change and at the time of my research proposals were underway for adult education to operate out of a new employability section whilst community development practitioners were being relocated into Corporate Services.

The third authority - LA3, was a city authority with a far bigger population than the other two authorities and it had a higher proportion of young people and also young migrants. According to the Council the population has been steadily rising in recent years with a substantial increase anticipated in the next two decades. LA3 has been described as a highly unequal city with ‘concentrated areas of deprivation’ and these were ranked as amongst the most deprived areas of Scotland. At the time of research LA3 had a large CLD section with strategic managers based in Council Headquarters whilst operational managers took on responsibility for area based teams. Unlike LA’s 1 and 2, the three strands of CLD were still together although I noted that a major review was to commence as my research was ending. LA3 possessed a large number of community centres which were run by CLD in partnership with local management committees. LA3 had previously been dominated by the Labour Party but at the time of research the SNP were responsible for governing the Council.

The bulk of data was obtained from LA1 and 18 people were interviewed in this Council which constituted almost the entire CLD team (only 1 person was not interviewed because they did not respond to my request for interview). In the other authorities, 11 people were interviewed, 6 from LA2 and 5 from LA3; 2 additional interviews were conducted with representatives from the CLD Standards Council and Education Scotland. LA1 is over represented in the data due to two factors:

first, as an employee of this Council it was easier for me to organise interviews and to identify who the key players were. In addition, participant observation was conducted in LA1 which I discuss in a moment. I argue that the findings from LA1 were generalisable and that they constituted a 'typical instance' of community development in local government and according to Pring, a 'typical instance' means that there is space for generalising the findings beyond the particular events and contexts studied (see Pring, 2000, p. 40).

I noted that despite minor differences similar processes and practices were happening across the three authorities. For example, all three have experienced austerity related reforms which resulted in substantial cuts to their budgets and these cuts occurred regardless of which political party had overall control of the Council. In addition, all three authorities were undergoing a series of internal reviews which were referred to in the field as Service Level Reviews and one of their distinguishing features was the fragmentation of integrated CE/CLD services. New public management practices in the shape of computerised Management Information Systems, appraisals and workplans with quantifiable outcomes and targets were also similar across the three authorities. In addition, interviewees referred to the same set of policies whenever I asked them to identify which policies shaped their work and I noted that the policy context was shaped by Employability and Positive Destinations, Early Intervention, Curriculum for Excellence, Community Empowerment and Community Planning.

The research is centred on two groups of people in CLD/community development, practitioners and their managers both of whom I describe as 'professionals'. As noted, I interviewed 31 people in total including 23 women and 9 men. Age emerged as an important site of analysis and interviewees were categorised into three categories of age range; 18-34 (early years), 35-49 (mid-years) and 50-75 (later years). I interviewed 1 person in the 'early years' range, 8 in the 'mid-years' and 20 in the 'later years'. The 'mid to later years' were over represented owing to a number of factors; first, many entered CE/CLD in their 'mid-years' and in my sample it was not uncommon for interviewees to start their Community Education training in their late 20's and 30's. In addition, the 'later years' were disproportionately represented because CE/CLD has an ageing workforce not only in terms of the three authorities but also across Scotland as a whole (see Lifelong Learning UK, 2008). Out of 29 local authority interviewees, I classified 20 as 'professional practitioners' and 9 as 'manager/professionals' and approximately half of those I interviewed were 'Associate Inspectors', meaning practitioners/managers who have also been trained as inspectors.

With regards to sampling the majority of people I interviewed were selected by me although on several occasions people were recommended by interviewees. The type of sampling I used is referred to by grounded theorists as 'purposive sampling' whereby people are selected on the basis of sharing similar characteristics. Eligibility for interviews was determined by potential interviewees having a degree or recognised professional qualification in Community Education, alongside a minimum of two years' experience of working in a CLD local authority setting; I felt this was enough time for professionals to be familiar with ideas and practices associated with new public management and neoliberalisation.

### *Negotiating Access, Gatekeepers and Ethics*

In LA's 2 and 3 access was relatively straightforward and involved me writing to the senior manager responsible for CLD and providing them with an outline of my research and on both occasions access was authorised without any difficulties. In LA1 access was more protracted and negotiated owing to the fact that I was proposing to conduct 'insider research' at a time of change and uncertainty for the CLD team. The process involved writing to and then formally meeting with the Director (who became my gatekeeper) of the service responsible for CLD and at the meeting I provided as much information as possible about the aims, nature and procedures of the research (see Cohen, et al, 2011, p. 83). I also met with the Head of Service for CLD and with one of the divisional managers who also happened to be my line manager at the time of the meeting.

The meeting with the Head of Service was important because they outlined a number of concerns regarding my research. Their main concern was focused on proposed changes to CLD and I was informed that many of the staff were faced with the prospect of having to re-apply for their jobs. In addition, the Head of Service also raised concerns that sensitive research findings could 'get in the wrong hands' and mentioned the press and elected members and sought reassurances from me about how I would protect the anonymity of both employees and the authority. In response to these legitimate concerns, I explained that the authority would not be named in the research and that people taking part would be anonymised. Although names and job titles appear beside extracts of transcript data, it should be noted that these are pseudonyms.

My approach to ethics was informed by the following considerations:

- Voluntary participation and the right to withdraw.

- Protection of research participants.
- Informed consent.
- Not doing harm.

(Silverman, 2010, p. 139)

Permission was eventually granted in LA1 although I was always aware of the fact that my research was regarded as potentially sensitive. Humphrey describes insider research as 'sensitive research' and notes that there are divergent views about the ethics of insider research (Humphrey 2012). According to Pring, discussions on ethics are too often not recognised for the complex moral and practical debate that they entail:

'The principles which seem particularly important to educational research but often irreconcilable, are, first, the principle which requires respect for the dignity and confidentiality of those who are the objects of research, and, second, the principle which reflects the purpose of research, namely the pursuit of truth' (Pring, 2000, p. 145).

Given the fact that I was researching local government I was confident in the ethical case of the 'right to know' which was balanced in my mind with a 'respect for persons' (Pring, 2000) and during the course of the research no major ethical issues arose. Furthermore by having a Director as 'gatekeeper' I was able to gain access to senior people in LA1 on the grounds that my research was deemed important because it had been approved by the Director. Interviewees across the three authorities often provided me with sensitive information and when this occurred I refer to these interviewees as 'informants'.

#### *Participant Observation and Insider Research*

In LA1 participant observation was used as a research method and although I was part of a relatively small team it is common for ethnographers to study only one or a small number of settings (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2006, p. 39) - participant observation also occurred in regional and national meetings of CLD. My approach was informed by critical ethnography which meant that I was aware of the politics of ethnography and the fact that ethnography is based on a subversive worldview (see Hammersley and Atkinson, 2006, p. 13; Thomas, cited in Cohen, et al, 2011).

According to Becker and Greer, participant observation means the observer participates in the daily life of the people under study...observing things that happen, listening to what is said, and questioning people, over some length of time (Becker and Greer, 1957, p. 217). Others have described participant observation as forming the basis of a 'true ethnography' (Shweder, 1996), which creates a 'written photograph' (Marshall and Rossman, 1998, cited in Kawulich, 2005, p. 2).

Traditional ethnography often focuses on the 'exotic' (alcoholics, drug users, street gangs), however ethnography can also be utilised as a method to study the routine and the mundane (Denscombe, 2008, p. 63) and given the fact that I was observing routine situations such as team meetings and people in everyday office settings – especially in LA1, ethnography seemed like a natural choice of research method. Moreover, owing to the fact that I was an insider researcher, participant observation enabled me to analyse CE/CLD in a way that was naturalistic – meaning that the everyday social world was left relatively undisturbed by me as a researcher (see Hammersley and Atkinson, 2006, p. 6; Kawulich, 2005, p. 111). A naturalistic approach created a number of advantages; for example, because there was a reason for my presence in the CLD setting beyond that of doing research, people were often less guarded in how they behaved and also in terms of what they said and on many occasions this resulted in valuable data. In fact there were many occasions when this data was more valuable than that obtained from interviews especially in LA1 where it was easier for me to strike up a rapport with people.

Kawulich suggests that one of the advantages of insider research is that it reduces the 'reactivity' of people acting in a certain way when they are aware of being observed (Kawulich, 2005). Moreover, straightforward access to the 'backstage culture' improves the quality of data collection and interpretation which led to the development of new research questions or hypotheses (Ibid, 2005). In addition, I had access to powerful individuals in LA1 and knew beforehand who the important 'players' were and these people were often only an E-mail or telephone call away. During observations, regular fieldnotes were kept in a journal and I recorded 'thick descriptions' based on what was happening in the setting and how the people involved saw their actions and those of others (see Hammersley and Atkins, 2006, p. 6). My approach to fieldnotes was based on the premise that observations are not data until they are recorded into notes (Kawulich, 2005). Furthermore, by recording thick descriptions of what people said, I developed an understanding of events from the point of view of those involved (see Denscombe, 2008, p. 63). According to Spradley, 'rather than study people ethnography wants to learn from them' (Spradley, 1979, cited in, Thomas, 2009, p. 119) and this involved me drawing upon two approaches to ethnography – first, an

'idiographic' approach meaning to study real life as it is – which was influenced by interpretivism and phenomenology and the second a 'nomothetic' approach, which is shaped by critical social research and means to apply theory and locate ethnography within a wider theoretical context (see Denscombe, 2008, p. 67).

It is important to note that participant observation was a fundamental part of this research. Goffman in discussions on participant observation noted that – 'if you don't get yourself in that situation, I don't think you can do a piece of serious work' (Goffman, 1989). According to Habermas, 'social scientists...must already belong in a certain way to the lifeworld whose elements he wishes to describe' (Habermas, 1984, p. 105), whilst Bernard notes that, 'being on site over a period of time familiarises the researcher to the community, thereby facilitating involvement in sensitive activities to which he/she would not be invited' (Bernard, 1994, cited in Kawulich, 2005, p.5). Furthermore, according to Wind, 'participant observation performs the dual purpose of placing the researcher both inside – that is participation – and outside – that is observation of the social world of their host community' (Wind, 2008). Kawulich notes that participant observation involves the researcher becoming a part of the group being studied to the extent that the members themselves include the observer in the activity (Kawulich, 2005, p. 3) – and this was relatively straightforward because I was already an employee of LA1. As a consequence of the research being done from the inside, core concepts such as the impact of new managerialism on professional identity were grounded in the everyday issues of those involved in experiencing them (see Sikes and Potts, 2008).

Participant observation is also the subject of potential problems and ethical dilemmas and I noted that insider research (and participant observation) is often described as a 'schizophrenic activity' (see Merriam, 1988). According to McDermid, participant observation contains the following 'pitfalls':

- The researcher may be too 'native' to the setting and therefore unable to achieve authenticity.
- The researcher may be seen to be emotionally invested and have a personal stake in the outcome.
- Participants may assume that the researcher already knows the answers.

(McDermid, et al, 2014).

Cohen, et al, warn against researchers becoming so attached that they fail to act dispassionately (Cohen, et al, 2011, p. 206) – although the opposite is the detached ‘impartial spectator’ who as Edmund Husserl frames it is condemned to see all practice as spectacle (Husserl, cited in Bourdieu, 2005). Denscombe suggests that potential disadvantages of participant observation include providing stand-alone descriptions, storytelling, reliability and a blind spot associated with insider knowledge (Denscombe, 2008. pp. 72-73). Yet, owing to the fact that I was analysing other local authorities and undertaking a literature review I was confident that the research was generalisable. In addition, I was always willing to problematise the field and especially my relationship with it and on this point, I have often thought of myself with regards to community development as a ‘stranger in the crowd’ (see Ball, 2015, p. 821) and this mitigated against any possibility of going native and developing a romanticised view of practice. Furthermore, I used methods from grounded theory in order to generate theory as opposed to storytelling, whilst data obtained from participant observation was triangulated against the knowledge obtained from the literature review and data gathered from semi-structured interviews.

### *Semi-Structured Interviews*

52 semi-structured interviews took place and I interviewed 31 people in total, with 21 of those interviewed twice. I recorded every interview on a digital recorder and wrote a transcript of the interview usually within 24 hours of the interview taking place. 52 transcripts were completed which came to around approximately 260 thousand words of transcript material. The interview is often the most widely used method of data collection (see Anderson, 1998, p. 190) and I related the semi-structured interview to phenomenological approaches to social research and their attempt to understand peoples experience on their own terms – ‘interview’ means literally a ‘view between people, mutually, not the interviewer extracting data one way, from the interviewee’ (Cohen, et al, 2011, p. 205). Paulsen describes the interview as a ‘joint construction of meaning’ (Paulsen, 2014, p. 185) and from this perspective my approach to interviewing was influenced by the following factors:

- Engage, understand and interpret the lifeworld of participants.
- Explore nuanced descriptions of lifeworld.
- Display a deliberate openness to new data.
- Accept the ambiguity and contradictions of situations where they occur in participants.

(Kvale, 1996, cited in Cohen, et al, 2011, p. 414).

It is noted that structured interviews are often avoided in qualitative research (see Measor, 1985, p. 67) – therefore a ‘semi-structured’ approach was selected which included a mixture of open and closed questions, although mainly open questions which encouraged people to answer questions on their own terms whereby they actively construct their own world (see Morrison and Scott, 2007, p. 133). When people ‘opened up’ during the course of an interview and revealed sensitive information the dialogue was often more akin to a conversation than an interview something which grounded theorists refer to as ‘intensive conversations’ (see Charmaz, 2014, p. 56). Good interviews typically involved an ‘intensity in an examination of the particular’ (Pring, 2000, p. 41) and from this perspective, my aim was to explore the inner world of people with the hope of them revealing ‘authentic experiences’ (Alvesson, 2002, p. 111).

It should be noted that not every interview resulted in an authentic experience and there were many reasons for this. For example, those with power, resources and expertise might be anxious to maintain their reputation and so will be guarded in what they say, wrapping this up in well-chosen articulate phrases (see Cohen, et al, 2011, p. 205; Siles and Potts, 2008, pp. 87-88). This happened occasionally, especially when interviewing those reluctant to think critically (and honestly) about their organisations. Charmaz argues that ‘professionals and elites often recite public relations rhetoric rather than reveal personal views, much less a full account of their experiences’ (Charmaz, 2014, p. 73) and that interviews can become a ‘performance’ where ‘stories tumble out or are strategically calculated and enacted’ (Charmaz and Bryant, 2011, p. 299). According to Ball when powerful people are interviewed, interviews might be seen as an extension of the ‘play of power’ with its game like connotations (Ball, cited in Cohen et al, 2011, p. 73). Yet most people ‘opened up’ especially in LA1 where they knew and trusted me and were happy to talk. I also noted that it was those in senior positions who provided me with the most valuable data.

My approach to interviews was based on always trying to establish a rapport with people and not what has been termed ‘smash and grab’ (Charmaz, 2014, p. 33; Delamont, 2002; Kawulich, 2005) and establishing rapport was important in order to get under the surface of things. With regards to data analysis, semi-structured interviews can develop new theories and ideas in contrast with say a questionnaire because they create a space for developing hypotheses rather than connecting facts and numbers (Oppenheim, 1992, cited in, Cohen, et al, 2002, p. 412). This was particularly important when analysing interviews via the categories of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. In

the final section of this chapter I return to grounded theory and note the ways in which this approach was used to analyse the data generated during fieldwork.

### *Grounded Theory and Data Analysis*

Grounded theory was used to make patterns visible and understandable (see Charmaz, 2014) and important concepts such as de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation emerged as patterns in the research; I say 'in part' because they also appeared as important concepts in the literature review. Identifying patterns involved producing what grounded theorists refer to as codes and according to Donoghue, coding enables the researcher to attach meaningful labels to data chunks (O' Donoghue, 2003, p. 89). The coding evolved through several stages including descriptive coding, which was based on what participants said, to interpretive and explanatory coding, which involved my analysis of what they said; this was usually preceded by the development of abstract concepts and conceptual analysis (see Morrison and Scott, 2007, p. 136). The following documents and artefacts were subjected to grounded theory coding:

- Transcripts of interviews which totalled around 260,000 words.
- Fieldnotes and Journals: these included recordings of team meetings, CLD management meetings and national and regional events attended by professionals; I also recorded everyday conversations and my observations of everyday CLD settings.
- Various artefacts including e-mails, memos, minutes of meetings, individual work plans, team plans, annual reports, publicity material and policy documents.

The aim of coding was to 'let the world appear through data' (Charmaz, 2014, p. 23) and when analysing data especially transcripts, I was aware that certain pieces of information might potentially get lost in the analysis – e.g. body language, facial expressions and tone of voice (see Drever, 2003, p. 63). I also made myself aware of the following tactics when analysing transcript data:

- Note patterns and themes (Gestalts), which may stem from repeated themes and causes or explanations or constructs.
- Count frequencies of occurrence (of ideas, themes, pieces of data, words).

- See plausibility – try to make good sense of data, using informed intuition to reach a conclusion.
- Clustering – set items into categories, types, behaviours and classifications.

(Miles and Huberman, 1994, cited in, Cohen, et al, 2011, pp. 427-428).

My analysis of the data was continually developing and as noted the research questions evolved as new concepts emerged in data. According to Drever, data analysis involves reorganising, categorising and summarising texts to match research questions (Drever, 2003, p. 64).

What grounded theorists call ‘chunks of data’ were used to develop codes and concepts and a method of ‘constant comparison’ was used until codes and concepts reached saturation point (see Strauss, 1987, cited in Denscombe, 2008, p. 100). For example, interviewees often complained that ‘the bureaucracy had gone mad’ or that there was ‘too much paperwork’; in addition they said they were ‘micromanaged’ and felt like ‘glorified admin workers’ – chunks of data like these reached saturation point and were developed by me into codes such as ‘deskilling’, ‘demoralisation’ and eventually these codes would be used to inform concepts such as de-professionalisation. The concept of re-professionalisation followed a similar path and I would note the ways in which managers made statements which interested me; for example, they said that professionals were ‘elitist’, ‘barriers to reform’ or ‘lacked the right skills’. They argued that practitioners had to be ‘accountable’ and that professions must ‘adapt to change’ and statements like these reached saturation point and were grouped together and used to develop the concept of re-professionalisation which was also informed by ideas in the literature review. According to Strauss and Corbin, ‘concepts are the basis of analysis in grounded theory research...all procedures are aimed at identifying, developing and relating concepts (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, cited in Denscombe, 2008, p.98).

I also considered some of the more problematic areas of applying grounded theory to data analysis. For example, when analysing different codes or concepts, I was acutely aware of the fact that the language used by me as a researcher and the language of participants could be different and similarly, Humphrey noted in relation to their own research that:

‘Participants knowledge was internalised at the level of the subconscious – they embodied and enacted it in everyday life, and although some of their intuitive

understandings may have surpassed textbook knowledge, their practices had become detached from official labels, and their underlying theoretical frameworks had atrophied' (Humphrey, 2012, p. 590).

Terms frequently used by me during data analysis – new managerialism, neoliberalisation, de-professionalisation, re-professionalisation, new professionalism, and so forth - these were seldom used by real actors in the field. Yet, philosophically speaking I was always aware of the fact that a space existed between the terms professionals used in order to make sense of their world and my subsequent interpretations of that world which primarily drew upon ideas from academia. Charmaz argues that 'theoretical rendering offers an interpretive portrayal of the studied world, not an exact picture of it' (Charmaz, 2014, p. 17) and this is an important point and one which ultimately informed my approach to the knowledge generated by this thesis.

### *Concluding Remarks*

This chapter has introduced the reader to the research questions and situated the research within a theoretical approach to knowledge shaped by Foucault and governmentality theory and ideas derived from critical social research, interpretivism and phenomenology. In addition, I discussed grounded theory and argued that this was selected as a method for collecting and analysing data because of its potential to ground abstract concepts such as neoliberalisation, new managerialism and governmentality theory, in actual data. The chapters which follow constitute the data analysis sections of the thesis and I begin with a chapter which considers the ways in which the concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation were grounded in data.

## **Chapter 6: De-Professionalisation and Re-professionalisation - the Unmaking and Remaking of Professional Community Development in Local Government**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 6 marks the beginning of the data analysis section of this thesis. I begin with a short discussion on austerity and note that de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation are a product of the changing material context in local government. I argue that reforms linked with austerity are contributing towards a fragmentation of Community Education/Community Learning and Development as a graduate profession and also as a discrete set of professional practices and suggest that these processes are experienced in the field as de-professionalisation. Yet, I also draw upon data which points not to the death of a profession but rather to the ways in which a new professional practice is emerging which is interpreted through the prism of re-professionalisation. I discuss the key features of the new professional practices which include a new emphasis on partnership working and working in multi-functional teams and the emergence of a new workforce which I describe as 'CLD's precariat'. The main characteristics of re-professionalisation are considered which I suggest constitute the origins of a new professionalism in the field. In the final section, I discuss the extent to which the new practices are resisted which I relate to the literature on governmentality, especially Foucault's discussion on resistance and counter conduct. The chapter concludes with a discussion on Fournier's concept of 'boundary construction' and how it can be applied to contemporary developments in the field especially in relation to occupational professionalism and new professional practices.

### *Situating the Research in the Context of Contemporary Local Government*

As noted in Chapter 1, the research occurred at a time of austerity and it has been argued that spending reductions or cuts to public expenditure have created a crisis in local government (Levitas, 2012; Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012, p. 23; Taylor-Gooby, 2013; Stoker, 2012). In particular, the neoliberalisation of the state which I discussed in Chapter 3, whereby services that are no longer deemed affordable are 'contracted out' at lower cost, has intensified. Audit Scotland has claimed that local authorities have 'balanced their budgets' as a result of reducing the size of the workforce and reorganising those services that remain (Audit Scotland, 2016). In the three authorities, 'balancing the budget' involved a series of internal reforms in the post 2010/11 era, which were referred to in the field as 'service level reviews' and 'internal re-organisations'. According to

managers in LA1, the purpose of reviews was to create ‘new models of service delivery’, which one manager described as ‘doing more with less’. Similar points were made in LA’s 2 and 3 and it was within this changing material context that CE/CLD has been radically re-structured.

Two themes are important in the re-structuring of CE/CLD: first, the named service in local government which can be traced to the mid-1970s is disappearing. In addition, several Scottish local authorities have ‘contracted out’ their CLD function to the third sector and this is reflective of a general trend for services previously provided in house to be ‘contracted out’ to Development Trusts and ‘Arm’s Length External Organisations’ (ALEOs)<sup>8</sup>. In this context the idea that CE/CLD is an approach to working as opposed to a Council service – which first emerged in the Osler Report in the late 1990s, has re-appeared often as a managerial justification for the dismantling of CLD as a distinctive service in local government. Readers should note that although the political and economic context shaped by austerity is referred to throughout this research, I consider this work to be more than just a snapshot of community development in the context of reduced expenditure, because it also tells the broader story of the ways in which a social profession born in the era of social democracy has been reconfigured by new managerialism and neoliberalisation. Framed this way, I argue that the research points not to the death of a profession but rather to the emergence of a new set of practices which I interpret via the primary concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. Moreover, these concepts are not diametrically opposed discourses but rather different lenses through which readers can view the unmaking and remaking of professional CE/CLD.

In the next section I focus on de-professionalisation, which as noted in the literature review is focused on a number of themes including the ways in which professionals are losing their autonomy and prestige (see Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Flynn, 1999; Fournier, 2000) and becoming deskilled and demoralised by new managerialism (see Ball, 2003; Locke, et al, 2005; Walsh, 2006). The next section explores how austerity driven reforms in local government are challenging the autonomy and prestige of professionals which I discuss in relation to the theme of professional identity.

### *De-professionalisation and Professional Identity*

---

<sup>8</sup> Audit Scotland estimates that around 140 ALEOs are currently operated by Scottish Councils with three-quarters of those providing cultural, leisure, housing, or economic development services; this also includes adult social care and owning ‘public assets’ such as town halls, community centres, libraries and playing fields – Audit Scotland notes that ALEOs are a product of austerity and a ‘difficult financial climate’ (see Audit Scotland, 2016).

'Professional identity' emerged as a theme to investigate early on because it was commonplace for practitioners across the three authorities to refer to 'professional identity' whenever I broached the subject of what it was like to be a CLD worker in local government. Despite the fact that professionalism is problematic and ambiguous (see Chapter 4), the majority of those I spoke with described themselves as professional community education workers or professional CLD workers and they frequently compared themselves with other professionals most notably teachers and social workers:

'I'm trying to make sure that community education has a focus and that people understand what we do, the way they understand what a social worker does. But right now I think we are losing our professional identity...I wouldn't like to lose my professional identity' (Shona, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

I would often ask, 'what is it that makes you a professional' and most responded by referring to their professional qualification in Community Education. Yet, across the three authorities concerns were expressed that workers were being employed to do the frontline work who were not professionally qualified. Furthermore, I learned that LA1 was considering reducing the status of CE/CLD from a 'profession' to that of 'para-profession' which meant that those without a Degree in CE –but with a relevant qualification in say Social Work or Social Policy, could apply for professional CLD posts. According to some practitioners and managers this development was controversial:

'You are either community education qualified or you are not and I want someone who is community education qualified - it's a stamp that they have the skills that I am looking for. For me, Community Education is a profession because to continue to have this debate about whether we are a profession or not or whether we employ professional workers or not, is just ludicrous' (Margaret, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

'Currently, I would not employ anyone who does not have a Community Education qualification and this is something we wish to maintain...but I know we will have to fight for that. CLD should be seen as a profession in its own right' (Julie, later-years, CLD Manager, LA2).

In this context, practitioners and managers in LA1 claimed that professional identity was being 'diluted', 'eroded', 'lost', 'threatened' or was 'under attack'. In addition, concerns were raised in LA's 1 and 3 about other sections in local government who were said to be using a 'community development approach', which they as 'real' community development practitioners found problematic – for example:

'The Council think they are using community development approaches just because they are consulting. But they are not. I think this idea of just delivering training to people where there is no education or development should be questioned...it results in our jobs being discredited' (Gavin, later-years CLD Worker, LA3).

'I mean some people say that everyone is using a CLD approach - but come on, are they? CLD has been so diluted I'm not sure if they are? Where is the educational aspect of what they are doing? Are you really doing community work because you have done a consultation?' (Gail, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

'We have colleagues from other departments who say they are using a community development approach but I don't think they are doing it in the way we would, because it's all about engagement and consultation, ticking boxes and nothing beyond that. Our priorities are different' (Kenny, later-years Community Development Practitioner, LA1).

It is not my intention to argue whether the above claims were true or not; rather I want to suggest that professional anxieties such as these are best understood when situated in a context which involved the hollowing out of community development as an approach to working within integrated CE/CLD services.

Although developments were uneven I noted that CE/CLD was being fragmented across the three authorities by a series of reforms which I argue were challenging both the organisational and philosophical basis of Community Education. In a changing context, youth work - now defined as 'work with young people', increasingly operated out of schools where it had become either a support service for difficult pupils or a service increasingly focused on 'positive destinations' and employability. Consequently, traditional areas of CE/CLD based youth work such as youth clubs, detached and outreach programmes, 'residential', and supporting youth participation, were gradually disappearing. Similarly, adult education, which was defined as 'work with adults', was

increasingly framed in relation to the jobs market and in two of the three authorities proposals were being made to relocate it to those sections of local government responsible for employability. Similarly, proposals were being drafted in LA's 1 and 2 to re-locate community development – now defined as 'work with communities', into those sections of local government responsible for Community Planning and Economic Development. It was in this new organisational context that CD was increasingly viewed by local authorities as a methodology for supporting communities to provide public goods and services themselves, a theme I return to in Chapter 9. In this changing context, the 'generic community education worker' of old, who was trained to use a community development approach to adult education and youth work, was being phased out.

I noted that professionals across the three authorities responded to the above changes by claiming that it was an 'urgent task' to 'fight for the profession', – in fact, I was asked several times if my research could assist in the struggle. Those who engaged in such arguments claimed that a 'strong professional association' was needed, which they argued could protect the profession during difficult times:

'I think CLD needs its own union. Teachers as a professional body seem to have more rights and conditions but that is because they have fought for that. They seem to have more clout at the negotiation table. They have better rights in terms of maternity leave, even severance; there is a difference and I think it's because they have a stronger union and body behind them. For me the Standards Council needs to champion our cause' (Christine, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

'We need to stop the debate about are we a profession or not. I didn't realise how strongly I felt about our professional identity until management stopped calling us CLD and I felt quite pissed off with that. I have always felt in my heart that I was a community education worker. We are a profession, let's stop the debate and maybe if we stopped the debate we would be taken more seriously. I don't think the people above us understand what we do. But maybe CLD can come back with a vengeance. There is a need for a professional association. I am a professional with professional values. The Standards Council should have mandatory registration' (Wendy, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

Wendy's point about 'mandatory registration' refers to a discussion taking place as to whether or not practitioners should be registered on a mandatory basis with the CLD Standards Council (at the time of writing registration is voluntary); according to one manager:

'I didn't always believe in mandatory registration but now I'm convinced that it's the best way forward especially if we are going to safe guard what remains of the profession. Also it would put CLD on an equal footing with teaching and social work. But we never seem to get anywhere because it's turned into a debate...seriously could you imagine social workers having a debate about being registered with the SSSC? Or teachers? But we get stuck in a debate...we suffer because of that' (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

I revisit these discussions later in the chapter where I draw upon Fournier's concept of 'boundary construction' (see Fournier, 2000), in order to situate the data within a wider theoretical context.

The data considered has thus far suggested that professional identity and occupational identity were closely interlinked and I argue that two previously stable components of professional identity were being threatened by austerity related reform: first, the idea that CE/CLD is a graduate profession which can be traced to the 'Carnegie Report' of 1977 (see Chapter 4), was being challenged. In addition, CE/CLD as a discrete service within local government – which dates to the 'Alexander Report' of 1975, was also questioned. In this context, professionals experienced reforms as challenging both their status and prestige and also their autonomy to determine their work. It would be relatively straightforward to argue from the perspective of de-professionalisation that what I was witnessing was the death of a profession – yet this conclusion is problematic and ignored the ways in which practices associated with CE/CLD (youth work, adult learning and community development) were not only surviving in local government but were also being reinvented and this brings me to the concept of re-professionalisation which I discuss in relation to 'professional identity' in the next section.

### *Re-professionalisation and Professional Identity*

Re-professionalisation is centred on the ways in which the professions adapt and are reinvented in the context of new managerial reform (see Caser and Exworthy 1999; Evans, 2010; Noordegraaf, 2007; Noordegraaf and Schinkel, 2011). Readers should note that the data which follows emerged

primarily from interviews with managers and the reason managers were over-represented in data clusters which informed re-professionalisation was because management were lead actors responsible for facilitating service level reviews and re-organisations. Moreover, managers are also framed in this research as CE/CLD professionals and it is important to note that the CLD service was not dismantled from outside by a hostile employer, but was rather reformed from within by professionally trained Community Education managers. Relations between managers and professionals were especially tense – especially in LA1, and I noted that it was not uncommon to hear disgruntled professionals accuse management of being ‘anti-professional’ or causing the ‘death of the profession’; yet, as we shall see, framing management as anti-professional was problematic.

As noted, the professional qualification is an important component in producing professional identity; yet the data also suggested that the policy of employing only those qualified in Community Education was elitist and created conflict between CLD workers and other professionals. According to managers:

‘In the old CLD service we would only employ people with a degree in Community Education. Well for me that’s a barrier. People then start to make assumptions that they are just CLD and it gets in the way of joint work. What really matters is having an impact – not whether you are CLD or not’ (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

‘The community education qualification becomes divisive and elitist - you know, ‘we know better than you because we have the bit paper’ (James, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

‘Qualifications are important don’t get me wrong...but just because someone is community education qualified doesn’t mean they can do the job. I’m more interested in their practice...can they deliver...that’s more important than whether or not they have the right qualification’ (Pauline, mid-years Youth Work Manager, LA2).

Others argued that professional CLD workers were ‘barriers to reform’ and generally too protective about their remit:

‘People in community education play the professional card all the time which is very loaded. It implies ‘we are better than you’ and right now that type of attitude is a barrier to change’ (Martin, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Adult Learning, LA2).

‘For me, it doesn’t really matter what your qualification is, it’s about demonstrating your credibility and your impact and the difference that you make’ (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

In these extracts, the professional was framed as a ‘barrier to change’ and interestingly what ‘really matters’ according to Emily was not the professional qualification or occupational identity but whether or not the work of community development made an ‘impact’. Furthermore, in discussions with managers such as Emily, James and Martin who were from LA’s 1 and 2, I noted that they framed practitioners as professionals but with a critical distinction; professional identity in their view was no longer based on occupation – which they regarded as ‘elitist’, it was related to having a positive attitude towards both the work and organisational change. According to one of the manager’s, ‘the most important characteristic of the professional today is their ability to change’.

In addition, rather than CE/CLD being framed as a service and distinctive place in local government, it was argued that ‘new models of service delivery’ were emerging and I noted that managers in the three authorities frequently made reference to ‘partnership working’ and working in new ‘multi-functional’ teams. According to one manager/inspector:

‘If you’re in the camp, so to speak and you have a community education qualification people are very protective about that, of the service, of that identity. But I don’t always think that’s helpful. It prevents joint working and working with partners and generally speaking it gives the service a bad name’ (Emily, mid-years, Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

Readers will note that there is nothing substantially new about partnership working, yet its appearance in the contemporary scene denotes a new approach regarding how services are organised in local government. The new approach was referred to by managers as the ‘whole systems approach’ or the ‘one Council approach’ and is explained by one of the managers in the extract below:

‘Rather than social work, family learning, and health or in our case CLD just doing their own thing, everyone should be working towards the same set of outcomes and targeting our resources at those areas and at those individuals that cause us the most problems. So part of the solution is that we standardise everyone’s outcomes and we get everyone working from the same agenda’ (James, later-years, Quality Assurance Manager for Communities, LA1).

James reference to ‘targeting our resources at those that cause us the most problems’, involved the three authorities focusing their attention on ‘deprived areas’ and in this context youth work, adult education and community development were considered as approaches to working best targeted at the poor. Furthermore, James’ reference to ‘standardising outcomes’ was informed by a new policy – introduced across the three authorities, which involved every employee working towards the same set of corporately defined outcomes or ‘work related objectives’. As we shall see this policy has brought with it an increase in techniques and practices associated with New Public Management.

In general terms the ‘one Council approach’ aimed to create a centralised department which focused solely on deprived areas and this new approach had the potential to do away with discrete services such as social work and CLD by significantly reducing the number of departments in the local authority; it should also be noted that management – especially middle management, were in a contradictory position because whilst they were instructed to implement reform, they were also at the same time some of the biggest losers in the centralisation of services because less departments also meant less managers; in one authority I was told that the number of middle managers had been halved as a consequence of reform. Although managers seldom mentioned austerity, it is important to note that the driving force behind these changes is cost saving (reducing the number of managers) and in this context the new emphasis on ‘partnership working’ and working in ‘multi-functional’ teams can be understood in terms of what Audit Scotland has referred to as local authorities providing ‘new and different ways of delivering services within their reduced budgets’ (see Audit Scotland, 2016).

The new context has created what CE/CLD managers described as ‘new fields of work’ and ‘new areas of practice’ and two themes are worth noting at this juncture; first, the work was increasingly shaped by government policy or as one manager in LA1 described it, the ‘strategic priorities of the Council’ and according to informants in LA1 work which no longer ‘fitted with the new corporate

agenda', was increasingly shelved. In addition the universal CLD service was framed by managers in LA's 1 and 2 as costly and unproductive with the focus now on targeted work. I also noted that demand for CLD was no longer generated by young people or adult learners but by partner organisations who referred 'clients' and according to one youth work informant, most of the young people they engaged with were either referrals from social workers or guidance teachers in schools.

The second theme is that professional work was becoming increasingly managerialised and as noted in the literature view, the managerialisation of professional labour is one of the key themes in re-professionalisation (see Flynn, 1999; Hoggett, 1991). Moreover, increased managerialisation is a product of the job losses which have occurred at the level of middle management, which meant that managerial work has been transferred down the way. Due to the fact that professionals were engaged in more managerial work I noted that the frontline work they once delivered was increasingly provided by a new workforce, which I describe in the next section as 'CLD's precariat' and the role of professionals in managing the precariat emerged as one of the key characteristics of the new practices and re-professionalisation.

#### *Managing 'CLD's Precariat'*

The 'precariat' is a term Standing has used to describe workers on temporary or zero hours contracts and according to Standing, members belonging to 'the precariat' have risen in the public sector especially as a consequence of the drive towards privatisation, casualisation and outsourcing (see Standing, 2014, p. 90). I noted that across the three authorities the majority of the new frontline workers in CLD were on temporary contracts, hence why they are termed 'CLD's precariat'. In addition, the new workforce were not entitled to many of the benefits which has traditionally accompanied being a Council employee; for example, they had no rights to sick pay, parental leave or access to pension schemes and unlike professionals they were not reimbursed for transport costs or expenses incurred whilst at work – trades union membership was also lower when compared with professionals.

Readers familiar with CE/CLD may note that employing workers on temporary contracts is not a new phenomenon and that 'sessional staff' in the shape of part time youth workers and adult education tutors have always been a fixture of the CE/CLD workforce. Yet, the current context is distinctive from previous eras on the grounds that new forms of work were increasingly shaped by both policy and performance management; for example, although sessional youth workers and adult learning

tutors remain, albeit in declining in numbers – they have been accompanied by new workers with job titles which included ‘Youth Activity Agreement Workers’, ‘Positive Destinations Workers’, ‘Volunteer Co-ordinators’, ‘Employability Workers’, ‘Youth Mentors’ and ‘Transition Support Workers’. The new job titles are determined by policy, especially employability and positive destinations, whilst the work was shaped by the discourse of measurement – for example, how many young people volunteering or how many in positive destinations and so forth. Consequently, measuring the performance of the precariat and monitoring ‘outcomes’ and ‘work related objectives’ has become one of the key functions of contemporary CE qualified professionals. In addition, I noted that the bulk of educational work undertaken by professionals in all three authorities involved delivering training to the ‘precariat’. This training might include instructing the new workforce how to operate the various systems which have been put in place for measuring performance, most notably computerised Management Information Systems which were introduced across all three Councils. At one event I attended, a group of new employability workers were trained on how to ‘Measure and Monitor Impact’, with emphasis given to ‘Tracking the Journeys of Learners’ and ensuring that ‘Learner Journeys’ were recorded on the Management Information System. In addition, professionals delivered courses in relation to child protection training, first aid training, and Council policies and procedures.

The rise of ‘CLD’s precariat’ can be understood in relation to both de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. De-professionalisation in this context is centred on the ways in which local authorities were no longer recruiting professionals on permanent contracts with an annual salary, but rather part time workers on zero hours contracts who worked for significantly lesser pay than a traditional CE/CLD professional. It was not uncommon to hear complaints from professionals that the ‘precariat’ were not ‘fully qualified’ or that they performed ‘CLD work on the cheap’ and from this perspective, I noted that the precariat were presented as a new existential threat facing professionalism.

Yet, managing the ‘precariat’ was a key part of the job and also a site of re-professionalisation, especially in the sense that professionals were upskilled by their new managerial responsibilities most notably in relation to learning the technical skills required to monitor performance. Moreover, increased managerial work has led to an increase in status and according to informants some practitioners measured their status in terms of how many staff they managed. Managerial work has also brought with it the devolution of budgetary control and across the three authorities it was not uncommon to find CE/CLD practitioners having significant responsibility for the ‘day to day’

management of adult education and youth work budgets. Interestingly, a new way of thinking which is informed by managing budgets was emerging; for example, although the terms and conditions of the precariat were seen by some as ethically questionable – one professional in LA1 said it was morally wrong for an anti-poverty service such as CLD to employ people on poverty contracts, others justified zero hours or temporary contracts and spoke about why it was important to have a ‘flexible workforce’, especially at a time of budget cuts. Similarly one practitioner in LA1 said that temporary contracts made it ‘easier to dismiss workers who failed to deliver’. Managerial talk like this suggests that new mentalities shaped by managerialisation were emerging with traditional practitioners learning to think like managers and later I argue that a new fiscal consciousness has appeared which is linked with the devolution of budgetary control.

In concluding this section I want to note that the appearance of the ‘precariat’ suggested that a two tier workforce existed in CE/CLD; this consisted of ‘the precariat’ and administrative staff at one of the scale and at the other end Community Education qualified professionals in the shape of practitioners and managers. Professionals could be described as ‘the salariat’ and according to Standing, the ‘salariat’, denotes ‘privileged’ workers who have an annual salary as opposed to an hourly rate and permanent as opposed to temporary contracts (see Standing, 2014). In contrast with the ‘precariat’ who had very few entitlements, I noted that professionals or the ‘salariat’ had various perks at work including access to pension schemes, travel allowances for expenses incurred at work, holiday and sick pay and for managers, company cars and designated spaces in the car park. Framing professionals as a privileged ‘salariat’ challenged those ideas discussed earlier in terms of de-professionalisation, that professionals were losing their status and prestige and points also to the ways in which professional roles were adapting and being reinvented in the current context. In the next section I group together the main characteristics of re-professionalisation and suggest that the changes I have discussed thus far can be characterised in terms of a new professionalism which is emerging in the field.

### *Re-professionalisation and the New Professionalism*

The new professional practices, which I have discussed in terms of re-professionalisation, converge around several interrelated themes which can be summarised as follows:

- Professionalism is an approach to working not an occupational identity: rather than occupational identity, the new practices emphasise partnership working,

joined up working and working in multi-functional teams. Universal services are phased out and replaced with targeted work.

- The old professionalism is elitist: CE/CLD is portrayed as elitist, producer driven and creating barriers between different sets of professional actors.
- Management (and government) define practice: new fields of work are shaped by government policy and the strategic priorities of local states, whilst the field of judgment is controlled by government and in everyday practice settings by management and inspectors.
- Techniques associated with new public management monitor practice: various new public management techniques are introduced to ensure that practice is made auditable in terms of delivering governmental policy. The new techniques include computerised management information systems, inspections, work plans and work related objectives with quantifiable targets and measureable outcomes, and appraisals.
- The practitioner's role is managerialised: practitioners increasingly take on responsibility for managing a new workforce which delivers the frontline work. Increased managerialisation involves new corporate and strategic roles for practitioners and the devolution of budgetary control.
- Job titles and job descriptions are determined by policy and performance management: new fields of work have created new job titles – for example, 'Employability Officers', 'Positive Destinations Officers', 'Quality Assurance Managers' and so forth – these titles are shaped by policy whilst the new work is determined by performance management targets – increase the number of people volunteering or increase the numbers in positive destinations and so forth.
- Professionals are simultaneously de-professionalised and re-professionalised: the new practices are contradictory and are experienced in the field in terms of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation.

The above themes can be understood in terms of a new professionalism which was occurring across the three authorities and I develop this concept across the chapters which follow. The term 'new professionalism' featured in the literature review (see Chapters 3 and 4) where it was used to describe the impact of public sector reform on social work (see Banks, 2004, p. 44), the ways in which professions adapted and were reinvented in the era of new managerialism (see Evans, 2010) and also to highlight the opportunities which existed for a progressive agenda shaped by the professions in the era of public sector modernisation (see Banks, 2004). Readers should note that my use of the term draws upon Evetts' concept of occupational and organisational professionalism (see Evetts, 2009) which I discussed in Chapter 4. I suggest that the new professionalism provides a way of conceptualising the changing nature of professionalism which can be characterised as the hollowing out of occupational professionalism, which was associated with Community Education and CLD and the subsequent dominance of organisational professionalism in the current context. As noted in Chapter 4, Evetts argues that organisational professionalism involves new managerialism, hierarchical control, a free market rationality, technical/rational forms of regulation and accountability and management rather than practitioners define practice' (Evetts, 2009, p. 23).

The new professionalism is shaped by professionalism as opposed to professionalisation; rather than professionalisation – which is associated with occupational strategies to increase the status of an occupation, Evans notes that professionalism is informed by the 'attitudinal' and 'behavioural orientation' which an individual possesses towards their work (see Evans, 2010). Professionalism was evident in the data especially the ways in which management described the old professionalism as elitist and based on self-interest. In addition, professionalism can also help to make sense of why partnership working appeared in the data and according to Evans, professionalism 'breaks down barriers that exist between professionals and emphasises 'partnership working' and working in 'multi-functional teams' (Ibid, 2010). Similarly, Carrie and Kendall argue that a new 'inter-professionalism' is emerging, which involves professionals sharing and giving up exclusive claims to specialist knowledge (see Carrie and Kendall, cited in Banks, 2004, pp. 125-148). Fournier situates the new professional practices within the context of broader political and economic change and argues that boundaries between different groups are becoming blurred as professionals in organisations are asked to work in multi-functional teams in order to provide the 'flexibility' supposedly required to operate in a turbulent environment' (see Fournier, 2000 p. 68).

Yet, the appearance of de-professionalisation as one of the features of the new professionalism suggested that new professional practices were controversial and contested and in the next section I explore the extent to which the new professionalism was resisted by actors in the field. To do this, I return to the theme of 'fighting for the profession' and drawing upon Foucault and governmentality theory I discuss if practices associated with 'fighting for the profession' can be understood in terms of resistance or counter-conduct, the latter being a term Foucault discussed in the 'Governmentality Lectures' (see Foucault, 2009, p. 200)

### *'Fighting for the Profession' - Resistance or Counter Conduct?*

Those who believed in 'fighting for the profession' engaged in different strategies to defend as they saw it the old professionalism associated with CE/CLD. I noted that in LA's 1 and 2 they organised ad hoc trades union meetings which focused on specific aspects of the traditional professional project, especially job descriptions, terms and conditions, pensions and pay. In LA1, they appeared angry at the devaluation of the professional qualification and also at being 'forced into reapplying for their jobs' as they saw it. In addition, the fact that job titles were changing in LA1 from 'CLD Worker' to 'Lifelong Learning and Employability Officer' was a particular cause of contention. Managers were also affected by these changes and in LA1 managers told me of how they felt professionally degraded by their transformation from community development managers into new positive destinations managers.

At trades union meetings in LA1, angry professionals openly attacked management and a theme emerged – explored in the next chapter, that managers who implemented reforms had 'betrayed their professions'. As a participant observer at these meetings, I recorded notes in a fieldwork journal and the following extract offers an insight into the angry nature of the meetings:

'Peter said, 'we are all going to have to apply for the jobs we are doing and in the end managers will have us all competing against one another'. Janis said the workers should agree on mass not to apply for the new posts, which she said would 'truly fuck management's plans'. Wendy, who had stayed quiet until this point, said, 'look I'm just going to be honest, I don't want to be seen as a trouble maker, and I need a job in the new service'. Peter said he understood that people had 'bills and mortgages to pay' whilst Jackie said that management wanted 'yes people' and only 'people whose faces

fit'. Jackie added, 'I can't believe that people with community education degrees have done away with CLD' (Fieldwork Journal Extract, 2015, LA1).

In addition, I attended regional-wide meetings of CLD Standards Council members, which were organised to create a platform for professionals to discuss the impact of local government cuts on professional CLD. The following extract is taken from one of the meetings and featured professionals from the three authorities – readers should note that a full extract of this meeting is included as an Appendix:

'The local authority staff present were the most vocal at the meeting. In one authority, 10% of the workforce has left through voluntary severance and the meeting was told that these posts will not be replaced. In another authority staff said that CLD would not exist as an independent sector within the Council and that CLD would be split across positive destinations and lifelong learning and employability. 'We need to defend the concept of professionalism' said one worker. Concerns were noted that staff were working for CLD without proper qualifications. 'I don't say this to be elitist' said the person reporting these concerns, 'but only to highlight that non-qualified or less qualified staff were being used by management to drive down costs'. One of the academics wondered if there was still mileage in talking about the unity of youth work, adult education and community work, as one. 'It sounds like the end of CLD' said another. Another person stated that 'this is a really confusing time to be a CLD worker'. One participant was adamant that 'we don't have a national voice'. It was argued that the CLD Standards Council should be providing better political and strategic leadership. Others criticised the unions; 'there is no resistance' said Cathy adding that 'hardly anyone attended the protests on budget day' (Fieldwork Journal Extract, 2015).

In the above extracts practitioners can be described as 'persecuted professionals' (see Farrell and Morris, 2003) engaged in a series of conflicts and disputes with management. From this perspective, the professional who organised trades union meetings or meetings of the Standards Council, or lets it be known to management that they are demoralised by the new practices – they emerged as a governable problem for management.

'Fighting for the profession' was a natural site of resistance as professionals were confronted with the power of management; according to Foucault, 'where there is power, there is resistance' (see

Foucault, 2008). Yet, resistance is also problematic, note Cathy's reference in the extract to 'there is no resistance' and 'hardly anyone protests on budget day'. Similarly, Wendy's point that 'I don't want to be seen as a trouble maker' and 'I need job in the new service' suggests that professionals also saw that their long term interest was best served by compliance and co-operation as opposed to resistance. From the perspective of governmentality theory, Foucault's attitude to resistance or revolt- he used the terms interchangeably, was also problematic and at times contradictory; for example, he wrote the following in the 'Governmentality Lectures':

'I would just like to raise a problem of simple vocabulary. Could we not try to find a word to designate the type of revolts, or rather the sort of specific web of resistance to forms of power that do not exercise sovereignty and do not exploit but 'conduct'? I have often used the expression 'revolt of conduct', but I have to say that I am not very satisfied with it, because the word 'revolt' is both too precise and too strong to designate much more diffuse and subdued forms of resistance' (Foucault, 2009, p. 200).

After rejecting terms which included revolt, disobedience, insubordination, dissidence and misconduct, because they were either 'too strong, too weak, too localised, too passive, or too substance like', Foucault argued that 'counter-conduct' was a term he could settle on; counter-conduct he suggested, involved the 'struggle against the procedures implemented for conducting others' (Foucault, 2009, pp. xxi-xxii). Foucault's analysis interested me on the grounds that if resistance against the new professionalism was problematic, – or too strong, I still required a term which could capture practices and mentalities associated with 'fighting for the profession' and from this perspective, counter conduct appeared useful in terms of analysis.

Furthermore, Foucault's argument regarding the 'specific web of resistance to forms of power that do not exercise sovereignty and do not exploit but conduct', interested me especially in relation to the role played by management in the implementation of reform. With Foucault's analysis in mind I suggest that managers do not exploit and neither are they sovereign in the Foucauldian sense of the term – as we shall see in the next chapter, managers regularly complained of 'being powerless'. Yet, they have power, which is best understood in terms of procedural powers within a strategic consensus shaped by austerity and new managerialism. Viewed this way, they have the power to 'conduct the conduct of others', or in Foucault's terms 'direct human behaviour' (see Foucault, 2003), into new regimes of practice which I argue are shaped by the new professionalism.

Moreover, resistance was too strong a term in the sense that 'fighting for the profession' involved meetings which occurred outside the arena of work and outside work time and from this perspective 'fighting for the profession' caused no disruption to everyday practices associated with service level reviews or new models of service delivery. I was also of the view that whilst people talk defiance at these meetings, their everyday practice was based on compliance with new managerial regimes. Consequently, trades union meetings or meetings of the Standards Council could also be interpreted as a form of theatre whereby professional subjects vented their frustrations at the ways in which their everyday lives were intensely governed within the new regimes of practice. In addition to considering the extent to which resistance occurred, I was also interested in the arguments and strategies that professionals drew upon in order to 'fight for the profession'. In particular, I noted that many of the arguments coalesced around areas which Fournier has framed as 'boundary construction' (see Fournier, 2000) and in the next section I discuss 'fighting for the profession' in relation to boundary construction.

#### *'Fighting for the Profession' and Boundary Construction*

According to Fournier, the construction of boundaries or boundary work is central to the establishment and re-production of the professions with 'boundaries' the means by which professions claim authority and exclusivity. Yet, Fournier argues that practices associated with neoliberalisation and new managerialism have challenged the legitimacy and foundations of the professions whereby 'it has become commonplace to question the future of the professions in the context of current trends of economic, technological and organisational change' (Fournier, 2000, p. 67). According to Fournier, boundary construction involves 'legalistic tactics', 'credentialism' and 'discursive strategies' and with professionals engaged in 'defensive strategies' in order to erect boundaries around their particular field of practice (Ibid, pp. 69-74).

Fournier's argument can be applied to several themes in de-professionalisation and 'fighting for the profession' narratives; for example, arguments that professionals should have a recognised Community Education qualification or that registration with the Standards Council should be mandatory, these can be framed as defensive manoeuvres aimed at erecting boundaries around the field. Similarly, arguments that CE/CLD should be regulated by a strong professional association coupled with calls for it to be recognised as a statutory sector comparable with say teaching or social work, these can also be interpreted as legalistic and credentialist manoeuvres informed by boundary construction. Although the erection of professional boundaries were often dismissed by managers in

terms of elitism or vested professional self-interest, they can also be understood as counter conduct especially in the sense that erecting boundaries around a profession challenges some of the alleged 'truths' associated with austerity, neoliberalisation and local government; for example, 'fighting for the profession' and boundary construction involved demands for integrated and universal CLD services supported by local states whereby the state provides and protects the boundaries of professional practice. This can be framed as counter-conduct because it went against the grain of 'contracting out' and challenged an economics logic shaped by austerity.

Similarly, the debate regarding the value of the professional qualification can also be interpreted as a debate about financial resources - note the ways in which professionals were concerned with lesser qualified (and lesser paid) staff in the shape of the precariat being hired by local authorities to do work previously done by professionals. From this perspective, professional boundaries are drawn upon in order to defend the economic gains made by professionals during the era of the social democratic consensus and professional project (see Chapter 4), gains eroded by neoliberalisation. Viewed this way, boundary construction can be seen in terms of an occupational response – and site of counter conduct against the 'proletarianisation of professionalism' caused by neoliberalisation (see Elston, 1991; MacDonald, 1995; Smith, et al, 1991; Standing, 2014).

Boundary construction in this analysis can also be understood as a reflection of the status anxiety and frustrated sense of professional entitlement caused by proletarianisation. Moreover, status anxiety is best understood in relation to the individual biographies of many professional community education workers; for example, during interviews, many spoke of their pride at being 'the first in their families to go to university' – which was common amongst everyone I interviewed and in this context, the transcripts provided rich accounts of the working class origins of contemporary professionals:

'Well Dad worked in the mines. Mum was a housewife and we lived in a council house. I was the first person in my family to go to university. It was quite a big deal in my family...I remember my parents being really proud...I have a Degree in Community Education and an MBA in Public Sector Management' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

'When I left school I never dreamed of going to university...no one in my family went to university...I was an electrician before I did Community Education and I worked in bars

and nightclubs to get through university. I was the first to go to university. My family was working class. We grew up in a block of flats. Dad was a waiter and Mum was a Chambermaid. Both had left school without any qualifications. We were a working class Catholic family' (Gavin, later-years CLD Worker, LA3).

In these accounts CE/CLD was a profession which provided new opportunities for upward social mobility to those of working class origin, something originally envisaged by the architects of the influential 'Carnegie Report' (see Chapter 4). Moreover, many of the interviewees I spoke with, said they were materially better off than their parents, with some arguing that they had made the transition from working to middle class. Yet, the social mobility created by professionalisation was in retreat, especially as professional and bureaucratic careers are disrupted by austerity driven reforms. Furthermore, in a context of cuts many professionals, especially those in the 'early to mid-year' stages of their careers, reported feeling financially vulnerable and insecure regarding future career prospects and I came to the view that some were beginning to feel more like the 'precariat' whom they managed. Status anxiety is further compounded by the fact that current trends point towards professional jobs being 'deleted' (this is a term managers use), and replaced with new jobs with 'decreased public status' (see Socket, 1986), especially those performed by 'CLD's precariat'. As noted, in CE/CLD the new jobs are narrowly shaped by policy and performativity and are not 'jobs for life' but rather temporal 'fields of work' (see Sennett, 1998, p. 22) – shaped by the latest policy fad.

I want to conclude this discussion by returning to the theme of counter-conduct. According to Foucault, counter conduct is the inevitable effect of what happens when 'individuals exert power over others' (see Foucault, 1982, p. 217) and consequently counter-conduct is a natural product of the powers of managers (and the state) to determine the nature of the work. Furthermore, my approach to counter-conduct was not based on 'celebrating the existence of resistance' (see Deleuze, 1986) or championing the cause of the persecuted professional, but rather exploring the particular forms that counter-conduct takes in the field. Interestingly, counter-conduct is also conceptually different from resistance in the sense that it denotes smaller scale struggles against power which might not have any immediate effect other than the fact that they exist, which implies that power is always contested. However, in a context of stringent budget cuts and unprecedented austerity, where professionals are pressed against the organisational power of management (backed by the power of the state) I suggest that boundary construction is ultimately futile and reflects not so much resistance (which is why I prefer counter-conduct) but rather the noise the old professionalism makes as it withers away.

It is also important to note that not every professional actor responded to the new professionalism by 'fighting for the profession'; in fact, trade union meetings and Standards Council meetings were characterised by poor attendance which further demoralised those attempting to organise 'the resistance'. According to one informant in LA1, 'some people were too scared to fight for the profession'; whether this was true or not I had no way of knowing, yet based on interviews and observations I noted that many professionals often responded to organisational change in different ways – some chose to strategically stay quiet, whilst others learned to adapt and survive (and even thrive) in the new managerial regime.

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 6 has situated the concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation in data and I argued that both concepts are best understood in the context of organisational reforms linked with austerity and neoliberalisation. According to Evans, professions are informed by a 'consensus of the norms' (see Evans 2010), norms which are stabilising factors in maintaining not only a sense of purpose but also professional identity. I suggest that in CE/CLD the 'consensus of the norms' was breaking down as the old professionalism associated with occupational professionalism is hollowed out and replaced with a new set of professional practices. In the chapters which follow I develop the concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation further and use them as the means to organise, present and interpret data. Two themes emerged in this chapter which I discuss in depth in the chapter which follows: first, managers are important strategic actors in de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation and in Chapter 7 I investigate the changing nature of management in CE/CLD. In addition, relations between managers and practitioners became a theme to investigate and also a research question; in particular I consider the ways in which relations were characterised by a series of new conflicts and tensions which are a product of new managerialism and neoliberalisation.

## **Chapter 7: The New Public Manager in Community Development and Relations between Managers and Practitioners in the Managerial State**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 7 is divided into two sections and begins with a discussion on the changing nature of management in CE/CLD and I argue that the traditional managerial role is being transformed by reforms linked with austerity and new public management. I suggest that it is important to understand the organisational context which has produced the new professionalism and in which managerial work takes place and in particular I discuss the rise of computerisation, the culture of long working hours and the ways in which the devolution of budgetary control creates new conflicts between professionals. In the second section I consider relations between practitioners and managers and discuss the ways in which managers are framed as 'outsiders' by disgruntled practitioners experiencing de-professionalisation. Yet, practitioners accounts of management are one dimensional and I argue that contemporary managers are better understood as contradictory social actors with some experiencing 'loyalty conflicts' – that is loyalty to the old professionalism and loyalty to their employer, whilst others embrace identities associated with the new professionalism. The chapter concludes with the proposition that managerial practices linked with managerialism, especially performativity, have qualitatively changed the managerial role and I argue that the traditional bureaucratic manager of old has been transformed into the new public manager who played a strategically important role in the enactment of the new professional consensus.

### *Transforming Managerial Roles in the Managerial State*

The role played by management is at the heart of the new professionalism and in this section I consider the changing role of managers in contemporary local government. Reforms linked with austerity have transformed managerial roles and the first wave of reforms resulted in significant reductions in the number of managers across the three authorities. Before 2010/11, a typical CE/CLD team in any one of the authorities had two groups of managers, themed managers who specialised in youth work, adult education or community development and their counterparts who managed geographical and neighbourhood based teams. In addition, the traditional manager was embedded within a team of practitioners and usually worked out of a community based setting and it was not uncommon for junior managers to be involved in the delivery of frontline work. Yet, following the

first wave of reforms these managers were displaced with the old CE/CLD managerial posts deleted and replaced with new strategic posts.

The new strategic posts across all three authorities have been shaped by the language of policy and performance management with CLD Team Leaders being replaced by 'Quality Assurance Officers', 'Performance and Planning Managers' and so forth. The new managers were no longer expected to practice community development, work in the same space as the staff they managed (they were centralised in Council Headquarters) or act as the official custodians of the profession and as we saw in Chapter 6 they were placed in the role of lead actors in the transformation and hollowing out of CE/CLD. The new managerial role - as their job titles suggest, was predominantly shaped by new managerialism and performance management and the new managers were strategically positioned at the command centre of what I refer to as new regimes of performance management - as noted in Chapter 6, new practices concerned with audit and measurement have emerged which included individual workplans with quantifiable outcomes, team plans with measureable targets, computerised management information systems and a new system of appraisals.

The computer is the principal management tool and one of the key technologies for monitoring and measuring performance, however the data suggested that computerisation has brought with it new existential anxieties. CE/CLD managers across the authorities told me that they felt controlled by computerised bureaucracies and through lengthy discussions I began to understand that whilst managers monitored the performance of practitioners, they were also routinely monitored by what seemed like the all-seeing and all-knowing electronic eye of computerisation. The extent to which computerisation has transformed managerial labour was interesting; for example, several managers in LA2 explained how they 'fed' their everyday tasks into a computerised management information system, which then assembled the data on their behalf and produced reports to senior management which showed whether or not CLD's performance targets were being met. According to managers these practices created 'constant pressures' and drawing upon Standing they can be framed as a form of 'dataveillance' (Standing, 2014, p. 229) whereby the demand for data becomes a form of surveillance itself.

In addition, managers told me of how they had to respond to between 100 and 200 emails per day and alongside the demands of emails they discussed the challenges of being responsible for maintaining numerous management information systems. Computerisation was also at the heart of a culture of working long hours with managers explaining that since being issued with various

electronic devices such as smartphones and lap-tops, they have been under increasing pressure to do additional work from home. According to informants, being expected to work beyond their designated hours was an everyday occurrence and the 'long hours' (typically twelve hour days) were routinely described as 'part of the culture':

'If I can be blunt, my manager works all hours of the day and night, clocks up so many hours and it's become expected of me' (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

'I have always worked more than my hours but it is worse now than it's ever been and I think it will go on getting worse. They have added things on to my post - one and a half jobs to be exact, which were just given to me on top of my job. If I get less able to be the type of person I would like to be it's because I'm working in that way...it is beyond anything which you should reasonably expect of an employee but I can't complain because mostly every other person at managerial level is at the same place' (James, later years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

Many interviewees said they were regularly stressed and tired by the job which led to conflicts at work – note James reference to 'if I get less able to be the type of person I would like to be it's because I'm working in that way'. Others explained how working from home created strains on personal relationships and according to one informant it blurred the grounds between where the work started and where it ended.

Despite complaints of a long hours culture, several informants in LA1 suggested that many managers often showcased their long working hours as evidence of loyalty to the organisation and a belief in their managerial mission. This was interesting because it highlighted the ways in which norms associated with disciplinary regimes were internalised by managers and from this perspective, Gershuny argues that 'busyness has become the new badge of honour' (see Gershuny, 2005); similarly, Standing has claimed that workers often become addicted to 'binge working' (see Standing, 2014). I noted that binge working has become normalised and was seldom resisted by managers and rather than resistance, a new culture based on competitiveness was emerging and managers who failed to work the additional hours were branded in this context as 'weak managers', 'lazy' or 'freeloading' and subject to stigmatisation. Practitioners were also influenced by this new competitive culture and interestingly the psychological character traits of weak managers were often put forward in the three authorities as potential explanations as to why CLD was vulnerable to

budget cuts. The new culture of competitiveness which in historical terms is a product of the neoliberalisation of the state discussed in Chapter 3, is a phenomenon worthy of more detailed analysis and consequently I return to this theme in Chapter 10.

The environmental setting and in particular everyday office settings where managerial work occurred was frequently raised by managers (and practitioners) during interviews. Readers should note that managers in all three authorities worked in open plan office spaces and according to informants, the days when managers had their own private office space in local government were long gone. During interviews managers complained of a lack of personal space and many noted problems in relation to noise, especially hearing other people's conversations. In addition every manager I interviewed said that open plan offices were a major cause of work related stress especially in relation to overcrowding. They also frequently complained about the new 'hot desk' policy, which was described by one manager as follows:

'You no longer have your own desk and you can no longer put your own personal mementos on the desk. It's very de-personalising and it causes conflicts between staff who now fight over desk space. Seriously I have seen colleagues fall out with another over getting access to a desk' (Gavin, later-years CLD Manager, LA3).

Hot-desking is an increasing trend in the public sector and occurred across all three authorities and according to Standing it 'depersonalises the office' and produces a 'psychological effect' which reduces the sense of attachment which employees feel towards their firm or organisation (see Standing, 2014, p. 91). Similarly, Kim and De Dear suggest that hot-desking and open-plan offices are having a negative impact on the 'psychological well-being' of employees (see Kim and De Dear, 2013).

I would argue that open plan offices and complaints about overcrowding and hot-desking – all recent features in the field, highlighted the ways in which managers were losing their prestige and status in new managerial regimes and were also subjected to processes which can be described in terms of de-professionalisation. Furthermore, complaints of overhearing people's conversations – (which also meant that people could hear the manager's conversations) created in my mind a culture of peer surveillance which contributed towards the new culture of competitiveness. For example, managerial informants said that open plan offices made it easier to keep track of people's 'comings and goings', whilst also observing just how much work was taking place. Time emerged as

an important factor in these discussions, especially the amount of time spent doing productive work and I noted that in LA1 workers who took 'long lunches' or who 'surfed the internet' during work time or who 'were always blethering' were subjected to stigmatisation. It may also be the case that actors who engaged in non-productive acts, especially in workplace regimes which emphasised productivity, were also engaged in micro acts of counter-conduct.

The biggest site where the new competitive culture existed concerned the devolution of budgetary control. As noted in Chapter 3, the devolution of budgetary control, albeit within centralised systems of management, is one of the key features of new managerialism. Yet, budgetary control in the field takes place in a context of shrinking budgets and managers with remits for youth work, adult education and community development were forced into 'fighting it out' amongst themselves in order to decide which way the budget should be cut. According to one manager:

'If you are in a context where resources are reducing, it's like rats on a rung where the water level is rising and they are climbing up to avoid drowning and they are getting closer and closer and their backs are together and they start to eat each other. We are at the starting to eat each other point...we want to see our area of practice continue to exist and as resources decline the conflict between those different areas of practice gets greater and greater because there are less resources to fund them...therefore, people start taking bites out of each other on whether or not their area of practice has greater value to society than their colleagues do' (James, later-years, Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

According to one informant in LA1 managers engaged in acts of strategic manoeuvring, which meant that they lobbied senior managers and selectively used data in order to demonstrate how their particular field of practice was hitting performance targets or meeting social policy objectives. Moreover, in a context where all three authorities were committed to performance targets such as 'reducing welfare dependency', 'increasing employability' and 'increasing the numbers of young people in a positive destination', I noted that community development was 'struggling to compete' as one manager described it, against youth work and adult education. Anecdotal evidence such as this is also borne out by national studies which suggests that across thirty two Scottish authorities, community development is experiencing disproportionately more cuts compared with youth work or adult education (see CLD Managers Scotland Report, 2012).

In concluding this section I want to note that an analysis of everyday environmental settings can offer new ethnographic insights into a field of practice which is often studied conceptually and from a distance. In terms of a wider analysis I have focused on management in this section because management have occupied a role of strategic importance in the hollowing out of the old professionalism and the enforcement of practices associated with the new professional discourse. As noted in Chapter 6, the role of management in enforcing the new consensus has transformed relations between managers and practitioners which is a theme I consider in the next section of this chapter.

### *Relations between Managers and Practitioners in the Managerial State*

The role of management in enforcing the new professionalism has created new sites of conflict between managers and practitioners and a narrative emerged in LA1 from disgruntled professionals which cast managers as 'outsiders' who were accused of sabotaging their professions from the 'inside'. These were emotive claims and my intention in highlighting them here, is not to validate these positions, cast judgement or 'take sides' - but neither is it to contradict them either – instead working from a phenomenological perspective, I explore how these accounts came to pass, whilst situating them within a context shaped by new managerialism.

The four extracts which follow shed light on how contemporary managers were viewed by professionals:

'I think when you go into management you lose the primary fire, you lose the connection with the primary client, the individual, the groups, the community, you lose touch with their realities. You get caught up in a different perspective and that is a managerial, operational, target driven process and you lose people' (Tommy, later-years, CLD Worker, LA1).

'I think managers, the higher up they go in the system, and this includes CLD, they get trapped into management which is about Council structures. It's not about changing things but maintaining things as they are. Their obligations and duties become managing budgets and being accountable...they just tick the boxes for the Council' (Janis, later-years, CLD Worker, LA1).

‘When you are elevated to a managerial role, your values and principles get lost, they are not important. The reality is employers do not want extremely conscientious workers who think critically and analyse and reflect on their work; the culture is yes sir no sir - and get the box ticked’ (Jackie mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

‘They lose it once they become managers...I remember my line manager when she was a CLD Worker and you would never know that it’s the same person. They never have time for discussions now...everything’s form filling, box ticking and paperwork...endless paperwork’ (Shona, mid-years CLD Worker).

Accounts such as these reached saturation point and although the theme of conflict between managers and professionals is well documented in the literature (see Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Flynn, 1999; Fournier, 2000; Walsh, 2006) – the above accounts interested me because they made frequent reference to ‘target driven processes’, ‘form filling’, ‘box ticking’ and ‘endless paperwork’, terms associated with new public management, especially performance management. From this perspective, the manager – framed as the agent of managerialism and enforcer of new regimes of performance management, was constructed by the disgruntled professional as an actor who had not only separated themselves from their professional origins but who had also ‘betrayed their profession’. Consider these statements:

‘I don’t feel they see the bigger picture - their view of education is pedestrian and mechanical. They have forgotten their professional roots’ (Wendy, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

‘I don’t see them as community educators. Not anymore. They don’t use the language of education. Never. Everything is outcomes and outputs or measuring things that don’t matter...they try to count the things that don’t have any real value’ (Lisa, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

‘These days it’s as if they could be managing anything so long as the boxes are ticked and the management information systems are up to date. It’s irrelevant that we are community workers. They could be managing anything....maybe I am naïve but I always thought there would be a commitment to community education’ (Stevie, later-years CLD Worker, LA1).

‘Too be fair it’s not their fault but I really don’t see them as community education people anymore. But it’s no fault of their own. The Council need managers that are number crunchers and box tickers. They have no choice. They have no autonomy. But then, well, that’s true for everyone’ Gill, later-years CLD Worker, LA3).

In these accounts and others like them, I detected the emergence of a narrative which posited management as a discrete and separate profession in its own right. Interestingly, practices associated with new managerialism were presented an alien and imposed on community development professionals by ‘outsiders’. According to Becker, ‘outsiders’ appear in an organisation when people feel they are being judged according to rules they had no hand in making – rules forced on them by the outsider (Becker, 1973, p. 16).

However, these accounts were problematic for a number of reasons; first, the analysis was one dimensional and based on an ‘ideal type’ of professionalism which was then posited - falsely in my opinion, against the corrupting influence of management. Moreover, it ignored the practitioner’s role in ‘managing the precariat’, (see Chapter 6) which resulted in the managerialisation of professional labour. In addition, too much agency was granted to supposedly insincere managers who betrayed their professions and consequently a reductive account of managerialism emerged in which new managerial practices were associated with the alleged character flaws of management as opposed to the wider politics of the state and neoliberalisation. It was also the case the bulk of data was obtained from LA1 which was at the epic-centre of a controversial review and consequently managerial-practitioner relations were particularly fraught in this authority.

Rather than focus on the alleged character traits – or flaws of management, I was interested in an approach which started from the theoretical premise that the human personality is a product of culture. According to Goffman:

‘Individualistic modes of thought tend to treat processes such as self-deception and insincerity as characterological weaknesses generated within the deep recesses of the individual personality. It might be better to start from outside the individual and work inward than to start inside the individual and work out’ (Goffman, 1990, p. 86).

To 'start from outside the individual and work inward' involved understanding the character traits of management within an organisational culture shaped by competitiveness, austerity, and in general terms the neoliberalisation of the state discussed in Chapter 3. Furthermore, when the insights of management are included in the narrative, managers emerged as sympathetic figures and contradictory social actors and although some embraced the new professionalism others were privately sceptical and understanding of the plight of the disgruntled and de-professionalised professional. As a result of this analysis I noted that two categories of manager appeared in the data – those with mentalities which embraced managerialism and the new professionalism and those who experienced 'loyalty conflicts' – that is loyalty to their profession, community education/CLD, and loyalty to their new profession, management. I consider both positions and begin the next section with a discussion on those who experienced loyalty conflicts.

#### *Loyalty Conflict's and the Community Development Manager*

Managers who reported conflicting loyalties appeared across the three authorities and they used metaphors in which they described themselves as 'wearing two hats', being 'torn between' or 'sandwiched between' the plight of their respective professions and the demands that were placed upon them by organisations. These metaphors appear to be common throughout the public sector and in a study of middle management in education, it was noted that managers used metaphors such as 'standing between parties', 'sandwiched positions', 'in a split', 'standing at the crossroads', 'in front of the troops' and 'caught between two fires' (see Noordegraaf and De Wit, 2012, p. 96).

The metaphors used by CE/CLD management reflect the duality of the managerial role and the contradictory social position occupied by middle management whereby managers have to enforce decisions taken elsewhere which they privately disagreed with. According to one manager:

'I have to make tough decisions...well not so much make them but enforce tough decisions that perhaps I don't agree with...but I have to do it because that's my job and that's what I get paid for and I have to be thick skinned and take that on the chin. And yes we have to be tough and deliver outcomes. Sometimes in my darkest moments I think if people don't like it, they know where the door is, you know when I'm really frustrated, but actually I don't believe that' (James, later-years Policy and Performance Manager for Communities, LA1).

In contrast with claims made by disgruntled professionals that managers were obsessed by power or wielded too much power, powerlessness became a common theme in my interviews with managers:

‘I actually thought when I moved into management that I would have more influence and say when I went up the promotional ladder. Well let me tell you, it doesn’t really work like that’ (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

Some recalled that ‘in the old days’ it was possible to disagree with senior management whilst defending CE/CLD and managers who had previously managed adult education described the ‘spaces’ which once existed where they could strategically position adult education as ‘something different’ from vocational education and employability; youth work managers made similar points regarding ‘positive destinations’. These accounts suggested that before the onset of austerity driven reforms in 2010/11 and the consequent reshaping (and disappearing) of services that followed, managers had a degree of professional autonomy to define, interpret and defend the CE/CLD sector in local government. Moreover, the role of management in the old professionalism - occupational professionalism, was to act as the official guardians of professional boundaries.

However in a context of austerity, where services faced either reform or extinction, this role has been transformed and rather than defend professional boundaries, contemporary managers dismantled the old professional consensus from within. The interesting thing about this new role was the extent to which managers privately disagreed with the new reform agenda – consider these statements:

‘I went into the meeting and I said well its change and I can cope with change and I just need to find the positives out of what is happening. I thought there is no point in fighting a corner which could be detrimental towards my opportunities in the Council - and I feel manipulative and scheming in my dealings with senior management and I hate that part of myself; but I am looking out for number 1 and I went into that consultation and said, well we have to make savings, and we have to move with the times...and words were coming out of my mouth that were not my true heartfelt words’ (Julie later-years CLD Manager, LA2).

‘Sometimes I try to be positive...don’t cause problems; that way we acquiesce with things we don’t really agree with; it’s a horrible way to be and I don’t enjoy it either

professionally or in terms of my personal integrity...I don't enjoy behaving this way but I feel pushed into a corner' (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

'I have tried to do a 180 degree turn and have what remains of CLD seen as a force for positive good and I want senior managers to know that we are not troublemakers, we are happy to go with the flow and with changes. I think if I had made a stand and told them what I really think there would be a vindictive response...the reason I am still here and the CLD office open is because we have kept our heads under the parapet and been in total agreement and supportive of what management is doing...but purely for the service' (Denise later-years Community Development Manager, LA3).

'I'm going to have to go with the majority view against my principles and what I believe in. So I'm finding that uncomfortable at the moment. I suppose I recognise that I need the money and they pay my wages so I have to kind of toe the line in some ways' (Katie, later-years, CLD Manager, LA1).

Two managerial identities emerged in these accounts: the public self which advocated co-operation and compliance and a private self which was increasingly alienated. Paulsen describes the phenomenon of saying one thing yet believing the opposite as 'pretended obedience and fake commitment' (Paulsen, 2014, p. 10) and consequently I argue that 'pretended obedience/fake commitment' or what Teelken describes as 'pretend enthusiasm' (see Teelken, 2012, p. 278) were key components of managerial labour in local government. The narrative of 'they pay my wages so I have to toe the line' reached saturation point and corresponds with a historical and Marxian analysis of work which has described paid labour as the antithesis of freedom (see Paulsen, 2014). Managers argued that it was advantageous to 'stay quiet' and discussing scenarios where they said that they knew budget cuts were coming without knowing specifically where, they told me of how they 'kept their heads down' and made sure that the services they managed were kept 'off the radar'. According to one informant in LA2 'Head Office' was a place to avoid in case they met the Director or worse, the Chief Executive:

'There are times when it's been rocky and we have kept our heads down. That's deliberate. I have an office in HQ but I don't use it because if I am seen in that corridor of power it brings all the services I manage to attention and people think, 'oh I forgot

that you are still here’...so I have a tendency to avoid things like that’ (Margaret, later-years CLD Manager, LA2).

Yet informants in Margaret’s team argued that CLD was vulnerable to cuts because Margaret had failed to ‘sell the sector’ to the new Chief Executive.

Another common theme – again repeated across the three authorities was that managers were tired of fighting senior management:

‘Before, I was much more up front and was constantly fighting CLD’s corner...but that gets really weary after a time and I feel powerless; people who sit below me in the structure feel even more powerless and I feel that my values and principles have been eroded in some ways because I’m not doing that. I always make an analogy with racism, yes we should be challenging it, but sometimes that gets really weary and I think well, I just have to let that go or I will deal with that later’ (James, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

The everyday practices associated with pretended obedience/fake commitment have created existential anxieties and managers said they were ‘looking forward to getting out’ either through early retirement schemes or by accepting voluntary redundancy packages. Interestingly, one of the defining traits of managers who experienced loyalty conflict was that they tended to be ‘later-year’ managers and because of their age many were gradually being phased out via new redundancy schemes and replaced with a younger breed of managers drawn from community education’s managerial cadre. Furthermore, the new breed of younger managers appeared to embrace reform and showed enthusiasm for what they described as the new directions of travel. As noted in Chapter 6, this group of managers were key agents in the narratives of re-professionalisation and the new professionalism.

#### *Embracing the New Directions of Travel*

I was interested in a group of managers from across the authorities who spoke of ‘embracing change’, ‘meeting the challenges of change’, ‘adapting to change’ and so forth. The changes which these managers discussed were always in motion and they futuristically framed organisational change in terms of ‘going forward’, ‘constant improvement’ and in this narrative they posited

themselves as agents who 'rolled out' reforms which were generally informed by 'continual innovation'. The past frequently entered their narrative and contrary to those disgruntled professionals who constructed the past as a 'golden age of community development', the new breed of managers described the past in terms of a 'dark ages', 'where no one was accountable' and community education was a 'data free zone'. It was evident from these narratives that for a new breed of managers, computerisation and performance management equalled progress and although the existential angst and alienation caused by technology was acknowledged, it was nevertheless framed as a necessary evil within a utilitarian calculation.

The new managers also complained of disgruntled professionals – especially those in their 'later-years' whom they described in the following terms: 'barriers to reform', 'radical - but didn't do much', 'they give the service a bad name', 'intrinsically against management' or 'they spoke about Paulo Freire all the time but didn't deliver many outcomes'. In contrast, with those who experienced loyalty conflict, none of the new managers said they felt powerlessness and instead they presented accounts of themselves where they emerged as leaders and organisational visionaries who were able to make the 'tough choices' required by modernisation and in this context their managerial skills emerged as more important than their professional expertise (see Hood, 1991; Pollitt, 1998).

Interestingly, several showed a willingness to think outside of community development's 'leftist consensus' (see Kenny, 2010) and advocated positions which some in the field – especially those influenced by a radical tradition (see Chapter 4) found problematic. I noted that new managers often supported the retreat of local government from providing certain services – most notably in relation to child care, working with young people and services for older people and they argued that new and exciting opportunities were emerging for both communities and professional community development. In this context they welcomed the 'contracting out' of youth clubs, crèches, after school clubs and lunch clubs for the elderly on the grounds that local authorities had to balance the budget and devote resources to strategic priorities and several argued that the future of community development was to be found in policies such as asset transfer and co-production, which encouraged communities to provide services either themselves or in partnership with the Council.

I also noted that several expressed support for the UK government's welfare to work programme which they argued challenged dependency and adult education was described as a service with a role to play in promoting work and reducing welfare dependency; one manager in LA1 argued that attendance in employability programmes should be mandatory especially if the student was in

receipt of state benefits. I also discovered in LA1 that adult education practitioners routinely provided registers to Job Centre Plus as part of a new partnership agreement which encouraged information sharing. Despite the enthusiasm of the manager, several tutors said they were worried that information sharing could be used to 'dock the benefits' of students and consequently, they were hesitant to report them absent from an employability class.

The new managers presented change as unalterable and they argued that CE/CLD had no option but to reform and embrace change which generally meant that certain 'community education shibboleths' had to be jettisoned. One of these shibboleths included the principle that participants engaged with CE/CLD on a voluntary basis and according to one manager:

'Well most people's principles and values when they did Community Education was that it was a voluntary activity and that you weren't harassed into doing it. It was completely voluntary. But now...our Activity Agreement Workers and Positive Destinations Officers, they go knocking on doors harassing young people to death to get them out of their bedrooms...but that's what's needed for these young people because you can't really believe that it's a choice to say 'I don't want to work I'm happy just lying in bed'. Community workers have to fall on one side of the fence or the other...do you think people's right to self-determination is the utmost principle or do you think sometimes actually some people don't know what's good for them and they need a wee shove...so it's whether you are on the shove side of the campaign or the self-determination side. That's the dividing line' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

The shift from voluntarism was accompanied by a change in how traditional service users were described with 'participants' giving way to 'clients' – a term common in social work and increasingly found in employability narratives coupled with the appearance of 'customers' in CLD<sup>9</sup>. I also noted that the term 'trainee' was emerging in youth work, again due to the influence of employability.

---

<sup>9</sup> This was noted in adult education, which was identified as contributing towards the local authorities 'Income Maximisation' agenda (i.e. the Council made an income through charging students to attend classes), and in this context use of the term 'customer' was increasing – although many were critical of this development, one manager argued that framing people as customers brought with it a whole new series of rights in the form of customer care which should be welcomed by CLD. This statement highlighted the ways in which

I return to these themes in Chapter 10 where I draw upon Foucault in order to frame the beliefs of the new managers as examples of 'new regimes of truth' which have emerged in the field as a consequence of neoliberalisation. Moreover, the neoliberalisation of values and the subsequent creation of new mentalities is a phenomenon happening in other professions – for example, Holman researched the values and beliefs of senior managers in social work and discovered that many displayed an 'astonishing enthusiasm in embracing the Government's programme of minimising the local authority's function, imposing a market culture and destroying direct provision of public services' (Holman, 1993, p. 47) – and although managers in my own research would seek to refute the notion that they supported destroying public services, they were nonetheless supportive of governmental reforms which can broadly be characterised as neoliberal.

One of the themes which emerged in the data was that new styles of management were appearing in the field and in the next section, I argue that a conceptual shift has taken place which involves a move away from consensus management, which has traditionally been associated with CE/CLD towards a new authoritarian management which I argue is one of the key features of the new professionalism.

#### *From Consensus Management to Authoritarian Management*

Informants from across the three authorities described previous managerial styles in CE/CLD as participatory, democratic and based on consensus – although they noted that the 'right to manage' was an important component of management. In contrast, managerial styles in contemporary regimes were presented as top down, dictatorial and authoritarian. How accurate these accounts were is difficult to verify, yet what interested me was not so much comparing and contrasting contemporary regimes with previous ones, but rather noting how the shift towards authoritarian management was related in the accounts of informants with the introduction of new regimes of performance management. The managerial culture specific to community development is discussed in a moment, but first a word on the wider culture of management in local government. One informant likened the culture of their Council to that of the 'police or the army' - 'whatever is decided', they said – 'you do it'. Others said that questioning the decisions of Heads of Service or Directors was potentially career damaging:

---

neoliberalisation and marketisation were not merely destructive of values but also produced new sets of values and ethics.

‘Any criticism, however constructive is viewed very negatively. I lost a job because I did challenge management; I’m very reluctant to challenge management on anything. Especially at this time in my career. I just work away’ (James, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

The fear of speaking out was repeated across the authorities with informants noting that middle managers who ‘spoke out of turn’ or who ‘continually questioned decisions’ were less likely to be promoted or worse, ‘they could end up in the redeployment pool’<sup>10</sup>. Informants described senior managers as an ‘officer class’ who were ‘enamoured by private sector discipline’ and some recalled being coerced into attending glitzy events organised by senior management:

‘They organise Pride in our People events. The reality is that it’s spin. Big posters saying we are here to listen to you. Its motivational talks, music blasting, high energy stuff and these five Directors come onto the stage and then you are told to break into groups to discuss things’ (Cathy, later-years CLD Manager, LA3).

‘The new management team are very much Thatcher’s children beginning to come through...One manager who was giving a presentation said that one of the problems in the public sector was clockwatching staff and meddling councillors and he compared himself to Alexander the Great and how Alexander the Great could never have won his battles with people saying, “I better check my flexi time” (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

Practices like these can be read as symbolic representations of a shift from traditional public sector management associated with bureaucratic management and concerned with rules and procedures, towards new managerial regimes characterised by transformational management, motivational leadership and new public management.

---

<sup>10</sup> The redeployment pool refers to a system in local government known as ‘Switch’ which houses those employees whose original jobs have been deleted. In theory employees stay in the system until a suitable post is found. Based on speaking to several interviewees in LA1 I learned that managers in Switch were not portrayed as the unfortunate victims of circumstance but rather as ‘failed managers’ or ‘lazy managers’ who lacked the right corporate attitude.

With regards to community development, authoritarian management can be posited as a phenomenon born out of new public management, especially the ways in which NPM is based on what Banks describes as an 'ethics of distrust' (see Banks, 2004). The idea that practitioners could not be trusted and that performance was generally better when it was subjected to regular monitoring and inspection shaped the outlook of managers; moreover it created in my mind a game whereby cynical managers constructed the professional worker – 'whose defining trait was that they didn't like being told what to do' (this is what one of the managers said) – as a subject who left to their own devices would bend the rules to suit their own agenda – which typically meant being less productive than they otherwise could be.

At a team 'away day' which I attended in LA1, one of the managers said that the new computerised management information system meant that 'there would be no places to hide', whilst others argued that new performance management systems could make it easier to 'manage people out of the system', especially those who were 'underperforming' and failing to meet performance targets. According to one manager:

'It was really hard to remove any member of staff who wasn't performing. Performance Matters makes that much easier...and we took a conscious decision that when we devised the system that if people didn't play the game they would go straight into a Professional Development Plan' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

The new performance management framework was referred to by Emily as 'Making Performance Matter' and this system was introduced across local government between 2012 and 2014, during a period of major reform. The framework is overseen by a system of appraisals which are based on practitioners and managers meeting throughout the year in order to review and set performance targets and practitioners who failed to meet targets could find themselves placed in a 'Performance Development Plan' (PDP). Several informants claimed that the new appraisals system was hollowing out professional supervision which was gradually being replaced with a new system focused on performance and planning and in this context manager/practitioner encounters were increasingly mediated by performativity.

The new performance management framework was also designed to ensure that every Council employee works towards the same set of corporately defined outcomes. Responding to my question that professionals were often sceptical of new fields of work, especially work centred on employability and positive destinations, - and consequently sceptical of the new centrally imposed outcomes, one of the managers argued:

‘It doesn’t matter if people are philosophically against their organisation or have reservations about policy so long as they meet their outcomes...Philosophically they might not like where we are going and they can disagree with it all they want but at the end of the day they might just have to choose not to work here anymore’ (Denise, mid-years Quality Assurance Manager for Communities, LA3).

These statements sound harsh, especially when appearing in written form; yet it is important to situate the authoritative nature of these statements within a context where managers believed that CLD was an underperforming service, which they attributed to an ageing workforce which had failed in the past to meet corporate outcomes and performance targets. From this perspective, rather than destroying CE/CLD managers often argued that the field had to reform in order to be protected from cuts.

In concluding this section I want to note that the turn towards authoritarian management is a product of new managerialism rather than the character traits of individual managers. Moreover, the shift towards authoritarian management can be traced to wider discussions on managers ‘right to manage’ or ‘free to manage’ (see Hood, 2001) and I would argue that authoritarian management exacerbates de-professionalisation in the sense that the new focus on data and accountability has placed structural limitations on the autonomy of professionals to determine their work priorities. Moreover, the introduction of numerous performance management frameworks has resulted in the creation of a field of judgement which is controlled not by professionals but by managers and inspectors. In the final section of the chapter I argue that the role of management has been transformed to such an extent that a new professional subject has been created in community development in the shape of the new public manager.

*The New Public Manager in Community Development*

This chapter has highlighted the ways in which the role of management in CE/CLD has been transformed across the three authorities and in summary, the key features of the transformation include the following: managerial roles are pre-dominantly shaped by policy, performance management and new managerialism which was reflected in new job titles with a shift away from the traditional 'CLD Manager' of old towards the appearance of 'Quality Assurance Officers', 'Policy and Planning Managers' and 'Employability Managers' in the field. In addition, rather than protect the boundaries of the old professionalism – a role they once performed, contemporary managers – recast as leaders, played strategically important roles in re-structuring and reforming their traditional professions from within. Management styles have also been transformed with traditional 'participatory approaches to management' (see McCulloch and Tett, 1996, p. 22) giving way to a new style which I described in terms of authoritarian management.

I argue that the above changes constitute a qualitative shift in the nature of management in the field. I also contend that management is emerging as a discrete profession in its own right which is linked with the rise of new managerialism across the public sector (see Deem and Brehony, 2005; Flynn, 1999; Halford and Leonard, 1999; Newman and Clarke, 1997; Noordegraaf, 2007; Pollock, 2004; Shanks, et al, 2014; Walsh, 2006). The rise of professional management in general terms – and in my experience in CE/CLD, correlates well with an increase in management training and I noted that across the three authorities a formal qualification from the Chartered Institute of Managers, often at MBA level was a pre-requisite in order to practice management in the field. Management training can be framed in terms of 'boundary construction' (see Fournier, 2000) with 'certification' used as a means to control access into the new managerial profession (see Firth, 2012; Kirkpatrick et al, 2005; Newman and Clare, 1997; Noordegraaf, 2007; Walsh, 2006; Thrupp and Willmott, 2003).

Interestingly, managers have pursued their own professionalisation strategy at the same time as they have dismantled occupational identity in CE/CLD. Discussing the paradox of modern management, Noordegraaf argues that 'executives and managers who restructure and weaken professional control in service delivery are themselves trying to become professionals' (Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 764) - moreover, 'managers are forced to follow a classic model of professionalism that they are also forced to attack' (Ibid, p. 777). I would also argue that ideas such as leadership, equating new managerialism with progress, or arguments that 'data' should shape practice, which are all key features of the new professionalism, have their ideational origins in management training. In this context, Clarke and Newman have argued that management training serves an ideological function

and is designed to win 'hearts and minds' to new public management discourses (see Clarke and Newman, 1999).

It should also be noted as I argued in Chapter 6, that traditional professional roles have been managerialised and this development has increasingly blurred the boundaries between practitioners and management. Moreover, rather than de-professionalisation, the managerialisation of professional labour has created new opportunities and I noted that many professionals often viewed career progression and advancement in terms of moving into recognised management posts. It might also be the case that from the vantage point of the shop floor, where traditional professionals are losing autonomy and prestige, that a career in management increasingly looked like an attractive proposition to many disgruntled professionals. Age also entered the narrative and I noted that many practitioners, especially those from a youth work background reported feeling 'burn out' and claimed that they were 'no longer able to relate to young people' once they entered the 'mid to later' stages of their careers. It is also important to note that many exercised a degree of choice in terms of allowing their work to become bureaucratised by employing part time youth workers and adult education tutors to do the 'real work'.

The ubiquitous appearance of community in many job descriptions, has also increased the opportunities available to those of community education origin, to move into management across a range of different public sector arenas. Across the three authorities it was common to find Community Education trained managers practicing new public management in a range of different settings such as Community Care, Community Safety, Community Regeneration, Community Economic Development and Community Planning. Interestingly, one informant in LA3 referred to the spread of CE qualified practitioners/managers across the public sector as the 'community education diaspora' and in LA3 I noted there were more CE qualified practitioners working in different sections of the Council than there were those practicing in what remained of the traditional CE/CLD service. It was also the case that senior managers in local government, including Heads of Service and Directors, often began their working careers in community education and several of the new managers argued that thinking of CE/CLD as an approach to working rather than as a discrete profession was advantageous in the sense that it could lead to a number of different careers in local government.

In conclusion I want to note that the old bureaucratic manager associated with CE/CLD and occupational professionalism has given way to the new public manager who is a product of

neoliberalisation. Discussing the relationship between neoliberalisation and new public management Dardot and Laval argue:

‘The technical and tactical aspect of New Public Management made it possible to conceal the fact that main point was precisely to introduce private sector disciplines and categories, to increase political control throughout the public sector, to reduce budgets and civil service, to restrict the autonomy of professions, and to weaken public sector trade unions – to rationalise in practice the neoliberal restructuring of the state’ (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 231).

Dardot and Laval’s analysis suggests that new public managers have significant powers at their disposal especially in relation to the introduction of private sector disciplines and categories; yet in the field it is important to note that although new public managers wield considerable influence to shape the new professionalism, any power they have is only realised on the condition that they work within a strategic consensus shaped by new public managerialism and neoliberalisation – or as Gorz framed it; ‘it’s no longer people who have power: it’s the positions of power which have their people’ (Gorz, 1982, p. 57). Gorz’s analysis sheds light on why seemingly powerful managers or leaders regularly reported feeling ‘powerless’ in the face of contemporary developments in local government.

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 7 has focused on the changing nature of managerial roles in community development. I argued that austerity driven reforms coupled the spread of new managerial techniques have hollowed out the CLD Manager or Community Development Manager of old and replaced them with a new public manager who is at the heart of the new professionalism. I also considered the ways in which relations between managers and practitioners have been transformed by new managerialism and neoliberalisation. In the next chapter I turn my attention to everyday practices associated with systems of performance management and drawing upon governmentality, I frame these systems as technologies of performance management which I argue are an essential component of the new professional practices.

## Chapter 8: Technologies of Performance Management and the New Professionalism

### Introduction

Chapter 8 explores various systems of performance management and considers the role played by workplans, team plans, computerised management information systems and appraisals in everyday community development settings. Drawing upon Foucault, especially the ways in which his ideas have been applied to critical management theory, I frame techniques and procedures associated with performance management as technologies of performance. The primary concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation are utilised in order to discuss the impact of technologies of performance in the field. De-professionalisation and re-professionalisation suggest that two processes are simultaneously occurring; on the one hand practitioners are systematically deskilled but are also reskilled by technologies of performance management. The chapter also considers the appearance of a new language shaped by new managerialism and neoliberalisation and I argue that the new language has made a lasting impact in the field. In the final sections of the chapter I draw upon Foucault and governmentality theory in order to explore a number of themes including new managerialism as a discursive formation and also as a disciplinary project which has created a new self-governing subject in community development.

### *Performance Management in Community Development*

Performance management (PM) is one of the key features of new managerialism and the new professionalism and involves a comprehensive and systematic attempt by a range of actors - primarily new public managers and inspectors, to quantify and measure the performance of professional practitioners. According to Banks, PM involves 'increasingly detailed procedures for doing tasks and the setting of pre-defined targets or outcomes for work' - moreover the work is 'measured' by the production of 'quantifiable outcomes and outputs' (Banks, 2004, pp. 149-151). Across the three authorities the following systems and procedures constitute the main features of PM:

- Individual work plans and work related objectives with quantifiable and measureable performance targets.
- Team plans, divisional plans and local authority wide plans, which also feature quantifiable and measureable performance targets.

- Computerised management information systems.
- Appraisals.

The above systems are typically viewed as everyday systems of administration or bureaucracy and in my experience were seldom discussed in ways that were political or ideological; yet drawing upon an approach influenced by governmentality I argue that the above techniques can be framed as technologies of performance linked with neoliberalisation.

‘Technology’ is a term used by Foucauldian researchers, especially those with an interest in governmentality theory who are interested in the relationship between administrative systems, bureaucratic procedures and wider structures of power. According to Ball, performance or ‘performativity’ is a technology (Ball, 2003, p. 216) whilst Murdoch and Ward suggest that technologies are techniques employed by the state as it intervenes in the specific domains it seeks to govern (Murdoch and Ward, 1997). Clarke and Newman cite budgetary management, audits and targeting as examples of new managerialist technologies (Clarke and Newman, 1997). Moreover, Mackinnon notes that managerial technologies are those practices which shift from the bureaucratic control of ‘inputs’ towards a new focus on ‘outputs’ and delivery as government agencies become subjected to new forms of performance management (Mackinnon, 2000, p. 298). Furthermore, Dean argues that technologies form ‘part of a strategy in which our moral conduct and political conduct are put into play as elements within systems of governmental purposes’ (Dean, 2010, p. 202). McGrath’s analysis is conceptually important in this analysis, especially the ways in which data or evidence is framed as a means through which practice is ordered and shaped by government (see McGrath, 2016, p. 181).

In the next section, I provide a descriptive account of how technologies of performance operate in everyday settings and my intention is to highlight how the everyday lives of professionals have become intensely governed by new technologies of performance management. Readers should note that the following discussion is based on analysis of data from the performance management systems across the three authorities.

### *Technologies of Performance in Community Development*

I begin with individual workplans and team plans and in these detailed texts, practitioners framed their work in relation to pre-determined targets which were broken down into a set of measurable

outcomes and outputs. The new focus on outcomes and outputs – as opposed to process, has created what the CLD Managers Scotland group described as a ‘culture change’ in the field (see CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2007) and according to the guidelines in the plans, measurable outcomes and outputs are ‘those things, particularly behaviours that will change as a result of the CLD intervention’.

In the case of adult education and youth work, the majority of performance targets were shaped by employability and a typical plan contained the following targets:

- Reduce welfare dependency – target 40 job seekers on an employability programme.
- Increase progression pathways to 90% the number of young people entering positive destinations.
- Report that 95% of all young people will either be volunteering, in work or engaged in an educational activity.
- Reduce the number of people on benefits – target to be defined.
- Identify progression routes in relation to work or training for young people volunteering.
- Ensure that a wide range of vocational learning opportunities are available.

(Extracts from Individual Workplans, 2015, LA’1, 2 and 3).

Outputs are those practical things which the practitioner might do in order to meet a performance target – for example, to ‘reduce welfare dependency’ they might run a job club or offer courses on work related training or develop a partnership with Job Centre Plus. Outcomes on the other hand focus on something which happened as a result of the output – for example, as a consequence of the job club, X number of people found work or X number of people reported they were no longer in receipt of benefits. In the case of community development, performance targets focused on the involvement of communities - referred to in the texts as the social economy, in managing assets or providing public services; for example:

- Measure the numbers of citizens that are engaged with service delivery and development (% to be identified).
- Increase the proportion of citizens who are influential in local decision making.

- Increase the capacity of local people to manage the development and delivery of services.
- Set targets for asset transfer (numbers to be identified).
- Increase the number of people co-producing services.
- Offer training programmes on development trusts/social enterprise models.

(Extracts from Individual Workplans, 2015, LA's 1, 2 and 3).

CLD's performance targets were shaped by wider objectives in the local authorities Community Plan which featured sections on employability and community ownership. The Community Plan is informed by a Service Level Agreement between the Council and the Scottish Government and according to guidelines issued to practitioners, every plan – from the Scottish Government's national plan down to the level of the practitioners workplan is interlinked, a process referred to in the field – especially by inspectors, as 'the golden thread'. The CLD Managers Scotland Group noted that:

'It should be possible to follow a trail from a specific activity, such as a local youth strategy, from the work-plan of an individual worker, through a neighbourhood/team/project plan, to a service plan and finally to the Community Plan' (CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2011).

In theory, the plans are the means by which every employee works towards the same set of corporately defined targets and as technologies they 'steer' (see Mackinnon, 2000) the activities of the practitioner in a way which means that good practice is interpreted as practice quantifiable in terms of a governmental policy. During observations in LA1, I noted that several managers argued that if a piece of work was not a governmental priority, then practitioners should not be doing it.

The targets for CLD were divided into hard and soft indicators and according to the guidelines, hard indicators were pieces of work that constitute 'very good practice'; examples included 'communities developing and providing services for themselves in the form of self-help initiatives, or social enterprises'. Soft indicators on the other hand included counting the number of 'stakeholders', 'clients' and 'customers' who engaged at any one given moment with community development or CLD. The guidelines also made reference to SMART outcomes - that is outcomes that were 'specific, 'measureable, achievable, realistic and time-scaled'. According to the guidelines, SMART outcomes, 'provide the best service to our customers' and are based on working towards 'continual

improvement in performance'. In a discussion on targets and impacts, the Scottish Government provided the following advice to practitioners:

'Always use an action word when formulating intended impacts. These are words which have a tangible result, for example, to establish, to demonstrate, to support or to review. Intentions such as to liaise, to consider, or to seek to support do not provide effective guides to action, nor do they provide tangible criteria against which to evaluate progress and success' (Scottish Government, 2007).

The outcomes and targets of practitioners are subjected throughout the year to continual monitoring and possible inspection and at this juncture two new technologies were deployed to measure and monitor performance – computerised management information systems (MIS) and appraisals.

I have touched on MIS already and they were introduced across the CLD sector at the behest of inspectors and have been described by managers in all three authorities as an 'inspection tool' designed to improve the performance of CLD. According to informants in LA1, the cost of MIS – which a full time CLD worker maintained, was greater than the combined budgets allocated to youth work, adult education and community development. Although the cost was controversial, especially at a time of cuts, MIS should be seen within a wider context which according to Powers involves a shift of organisational resources from first-order to second-order functions, diverting resources from delivering the core business to the process of accounting for what is delivered (Powers, 1997).

MIS was a standing item on the agenda at team meetings in all three authorities and practitioners were informed at these meetings that maintaining 'up to date MIS files' was an important work related objective. The following memorandum issued to practitioners from the Performance and Planning Manager in LA1 provides the reader with an insight into what is meant by 'maintaining MIS files':

MEMORANDUM

TO: CLD STAFF  
FROM: PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING MANAGER  
DATE: 8 OCTOBER, 2014

SUBJECT: MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

---

Following an MIS Project Management Meeting, it has been decided that urgent action is needed to progress the use of the Management Information System. CLDWs (CLD Workers) must ensure that MIS files are up to date. We have now had the system for over 3 years and have slowly been embedding it into our work but this has taken longer than anticipated. Indeed, on at least 2 occasions we have had an “amnesty” where we have agreed to ignore projects that had already taken place and details had not been input. However, we have now reached the point where, for this to be meaningful, we need to develop reports and get information back out of the system. We cannot do this without all of the data being accurate, up to date and entered onto the system. Therefore, all staff are advised that a deadline of Wednesday 6th November 2014 has been set for all outstanding data to be entered.

This includes:

- All participant registration forms
- All session evaluations and reports
- All participants attending sessions
- All projects currently being delivered

This means that CLDWs need to ensure that:

- All project forms are up to date, entered on the system and authorised. If work is taking place without an authorised project on the system, operational Managers will be meeting with staff to address this.
- All session evaluation forms are input onto the system (either by CLDWs or support staff). This will mean collecting/checking forms on a regular basis to ensure they are up to date and complete.
- All projects have a tag list created that is populated with participants.
- All sessions have the attendance of known participants and staff recorded.
- All participant registration forms have been passed on to support staff in time to be entered onto system.

(MIS Memorandum, Fieldwork Journal, October, 2014, LA1).

Practitioners complained that MIS was a labour intensive process, especially given the fact that they were expected to report into other systems including a centralised Council system, the system in

schools and their partners systems - yet, because 'maintaining MIS files' was a 'core work related objective' failure to update files could be considered as a disciplinary offence.

I noted that practitioners were encouraged by inspectors to showcase 'sector leading MIS files' and for a file to be sector leading it had to contain information regarding the impact of the intervention (for example a young person was in a positive destination) alongside information on the learning journeys of participants and clients. According to the guidelines, the best journeys were those recorded in terms of 'hard indicators' – for example, 'someone was in a positive destination' as a result of the CLD intervention. Practitioners were told that inspectors wanted to hear the 'stories behind the statistics' and according to one inspector, CLD was 'good at statistics, but it lacked a story'.

The fact that numerous MIS systems existed in each of the authorities was an issue and in LA1 managers and partners were looking at creating one centralised system. At my request I attended a meeting of an MIS Working Group in LA1 and the following extract is based on a 'thick description' recorded in a fieldwork journal; I include the extract here because it contained interesting data on the wider thinking behind MIS:

'The manager who was leading on MIS said that he wanted to create 'one big data hub' which everyone including 'CLD, Skills Development Scotland, Job Centre Plus, the Careers Service, Schools Social Work, could feed into'. He added that the new system would be 'all singing and all dancing' and said that the technology made it possible to provide data on every community in the local authority area; he said that the hub could 'zone in' on communities right down to 'street level' and 'problem areas', especially those which 'cost the Council the most money'. The new system was linked into other systems and produced valuable data which included the following; the unemployment rate for the area – down to street level; the amount of people using foodbanks; data on the number of times the police were called to an area; the number of registered drug addicts; and the number of children referred to social work. It was a 'data goldmine' he said and could be used to 'target the work of partners'. One of the social work managers said their 'clients' were like 'jig saw puzzles'; every partner has a piece, she said – 'but we don't all see the overall puzzle' - the integrated data hubs she added would allow managers to 'see every piece of the puzzle' (Fieldwork Journal, January, 2015, LA1).

In addition to MIS, performance was also monitored in the three authorities via a regular systems of appraisals, which involved quarterly meetings between practitioners and managers and these meetings focused on whether or not performance targets were being met. The annual appraisal – which is one of the most important meetings in the practitioner’s calendar, involved managers grading practitioners into three categories of performance – ‘under performers’, ‘satisfactory performers’ and ‘high performers’. I was told that ‘under performers’ were automatically placed in a ‘Performance Improvement Scheme’, whilst ‘high performers’ were awarded with potential increases in pay, introduced after local authorities across Scotland implemented performance related pay schemes. In addition, ‘high performers’ were interviewed for the Council’s ‘in house’ staff magazine and they met the eligibility criteria for being nominated as the ‘Employee of the Year’. According to one informant, who was a shop steward with the union, the ‘Employee of the Year’ in LA1 tended to be those who had helped the Council to either save money or generate income. Another informant in LA2 said that workers who thought of themselves as ‘high performers’ would often make official complaints if they had been graded as merely ‘satisfactory’ by their managers.

I mention workplans, team plans, MIS systems and appraisals in a detailed way because they highlighted the ways in which a new professional discourse seemingly obsessed with quantification and measurement was dominating the work of professionals. In the next section I draw upon data to discuss the ways in which the everyday working lives of professionals have been transformed by these technologies and I relate the data to the primary concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. I begin with a discussion on de-professionalisation and explore why professionals in the three authorities felt deskilled and demoralised by the new practices.

### *De-Professionalisation and Performance Management*

The bulk of practitioners displayed negative reactions towards the numerous systems of performance management; reactions included hostility (sometimes this could take the form of refusing to do a PM task or not prioritising PM), scepticism (questioning the logic of PM especially claims that it improved practice) and ridicule (especially the language of PM). Moreover, practitioners (and managers) reported concerns that certain pieces of work were no longer prioritised. In addition, managers as enforcers of regimes of performance management, were described as villains of the piece and were said to be ‘over- zealous’, ‘bean-counters’, ‘administrative

tyrants', 'corporate robots', 'obsessed by outcomes and outputs' and so forth. Again, these narratives suggest that practitioners often understand developments relating to new managerialism by focusing on the individual character traits of certain managers.

The biggest complaint across LA's 1, 2 and 3 was that practitioners spent less time working with individuals and groups due to a rise in paperwork generated by 'the bureaucracy'. When I asked them to quantify how much time they spent on paperwork or administrative duties, the majority of those said that it was over 50% of their time with some going as far as to say 70-80% of the time. In addition, practitioners said they felt deskilled and as noted in Chapter 6, the 'real work' was increasingly provided by CLD's precariat. MIS (and inspections) were routinely cited as the biggest contributory factors in accounting for low morale and stress – consider the following transcripts:

'It's part of the huge machine that is driving everything. There is a whole layer of paperwork that is unnecessary and I don't think that it's ever read, or acted upon. It's an out of control machine. It just seems to have overtaken people's professional judgement. A report needs written, or a meeting to go to. It's all about covering ourselves; everything's about quantifying things that aren't really quantifiable...constant need for evaluation, questions...Constant need for feedback and questionnaires. What we do is never enough. I always feel lacking. I have never had a feeling like it. I'm never enough. Always paperwork. The level of surveillance and interference has made me feel that I can't do my job properly. I feel constantly spied on' (Connie, later-years CLD Worker, LA1).

'The system has been paid for and it's not going away - so get on with it, that's the attitude from managers. I do so many administration tasks that should be done by admin workers. In fact I feel like an admin worker and I often think to myself, why am I doing this?' (Carolyn, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

'CLD is very business task focused...it's now employ youth workers and tutors to get on with it, and the role of the CLD worker is to make sure that the outcomes are met and the boxes ticked' (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

Concerns that the job had become bureaucratised or reduced to 'box ticking' in Katie's terms, reached saturation point and I noted that practitioners regularly described themselves as 'glorified admin workers' – for example:

'When I come into work I feel manipulated and controlled by this great big data system...There is this view that nothing is valid until it has been evaluated and logged. I find that when I run my group that the evaluation log has become more important than the actual activity' (Lisa, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

'Constantly being asked for statistics. Just constantly being asked - from the Council - from Education Scotland. But the management team constantly want us to justify what we are doing. I spend two days face to face and more time at my desk. Maybe 60% or even 75%. I think that should be done by an admin and not a CLD Worker. It's a waste of money having community workers on thirty odd grand a year sitting doing that' (Eileen, later-years CLD Worker, LA2).

The criticisms of MIS were also shared privately by managers:

'I think what we have done is that over the years our CLD Workers have become administrators rather than doing face to face work. When I started out probably 90% of my work was face to face with either young people or adults. I think that's turned the other way...probably only 30% is about face to face and the rest is about organising and moving resources around. And what we are doing is employing people on fixed term zero hours contracts to do the most difficult work. So we have people delivering our work with young people who are not as skilled as we are' (Julie, later-years Quality Assurance Officer for Communities, LA2).

'Demoralisation' emerged as a theme in the data and practitioners in LA's 1 and 3 told me of how they had been signed off work as a consequence of stress, which they attributed to pressures associated with inspections and MIS. Others claimed that the stresses of the job caused problems in their personal lives and according to one practitioner in LA1, 'sometimes I feel that for the good of my sanity I need to do something else with my life other than what I'm doing at the moment'. Insights such as these corresponded with research into the effect of PM on teachers which found

that performance management systems were causing high levels of 'existential anxiety and dread' (see Ball, 2003; Chadbourne and Ingvarson, 1998).

The impact of new managerialism on the mental health of professionals – which appeared to be significant, can be compared with what La Bier has conceptualised as 'modern madness'; this refers to the hidden link between work and emotional conflict and according to La Bier, the symptoms include emotional conflict ranging from mild distress and pervasive sadness, to feelings of self-betrayal, stress and burnout (La Bier, cited in Casey, 1995, p. 83). According to informants in LA's 1 and 3 'low morale' and 'hating the work' reached the stage where many wanted to 'leave the profession' and 'quit the job' and in this context arguments that 'you don't need a degree to do the job I am doing' or 'I didn't study Community Education to end up doing this' (meaning MIS) were common. I interviewed one practitioner in LA3 who subsequently resigned during the course of my research, and explaining their decision to resign, they told me that they were 'happy to be getting out':

'I just got to the stage where I thought, right that's it, I've had enough. The job's not what it used to be and it's not going to get better anytime soon. I used to do group work, run classes, work with women's groups...all sorts of stuff. Issue based stuff. Now everything's training for work or doing paperwork. I'm just glad to be getting out' (Deborah, later-years, CLD Worker, LA3).

Deborah's account chimed with research by Banks which suggested that the demands and challenges of managerialism were leading to leaving the job or 'principled quitting' (see Banks, 2004, pp. 15-16).

The new focus on targets, outcomes and outputs were also used in LA1 as a justification for re-naming CE/CLD as a new Lifelong Learning and Employability service and responding to my question if the name CE/CLD was important one of the managers argued:

'It doesn't matter what it's called... it's about outcomes now. This is Education Scotland's move towards outcomes, so it's not about the service you deliver and what it's called, it's about outcomes, the differences that you are making...you don't need a named service any more' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

Emily's narrative that, 'it doesn't matter what it's called, it's about outcomes now', highlighted the ways in which managerialism challenged occupational professionalism. In addition, I noted that performance targets were used to decide the new priorities of CLD/community development; for example, at a series of meetings I attended in LA1 entitled 'Outcomes Focused Training Events', managers instructed practitioners to prioritise work in terms of three categories - 'economic growth', 'employability' and 'positive destinations' and work which no longer fitted with these priorities would be either cut or shelved. The extracts below, taken from fieldwork journals, provide an ethnographic account of the ways in which practitioners responded to such a task:

'Janis said we need to think critically - for example, economic growth – whose growth? Peter said 'what is a positive destination? Who decides? - the local authority or the participant'. Shona interrupted, and appeared frustrated; 'Right, I'm going to be honest', she said 'what do we need to get rid of? - That's the purpose of the task at hand. 'What are the weak pieces of work which should be removed'? - 'We are not doing the exercise right' she said. Peter said we need to be creative with language, that we should 'fit our practice into the language of policy' and not 'get rid of practice because it does not fit policy'. Shona shook her head'...'Connie said that 'economic growth' and 'positive destinations' were an assault on the 'collective values of CLD'. Peter said he genuinely struggled to see how CLD could contribute to 'economic growth'. Natalie who had said nothing at this point, suddenly got upset and started swearing and was on the verge of tears. 'I'm not going to fucking sit here and get rid of services'. 'Sorry' she said, 'I'm too angry to do this' and left the meeting',

(Fieldwork Journal, January, 2015, LA1).

These extracts provide an insight into how practitioners responded to change, with some questioning the process, others collaborating and in this instance someone becoming emotionally upset. Shortly after the meeting described above I interviewed one of the managers and when I raised the issue of the controversial new priorities the manager argued;

'We can't think all the time about our own interests as professionals. We also need to think about the needs of our service users, learners and communities. We must support them because they are the ones that count at the end of the day. Our work has to be

shaped by key policies and drivers and yes our work is also shaped by the hard financial climate – that’s what’s driving all of this...But that should makes us think more about our service users, learners and communities. We need to focus on what our core business is, and that’s where positive destinations comes in... its making sure that our young people are better prepared for the world of work and that no one gets left behind’ (Emily, mid-years, Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

Emily’s comments highlighted a number of features which are important aspects of the new professionalism; in particular, professionals were no longer granted agency to define their work, note the comment ‘we can’t think about our own interests as professionals’. In addition, new practices were focused on ‘key policies and drivers’ (e.g. government policy), in a ‘hard financial climate’ (e.g. austerity). Interestingly, in Emily’s narrative, ‘service users, learners and communities’ were discursively mobilised as being on the same side as management and against the self-interested professional and this informed my analysis that one of the main features of the new professional discourse was the idea that the old professionalism was elitist.

De-professionalisation shines a theoretical light on the destructive aspects of the new professionalism and how it is experienced by actors in the field. From this perspective, although technologies of performance may have improved performance – and I suggest this is debateable, they have also created what Boyne describes as a ‘dull conformity’ which is associated with modern working (see Boyne, 1999). Similarly, rather than high levels of professional commitment and motivation, performance management systems have a tendency to create ‘ritualised’ and ‘bureaucratic compliance’ (see Clegg, 1999; Flynn, 1999; Newman, 2003, p. 95; Teelken, 2012, p. 278). Moreover, Newman argues that the ‘tyranny of numbers’ and the obsession with measurement stifles creativity and reason (see Newman, 2003) and in my experience this often led to a practice which was increasingly safe and corporate.

Yet, despite data which suggested that professionals were de-skilled, I also noted the appearance of a discourse which emphasised the importance of ‘continuing professional development’ and the acquisition of new skills related to managerialism. In the next section I discuss this new discourse in terms of re-skilling which I argue is one of the key characteristics of re-professionalisation and the new professionalism.

### *Re-professionalisation and Performance Management*

In contrast with de-skilling narratives, I noted that data across the three authorities also suggested that upskilling or re-skilling was an issue and the term upskilling featured in several training events aimed at practitioners; for example, one national event I attended was organised by inspectors entitled 'Upskilling the Workforce' and focused specifically on digital literacy. I noted that the acquisition of new skills were often related to computerisation and learning how to operate other digital technologies; consequently, contemporary and future practitioners are expected to be digitally literate – often to a high standard. According to Banks, managerialism is learned through the introduction of competency based training, with a focus on discrete technical skills, driven by employer need (Banks, 2014, p. 43). In addition to acquiring new practical skills professionals also need to understand the role played by data and 'auditable images of performance' (see Power, 1997), in shaping the work of community development. Re-skilling is also an ideational project which encourages professionals to think in ways shaped by new managerialism and according to one manager/inspector:

'Yes, there is more bureaucratic work and the flip side of that is workers are feeling the pain of where they sit in a sector. If I go back ten years it was a data free zone; what you got out of CLD was anecdotes and even the anecdotes were thin too; but now CLD is improving their data systems and data systems are here to stay and...you are no different from anyone else. The IT revolution is sweeping in. Government has a demand for data. The public wants data whether we like it or not...so a lot of the profession at the moment, they are saying it's bureaucratisation...it's actually a point in time thing as well guys, and it's just you are locked up in this moment in history' (Colin, later-years Inspector).

In the above narrative, new public management techniques are discussed in terms of events in history with practitioners 'locked in this moment in history'; my reading of this argument suggested that Colin was offering a view of the world where agency is restricted and resistance was futile. Other inspectors made similar points and said that if the system was impossible to change, then professionals should adapt, mutate or learn as one inspector framed it, 'to embrace the technology'...and 'learn to see the ways in which technology improves the work of the sector'. Technologies of performance emerged in these accounts not as distractions from the real work as disgruntled professionals argued, but rather as constituting the real work in new professional practices.

Arguments which rationalised and justified performance management often coalesced around the theme of accountability and according to one manager:

‘I think the inspection regime has put us down an evidence based route of having to put everything into an MIS system...for the right reasons. To justify on a business basis. So using business tools to justify the work...so yes, there’s more pressure. But that’s about proving your worth and being accountable for what you do’ (James, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

The discourse of ‘proving your worth’ and ‘being accountable’ – especially within a ‘business model’, was deemed necessary if community development was to survive in a competitive environment and turbulent financial situation. Furthermore, in James’ narrative it was not enough for practitioners to be able ‘just to do the job’, they also had to prove to an array of audiences - ‘chief executives, directors, inspectors, funders, government officials, the taxpayer’, and so forth, - that the job was being done, a development which I argue in Chapter 10 has created a new entrepreneurial professional.

In contrast with those professionals who felt that the new systems for measuring performance were a curse on their working lives and the primary cause of work related stress and ‘modern madness’ (see La Bier, cited in Casey, 1995), it was also argued that new systems were a force for good, especially in the sense that data improved performance. According to one manager:

‘We have statistical profiling evidence...so facts or evidence inform what we do. We do really well on that. So our single plan is based on a strategic analysis of performance. We have a very evidence based policy planning framework which drives the priorities. The data tells us that our positive destinations aren’t good enough. We need to focus things and in that environment of not having money that is now informing what we do, but that comes from an evidence base, so workers now have less flexibility than they had before because they need to hit those targets’ (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

In the above extract, performance management systems are said to produce via computerisation ‘statistical profiling evidence’ which calculated for practitioners what the nature of the work should

be. A familiar theme appeared in this narrative, namely that the work was not determined by professionals but by 'strategic analyses of performance' and 'evidenced based policy planning frameworks'. I suggest that the autonomous professional of old is being phased out replaced by a new subject who has been re-skilled into working within a field of judgment controlled by data. Moreover, supposedly freed from the constraints of human subjectivity, the new professional is trained and re-skilled to use data, statistical profiling evidence and strategic analyses of performance and so forth, in order to justify professional intervention. From the perspective of re-skilling, data and the ability to generate it, emerged as an important feature of new professional practices.

Proponents of this brave new world drew upon a narrative whereby independent professional judgement was hollowed out and replaced with a new focus on 'evidence', 'what works' and even 'science'; one training event I attended in LA1 was entitled 'Delivering Outcomes in CLD' and marketed itself as revealing the 'science behind the outcomes'. The focus on evidence, data, outcomes and outputs interested me and in the next section I argue that one of the characteristics of new managerialism – and also new professionals, is the appearance of a new language for talking about and also thinking about work. I also draw upon Foucault and governmentality theory in order to discuss the new vocabularies of practice within a wider theoretical framework.

### *New Professionals/New Vocabularies*

In this section I explore the ways in which a new language of the workplace has emerged in community development. I noted that the new public manager was often the official advocate and strategic enforcer of the new language, which is shaped by new managerialism. In this context, managers took on a policing role, whereby they disciplined practitioners into using the correct managerial terms, especially outcomes, outputs and targets. Consider this email from LA1 as an example:

From: Community Development Performance and Planning Manager

Sent: 21 May 2015 14:47

To: All staff

CC: Other managers including head of service

Subject: Management Information Project Proposals

Importance: High

I have recently been approving projects on our MIS and discovering that there is still an issue with our understanding of outcomes and outcome measures. The common problems I am identifying are:

- Outcomes listed are not actually outcomes (the difference you want to make) – sometimes they are identification of need, description, processes or outputs. For example, getting people together is not an outcome, it is a process. Your outcome may actually be to reduce social isolation.
- Some outcomes do not have measures identified e.g. people putting in 4 or 5 outcomes but only being able to measure the success of 2 of them. So if you have an outcome, you have to put in a measure that demonstrates how are you going to know you made a difference?

If you currently have projects awaiting authorisation on the system can you check that they have clear outcomes, outcome measures and they are costed? If not, please make any amendments as necessary and let managers know that you have amended/checked them so we can authorise. I have attached a document about outcomes which you might find useful. I am happy to answer questions or give advice.

(Email Extract, Fieldwork Journal, May 2015, LA1).

The above extract highlighted the ways in which work was expected to be described in a particular way; yet professionals were also well versed in the new language and importantly when to deploy it – for example:

‘You talk yourself into the language. I’m quite apt at that. Funding applications. Reports for senior managers - I can talk the language. It’s so embedded in my head that I don’t even think about it’ (Heather, mid-years CLD Worker, LA2).

‘It’s a language I only use when at work and I know what it means. But of course, I never talk that language outside of work and never with clients’ (Wendy, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

'I'm sucked into this now - you know everything's an outcome and an impact. I use that stupid language all the time and I never used too. I find when I'm talking with communities it's different. But when I come in here I start talking this language' (Eileen, later-years CLD Worker, LA2).

The new language can be considered as re-skilling especially in the sense that it is a technical language which is learned and according to Shaw, professionals are becoming 'strategically bilingual' (see Shaw 2015). The new language can also be understood as a situated vocabulary – situated in the sense that it is spoken by public sector elites in their communications with one another, note Eileen's reference in the transcript too, 'it's only when I come in here I start talking this language' and 'of course, I never talk that language outside of work and never with clients'.

Read one way, Eileen's comments can be interpreted as practitioners avoiding 'jargon' especially in front of those 'not in the know', but they can also be framed as attempts by professionals to erect discursive boundaries around the field of practice and viewed this way the new language enhanced status and professionalisation (see Abbott, 1995; Fournier, 2000; Paisey and Paisey, 1987); according to Abbott, 'high status in a profession goes with being able to talk purely professional language' (see Abbott, 1995). The new language is also constructed into existence and legitimised by everyday texts including emails, memos, internal reports, workplans, minutes of meetings and so forth. Moreover, influential texts in CLD most notably reports produced by government and management (see CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2010; 2010b; Scottish Government, 2007), and those used by inspectors (see HMIE Scotland, 2006) are littered with examples of the new managerial language. These 'texts' constituted examples of what Dardot and Laval have described as the 'mass production and diffusion of a homogenous vocabulary' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 181) and interestingly community development professionals, inspectors and government officials regularly construct their world in terms of language shaped by new managerialism.

New managerialism emerges in this analysis as a discursive project and qualifies as an example of what Foucault described as a 'discursive formation' (see Foucault, 2002). According to Cousins and Hussain, discursive formations occur, whenever 'discursive events refer to the same object, share the same style...support a strategy...a common institutional, administrative or political drift and pattern' (Cousins and Hussain, 1984, pp. 84-85). Moreover, based on Cousins and Hussain's perspective, I argue that the general 'political drift and pattern' of the new vocabularies points towards a language discursively shaped by the imagery of the market. From this perspective, the

obsession with quantification and measurement can be understood as strategic attempts by government, management and inspectors into encouraging public sector organisations to imitate cultural practices traditionally associated with a capitalist firm, a point noted by Scott who conceptualised the targeting culture in community development as - 'electronic square miles,...organisers with sales targets to meet – how many people did you get to volunteer this week' (Scott, 2010, p. 136). As a discursive formation, new managerialism creates a new disciplining of the subject at work by 'transforming professionals into calculating individuals within calculable spaces subject to particular calculative regimes' (Dean, 2010).

The new language of the workplace emerges in this analysis as a disciplinary project which creates a new professional subject at work and the disciplinary nature of new managerialism, especially in relation to computerisation is a theme I explore in the next section.

### *Managerialism as a Disciplinary Project*

This chapter has highlighted the ways in which the everyday lives of professionals at work are subjected to regulation, monitoring, control and surveillance by technologies of performance management. The analysis I have developed is not intended to read as a dystopian fantasy or heightened reality, rather it is reflective of real world occurrences made possible by new managerialism and in particular developments in technology, especially computerisation. The new managerial ideas discussed in this chapter, especially those which suggest that practice should be informed by data owe their ideational origins to computerisation and information technology which nurtured a positivistic belief that all objects, including public sector professionals and populations at large, could be ordered, controlled and monitored by systems of administration and subjected to what Foucault referred to as a 'quantifiable set of frequencies' (see Foucault, 2002).

The ways in which information technology has transformed sites such as community development is fascinating and as noted, the bulk of professional labour in the three authorities was often spent in front of a computer with practitioners in all three authorities saying that they spent 70 or 80% of their time doing bureaucratic work. I argue that digital technology is creating new forms of discipline and according to Deleuze, new systems of domination are informed by computer based systems of electronic tagging which make sure that everyone is in a permissible place (see Deleuze, 1995, p. 182). Deleuze's notion of 'electronic tagging' could be applied to a number of practices in

community development; for example, MIS kept a record of every form of work undertaken by practitioners and detailed electronic forms were expected to be completed at the end of an activity. In addition, I noted that for most practitioners the working day only began once they were logged onto their computers and it was here that many micro acts of 'electronic tagging' occurred; for example, the amount of time it takes to reply to an email or the ways in which the computer enabled every employee to keep an 'electronic diary', which could also be viewed by every other employee in the organisation; the diary functioned as an electronic eye which kept a track of professionals throughout the working day and ensured that everyone from the Head of Service to the administrative assistant was situated within a field of permanent visibility. I noted that failure to update electronic diaries was considered a disciplinary offence and informants said their diaries were regularly checked by their peers and monitored by management. Weber once compared bureaucracy to an 'iron cage' in reference to how it controlled and monitored people and with Weber's analysis in mind, the rise of information technology suggests that the 'iron cage' has now become an 'electronic cage' which is used to trap professionals in a rationality shaped by new managerialism (see Gillingham and Graham, 2016, p.196).

In addition, MIS in all three authorities kept a record in the form of an activity log of the amount of time spent by practitioners doing MIS related work. In LA1, a copy of the log was sent to management for scrutiny and according to informants, practitioners competed with one another in order to be at the top of the activity log. The log was published across CLD and those at the bottom who had spent the least amount of time on MIS were 'named and shamed' and sometimes branded by their colleagues as 'lazy' and 'letting the team down'. Electronic diaries were also used to publicly showcase how busy practitioners were and practices like these and many others like them (note the earlier discussions on 'Satisfactory' and 'High Performers') have created new cultures in the field based on what Ball refers to as 'performative competition' (see Ball, 2003, p. 219). Moreover, 'performative competition' was a product of the fact that professionals knew that somewhere in the virtual bureaucracy an electronic footprint had been left in order to prove to someone – typically a superior, that they had been working. In addition, the use of MIS or appraisals as a means of judging and chastising the performance of colleagues was indicative of the ways in which team working and peer pressure produces total systems of control which are difficult to resist (see Paulsen, 2014, p. 33).

The disciplinary nature of computerisation has been referred to in terms of an 'updated Panopticism' (see Burrell, 1988, p. 233) and this draws upon an analysis originally outlined by

Foucault (see Foucault, 1995). According to Foucault, the panopticon worked in two ways (he used prison as an example): the prisoners could always be seen from the central control tower, but through the use of blinds or screens the presence of the guards could be concealed, creating in the minds of the prisoner the 'apparent omnipresence of the inspector' (Foucault, 1995; see also, Davies, 2013, p. 2; McGill, 1997, p. 64). Gane argues that the model of the panopticon worked not because it produced a power that was verifiable but because it normalised the conduct of the inhabitants, who acted as if they were being watched (see Gane, 2012, p. 615).

Drawing upon an analysis informed by governmentality, I suggest that technologies of performance management in the field –workplans, MIS, appraisals, inspections, audits, and so forth - have created in the minds of the professional subject the 'omnipresence of the inspector' and a subject who works as if they were always being watched. Moreover, the work is not only intensely governed and monitored by a triumvirate involving government officials, new public managers and inspectors – the professional subject has also learned to use technologies of performance management of their own accord and these technologies enable the subject to see the world through the eyes of the inspector and also to talk the same language; consequently, I argue that 'success at work' is increasingly internalised in terms of meeting governmental outcomes.

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 8 has explored the ways in which administrative and bureaucratic systems in community development can be framed from the perspective of governmentality theory as technologies of performance management. In addition, I drew upon data which suggested that professionals were de-professionalised but also re-professionalised by the new managerial emphasis on measurement and quantification. Furthermore, I argued that technologies of performance management aimed at creating a new professional subject in the field, someone who in Foucauldian terms was intensely governed but also adept in the art of self-government and this is a theme continued in the remaining chapters. In concluding this discussion and also setting the scene for the next chapter, I want to note that technologies of performance management serve a function beyond that of bureaucratic domination or the normative claims of accountability or generating data based on 'what works' and 'evidence based work'. Technologies can also be understood as the means through which community development is aligned with the objectives of neoliberalisation and in the next chapter I draw upon the performance targets of community development in order to argue that a neoliberal model of practice is emerging in the field.

## Chapter 9: Towards a Neoliberal Model of Community Development?

### Introduction

Chapter 9 argues that new managerialism and in particular technologies of performance management are related to a model of practice which can broadly be characterised as neoliberal. I argue that the performance targets of practitioners are related to an economic policy of reducing public expenditure and I consider three specific policies, Community Planning, Asset Transfer and Co-production. In order to ground neoliberal community development in data a thick description of practice is provided focusing on co-production and asset transfer and how these policies are played out within Community Planning structures. I discuss the ways in which professional workers rationalise their involvement in austerity programmes and I return to the theme of re-skilling to suggest that new managerialism and neoliberalisation are changing the very competencies required of community development practitioners. The final section provides an outline of the main characteristics of neoliberal community development and draws upon a theoretical perspective which is again informed by Foucault and governmentality theory.

### *Neoliberal Community Development: Community Planning, Asset Transfer and Co-Production*

In this section I explore three policies, Community Planning, Asset Transfer and Co-production, which I argue are contributing towards a neoliberal model of community development. I begin the discussion by situating neoliberal community development and the performance targets of practitioners within the context of austerity. According to Audit Scotland, the 'difficult financial climate' has meant that Councils need to think of 'new and different ways of delivering services' (see Audit Scotland, 2016), and consequently community development is positioning itself in this context as an approach to working which can reduce (in theory) public expenditure. Viewed this way, the following performance targets - which I discussed in Chapter 8, can be interpreted as strategies which aim to 'provide new and different ways of delivering services':

- Measure the numbers of citizens that are engaged with service delivery and development (% to be identified).
- Increase the proportion of citizens who are influential in local decision making.
- Increase the capacity of local people to manage the development and delivery of services.

- Set targets for asset transfer.
- Increase the number of people co-producing services.
- Offer training programmes on development trusts/social enterprise models.

(Extracts from Individual Workplans, 2015, LA's 1, 2 and 3).

These targets were informed by outcomes in the Community Plan and readers should note that Community Planning in Scotland is informed by the Local Government Act (2003), which placed a statutory duty on local authorities to establish Community Plans in partnership with local people, the voluntary sector and local businesses.

Historically Community Planning emerged from the 'modernisation' of local government associated with New Labour (see Bevir and O'Brien, 2001), and created a 'new context' for community development (see Scott, 2012). In the current context the Scottish Government also notes that CLD plays an 'essential role' in Community Planning (see Scottish Government, 2012). Community Planning is informed by a policy commitment to promote 'democratic engagement' and 'democratic renewal' (see Audit Scotland, 2006; Lloyd, 2008, p. 62; Stoker, 2003), yet democratic engagement or involving the public in the planning of services is increasingly problematic especially in the context of austerity. Furthermore, I suggest that the rhetoric of democratic engagement and participation is utilised in order to involve the public in programmes which are based on managing the fiscal crisis of the state and in the next section I discuss this claim in relation to two specific policies associated with Community Planning, namely Asset Transfer and Co-production.

### *Asset Transfer*

Asset transfer is one of the key performance targets in community development and involves the potential transfer of Council owned assets to community based organisations and across the three authorities I noted that hundreds of Council owned buildings, including libraries, community centres, leisure centres and swimming pools, have been identified for either closure or asset transfer. In LA3, informants said that a 'buildings rationalisation programme' was in operation, which meant that every public building was in theory a candidate for asset transfer, including all 25 of the community centres managed by local management committees with support from CLD.

According to managers, if the asset transfer agenda was successful, then the Council could stand to save 'millions in expenditure' and from this perspective the performance targets of community development were explicitly designed to facilitate cuts in public expenditure. In this context, I noted that practitioners and managers in LA's 1, 2 and 3 were often encouraged to attend national conferences and seminars organised by the key players in asset transfer. I also attended these events and in the main they tended to promote policy by focusing on examples of good practice with asset transfer described in progressive rhetoric associated with Community Planning - 'community empowerment', 'democratic renewal', and so forth. At one event, entitled 'Community Ownership: Asset Ownership and Transfer', the facilitator argued that asset transfer was community development's 'bread and butter' and said that CD 'should be leading the way in promoting community ownership'. The extent to which community development approached asset transfer with professional self-interest should not be disregarded and I noted that many of the people I spoke with framed the policy in relation to protecting the workforce at a time of cuts.

This research suggests that asset transfer is a difficult policy to implement and across the three authorities a successful transfer had yet to occur. The failure to deliver policy is complex and I explore a number of themes in this section. In particular I noted that managers and inspectors argued that the community development workforce 'lacked the skills' necessary to transform community groups and management committees into successful development trusts and social enterprises and consequently, the theme of re-skilling appeared, discussed later in the chapter. Yet, although re-skilling was an issue, I also noted that asset transfer was a controversial and politically contested policy; for example, in LA1 the Council proposed an asset transfer which also involved the closure of several local authority buildings, including the community centre where CLD workers were based.

According to informants, the aim of the Council was twofold: close the library and leisure centres, which were to be re-located into a new school and use the 'community development approach' to engage the community on transferring the community centre into community ownership. However, instead of acting as the willing subjects of asset transfer, which is how they were represented in the performance management texts of community development, local people including management committee representatives and members of the Community Council embarked upon a campaign of opposition to the Council and formed a group entitled 'Save our Services' (SOS). According to informants, the aim of the SOS was to keep all of the buildings open (its campaign slogan was 'say no to Council cuts') and also for the buildings to remain under local authority control.

The emergence of the SOS caused a series of problems for community development and according to informants, practitioners were instructed by management not to attend any of the anti-cuts meeting, which were also perceived as anti-Council meetings; I was told that the Director of Education attended a community development team meeting (this was quite unusual) in order to warn practitioners that they should not offer any support to a group campaigning against the Council, which the Director argued was a breach of corporate policy. According to the informant, this placed practitioners in a dilemma because members of the SOS were also management committee members and Community Councillors, with long histories of working in partnership with CLD.

Interestingly, the SOS attempted to use official Community Planning structures to 'save the buildings' and lobbied the Council to have keeping the buildings open as an outcome in the local Community Plan; yet the informant told me that senior officials in the Council – including the Performance and Planning Manager for Community Development, argued that 'saving the buildings' was not a realistic outcome and that Community Plans could not be used to oppose corporate policy. I was told that angry scenes occurred at the Community Plan meetings and one practitioner noted:

'Well people walked away from the Community Planning process. People were very angry. They were involved in a process of producing a Community Plan for the area and then they were told that their centre was closing and that there was nothing they could do about it. The consultations were seen as a waste of time because the Council had already decided to close the building. I can see why people walked away in that context. People were very angry' (Kenny, later-years Community Development Practitioner, LA1).

Kenny's account suggested that Community Planning contained no in built mechanisms which could accommodate conflict or dissent and consequently, the SOS campaign focused their energies elsewhere leaving community development (and Community Planning) with what Kenny described as a 'huge credibility problem in the local community'.

Readers should note that scenarios like these were not isolated examples and in LA's 2 and 3 asset transfer was often greeted with scepticism by practitioners and managers. According to one practitioner/informant with a remit for capacity building in LA3, community ownership was opposed by most of the management committees who were responsible for the day to day management of

community centres; when I asked why a number of reasons emerged. In particular, the informant claimed that many of the assets were 'toxic' meaning they were more of a financial liability than a financial asset. In addition, management committees were said to be unwilling to make 'tough decisions', especially around issues such as staffing which often emerged following an asset transfer and the informant argued that management committees did not want to be involved in decisions such as outsourcing janitorial and cleaning staff to other (and cheaper) providers. The informant also argued that committee members were reluctant to spend their volunteer time doing work which they saw as the job of the Council. Senior managers I spoke with in LA1 raised similar concerns and one manager told me that asset transfer was unlikely to occur in poorer communities on the grounds that deprived communities did not have the capacity to run services and manage assets.

These accounts of asset transfer are supported by research and according to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, asset transfer is more successful in 'affluent areas where it was easier to generate income and recruit volunteers who had the capacity to take over facilities' (see Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2015). Similarly, research by Nichols, et al, describe volunteers involved in asset transfers as being from 'affluent areas, with higher levels of skills, confidence and social capital than their poorest counterparts'; according to Nichols, et al, the 'typical volunteer' is a 'well-connected, educated professional, usually a retired or a semi-retired professional' (see Nichols, et al, 2015, p. 13). Whitfield argues that despite the 'empowerment rhetoric' of local authorities (and Community Plan Partnerships), the reality behind many asset transfers is that 'volunteers replace paid labour, contracting reduces advocacy, and community initiative is directed into financing and managing facilities'. Consequently, Whitfield claims that the rationale for asset transfer is not 'community ownership' but 'primarily cost driven, with budget savings achieved by increased efficiency, improved productivity and reductions in jobs, terms and conditions' (see Whitfield, 2012, pp. 38-60). In a similar vein, Bailey et al, highlight the relationship between asset transfer and budget cuts and note that austerity programmes have 'energised asset transfer' (see Bailey, et al, 2015, p. 613).

Yet, despite the problematic nature of the policy – and the scepticism of professionals, community development was tasked with promoting asset transfer. Moreover, despite local opposition in LA1 asset transfer has remained a performance target for the last four years, which suggests - in my mind anyway, that the fiscal crisis of the state – as opposed to the demands of communities, is the driving force behind asset transfer in the current context. Interestingly, one of the managers claimed that following the next round of budget cuts asset transfer would inevitably be back on the agenda;

when I asked if that also meant that the SOS would be ‘back on the agenda’, the manager said that he was hopeful that, ‘this time the SOS would adopt a more realistic perspective’.

Readers should note that this section is not intended to read as being against asset transfer and I am aware of the fact that successful asset transfers which are supported by local communities have also occurred. Rather my attention has been to highlight the politicised nature of asset transfer and also the ways in which it is driven by local states (and community development) with the aim of facilitating public sector cuts. In the next section I consider co-production a term which also features regularly in Community Plans and I discuss how co-production approaches were deployed in order to facilitate budget cuts to the local voluntary sector in LA1.

### *Co-Production*

In a report issued in 2012, the CLD Managers Scotland Group noted that:

‘We (CLD) are currently establishing a sub-group with community and voluntary sector partners to consider ways of making budget savings proposals together rather than have it done to us’ (CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2012).

I mention this report because the statement, ‘making budget savings proposals together...rather than having it done to us’, is a common argument in the field and one which sheds light on how the term co-production - despite a variety of different meanings in the literature (see Bransden and Pestoff, 2006; 2007; Durose and Richardson, 2015), is being deployed in the field. In a moment I discuss how a ‘co-production approach’ was used in LA1 in order to make significant reductions in the voluntary sector’s budget. As we shall see, the cuts or savings (the terms were used interchangeably) were substantial and my interest in co-production was twofold – first, it provided a specific example of community development practitioners involvement in the process of facilitating cuts and unlike asset transfer the policy was ‘successful’ in terms of reducing expenditure. In addition, I was interested in how professionals rationalised their individual involvement in facilitating cuts to a voluntary sector they had spent years of their working lives supporting.

According to managers, community development was instructed by the Council’s Corporate Management Team (CMT) to establish ‘co-production panels’ and membership of these panels included the main Community Planning Partners drawn from the voluntary sector and community

representatives. The panels had a specific remit, namely to consider how savings could be made to the grants allocated to the voluntary sector following significant reductions in the Council budget. I sensed that rather than the Council cutting the voluntary sector budget directly, the CMT wanted to use an approach based on partnership and participation or in the words of the CLD Managers Scotland Group, 'make budget savings together' (see CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2012).

In the extract which follows, one of the managers explained the co-production process in greater detail:

'We decided to review all grants in the Council to make it co-production. Normally Council staff would review the grants but we wanted to do it with people who were recipients of grants and who know about the voluntary sector; so we recruited five folk from the voluntary sector, five Council staff and I chaired it. It was fine until you got to the cuts; the people from the voluntary sector said at this point, there should be no cuts - but that's hardly realistic is it? So, on the co-production panel we had a really sophisticated debate that said there should be no more than 17% cuts - this figure is based on evidence of what we thought the sector could sustain. We took the view that the local authority was in a difficult situation and well, we do need to save money - so, let's not just say don't do any cuts, because that's not going to get us anywhere' (Emily, Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

The manager noted that after a 'sophisticated debate' (the nature of which was never explained) the voluntary sector shifted from an initial position of 'no cuts' – which the manager felt was unrealistic, towards accepting a 17% cut – readers should note the actual cut was increased to 32%, following the intervention in the co-production by process by the Corporate Management Team<sup>11</sup>. Subsequently, community development and the voluntary sector partners were tasked with making a 32% cut and according to one of the managers, the biggest challenge they faced was 'keeping the voluntary sector on board and participating in the co-production panel'.

---

<sup>11</sup> According to one informant, who attended meetings of the Corporate Management Team (CMT), the CMT was of the view that the voluntary sector could sustain more cuts than initially proposed. The informant stated that the more money the Council could cut from the voluntary sector the less it would need to cut from its own budget.

I was interested in the specific ways in which the co-production panels reduced the grant and I learned from managers that the panels did not identify cuts directly, rather community development practitioners designed an administrative system which involved voluntary sector projects applying for grants against a 'strict criteria' based on outcomes in the Community Plan. I was told that a points based system was introduced to score projects and that the strict criteria was shaped by employability and positive destinations, which some in the voluntary sector felt was too narrow. Simply put those who failed to match their objectives to the criteria of the Community Plan had their budget cut. According to informants, the voluntary sector 'played the game' on the grounds that 'there was no alternative' and from this perspective the 32% cut which was approved in principle by the CMT and also at a meeting of Councillors, was implemented.

I learned that the cuts to the voluntary sector which followed were substantial and included staff redundancies, the closure of buildings and consequently, several youth projects had either closed or were forced to reduce their opening hours; meanwhile, those that survived were given support from community development practitioners to re-align their core business in ways which made them compatible with employability and positive destinations. According to one informant, many people in the voluntary sector felt betrayed by co-production - 'it's become a dirty word' they said, whilst others noted that relations between the voluntary sector and the Council were at their lowest point since their working careers began. Yet, what interested me were the ways in which the co-production approach shifted the voluntary sector from a position of 'no cuts' towards accepting a 17% cut followed by a 32% cut in its grant. From the perspective of the Corporate Management Team – which had unprecedented savings to make, the co-production approach was successful and according to one of the managers cuts were achieved without any public opposition from the voluntary sector.

One of the community development managers argued that the co-production approach was intentionally selected as a method because it reduced the likelihood of conflict between partners and the local authority:

'If you go head on with the local authority you will lose. You need to negotiate. Communities will get more if they negotiate...head on confrontation they will lose...sometimes going head on with a local authority...well you are never going to get there. Communities are better off if they adopt a less radical and more phased

approach and negotiate in partnership than through confrontation' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development, LA1).

Managers used the terms community development and co-production interchangeably, although Emily argued that 'community development' was outdated when describing contemporary practice:

'I think community development is about campaigning. If people have that view, particularly in this day and age it can lead to head on confrontations...for me community development is just the communities agenda; it's supporting the activists or management committees to do whatever they want to do, whereas co-production is a joint thing we do together'.

I also noted in the other authorities examples of where co-production or community development approaches were used to involve the public in the administration of cuts; for example, practitioners in LA3 organised a series of 'Have your Say' consultations where members of the public were invited to events in order to identify where spending cuts or savings could be made. In addition, the interactive websites of all three authorities featured 'budget calculators' and members of the public were encouraged to use these calculators to see if they could 'balance the budget'. In LA2 discussions were underway to devolve budgets to Community Planning Partnerships – a process which the Council and some of the Partners described as 'participatory budgeting' – yet, it was also framed by informants as a means for furthering the involvement of communities in the process of cuts, a process I heard referred to several occasions as 'devolving the axe'.

It appeared to me that methodologies associated with community development - community engagement, participation, partnership working, and so forth, were being utilised by the authorities to involve the voluntary and community sectors in processes designed at the outset to reduce public expenditure. In particular, it was interesting that the Corporate Management Team in LA1 seemed to view community development as the 'go to' section for ensuring community participation and engagement in this process. Moreover, the adoption (or appropriation?) of community development methods for controversial ends corresponds with Mahony's argument that the methodologies of CD 'may be orchestrated in ways that minimise conflict and promote consent' (Mahony, cited in Newman, 2014). In a similar vein, Community Planning structures were also utilised to invite communities and the voluntary sector into 'official spaces' and once inside these spaces they worked with community development to plan and implement local austerity programmes. Community

Planning emerged in these scenarios not as a forum for promoting democratic renewal (Scott, 2012) but rather as a new public management tool used by local authorities to facilitate communities into a strategic consensus shaped by austerity. From this perspective, this research adds to the literature which has provided a critique of Community Planning in Scotland<sup>12</sup> (see Cowell, 2004; McWilliams, 2013; Mowbray, 2011; Skelcher, 2000; Sullivan, 2003).

The research suggested that community development was used an approach by local states as a technique for managing austerity and if we accept Newman's argument that austerity has 'amplified neoliberalism' (see Newman, 2014, p. 3291) then it is logical to argue that community development plays a role in accelerating the neoliberalisation of the public sector. Consequently, I suggest that a neoliberal model of practice is emerging. Moreover, framing community development as a technique for managing austerity raises interesting ethical questions regarding the ways in which professionals rationalise their involvement in local austerity programmes, which I explore in the next section.

#### *Rationalising Austerity: De-politicisation and Individualisation*

Given the scale of the cuts made via co-production or the campaigns against building closures, which arose as a consequence of asset transfer, readers may expect to find a workforce angered and politicised by austerity. Yet, in most cases, I noted that rather than being politicised, the opposite was occurring and de-politicisation emerged as a theme to investigate, which I consider here and also in Chapter 10. Practitioners often shunned working with those opposed to Council objectives,

---

<sup>12</sup> Cowell's critique of Community Planning focused on public participation: Cowell argued that one of the reasons why public involvement was minimal is because Community Plans have no statutory remit regarding many of the controversial decisions taken by local authorities and Cowell concluded that concerned publics typically channel their participation elsewhere (see Cowell, 2004, p. 505). Cowell's view is supported by my own research; for example, I noted that community development workers in LA1 spent considerable time (in some cases a number of years) working with communities to produce a Community Plan for the area – yet when a controversial decision arose, say the closure of a building discussed earlier or other scenarios not highlighted in the main text such as the re-location of a school or a hospital, or controversial plans to develop a new road, because the plans had no remit over the land use planning system their scope for engaging publics in these issues was severely limited. Meanwhile research by Mowbray makes explicit the link between Community Planning and new managerialism with Mowbray arguing that Community Plans are informed by cost-effectiveness and cost efficiency, with narrow performance measures tied to budgets, timelines and milestones (see Mowbray, 2011).

whilst many spoke of Community Planning, Asset Transfer and Co-Production in ways that were devoid of political analysis – in fact, some said that co-production was not political which surprised me given its links with austerity. My argument that professionals were de-politicised should not imply that they were not angry at cuts to the voluntary sector – they were, but in the absence of political analysis the cuts were often blamed on powerful individuals within the local state’s bureaucratic apparatus, typically Chief Executives, Directors or Heads of Service.

The blame was more intense and personalised when those individuals originated from backgrounds in the ‘social professions’ (see Banks, 2004) especially community education, teaching and social work. I noted that senior managers from across the authorities were described in interviews as ‘cold-hearted’, ‘calculating’, ‘hard’, ‘ruthless’, ‘dictatorial’ and so on and I came to the view that by subjecting managers to blame the politics of austerity receded from sight. Yet, the individualisation of blame, although devoid of structural analysis, can also be framed as a rational response from actors experiencing everyday austerity or what Mirowski has termed ‘everyday neoliberalism’ (see Mirowski, 2013) and although senior managers were powerless to stop all cuts, they did possess at their disposal significant procedural powers to identify where specific cuts or savings could be made. Moreover, it was often the case that the fate of community development was dependent on whether or not it had support from individual Chief Executives and Directors and this led to particularly tense relationships between professionals and senior officers.

The blame culture was also nurtured by the fact that it was a common practice at community engagement events where controversial decisions were being discussed – say a buildings closure - for senior managers to address the public rather than elected politicians and several informants in LA1 claimed that a ‘blurring of the grounds’ existed with regards to who was responsible for running the authority. It could be the case that cynical councillors were happy for unelected officials to take the blame for controversial cuts, however I noted during interviews that several high ranking informants in LA1 and 2 argued that senior managers wielded more power than elected officials in the everyday administration of local government. This corresponded with other analyses of neoliberalisation whereby the transfer of power from elected politicians to the bureaucracy constitutes one of the core components of depoliticisation in the managerial state (see Burnham, 2001). Moreover, de-politicisation is aided in this context by the narrative of ‘let the managers manage’ whereby ‘accountability is more managerial than political’ (Christensen and Laegried, 2001, p. 74).

The rise of a new managerial culture emphasising ‘leadership’ and ‘transformational management’ (O’ Reilly and Reed, 2011, p. 1088) – although frequently mocked by public sector actors, also created a cultural context where the individual qualities of managers (or leaders) becomes the focus of attention and this further consolidated de-politicisation. Interestingly groups such as the SOS, who campaigned against austerity, were framed by managers and practitioners as ‘political activists’ whilst those engaged in the administration of austerity through Co-production Panels or Community Planning Partnerships were routinely described as ‘volunteers’, ‘community representatives’ and ‘responsible citizens’. From this perspective, I drew the conclusion that in the minds of professionals, opposition to austerity was ‘political’ whilst the enactment of austerity was not. This analysis corresponded with Newman’s insight into neoliberalisation that ‘politics comes afterwards, as a space of resistance to an already completed ideological formation or political project’ (Newman, 2014, p. 3302).

The progressive rhetoric associated with Community Planning and terms such as co-production also made it easier to implement cuts and in the next section I argue that the new language of the workplace – which I discussed in the last chapter, also played a key role in shaping the ways in which professionals rationalised their involvement in local austerity programmes.

#### *Cuts or Savings? Exploring Language and Rhetoric in Community Development*

Community development actors rationalised their involvement in cuts by drawing upon an official language and rhetoric shaped by policy and new managerialism which I described in the last chapter as the new language of the workplace. Discussing Community Planning, McWilliams argues that much of the rhetoric is informed by a ‘misplaced optimism’ (see McWilliams, 2013) and similarly, I noted that misplaced optimism existed in the rhetoric of community development. The gap between the rhetoric of practice and the reality on the ground is well documented (see Atkinson, 2003; Kirkwood, 1990; Mayo, 1997; Taylor, 2011, p. 298) and in my view the philosophical niceties associated with terms such as co-production, community engagement, community empowerment, community ownership, democratic renewal, participatory democracy and so forth often bore scant resemblance to real events occurring in practice. Moreover, I came to the view that managerial language served an important political function in the sense that it discursively shielded (or deceived?) practitioners and managers from the effects of the local austerity programmes they were administrating; one notable example of this was the ways in which community development

practitioners in LA1 were instructed by their seniors never to use terms such as cuts but always 'efficiency savings', especially when engaging with the public.

Furthermore, rather than make reference to cuts managers in LA's 1, 2 and 3 instead chose to speak of 'leaner processes', 'leaner delivery mechanisms', 'trimming the fat' and being BOLD – 'better outcomes, leaner delivery'. These terms were routinely used to describe scenarios such as making staff redundant, justifying zero hours contracts for youth workers, closing youth projects or significantly reducing their opening hours, cutting adult education classes, closing mobile libraries and in one case reducing the number of Citizens Advice Bureaux's in LA1. I noted that if budget cuts involved job losses managers would seldom say so directly – instead they spoke of 'posts being impacted' or they argued that 'savings' could be made through 'natural wastage' which meant posts not being replaced as a result of workers accepting redundancy packages. Meanwhile, if a service such as CLD or one provided by the voluntary sector was considered for cuts, managers said the service was 'in scope' where it would be part of an 'options appraisal' and 'service level review'. When asked by me whether it was appropriate to describe what was taking place in local government as cuts or savings, one of the managers stated that it was 'best to avoid emotive language' adding that they were 'encouraged to spin things in a certain way in order to get less resistance'.

Several managers said they were aware of the 'Orwellian' nature of 'managerial language'<sup>13</sup> – for example:

'Managerial language mitigates against people being allowed to talk about things which are regarded as emotive and winding up the situation - although everyone knows we are experiencing the worst cuts in expenditure in a generation; but why would you wind people up by constantly going on about that...our job is to manage the consequences' (James, later-years, Performance and Planning Manager for Communities, LA1).

---

<sup>13</sup> 'Orwellian' is used here to denote George Orwell's insights into how the English language was often abused, a process which he described as 'double-think'. On the question of political (and bureaucratic language) Orwell wrote that it was 'designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind' (see Orwell, 1986). Interestingly he described 'double-think' in the following terms: 'To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them' (see Orwell, 2000, pp. 40-41).

The narrative of 'managing the consequences' or 'there is no alternative' was common and I noted that what informants told me in private was often markedly different (and more accurate) than the official rhetoric associated with community development which they espoused in public. Implicit in their argument was a sense that professionals were subjected to powers beyond their control and from this perspective, many rationalised their involvement in budget cuts by presenting accounts of themselves as 'innocent bystanders' which reminded me of Bauman's analysis of bureaucracy, namely that it turned human beings into the 'blameless instruments of an alien will' (Bauman, 2005, p. 25).

Yet, many professionals, especially those who embraced the new professionalism discussed in Chapters 6-8, also drew upon 'new truths' whereby the economic conditions caused by austerity presented new opportunities for community development. In addition, the competencies required of practitioners were also transformed by their role in supporting communities to become providers of public services and owners of public assets and in the next section I argue that re-skilling emerged as one of the key features of re-professionalisation and the new professionalism.

### *Re-skilling and Neoliberalisation*

In this section I discuss how a material landscape shaped by austerity and in a broader sense neoliberalisation has transformed the skills required of contemporary community development practitioners in local government. The effects of neoliberalisation on the skills base of professions such as social work are well understood and it is argued that the traditional role of the social worker has been transformed by neoliberal practices such as contracting out, outsourcing and marketisation (see Harris, 1998; Jones, 1999; Noordegraaf, 2007) - yet, the impact of 'contracting out' or 'outsourcing' on community development is less documented.

During the course of my research I noted that financial pressures caused by austerity have not simply led to cuts which I discussed via co-production, they have also involved a new emphasis on practices related with the contracting out and outsourcing of public services. Asset transfer which I discussed earlier, is perhaps the most significant example of this, whereby practitioners built the capacity (in theory) of community groups to acquire assets previously owned by the local Council and once 'capacity is built' services or in this instance buildings could be contracted out to new (and cheaper) providers. In addition, I noted practitioners in all three authorities were involved in the

outsourcing of services such as lunch clubs for the elderly, after school clubs, crèches and youth clubs. One group of practitioners in LA2 wanted to outsource the entire youth work service, including the youth work staff, to an independent development trust. When I asked why – they argued that it would allow traditional youth clubs to continue to run, whilst the Council focused its priorities on employability and positive destinations. They argued that if services were not outsourced to new providers then they would be lost altogether which placed a moral pressure upon them to support reform. In addition, I met a group of practitioners in LA3 who transformed an ‘unemployed workers group’ into a successful social enterprise which was awarded with a contract to deliver a local authority service. I was also interested in a new development in LA2 which saw Community Planning Partnership’s take on greater responsibility for providing services and managing budgets and I anticipate that in a context of cuts many Partnerships are increasingly likely to take on the characteristics of Arm’s Length Executive Organisations (ALEO’s) which I discussed in Chapter 6.

The work of community development in all three authorities tended to converge around particular themes and practitioners were expected to transform community groups – or ad hoc groups of local people, into social enterprises, development trusts, registered charities and community businesses. Consequently, a new way of conceptualising ‘community’ was emerging with communities no longer framed as places where people live and work or communities of identity, but rather as potential players in the public services delivery market. A new discursive repertoire was also evident - note the ways in which communities were referred to as ‘the social economy’ in the performance management texts. In addition, they were encouraged to think of the social world in terms of ‘community capital’ and to see themselves as part of Scotland’s ‘enterprise movement’, whereby community groups could ‘own and acquire assets’ and take advantage of the opportunities emerging in the ‘public service delivery market’.

In order for practitioners to successfully navigate this new and at times complex landscape, the acquisition of new sets of skills was required and contemporary practitioners were expected to know how to write business plans or present business cases on what successful development trusts and social enterprises might look like in practice. In addition, they might be expected to have a basic knowledge of procurement law and contracting out and tendering processes, especially if community based organisations are going to win contracts in public sector delivery market. Practitioners were also expected to be knowledgeable about ‘external funding’ and employers wanted competent professionals who could write funding applications which could bring in much

needed finance during a period of fiscal austerity. According to one practitioner, increasing the amount of 'external funding' was one of the main strategic priorities for community development:

'I think if local authorities are going to continue to employ community workers then we have to prove that we can bring in additional monies. I have always been good at writing funding applications and I can talk the type of language that funders want to hear. You know make the links with policy – use the correct buzzwords. And that's an asset right now because bringing in external funding is a big part of the authorities income generation strategy' (Christine, later-years Community Development Worker, LA1).

'Contributing to the local authorities income generation strategy' also meant nurturing groups of local people to become official charities (often because the Council cannot apply directly for funding) and in this context community groups were expected to be self-sufficient and according to one manager in LA1, the aim was to encourage community groups to achieve 'sustainable income streams whilst becoming less reliant on grants'. I noted that 'sustainability' and 'independence' featured regularly in social economy narratives, alongside 'self-help', 'community empowerment' and 'real public ownership'.

Practitioners were also involved in the everyday governance of existing social enterprises and development trusts where they sat on various project boards as advisors. Moreover, practitioners played a leading role in encouraging organisations to discursively define their work in ways shaped by managerialism - targets, outcomes, outputs, baselines and so forth – and as noted in Chapter 8, the aim of this was to ensure that community organisations were auditable in terms of the priorities of funders and government. In addition to monitoring performance, practitioners were also expected to manage the impact of cuts on community based organisations and this work saw them preparing 'business reviews' which recommended various 'options appraisals' to project boards, especially boards having to revisit their 'core business' as a consequence of the loss of grants. In this context, I spoke with practitioners in LA1 who were encouraging organisations to consider re-branding (to make them more focused on employability and positive destinations) and downsizing – with the latter achieved through making staff redundant and recruiting volunteers to plug the gap in the absence of paid workers.

A similar process of re-skilling or upskilling was occurring with community representatives and in these scenarios the 'active citizens' of old were transformed into new 'entrepreneurial citizens'; according to Newman 'entrepreneurial citizenship' is a new form of citizenship informed by the logic of the market (see Newman, 2011). Moreover, various learning opportunities were targeted at communities most of which were framed around the social economy and making communities more entrepreneurial. According to the workplans of practitioners, learning meant acquiring practical knowledge about the day to day governance of social enterprises, development trusts, and registered charities and discussing 'learning' in this context, one of the managers argued:

'I actually think there is more learning now than there has ever been. Before community workers just ran their groups and you know quite often it was the same groups. Maybe they did some group work. But now they do so much more...communities don't always know the opportunities that are available to them and that's where the learning comes in, especially now that the Council can't reasonably be expected to provide everything' (James, later-years Policy and Performance Manager for Communities, LA1).

In the above transcript, James conceptualises learning in relation to the withdrawal of the state, a process facilitated by 'entrepreneurial citizens' who worked in partnership with local officials in Community Planning Partnerships and Co-Production Panels, discussed earlier. Martin's analysis of lifelong learning is interesting at this juncture and according to Martin, lifelong learning has enabled the deconstruction of welfare to be effected through the reconstruction of citizenship (Martin, 2003).

Re-skilling or upskilling was shaped by values and practices drawn from the world of business and the neoliberalisation of the state, discussed in Chapter 3. Re-skilling is also a product of a context which involves the local Council having to engage local communities in the planning, management and delivery of services and Audit Scotland has claimed that, 'the Council workforce may need to retrain or develop further their skills in this area' (see Audit Scotland, 2016). Yet, whilst involving people in the planning of services might sound like bread and butter issues for community development, I noted that some professionals especially those in their later years, were often struggling to survive in this new world, hence the reason why upskilling has been identified as an issue by management and inspectors. The emergence of an older group of professionals across CLD who were struggling with reskilling is worthy of further analysis. I suggest that the new focus on business values and practices which has accompanied the contracting out of public services creates

political and ethical problems for a workforce traditionally informed by a 'leftist consensus' (see Kenny, 2010). Moreover, a small group of professionals influenced by the radical tradition in community development (see Chapter 4) were innately sceptical of business values and practices and in some cases the very concept of the market and this might explain why the CD has struggled to find success in policies such as asset transfer. I also noted that an anti-upskilling narrative existed which was framed in terms of a nostalgia for the 'old days' when community development workers engaged in issue based group work and advocacy work. The extent to which traditionally advocacy work is disappearing has been noted by the Scottish Community Development Network who argued that the 'narrow focus of professional community development has reduced advocacy work and the nurturing of independent community activity' (see Scottish Community Development Network, 2015, p. 4).

I would argue that re-skilling is increasingly likely to be an issue for community development's 'ageing workforce' (see Lifelong Learning UK, 2008) especially given the likelihood of continued public spending cuts coupled with the placing of community development in sections of local government with a different cultural ethos from CE/CLD – for example, community economic development or regeneration. In particular, the new organisational context for practice has further challenged CD's status as a graduate profession linked with Community Education (see Chapter 6) and consequently CE trained practitioners are increasingly drawn into competition for new community development posts against candidates with backgrounds in the third sector and also private sector management. Yet, it is also important to note that a younger breed of professionals were also emerging in the field who as noted in Chapters 6-8 appear to embrace the new professionalism and as we shall see have learned to think in ways shaped by new managerialism and neoliberalisation.

In concluding this discussion, I want to note the changing nature of professional competencies is one of the key characteristics of the new professionalism and in the final section of this chapter I argue that a new model of practice which can broadly be characterised as 'neoliberal community development' has emerged in the field. In addition, I draw upon governmentality theory in order to discuss the relationship between neoliberal community development and the wider politics of the local state.

### *Neoliberal Community Development and the Local State*

The key features of neoliberal community development include the following: local government invests in community development at a time of financial restraint on the grounds that the professional workforce can facilitate the retreat of local government from certain forms of public provision; in this context the methodologies of community development – group work, community engagement, participation, have proven useful tools for local states wishing to involve communities in the peaceful management of austerity. The language of CD, certainly in terms of official texts – ‘democratic renewal’, ‘capacity building’, ‘community planning’, ‘community empowerment’, is of such an ambiguous nature that it can be applied to a political project which on the surface appears to involve the rolling back of the state and the promotion of community in providing public goods and services previously delivered ‘in house’ by local authorities.

In a changing material landscape shaped by neoliberal austerity community groups are encouraged by community development to organise themselves into registered charities, social enterprises, development trusts and community businesses, who are then equipped with the skills to become new players in the public sector delivery market. The role of professionals in the governance of existing third sector projects is also a key feature of neoliberal community development, with the grants previously given to community groups replaced with service level agreements which in turn are closely monitored by professionals trained to operate various technologies of new managerialism. Neoliberal community development also involves a significant re-skilling of the workforce with professionals equipped with new skills and encouraged to think of the world in ways shaped by business values and practices.

Governmentality theory offers new theoretical insights which can also deepen our intellectual understanding of neoliberal community development and in particular the ways in which ‘community’ has become a target of government policy (see Stenson and Watt, 1999, p. 191; Wills, 2012). According to Ling, the state uses technologies of performance management in order to extend its reach into civil society and consequently civil society itself is articulated as a policy of governmentality (see Ling, 2000). Similarly, Newman argues that ‘new governmentalities’ are linked with neoliberalisation and have involved greater penetration of market based provision into areas previously under local democratic control (Newman, 2014, p 3295). The ‘new governmentalities’ are shaped by an ‘economics logic’ which Newman argues is based on an ‘economic calculus of debt reduction and financial stringency’ (Ibid, p. 3292). Technologies of performance management which I considered in Chapter 8 – audits, computerised management information systems, appraisals, inspections, emerge in an analysis informed by governmentality not just as the bureaucratic means

for subjecting community development to ‘administrative domination’ (see Davies, 2013, p. 8) but also as new ‘technologies’ for governing communities (see Darcy, 2002, p. 36; Kenny, 2016, p. 54). Readers should note that this analysis also draws upon Cockburn’s prescient argument from the 1970s, namely that one of the aims of state sponsored community development was for the local population to join the local states own employees as a twin subject of management (see Cockburn, 1977, p. 18).

In conclusion, I would emphasise that the state is not in retreat rather it is being re-configured in the image of the market and drawing upon Foucault’s analysis of neoliberalism discussed in Chapter 2, the key features of the new neoliberal state in terms of local government include services such as community development being used to promote the virtues of competition and entrepreneurialism – rather than controlling their adverse effects. From this perspective, professional community development emerges not as a benign set of practices concerned with community engagement and democratic renewal but rather as a technique and technology used by local states to further neoliberalisation.

### *Concluding Remarks*

The purpose of Chapter 9 has been to argue that a neoliberal model of community development has emerged in the field which is connected to an economic policy shaped by austerity. Neoliberalism in relation to community development has been approached in this chapter as both a destructive and productive power and from this perspective it is simultaneously both the ‘problem’ facing communities – meaning austerity, but also the ‘solution’ – meaning that communities have to become more entrepreneurial in order to survive. The latter suggests that a different type of society informed by the values of entrepreneurialism is being constructed and Foucault described this new society in the ‘Governmentality Lectures’ as the enterprise society. The role of the new professionalism (and new professionals) in creating the new society of enterprise is the subject of the next Chapter.

## **Chapter 10: The New Professionalism and the Enterprise Society**

### **Introduction**

In Chapter 10, I continue the discussion on the role of professionals in the cultivation of a new society, which Foucault described in the 'Governmentality Lectures' as the enterprise society. I return to the concept of 'entrepreneurial citizenship' which was introduced in the last chapter in order to explore the concept of employability, which as noted in Chapter 6 is a policy transforming contemporary practice. I argue that professionals are involved in creating new entrepreneurial citizens who are transformed from being dependent subjects of welfare into new self-governing actors who think of themselves as products or commodities in the enterprise society. Drawing upon Foucault and governmentality theory, I argue that new managerialism in this context is producing new subjects to govern in the shape of the unemployed and those not in positive destinations. I argue that the professional subject is also transformed by the discourse of entrepreneurialism and explore the ways in which the neoliberalisation of the state, discussed in Chapter 3, has produced a new professional subject whom I frame as the entrepreneurial professional. In the final section, I draw upon Foucault in order to frame the ideas which inform neoliberal community development as new regimes of truth and I suggest that the new truths have their ideational origins in ideas associated with the 'Neoliberal Thought Collective'.

### *Employability and the Entrepreneurial Citizen*

The creation of entrepreneurial citizens is at the heart of new professional practices and in the last chapter, I discussed the ways in which communities were encouraged to learn new entrepreneurial skills in order to survive in a post social democratic world. The concept of entrepreneurial citizenship can also be applied to the contemporary policy context surrounding employability which as noted in Chapter 6 is transforming CE/CLD. In the discussion that follows I consider the ways in which the individual subject is encouraged by professionals to think of themselves in terms of a product or commodity equipped with the skills necessary to survive in the enterprise society. Readers should note that the analysis is influenced by my reading of various texts produced in the field and obtained from LA's 1 and 2 – these included annual reports, promotional materials and internal reports coupled with interviews with managers and practitioners. The analysis draws upon an approach – discussed in Chapter 4, which is influenced by governmentality theory whereby 'texts' become one of the ways through which government policy seeks to order and shape practice (see Larner and

Butler, 2005, p. 87; McGrath, 2015, p. 181). Texts emerge in this analysis not as neutral documents but rather as tools which construct a particular representation of reality.

In the field, various texts make reference to the role of CLD in creating successful and employable individuals who have learned to market themselves to different audiences, most notably employers. In addition, successful individuals are portrayed in these narratives as those who 'aim high' and have positive and can do attitudes; by engaging with CLD it claimed that they will 'take the first steps towards being employable'. I noted that practitioners made frequent reference to an 'employability pipeline', which referred to the stages the individual takes in their job seeking journeys. According to practitioners, the pipelines begin with 'activity agreements', effectively formal agreements whereby young people formally agree with a trusted professional to find a positive destination and at the end of the process the young person is said to be 'employability ready' and 'ready to enter the world of work'. Across the three authorities, many practitioners who previously considered themselves 'generic community education workers' – which as noted involved a community development approach to adult education and youth work, have subsequently discovered that their work is shaped by the employability pipeline.

The concept of employability interested me on the grounds that the individual constructed was not someone who was merely unemployed or a future worker but rather a subject of enterprise. In this context, CLD promoted courses which highlighted the importance of branding and marketing the self and I noted that two in particular focused on 'learn how to market yourself on social media' and 'learn how to sell yourself to employers'. In addition, various learning interventions targeted the psyche and thought processes of the individual, with courses offered in relation to 'Confidence Building', 'Challenging Negative Attitudes' and 'Believing in Yourself'; these courses promoted the virtues of positive thinking and positive attitudes whereby learners 'could be the change they wanted to be'. Other leaning interventions focused on practical skills, especially those 'skills employers want', with learning framed as 'learn how to do spreadsheets', 'learn how to complete a CV and application form' and 'learn the skills for doing well in interviews'. Courses which offered 'real work experience' were entitled 'Get Ready for Retail', 'Get Ready for Work', 'Crèche Worker Training', 'Careers in Care', 'Tourism Academies', 'Social Care Academies' and 'Pathways into the Army'. In addition, practitioners ran job clubs in partnership with Job Centre Plus, which were targeted at deprived communities.

These practices have created a new focus for work and across the authorities there was a real sense that employability was, in the words of one practitioner in LA2 'taking over everything else'. As noted, job titles were changing to reflect the new work and 'Youth Workers', 'Adult Learning Tutors' and generic 'CLD Workers' of old were disappearing and being replaced with 'Life Coaches', 'Mentors', 'Activity Agreement Workers' and 'Transition Support Workers'. Moreover, learning was framed in the new discourse solely in terms of training for work and consequently there is a qualitative rise in the number of courses and projects offering certification and accreditation. According to one manager, the field of youth work has been transformed:

'We used to understand that youth work was a voluntary activity and that youth work was about exploring identities with trusted adults in a way you couldn't do with a parent or a social worker and that it was a space for young people's development and growth. Nobody told me that I had to account for the nature of that interaction beyond it being caring supportive and helpful. Yet, we now have in our field of practice an expectation of purposeful learning activities and extension of Curriculum for Excellence into wider achievement and certificated learning of every kind is now described as youth work – so everybody must now have a certificate to prove that there was value in the interaction between the young person and the adult. So you have to get a Duke of Edinburgh Award, a John Muir Award, a Youth Achievement Award and inspectors have laid the charge that what we used to do didn't have a value' (Martin, later-years Youth Work Manager, LA2).

In this economistic discourse, certificates and accredited courses emerge as commodities which have value and according to the narrative, the more commodities the young person accrues, the greater their chances of securing a positive destination. The rise of certificated learning is also a product of a discourse emphasising measurement because 'qualifications are easy to count' (see Wolf et al, 2007, p. 540).

The new practices promoted a culture of individualisation with Simmons and Thompson arguing in relation to employability programmes, that the 'collective experiences of class, gender and culture are being replaced by unique biographies and ambitions alongside a greater reliance on individuals own resources to achieve personal goals and avoid undeserved outcomes' (Simmons and Thompson, 2011, p. 6). The discourse of individualisation also encourages young people to view themselves as a product or commodity and according to Fraser, the new entrepreneurial subject can be described as:

'A subject of (market) choice and a consumer of services, this individual is obligated to enhance her quality of life through her own decisions. In this new 'care of self', everyone is an expert on herself, responsible for managing her own human capital to maximum effect' (Fraser, 2003, p. 168).

Fraser's last point that everyone should be 'responsible for managing their own human capital to maximum effect', takes its theoretical cue from an analysis outlined by Foucault who argued that the individual under neoliberal conditions was encouraged to think of themselves exclusively in relation to their 'capital ability' and viewed through his lens, the individual emerged as an 'enterprise unit' and 'enterprise of themselves' (see Foucault, 2008, p. 224). Dardot and Laval drew upon this analysis and argued in relation to employability programmes that the subject was encouraged to think of themselves and behave in every dimension of their existence, as the holders of capital to be valorised (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 156). From this perspective, the courses offered by CLD such as 'believing in yourself' or 'learn to market yourself to employers', these aim to create subjects that are 'flexible, adaptable, entrepreneurial and self-reliant' and who learn to manage themselves in accordance with the logic of the market (see Hilgers, 2011, p. 358; Jessop, 1999; Simmons and Thompson, 2011, p. 32).

The discourse of employability and entrepreneurial citizenship has wider societal implications, especially for the ways in which unemployment is conceived. According to Gordon:

'Work for the worker means, according to the neoliberals, the use of resources of skill, aptitude and competence which comprise human capital, to obtain earnings which constitute the revenue of that capital. Human capital is composed of two components, an innate component of bodily and genetic equipment, and an acquired component of aptitudes produced as a result of investment in the provision of appropriate environmental stimuli: nurture, education, etc' (Gordon, 1991, p. 44).

Moreover, the discourse of individualisation or what Connor refers to as 'responsibilisation' (see Connor, 2010, p. 48) has created a narrative whereby it is the unemployed individual as opposed to government, who is responsible for their unemployment (see Barnett, 2003; Gane, 2012, p. 621; Gordon, 1991, p. 44; Standing, 2014, p. 77). This narrative influences professionals, note the ways in which welfare to work programmes often had the support of managers and practitioners. The

discourse also allows local authorities to promote the dual strategy of marketing themselves as agents of employability, whilst simultaneously pursuing a policy of unemployment, in the sense that thousands of Council jobs have disappeared as a consequence of austerity driven reforms.

The emphasis on employability was also illustrative of the productive capacity of new managerialism, where new forms of work emerged in relation to measurement – for example, measuring the number of young people in positive destinations, volunteering, or measuring the number of people with certificates. The discourse of measurement was also focused on measuring the number of people ‘at risk’ and drawing upon Fraser I suggest that professionals are creating a new governable subject who is made ‘knowable in data’, a process Fraser described as ‘population profiling’ (see Fraser 2003, p. 169). In the case of CLD, population profiling was a regular practice, especially in youth work, as information on at risk young people – and their families, was shared between schools, social workers, CLD and other partner organisations.

Foucault argued that the ‘art of government’ is dependent upon the ‘identification of a particular kind of person or collective of persons as an object of intervention’ (see Foucault, 2008) – and from his perspective the ‘particular kind of person’ emerged in CLD in the shape of the unemployed young person or those not in a positive destination. These subjects appeared in data and on this note Gordon argues that computerisation plays an important role in the new government of society:

‘Computerisation and administrative rationalisation begin to make possible for the first time a ‘real’ government of population which, by co-ordinating appropriate forms of expertise and assessment, is capable of identifying all these individual members of society who can be deemed, by manifesting some combination of a specified range of ‘factors’ to present a significant, albeit, risk to themselves or to the community’ (Gordon, 1991, p. 45).

Intervening in the lives of the at risk in order to turn them into Homo Economicus (see Chapter 2) provides the new professionalism with legitimacy and in Foucault’s terms a new governable subject enters the narrative as someone who is made ‘thinkable and measureable for the purpose of government’ (see Foucault, 1991).

As noted in Chapter 6, youth work was emerging in this new context as a targeted service with young people increasingly referred to CLD by guidance teachers in schools and social workers. Yet,

the shift from voluntarism to referral based work is problematic because youth work has traditionally been defined as an approach to working based on the 'voluntary participation of young people' (see Fyfe and Moir, 2013, p. 7; Youthlink Scotland, 2009). Moreover, I would argue that youth work and adult education (see Chapter 6) are being reconfigured not as discrete professions within CE/CLD but rather as specialist services concerned with what Standing refers to as 'human capital formation and job preparation' (see Standing, 2014, p. 116).

It is not only young people and adult learners who are transformed by the enterprise society but also professionals and in the next section I argue in relation to re-professionalisation that the neoliberalisation of the state has produced a new type of professional whom I frame as the entrepreneurial professional.

### *The Neoliberalisation of the State and the Entrepreneurial Professional*

The new professional actor is a product of the marketisation of the state whereby practices associated with privatisation, contracting out, auditing, internal markets, best value regimes and new public management, have transformed the material context of local government. Moreover, these practices have produced a new culture shaped by values and practices drawn from the market and I argue that a new professional enters the scene who can be described as an 'enterprising subject at work' (see Barratt, 2003, p. 1073) or entrepreneurial professional. The new culture encourages professionals to market, advertise and brand their work to an array of audiences, most notably those with the power to provide the professional field with legitimacy, especially government ministers, local authority Chief Executives and Directors, and inspectors. Consequently, professionals spent increasing amounts of their labour time engaged in marketing tasks - for example, preparing press releases for local newspapers, liaising with communications officers and making promotional films.

CLD has become a brand with its own distinctive logo, mission statements and unique set of professional values which were framed in LA1 as 'our contract with the people'. According to informants in LA1 practitioners were instructed by management to always make sure that the CLD logo featured on any material issued for public consumption. According to one practitioner:

'The biggest row I ever got from management was when I mistakenly forgot to put the CLD logo on the Council's annual report. Every other logo was there – the Scottish

Government's, the Lotteries, all the funders and partner's logos...everyone's except ours. Seriously I was scared to come into work the next day' (Natalie, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

Accounts such as these highlighted the importance attached to branding and marketing by management. In addition, having spent many hours observing how professionals talked at team meetings or meetings of regional and national managers, I noted that work was constructed in discursive patterns shaped by the market and the discourse of entrepreneurialism. Consider these statements:

'We need to champion what we do and sell it to the Scottish Government. What the sector lacks is a story, a big story to tell about itself. We can tell small stories. And we are good at that. But we need a big story that we can tell the Scottish Government' (Colin, later-years Inspector speaking at a Regional Forum for CLD).

'CLD is at the heart of the policy context - but we need to get better at advertising what we do and showing to the government that we are best placed to deliver policy' (Emily, mid-years Strategic Manager for Community Development speaking at a Community Development Team Away Day, LA1).

'What CLD is about is continual improvement and the government is getting that - Eventually! But what the sector needs is a corporate plan which demonstrates that we are at the heart of the Scottish Government priorities' (Pauline, later-years Quality Assurance Officer addressing a meeting of the CLD Managers Scotland Group).

(Fieldwork Journal, May, 2015).

Professionals made frequent reference to terms such as 'sector leading practices', 'best practices', 'benchmarking', 'quality assurance', 'impacts', 'improving outcomes', 'better outputs' and 'continual improvement' and in these new discursive narratives, practice was framed as a product or commodity, which was packaged and then sold by professionals to government.

The new discursive repertoires are not surface discourses and neither should they be dismissed as jargon - rather they can be posited as discursive practices which qualitatively change the ways in which

the work is mentally processed. In other examples, the field was presented as existing/surviving in a world of competition with community development framed as being under constant threat from 'in house' competitors or poachers from the third sector:

'CLD is outperforming other sectors, particularly schools, but are we getting the credit for that? We need to get better at letting ministers know how we contribute to national priorities' (James, later-years Performance and Planning Manager for Communities speaking at a team meeting, LA1).

'Not everyone in this authority is an ally...You know who I'm thinking about here...we need to demonstrate to the Chief Executive that we should take the lead on community planning and co-production. That's our bread and butter' (Tommy, later-years CLD Worker speaking at a specially convened team meeting to discuss the strategic priorities for Capacity Building, LA1).

(Fieldwork Journal, May, 2015).

In an everyday working environment where the threat of contracting out or cuts created permanent uncertainty, professional actors used social policy as a means to strategically erect boundaries around the field of practice, perhaps in the hope that boundary construction could protect CLD from austerity's axe. According to managers, CLD was 'safe from cuts' on the grounds that it could prove that it was best placed to deliver policies such as Community Planning, Co-Production, Community Empowerment, Curriculum for Excellence and Employability and I noted that these arguments contained elements of what Du Gay refers to as 'policy entrepreneurialism' (see Du Gay, 2000, p. 62), whereby policy is perceived narrowly in terms of professional self-preservation and interest.

The data generated by MIS was also used as a means to promote 'brand CLD' (increasingly 'brand Lifelong Learning and Employability') against 'in house' competitors, note the references in the transcripts to 'we have the data to prove that we make an impact'. In addition, community development was marketed as a service which could 'cut costs' (see CLD Managers Scotland Group, 2010). Professionals were often strategically aware of the fact that they were expected to brand and advertise their work and one practitioner in LA1 told me that they always 'sang from the rooftops' about their work and ensured that the 'key players in local government knew what they were doing'. 'Singing from the rooftops' involved making sure that CLD was in the local press, that 'glossy reports'

with 'statistics and stories' (this is a term inspectors use) were produced, and making short glitzy films which featured strategically selected participants who talked on camera about their learning journeys and how their lives were transformed by community development. One informant in LA1 said they kept a list of community representatives whom they explained could always be relied upon to provide a good PR quote in favour of community development. It has been argued that community educators have traditionally kept a low profile about the professions achievements (see Tett, 2010, p. 32), yet, I suggest that one of the features of the new professionalism is the emergence of a public relations culture based on branding and marketing the profession, especially in a turbulent financial environment.

The entrepreneurial professional is a product of new managerialism and Hodgson, argues that the obsession with measurement and control methods involve 'showcasing professionalism' and turning professionals into actors engaged in 'professional performances' (see Hodgson, 2005, cited in Noordegraaf, 2007, p. 778). According to Newman, a particular form of managerialism is being created, one that is orientated towards organisational survival, effectiveness and competitive success (Newman, 2003, p. 58). Moreover, Evans argues that the new professionalism in the public sector is a 'performance art' (see Evans, 2010) – yet, the pressures to perform or showcase best practice creates new dilemmas for practitioners and managers; for example, informants from across the three authorities claimed that they deliberately manipulated performance management data with manager in LA2 telling me that they 'told their management information systems, what the systems wanted to hear'. According to one practitioner:

'We have become very good at producing paper trails designed to satisfy funders and inspectors...paper trails that often don't tell a true picture of what is happening in our communities. So the data says that we score well on positive destinations but positive destinations includes all those youngsters in bullshit jobs or on training programmes where there is no guarantee of work. But the stats say we are doing well' (Peter, mid-years CLD Worker, LA1).

It could be argued that certain aspects of the new managerial culture, especially in relation to showcasing best practice and performance related pay, have provided new incentives for actors to manipulate data. Viewed this way, just as a capitalist firm exaggerates its profits, manipulate its sales figures or uses PR techniques to promote a positive self-image, technologies of performance management have produced similar effects in the field. According to Ball:

‘Technologies and calculations which appear to make public sector organisations more transparent may actually result in making them more opaque, as representational artefacts are increasingly constructed with great deliberation and sophistication’ (Ball, 2003, p. 225).

Similarly, Bolchover argues that technologies of performance management manufacture a set of games which are played out in the field with new managerialism creating a ‘dominance of image over reality, of obfuscation over clarity, of politics over performance’ (see Bolchover, 2005). Viewed this way, Newman suggests that new managerialism may also lead to organisations focusing their energies on the production of ‘discourses of success’ and ‘narratives of achievement’ – to ensure survival in a competitive environment (Newman, 2003, p. 93). The ‘entrepreneurial professional’ emerges in these scenarios, not as a reflective practitioner who problematises their work but rather as an actor prone to hype and someone who is adept at public relations and knows how to strategically exaggerate performance. According to Dean, new managerialism creates a subject that is a ‘calculating individual within calculable spaces subject to particular calculative regimes’ (Dean, 2010).

In concluding this section, the new entrepreneurial professional is a product of the neoliberalisation and marketisation of the state, whereby different departments in local authorities are forced into competition with one another, especially in a context of ever diminishing financial resources. From this perspective, despite the rhetoric of partnership working and multi-functional teams, all legitimate features of the new professional discourse, local government can also be framed as sites of intra-departmental turf wars and competing bureaucracies. In the next section, I turn my attention to the ideas which shape the new professionalism and I argue that new mentalities are being created in the field. In particular, I suggest that one of the distinguishing features of the entrepreneurial professional – and new professional discourses in general, is the appearance of a de-politicised subject.

### *New Professionalism and De-politicisation*

As noted in Chapter 9 de-politicisation was one of the main characteristics of the new professionalism and according to Mowbray, ‘de-politicisation in community development is a

product of neoliberalisation' (see Mowbray, 2010, p. 134). I noted that some professionals, especially those in the later-years cluster, saw de-politicisation as an issue – for example:

'I have seen community work change in my time. When I think back to when I was a young worker, without exception everyone was politically aware and I mean that in a broad sense. We also linked education to social change: but I would say that over the last ten years I have not seen as much of that - it's almost a paternalistic attitude rather than let's change things' (James, later-years Policy and Performance Manager for Community Development, LA1).

'Anything that is deemed as political is off limits and people find themselves drawn into not discussing policy in ways that are political...community workers shy away from controversial politics' (Katie, later-years CLD Manager, LA1).

When I asked professionals in the above cluster why they were motivated to work in community development, they often replied by referring to political beliefs – for example:

'I have always been politically active. I did anti-racist work, anti-fascist work. I was always an activist and that's where my passion lies. And that's what made me want to be a community worker – the desire to change society' (Peter, later years CLD Worker, LA1).

'I was motivated to work in community work by a political commitment. I'm a socialist. I believed from a young age in wanting to change the world and create a more socially just and equal world and that's why I studied politics and it seemed to me that adult education and community work was a good way of pursuing that and it could also be a career as well' (Gavin, later-years CLD Worker, LA3).

Interestingly, these later years professionals were not only sceptical (and cynical), about new forms of work, which they saw as a betrayal of leftist politics, they also appeared to be existentially alienated from many of their younger colleagues, whom they framed as a-political and it was not uncommon to find a-political colleagues dismissed as 'bureaucrats', 'careerists' and in more derogatory terms as 'management stooges', 'corporate robots' and 'politically naïve'. Yet, the overtly left wing professional was a dying breed and many were leaving CLD as a consequence of

redundancy packages and early retirement schemes. Furthermore, the new breed of professionals – both practitioners and managers, were as the above cluster claimed a-political and described their work in ways devoid of political analysis.

When I asked the new breed of professionals from across the authorities what motivated them to work in community development, they often made reference to values and in particular they referred to the official values of the CLD Standards Council, whereby good practice was defined in terms of self-determination, empowerment, self-help and working collaboratively (see CLD Standards Council, 2009). In the absence of political analysis, ideology or theoretical stances, this group discussed the importance of ‘putting values into practice’, ‘what works’ and ‘evidence based practice’ and in this technicised discourse, the values of the Standards Council, especially self-help and empowerment were routinely used to describe – and justify ethically, the contracting out of public services, asset transfer, privatisation and the general retreat of the state from social provision, with the latter seen as creating new opportunities for social economies to grow. Although, the values of the CLD Standards Council are ambiguous and can be interpreted in different ways (see Chapter 4), I suggest that in the current context, they are being framed in such a way, especially if ‘structures of power are received and internalised without question or even recognition’ (see Scott, 2010) – that they become compatible with neoliberalisation. Furthermore, judging by the ways in which professionals frequently referred to self-determination, empowerment or self-help when discussing the retreat of the state, it could also be the case that the Standards Council values provided an ethical rationale for neoliberal community development.

Anti-intellectualism also emerged as a close cousin of de-politicisation and many of those who were a-political said they had little time for ideas which were not practical. They associated theory with university and several argued that community development was overly theorised by academics who were not linked with the real world of practice. In addition, several managers argued that the Community Education Degree should be reformed in such a way that made it less theoretical and more focused on what they described as the realities of everyday practice. These statements should not be thought of exclusively in terms of anti-intellectualism because they also highlighted one of the issues raised by re-skilling, namely that new material landscapes caused by the marketisation of the state were changing the competences required of practitioners and consequently a new type of professional was required to navigate this environment. It is also important to note that de-politicisation and anti-intellectualism are common character traits of professionals across

contemporary welfare states (see Christensen and Laegried, 2001, p. 87; Clarke, 2000, p. 197). In social work, Jones argues that:

‘In the contemporary welfare system, state social work agencies do not require highly informed or educated, research aware social workers – what is demanded is agency loyalty, an ability to follow instructions, complete procedures and assessments on time, modify and placate client demand, manage inadequate budgets and do not expose the agency to public ridicule or exposure’ (Jones, 1999, p. 47).

Jones analysis could equally be applied to community development, especially in a context where the field was transformed from a professional activity which was self-regulated into a new set of practices that are organisationally and managerial defined. Furthermore, the increased emphasis on upskilling and reskilling is nurturing a culture in local government which is pro-training but anti-educationalist.

Work was increasingly understood in this context as a series of practical actions and a space for achieving targets, outcomes and outputs and this conceptualisation of practice hollowed out spaces for reflection and analysis. Moreover, although upskilling and reskilling were focused on practice, they also have ideational effects, especially in the sense that they create new ideas for thinking about practice. The new ideas – anti-statism, the rationalisation of austerity (see Chapter 9), the belief in mixed economies of welfare (especially in relation to expanding the role of the third and community sectors) coupled with the views that data should determine practice and that new public management techniques equalled progress – these ideas have their ideational origins in neoliberalism and consequently neoliberal ideas take on the mantle of what Foucault and governmentality theorists have referred to as new regimes of truth which I discuss in the next section.

### *New Regimes of Truth in Community Development*

Drawing upon Foucault and governmentality, the new regimes of truth in community development can be framed not as natural facts about the social world but as socially constructed ideas which reflect where professionals are placed within apparatuses of power - in this instance, the local state. Viewed this way, the values which inform entrepreneurial citizenship – self-determination, empowerment and self-help, these values are not neutral ideas free floating in the middle of

nowhere – rather, they are better understood as ideas which in Gordon’s terms, are ‘practically serviceable’ to the needs of those in power, especially government (see Gordon, cited in Foucault, 2000).

The new regimes of truth also reflect what Dardot and Laval have described as an ‘existential norm associated with neoliberalism’ (see Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 3) whereby politically contested ideas are internalised by individuals in ways that are a-political. According to Foucault:

‘Each society has its regimes of truth, its general politics of truth: that is to say, the type of discourse that it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and authorities that enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true’ (Foucault, 2008, p. 131).

Foucault also argued that ‘the exercise of power, perpetually created knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power’ (Foucault, 2000, p. xvi). Moreover, in Foucault’s analysis, the ‘truth’ isn’t outside power, but is a product of power and those institutions that produce it (Foucault, 2000, p.131).

The new regimes of truth should not be thought of as errors or false consciousness either and according to Foucault, regimes of truth are neither, ‘wicked illusions or ideological products to be dispelled in the light of reason finally having reached its zenith’ (see Foucault, 2008, p. 19). From this perspective, the purpose of this chapter (and this thesis) is not to look for alternative ‘truths’, but rather to understand the ways in which the new mentalities in the field are a product of power. Moreover, the new truths are best understood as the ideational outcomes of a discourse whose origins are not found in theory but in everyday practices associated with upskilling and reskilling and according to Halford and Leonard, ‘who we are’ is constructed out of ‘what we do’ (see Halford and Leonard, 1999, p. 102).

In essence a subjectivity shaped by neoliberalism has emerged and neoliberal subjectivity starts from the supposition that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with society, rather it is maladjusted individuals (and communities) who should be adaptable to the demands placed upon them by the new enterprise society. This mindset is aided by techniques of new public management which

encourage professionals to rationalise the imperatives of government in what Exworthy and Halford describe as ‘bureaucratic and importantly, non-political terms’ (see Exworthy and Halford, 1999, p. 10). According to Bauman bureaucratisation:

‘Prompts us to view society as an object of administration, as a collection of so many ‘problems’ to be solved, as ‘nature’ to be ‘controlled’, ‘mastered’ and ‘improved’ or ‘remade’, as a legitimate target for ‘social engineering’, and in general a garden to be designed and kept in the planned shape by force (the gardening posture divides vegetation into ‘cultured plants’ to be taken care of and weeds to be exterminated’ (Bauman, 2005, p. 18).

Bauman’s ‘society as garden’ metaphor influenced my interpretation of how professionals increasingly viewed their social milieu and from this perspective, professional intervention seldom stretched into anything which went beyond what Beck referred to as ‘biographical solutions to systemic contradictions’ (Beck, 1992). Furthermore, despite on the surface appearing as a-political or ‘common sense’ (see Hall, pp. 52-69), the new regimes of truth were in fact political ideas shaped by neoliberalism and in the next section I argue that the ideational origins of the new truths can be found in the works of ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’, discussed in Chapter 2.

### *Ideational Origins of Neoliberal Community Development*

The ambition of the ‘Neoliberal Thought Collective’ was to design a society where individual citizens (and communities) would be implicated as players in a market game (see Gordon, 1991, p. 36) and in this context the market would become the arbiter of social destiny (Giroux, 2004, p. 494).

Furthermore, they wanted to create not just a market economy but more broadly a market society or society of enterprise and the theoretical and sociological analysis they developed helps to explain and deepen the theoretical understanding of the ways in which the individual subject and society is constructed in contemporary community development discourses.

Friedman wrote that the state ‘killed self-help’ (see Friedman, 2002, p. 201), an idea which influences contemporary practices in relation to policies such as asset transfer, co-production and the everyday management of austerity discussed in Chapter 9. In addition, Ropke – who was a founding member of the Mont Pelerin Society, developed an analysis which pre-figured the social economy and according to Ropke, the ‘management of small neighbourhood communities should be

constructed as a form of enterprise with the purpose being to shift the centre of gravity of governmental action downwards' (Ropke, cited in Foucault, 2008, p. 139). Similarly, Hayek argued that:

'Nowhere has democracy ever worked well without a great measure of local self-government, providing a school of political training for the people at large as much as for their future leaders. It is only where responsibility can be learnt and practised in affairs with which most people are familiar, where it is the awareness of one's neighbour rather than some theoretical knowledge of the needs of the people, which guides action that the ordinary man can take a real part in public affairs because they concern the world he knows' (Hayek, 2001, p. 242).

An intellectual rationale for de-politicisation or what Christofferson describes as the neoliberal belief in the 'merits of ignorance' (see Christofferson, 2016), can be found in Ropke and Hayek's analysis – for example, note Hayek's reference to, 'it is awareness of one's neighbour rather than some theoretical knowledge of the needs of the people' or Ropke's argument, that creating communities of enterprise 'shifts the centre of gravity of governmental action downwards'. In addition, Hayek was fond of Socrates maxim that 'the recognition of our ignorance is the beginning of wisdom' which had profound implications for the ways in which he understood society (see Hayek, 2006, p. 21). It could also be argued that the current fascination with 'localism' in government policy (see Blanco, Griggs and Sullivan, 2014, p. 3132; Davies, 2000; Nichols, et al, 2015;), which is associated with the Conservative Government's 'Big Society' agenda in England and Wales (see Scott, 2011; Shaw, 2011) or the 'Community Empowerment' narrative in Scotland, owes its intellectual lineage to the 'Thought Collective', especially Hayek and Ropke.

Ropke's conceptualisation of unemployment also anticipated the thinking inherent in contemporary employability narratives and Ropke argued that, the unemployed person is not someone suffering from an 'economic disability' – they were not a 'social victim but a worker in transit between an unprofitable activity and a more profitable activity' (Ropke, cited in Foucault, 2008, p. 139). The argument that the unemployed individual was not a social victim corresponds with the discourse of individualisation and responsabilisation discussed earlier, whereby individuals were nurtured by professionals into thinking of themselves not in terms of class or politics, but rather as 'autonomous, self-possessed, agentive individuals' (Rose, et al, 2006, p. 90).

The concept of education is framed in neoliberal discourse as an ‘investment in human capital’, (Friedman, 2002) and viewed this way neoliberals have constructed education as an instrument of economic policy (see Teixeira, 2014, p. 2). Conceptualising education in terms of human capital formation has influenced in general terms the policy direction of Community Education in recent years and discussing adult education, Martin argues that learners or human beings are framed as ‘economic animals’, whilst adult education is reduced to ‘training for work’ (Martin, 2000, p. 255). Moreover, the idea that the learner is an ‘economic animal’ or in Foucault’s term ‘Homo Economicus’ – the subject of enterprise, is theoretically indebted to Becker, whom as noted, was described by Foucault as the most ‘radical’ of the neoliberals (Foucault, cited in Dean, 2016). As discussed in Chapter 2, Becker was the first of the neoliberals to apply economic theory to areas such as education, health, addiction, altruism, crime and the family (see Becker, 1995), and whilst his work was met with scepticism when it first appeared (see Dean, 2016), it is testament to the strength of Becker’s theorising that ideas such as human capital or viewing education as a financial investment, are increasingly framed as common sense and a-political ideas in the contemporary era.

As noted, Becker’s ideas were rich in policy implications (see Lazear, 2015, p.82; Newheiser, 2016, p. 3), not only in terms of lifelong learning, employability and the social economy, but also in the emergence of a new concept emerging in CE/CLD, namely early intervention or work with the early years. I noted that across the three authorities every CLD team had a designated officer responsible for early years and this work involved targeting CLD provision at families, especially babies and toddlers from deprived areas. Discussing the importance of the early years, one practitioner argued:

‘If we get it right for the early years, children and even babies...we can solve a lot of problems and it will have a knock on effect through the years... did you know that 40% of children are not securely attached. That has an impact in later life. So we are looking at brain development in some of our Raising Children with Confidence classes. If we get it right...that sense of attachment, security and sense of belonging...then later on they will have more abilities to take part in life...they will have more drive, less depression, and they will take part in life. That helps with education and ultimately getting a job and taking part in society’ (Eileen, later-years CLD Worker, LA2).

In a similar vein, others framed early intervention in terms of the ‘preventative spend’, which referred to policies designed to reduce public expenditure in future years. What interested me in these narratives was not whether the claims of the early interventionists were true or not, but

rather the extent to which professionals drew upon an economic discourse of employability, economic productivity and reducing public expenditure in order to justify and rationalise their intervention. I was reminded of Becker's point that economics can be understood in terms of a 'universal framework for understanding all human behaviour' (see Becker, 1976) and as noted, I suggest that a fiscal consciousness is one of the key characteristics of the new professionalism with practice increasingly viewed in terms of how it benefits the neoliberal economy.

The idea that social policy is closely related with economic policy was discussed by Foucault in the 'Governmentality Lectures'. According to Foucault, social policy in neoliberal societies (he cited the US as his example), was increasingly framed as an economic policy targeted at the whole of society and although Foucault did not use the term early years, he nonetheless noted:

'We know that the number of hours a mother spends with her child, even when it is still in the cradle, will be very important for the formation of an abilities machine, or for the formation of human capital' (Foucault, 2008, p. 229).

Discussing the family and the household, Foucault argued – drawing upon Becker, 'what in actual fact is the household if not the contractual commitment of two parties to supply specific inputs and to share in given proportions the benefits of the household's outputs?' (Ibid, 2008). In addition he stated that, 'we are seeing the economic policies of all the developed countries, but also their social policies, as well as their cultural and educational policies, being orientated in terms of creating human capital' and he cited the US as the best example (in 1979) of where the 'entrepreneurial self' or Homo Economicus was in its most advanced form, whereby 'economic analysis to the non-economic was found everywhere' (Ibid, p. 243). Foucault was fascinated by what he termed 'American neoliberalism' on the grounds that it 'involves generalising the economic form throughout the social body and including the whole of the social system not usually conducted through or sanctioned by monetary exchanges' (Ibid, p. 243).

What is particularly interesting about Foucault's prescient analysis in 1979 – and in general terms the analysis of 'Neoliberal Thought Collective' – especially Becker, was that economic policies based on the market, privatisation and the reconfiguration of the state, served the broader social purpose of creating a new human subject. According to Dardot and Laval:

‘Neoliberalism was based on the clinical observation that capitalism had inaugurated a period of permanent revolution in the economic order, but that human beings were spontaneously adapted to this changing market order because they had formed in a different world...the policy must target individual and social existence as a whole’ (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p.64).

The outcome of a social policy which in Dardot and Laval’s terms, ‘targeted the individual and social existence as a whole’, is the construction of a new subject who thinks of every endeavour as an endeavour to develop human capital (see May, 2012, p. 52). Moreover, rather than the social policy re-distributing wealth, its aim under neoliberalism is to ‘de-proletarianise’ workers by turning them into ‘entrepreneurs of their own life circumstances’ (Bonfeld, 2012, pp. 17-18). The Foucauldian suggestion that social policy is an extension of fiscal policy offers not only a way of understanding why professional intervention was designed to nurture entrepreneurial citizens but also the ways in which the professional subject was also transformed by neoliberalisation and the discourse of entrepreneurialism.

According to Dardot and Laval, the reason why neoliberalism is successful – and perhaps more politically sophisticated than its opponents acknowledge, is because ‘neoliberalism denies it is an ideology, because it is reason itself’ (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 191). Dardot and Laval’s analysis sheds possible theoretical light on how new regimes of truth were reproduced in community development and according to Siow – paraphrasing the renowned quote by Keynes, ‘practical men and women who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence are the slaves of Becker’ (Siow, 2015, p. 6). From this perspective, professional narratives informed by ‘what works’, ‘evidence based policy’ and ‘statistical analyses of performance’ - which frame the worker as merely a neural facilitator, are problematic and may serve to actually conceal the relationship between community development and the politics of the state. Discussing the alleged neutrality of practitioners, Shaw argues that ‘the claim to neutrality actually makes the workers position more political than that of a practitioner who is explicit about the political values, because it literally neutralises power rendering it invisible and therefore non-negotiable’ (Shaw, 2013, p. 6).

### *Concluding Remarks*

Chapter 10 has discussed the ways in which the new professionalism is informed by a governmental project of creating a new citizen, namely Homo Economicus or the entrepreneurial citizen - someone

equipped with the skills necessary to survive (and thrive) in the new enterprise society. In addition, I argued that the professional subject was also transformed by the marketisation of the state and the discourse of entrepreneurialism. Despite the fact that professionals felt alienated by the new practices which I have discussed in terms of de-professionalisation, I argued that a new professional subject was emerging, someone who conceived of practices associated with the marketisation of the state in ways which are a-political. Neoliberalism emerged in this narrative as the natural state of affairs and as a new rationality for governing human beings, whilst the new subject in the field - the entrepreneurial professional, can be understood as a subject who in Foucault's terms was 'eminently governable' (Foucault, 2008, p. 270). In the next chapter, which is also the final concluding chapter, I summarise the thesis and discuss the main contributions this work makes to new knowledge regarding the field of practice.

## **Chapter 11: Conclusion - The New Professionalism and Community Development**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 11 is a short chapter which concludes the thesis. The chapter begins by revisiting the research questions and considers how these were addressed and also what contribution the research makes to knowledge of the field. In particular, I focus on the main proposition of the thesis, namely that a new professionalism has emerged which is a product of new managerialism and neoliberalism. I summarise the main characteristics of the new professionalism and consider why an approach to community development influenced by Foucault and governmentality theory creates new theoretical insights into the field especially the ways in which the everyday working lives of professionals have been transformed by new managerialism and neoliberalism. The final section explores issues of agency and resistance in relation to the new professionalism.

### *Summary of Research and Research Contribution to Knowledge*

The research questions focused on the impact of neoliberalisation and new managerialism in community development in relation to the following areas:

- Professional identities.
- Professional relationships.
- Professional practices.

As noted in Chapter 5, the questions continually evolved as ideas I investigated in the literature review interacted with the field of practice. Furthermore, by drawing upon an approach influenced by grounded theory, my intention was not merely to apply the ideas of Foucault and governmentality theory to the field but also to draw upon the data obtained from fieldwork in order to develop theory; the extent to which I have been successful in this venture is for the reader to decide. I now provide a summary of the research whilst focusing on the concept of a new professionalism, which was this research's main contribution to knowledge regarding community development.

I argued that neoliberalisation and new managerialism have made a lasting and significant impact on community development and that identities, relationships and practices have been transformed by a

changing material context in which contemporary practice occurs. In particular, I suggested that professionals were simultaneously de-professionalised and re-professionalised by neoliberalisation and new managerialism. The concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation emerged in the literature review and were also a product of grounded theory coding and as noted in Chapter 5 they were the principal means through which data was filtered and subsequently analysed. Moreover, the concepts were framed throughout Chapters 6-10, not as diametrically opposed discourses but rather as different lenses through which readers could make sense of the unmaking but also the remaking of professional practice.

The ways in which professionals were de-professionalised and re-professionalised also helped develop the main proposition of this work, namely that a new professionalism was emerging in the field. As noted, in Chapter 6, the main characteristics of the new professionalism included the following:

- Professionalism is an approach to working not an occupational identity: rather than occupational identity, the new practices emphasise partnership working, joined up working and working in multi-functional teams. Universal services are phased out and replaced with targeted work.
- The old professionalism is elitist: CE/CLD is portrayed as elitist, producer driven and creating barriers between different sets of professional actors.
- Management (and government) define practice: new fields of work are shaped by government policy and the strategic priorities of local states, whilst the field of judgment is controlled by government and in everyday practice settings by management and inspectors.
- Techniques associated with new public management monitor practice: various new public management techniques are introduced to ensure that practice is made auditable in terms of delivering governmental policy. The new techniques include computerised management information systems, inspections, work plans and work related objectives with quantifiable targets and measureable outcomes, and appraisals.

- The practitioner's role is managerialised: practitioners increasingly take on responsibility for managing a new workforce which delivers the frontline work. Increased managerialisation involves new corporate and strategic roles for practitioners and the devolution of budgetary control.
- Job titles and job descriptions are determined by policy and performance management: new fields of work have created new job titles – for example, 'Employability Officers', 'Positive Destinations Officers', 'Quality Assurance Managers' and so forth – these titles are shaped by policy whilst the new work is determined by performance management targets – increase the number of people volunteering or increase the numbers in positive destinations and so forth.
- Professionals are simultaneously de-professionalised and re-professionalised: the new practices are contradictory and are experienced in the field in terms of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation.

The new professionalism is best understood when situated within the context of contemporary developments in local government, especially reforms linked with austerity and by extension neoliberalism. The focus on identities, relationships and practices also allowed me to discuss from the perspective of an 'insider' the ways in which key aspects of the new professionalism were experienced by practitioners and managers in everyday settings. Moreover, the analysis which followed was grounded in data and I argued that an ethnographic approach offered new empirical insights into a field of practice which was often studied conceptually and from a distance. In the next section I explore why the concept of the new professionalism was shaped by ideas drawn from Foucault and governmentality theory.

#### *Foucault, Governmentality Theory and the New Professionalism*

The idea of a new professionalism in community development was centred on how professions adapt and were reconfigured by practices associated with neoliberalisation and new managerialism. The term 'new professionalism' featured in the literature review (see Banks, 2004; Evans, 2010; Noordegraaf, 2007) where it was used to denote the changes to professions which have occurred as a consequence of public sector modernisation. My use of the term is partly indebted to Foucault's

suggestion that neoliberalism was a power which was productive as opposed to merely repressive (see Fraser, 2003, p. 164; May, 2012, p. 52; Newman, 2003, p.21). As noted, Foucault argued that, 'if power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it?' (Foucault, 2000, p. 120) - and his framing of neoliberal power shaped my thinking about how neoliberalisation in local government could be understood. I argued that neoliberal reforms were not only destructive of practices associated with the old professionalism – CE/CLD which I framed via Evetts as occupational professionalism but also productive of new professional practices which were described as organisational professionalism (see Evetts, 2009). Moreover, I argued that practices associated with neoliberalism - austerity, privatisation and the contracting out of public services coupled with practices associated with new managerialism – audits, performance management, devolution of budgetary control and so forth – these were productive of new regimes of practice and new mentalities for thinking about practice in community development settings.

Foucault's proposition that neoliberalism was productive - and my support for this position, should not imply that I was sympathetic with neoliberalism and as I argued in Chapters 1 and 5, far from being sympathetic with the neoliberal creed this research was critical in the sense that it framed neoliberalism as a politically and ethically questionable concept which was destructive in terms of its impact on professional community development and also communities in general. With regards to the field, the appearance of de-professionalisation as a core concept suggests that the new professionalism is a problematic discourse and one containing inherent contradictions and instabilities; for example, the fact that professionals in the three authorities felt de-professionalised, devalued and de-skilled, raises important ethical concerns about the direction of travel professional CE/CLD is being forced to take in the neoliberal/new managerial era. My own position in these discussions is not neutral and for me de-professionalisation was reflective of broader patterns which can be understood in relation to the nature of work in neoliberal societies. According to Dardot and Laval:

'Work no longer affords a stable framework, a predictable career and a robust set of social relations; instability of projects and missions, continued variation in networks and teams: instead of social relations involving a minimum of loyalty and fidelity, the professional world becomes a set of one off transactions' (Dardot and Laval, 2013, p. 290).

In addition, I have political concerns with the neoliberal model of community development which I described in Chapter 9; for example, community development should be a practice grounded in the social interests generated within communities (see Ledwith, 2011) and also a practice which grows out of the lived experiences of people and communities (see Tett, 2010) – however, in its neoliberal incarnation community development is top down and obsessed with governmental outcomes. Furthermore, this research suggests the democratic rhetoric associated with capacity building, co-production, community planning, community engagement and so forth, hides a more problematic reality which involved professional workers embroiled in the management and implementation of local austerity programmes.

The new professionalism is also a contradictory practice; for example, it is enforced by the power of the state and is informed by bureaucratic compliance as opposed to professional commitment, which explains why the rise of authoritarian management in CE/CLD (see Chapter 7) correlates well with the appearance of the neoliberal/new managerial state in local government. Yet, the new professionalism also operates on the basis of consensus and was continually re-produced and enacted in everyday practice settings. In Foucauldian terms I argued that a new professional subject has been constructed by neoliberalism and that this subject was intensely governed but also self-governing. This view of the subject was indebted to ideas in the ‘Governmentality Lectures’ and as noted in Chapter 2, Foucault argued that his philosophical objective was ‘to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects’ (Foucault, 2000).

Framing the human subject as a product of power might sound bleak to some readers and I noted in Chapter 2 that Foucault’s analysis was criticised on the grounds that it denied agency and the possibility of human liberty (see Amselle, 2016, p. 160) and that he had neglected to find a subject capable of resisting neoliberalism (see Rose, et al, 2006, p. 100). Yet, these criticisms are problematic because Foucault also wrote ‘where there is power there is resistance’ and that the possibilities always exist for ‘resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings’ (Foucault, 2000, p. 294). Although my focus was on how practices associated with neoliberalism and new managerialism were reproduced it is important to note that these practices were contested and in the final section of this chapter (and this thesis) I explore issues relating to agency and resistance and how these can be applied to practices associated with the new professionalism.

*On the Question of Resistance and Agency*

Small everyday acts of agency could be found within regimes of practice shaped by neoliberalisation and new managerialism and agency is used in this context to denote the freedoms that professionals possess at their disposal in order to work against the grain of the new professionalism. For example, I noted that some professionals – mainly those in the ‘early to mid-stage’ of their careers, continued to engage in frontline work, which suggested that some degree of choice existed regarding the extent to which the work was bureaucratised by regimes of new managerialism. In addition, some continued to use the term ‘Community Education’ to describe how they viewed themselves professionally and use of this term was a site of resistance or counter conduct - note the ways in which those who engaged in acts of ‘fighting for the profession’ (see Chapter 6) saw themselves as professional Community Education workers and viewed management as having ‘betrayed their profession’ (see Chapter 7). Interestingly, Ball argues that if neoliberalism creates new subjectivities then subjectivity has the potential to become a site of resistance to the neoliberal project:

‘If subjectivity is the key site of neoliberal government, the production of particular sorts of ‘free’ ethical subjects – striving, enterprising, competitive, choosing, responsible, then it is here also, in ‘relation to ourselves’, that we might think to begin to struggle to think about ourselves differently’ (Ball, 2016, p. 1134).

With Ball’s analysis in mind I suggest that subjectivities and practices associated with Community Education have the power to disrupt the narratives of regimes of practice associated with the new professionalism.

It is also important to note in terms of professional agency that the fiscal policy of austerity looks set to continue in the years post-2016 (see Audit Scotland, 2016) and although this creates challenges it also produces a milieu pregnant with possibilities. For example, ‘anti-cuts’ campaigns based on political opposition to austerity and keeping buildings and services under local authority control are likely to re-appear (see Chapter 9), presenting practitioners with strategic choices to make about who they work with but also whom they choose to ignore. In this unsettled context, practitioners are likely to experience ‘community’ as an increasing site of contradictions, between what Martin and Shaw describe as, ‘community as policy’ reflecting the politics of the state from above but also ‘community as politics’ reflecting the political aspirations of people from below (see Martin and Shaw, 2000). Moreover, this milieu creates possibilities because if community development is to be taken seriously on its claim that it is a profession ‘grounded in the social interests generated within communities’ (see Ledwith, 2011) then it’s adherents need to think critically and strategically about

how they develop alliances beyond that of the 'consultative elite' and those already involved in official community governance structures. The extent to which it is possible for community development to play a role in strengthening democratic processes outside of official governance structures (see Shaw, 2017, p. 17) is also an area worthy of serious consideration, especially if alternatives to neoliberal austerity are to be sought.

Yet, a note of caution is required at this juncture; any work which takes place with autonomous groups opposing Council objectives is likely to be 'off the radar', especially if practitioners are to work in spaces which escape the disciplinary gaze of new managerialism and by extension the local state. Agency in these scenarios is best understood in terms of small (although not insignificant) acts of counter-conduct as opposed to resistance (see Chapter 6) - it should not imply that 'agency can triumph over structure' (see Marston and McDonald, 2012, p. 1026). Moreover, I suggest that in an environment where local authorities are encouraged to find 'new ways of providing services' (see Audit Scotland, 2016) that neoliberal community development is likely to remain the dominant variant of practice. In this context, the role of development trusts, social enterprises, ALEOS and registered charities in the provision of public services looks set to continue.

It is also important to note that whilst examples of counter conduct or 'strategic skirmishes' exist (see Ball, 2016) the new professionalism is an enacted professionalism which has produced a new class of corporate professionals whose practice is based on co-operation and compliance with new managerial regimes. Moreover, the new class of professionals increasingly view community development not in terms of a democratic cause or social movement (see Chapter 4) but as a career. Sennett's definition of career is useful here and according to Sennett a career is the 'lifelong channel for one's economic pursuits' (Sennett, 1998, p. 9). The idea that work equals career sheds light on why some professionals refused to challenge or speak out against the social injustices caused by neoliberalism and why they often stayed strategically quiet amidst the chaos caused by austerity. LaBier argues that the 'modern careerist' is often adapted to a 'disturbed work environment' (see LaBier, cited in Casey, 1995) and it could be the case that those who embraced the new professionalism were psychologically more content at work than their counterparts who experienced de-professionalisation. According to Casey:

'Traits and attitudes that are unnecessary or that impede the process of the workplace culture...are thwarted and suppressed. Individuals who display more of these corporately undesirable features tend to experience higher degrees of intra-psychic

conflict, discomfort and alienation than those more disposed to or more willing to comply with the corporation's character type' (Casey, 1995, p. 139).

Casey's analysis interested me on the grounds that many of those who opposed the new professionalism and talked of 'fighting for the profession' (see Chapter 6) also complained of stress and other work related sicknesses, whilst their colleagues who embraced the new practices displayed positive attitudes towards work and in general terms appeared 'happier'. I am not arguing that professionals should learn to embrace the new professionalism because 'it is good for them', rather highlighting the existential dangers inherent in periods of prolonged opposition to the new consensus, especially if that opposition is without success.

In conclusion, I argue that the new professionalism and the neoliberal model of community development discussed in this work looks set to be the dominant paradigm for thinking about contemporary community development. Yet, micro acts of agency and resistance do occur and from this perspective readers should note that neoliberalism is always a contested practice. Foucault said this of governmentality theory - 'I don't construct my analyses in order to say, this is the way things are, you are trapped' (Foucault, 2000, p.294) and similarly, I have chosen to end this work on the questions of resistance and agency in order to argue that professionals are not always trapped in regimes of practice with no alternatives.

### *Concluding Remarks*

I want to conclude this thesis by noting how during the course of this work I was haunted by two interrelated questions – first, to what extent was it possible to do away with new managerialism and second was there a 'way out' of neoliberalism. Yet, although serious thought (and reading) was given to these questions I came to the conclusion that answering them would be too complex for a small scale research project grounded in the problems and challenges of everyday practice. Moreover, such an approach easily lends itself to polemics and as noted I was interested in following Foucault's advice to researchers, namely 'never engage in polemics' (see Foucault, 2009, p. 4). The absence of a polemical tone was not intended to read as if I were sympathetic with the neoliberal creed; rather my intention was to develop an argument that neoliberalism has 'penetrated much more deeply into our existence' than is commonly acknowledged (see Foucault, 2000, p. 86). I was also motivated by a desire to have a degree of critical empathy with my professional colleagues who work in contexts shaped by the dilemmas, challenges and structural limitations that are presented by regimes of

practice associated with neoliberalisation and new managerialism. For me, an analysis shaped by Foucault and governmentality theory sends out a warning about the current state of professional community development and how it has been incorporated into a rationale shaped by neoliberalism. It also raises important issues about the ways in which neoliberalism has produced new subjectivities and new mentalities in the field and how it has turned professional actors into governable subjects. Foucault's advice that, the 'challenge might be not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are' (Foucault, 2000, p.336) – seems particularly insightful given the impact of neoliberalism on our subjectivities at this historical moment.

## Appendix 1: Extract from Semi-Structured Interview

I conducted 52 semi-structured interviews with practitioners and managers across the 3 local authorities and the extract below provides the reader with a flavour of the interview and the type of questions that were asked – readers should note that GF refers to me in the transcript.

### INTERVIEW

Name of Interviewee: Emily Williams (EW)

Gender: Female

Age:

18-34

35-49 X

50-75

Transcript

GF: What is your current job title?

EW: Strategic Manager for Community Development

GF: And your current salary?

EW: (Silence).

GF: Roughly...

EW: I don't know.

GF: Just roughly...

EW: It must be about 50 something.

GF: And your length of service in community education type work?

EW: I started 20 years ago. I graduated from university at a young age. I was the youngest person on my course. I started at 18. I got a post as soon as I graduated. I did holiday work and this helped me get a post.

GF: Can I ask what your current post involves?

EW: As part of a management review they have brought together what was Community Learning and Development with Vocational Employability Services. They want us to focus on positive destinations and lifelong learning...currently my job is about full service re-design and it's about creating new outcomes, new priorities and service structures that will facilitate the delivery of those outcomes. Part of the senior management team...so service redesign...getting ready for inspections, quality assurance...benchmarking with other local authorities.

GF: Could you say more about quality assurance?

EW: I suppose I mean performance indicators to measure how well you're doing. Also what self-evaluation is embedded within the service? How the service knows what it should be continuously improving.

GF: Okay, can we jump back a bit. Can you tell me about your training and professional qualifications?

EW: I got my degree in community education.

GF: What motivated you to study community education?

EW: I suppose it's about a desire to help people. I had a belief that no matter what folk had done in life they had a right to opportunities, regardless of what they had done in the past.

GF: And was that conscious from an early age that you wanted to 'help' people?

EW: Yes.

GF: Was there you know an 'ah-ha' moment, a time when you realised this is what you want to do?

EW: I was suppose it was just cultural. Our family were...not religious, but you had to go to Sunday School and you had to go to church, all those messages about putting people first. So that informed my thinking. Also I supported a friend who had mental health problems and that influenced me. So there's that culture of that's what you do...very working class background. Dad worked in the mines. Lived in a council house. I was the first person in my family to go to university.

GF: That was my next question, but keep going...

EW: I went to university.

GF: Was it a big deal that you went to university?

EW: Kind of. They were more annoyed that they had to say what they earned on the grants form. They weren't on benefits but they were on the breadline. You know, you knew that you didn't have as much money as other people at school. And you stayed in a council house. Whereas other folk stayed in private houses round about those council houses. So, I think it was more a big deal to declare what your parents earned.

GF: Okay, can I ask you what term best describe the way you think about your working identity. I have here Community Learning and Development, Community Education, Community Development; you might want to say another?

EW: I think it's about creating a range of opportunities...learning opportunities for people who might not naturally take up these opportunities and improving their life in some way, whatever way that might be.

GF: I see are there any terms that you identify with?

EW: I would probably think...in my head I would probably say Community Learning and Development but I'm not...some people have a real...you know it really matters to them what it's called. I've worked in so many different settings but you know managing the Community Care team. To me, it doesn't matter what it's called, it's the principles and philosophies that you work to. So for me, it's more about the principle and philosophies of your work and not about the qualification. So some people think only people with a community education qualification should be doing community education. I think it's about demonstrating that you have professional values and understanding and principles in how you work. Then it's a way of working rather than a field for me.

GF: And what about the teams you manage – you mentioned that you manage quite a lot of teams – I get the impression that there is often tension regarding which terms people use?

EW: I think there are different perspectives...so I've managed teams with people who have 'Com Ed' qualifications and without. So if you're in the camp, so to speak and you have a community education qualification people are very protective about that, of the service, of that identity. I don't always think that's helpful. I think it becomes a bit of a barrier to joint working. It becomes divisive. You know 'we know better because we have the bit paper'. Grading's can be affected by that so people are paid different grades because they have that qualification. Other people have higher qualifications but because you have to have a specific qualification they are downgraded. I think there are some community workers who are fantastic and there are some rubbish community workers. With or without the bit of paper. I don't think the bit of paper...well when I did my training there was not enough observed practice or scrutiny. So we churned out community workers who were not very good community workers. So that bit of paper, you know seeing people in practice is more worthwhile than a bit of paper.

GF: You're saying that you value experience as much as qualifications?

EW: Yes, the thing that annoys me most is that people in the field promise to do things and they don't deliver. So the credibility of community workers is not very good.

GF: That's an interesting point – is this a cultural problem with community work?

EW: Well its individual cases but I think it's led to a culture of other management teams saying that CLD does not deliver. Or they say they will do it but they never do it. If I could have one thing in my new service and I think it would be massive for credibility it's that if you say you are going to do something on a set time then make sure it's done on that set time. And I think that would change the perception of CLD. Right now there's lots of problems...

GF: Do you want to say more?

EW: As I said people are very defensive about CLD. I think it's a barrier. People make assumptions that they are just CLD and that's got in the way of joint work. For me, it doesn't matter what your qualification is it's about demonstrating your credibility and impact and difference that you make. So for me it's about us as professionals creating your own reputation rather than it being about a degree or qualification. But other people get really caught up in it but it's about creating your own credibility. I was an inspector with Education Scotland and that really influenced my thinking.

GF: okay, I will come back to this later but can I ask you something about community development...how do you feel about community development workers working with groups campaigning against the local authority?

EW: I think they have to be very clear about their boundaries. When I did my training we were told that you can't be up front with the placard but you can help them make the placard. So it's a fine line. You are employed by the local authority so you have to adhere to the policies of that local authority. If you are going to support something that is against the local authority then you put yourself at risk. But you can't cross the line. You can't seem to be agitating. So if a community group wants to campaign you explore the options. What is it you want to do? Create a fuss? Or do you want to find a solution. And for me, and I think people find my view difficult, it's about what is the solution and what's the best way of getting that solution. For me it's a really skilled professional that can do that. And for me, it's not about campaigning it's about the outcomes they want to achieve through that campaign. And sometimes going head on with a local authority you are never going to get there. You are maybe better having a less radical more phased approach and negotiate in partnership than through confrontation. I think the Grant's Review is a good one.

GF: Okay, do you want to say more about the Grant's Review?

EW: We decided to review all grants in the council to make it co-production. So normally council staff would review the grants but we wanted to do it with people who are recipients of grants and know about the voluntary sector so we recruited five folk from the voluntary sector, five council staff and I chaired it. It was fine until you got to the cuts. Everything else was fine, the three strands, policies. When we got to cuts it was okay. But the people in the voluntary sector said there should be no cuts but on the co-production panel we had a really sophisticated debate that said there should be no more than 17% cuts and that was on evidence about what we thought the sector could sustain. It took this view that the local authority is in a difficult situation, we do need to save money, let's not just say don't do any cuts, because that's not going to get us anywhere, we thought let's use a co-production panel, by saying no more than 17% cuts and we could manage that. But then the elected members voted to go with 30% which completely defeated the purpose of that co-production group. That was, you can imagine...it was a difficult thing to hold together but we did it really well. But you could be involved in the co-production process but still campaign against the local authority. The voluntary sector struggled to be involved.

GF: What is your understanding of co-production?

EW: There are four stages to co-production. There's Governance International, but basically...four cycle process. Co-design where you work with local people or service users to co-design something. So we co-designed the grants process. So you work with service users to analyse need. Is their need... pull the expertise of the staff and local members...You can co-review services. Are they efficient? Co-run services. You run a bit and I run a bit. So in some ways its capacity building, what we've always done in community development...the voluntary sector, the Council and local people deliver stuff. That's co-production. Community development for me is where...so co-production is equal status.

GF: And would you say that is the case...you mentioned the difficulty around cuts?

EW: Within the groups that are facilitated...well if you have control of the decisions in the service then it is co-production. In the local authority we struggle if it's going up to the elected members so if it's devolved and managers are willing to give up their power then it's fine. I wanted elected members to be on the panel so they were informed so they were using a co-production experience to inform their decision making. But the council wasn't up for that. Managers or Directors. So it's

equal decision making where you have delegated that decision making. You have given up your power...but well you have put boundaries around it.

GF: Okay, I'm just thinking about what you said, 'putting boundaries around your power'. Is that not another form of power rather than giving up power?

EW: Yeah...well no. Well you're saying you have this money but there is a little bit of boundary around it. But you can design your service. For me community development is just the communities' agenda. For me, it's supporting the activists or management committee to do whatever they want to do. For co-production it's a joint thing we want to do. We want to improve it. Together.

GF: Okay, is there a debate or discussion within the community development community over these terms and approaches?

EW: I'm not really linked into the national but locally workers debate it.

GF: Do you want to say more?

EW: I think it's controversial. Some community workers think it doesn't mean anything but I think it clarified what we meant by capacity building. Community development...I think community development is about campaigning. If people have that view, particularly in this day and age it can lead to head on confrontations.

TRANSCRIPT ENDS

## Appendix 2: Extract from Fieldwork Journal

Throughout the course of my research I kept a fieldwork journal which was used to record observations. The extract below is based on a meeting of the CLD Standards Council which I attended.

Wednesday 31st March

I attended a meeting of the CLD Standards Council. 14 people were present including 'CLD Workers' from three local authorities, representatives from the third sector and academics from the University of Edinburgh. The comments which are recorded do not include people's initials (I forgot to ask for names) but rather where they are located in terms of the different CLD sectors. The facilitator explained the purpose of the meeting which was to discuss current issues concerning the CLD sector. He explained that the Standards Council wanted to listen to members. It was a membership led organisation he said. We split into groups with a representative from each sector present.

The local authority staff present were the most vocal. In one authority, 10% of the workforce has left through voluntary severance and we were told that these posts will not be replaced. In another authority staff said that CLD would not exist as an independent sector with CLD being split across positive destinations and lifelong learning and employability. 'We need to defend the concept of professionalism' said one worker. Concerns were noted that staff were working for CLD without a proper qualification. 'I don't say this to be elitist' said the person reporting these concerns, 'but only to highlight that non-qualified or less qualified staff were being used by management to drive down costs'. One of the academics wondered if there was still mileage in talking about the unity of youth work, adult education and community work, as one. 'It sounds like the end of CLD' said another. Another person stated that 'this is a really confusing time to be a CLD worker'. One participant was adamant that 'we don't have a national voice'. That she said should be the responsibility of the Standards Council, to provide political and strategic leadership.

'10% of our workforce have gone' said a CLD worker and 'yet there is no resistance. Hardly anyone attended the protests on budget day and the 'unions don't do anything'. 'Where is the resistance' she asked? In response to this question someone stated that people were scared of losing their jobs which makes them more compliant with the agenda of management. It's interesting that cuts, or job

losses is seen as 'the agenda of management', which potentially ignores a wider ideological and political agenda. CLD has an ageing workforce said another adding that their authority many young people had lost their jobs because they were on temporary contracts.

A big group discussion followed with each of the small groups reporting back. 'The CLD profession needs to assert itself' said one participant, noting that there was a distinction between 'professionalism and professionalisation', although the distinction was not explained. The Standards Council representative said that CLD was a 'profession of the future and not the past', a controversial statement given that many people openly expressed doubt as to whether CLD would exist in 'the future'. Yet he argued that CLD was a 'new profession' whose purpose 'was to challenge the status quo and promote social justice'. He reminded the group that the CLD 'standards' had been agreed by the members. 'We need to build a nascent sense of identity' he said, and 'we need to take the fight to people'. He made reference to 'the fight' on several occasions and I was unclear if he meant fighting for the people, or fighting for CLD. One participant said that she had read a report in Glasgow which said that CLD was a 'discredited approach'. Another participant said she had heard similar things in other local authorities, which she said was a paradox because at 'national level our star has never shone higher' – this is the umpteenth time I have heard this phrase. 'There is a contradiction between national policy and local strategy' she said. 'CLD is being decimated at local level but nationally it has never had a higher profile, how can this be', the participant claimed. CLD is a 'mish-mash' she said adding that 'workers had become de-professionalised and deskilled and demoralised'.

The Standards Council representative said that 'we need to champion what we do and sell it to the Scottish Government'. 'I can't believe there is no resistance' said the local authority participant and that 'CLD is letting this happen'. 'What we are witnessing' she said was the 'breaking up' and 'end of CLD'. A discussion then followed on the potential impact for universities; for example, would numbers decline on community education courses? One of the academics noted concerns about a potential drop in the number community activists applying to study 'Community Education'. He explained that because many students found their way into university because of their involvement with CLD, that if CLD didn't exist then it was logical that there would be an eventual drop in student numbers.

A discussion then followed on the relationship between CLD, the public sector and third sector. According to the third sector person, the entire homelessness section in one Council had been

commissioned to the third sector; 'But, we need a different way of doing things' she said. 'If the public sector is no longer able to provide CLD then people ought to think about the third sector'. Yet they added that, 'we must remember that the third sector is being hit as well', and that the voluntary sector's budget had been cut by 33% in their area.

The question then arose, did the voluntary sector use a 'CLD approach'. 'We do', said someone, but many of the workers do not use the term 'CLD' she said. According to the worker, this was one of the reasons why membership of the Standards Council was lower for the voluntary sector compared with the sector in local government. The worker added that 'we should never have stopped calling ourselves community education'. 'The term CLD' she explained, 'does not bring people together'. At this point another worker said that she didn't like the term community education. 'We are struggling with our identity and need to be honest about it' another participant added saying that 'teachers and social workers know what they are and don't keep debating their identity every 10 minutes'. 'What other professions change their names' she asked, seemingly frustrated at this situation. 'We are a profession' she said, with a Degree qualification'. 'Can you be a professional and still be inclusive' asked someone. This question, although it may have been pondered in silence, was not answered.

'We need to reclaim the language of community education', said one of the academics adding that 'the state has fragmented and that we need unity between the public sector and the third sector'. The Standards Council needs to reach out beyond the state' he argued. 'It looks like our profession is being turned into something else' said someone, 'with the focus on employability and positive destinations'. I thought the use of the term 'our profession' was interesting. The CLD Standards Council rep asked aloud 'where the critique of policy is', and said that 'academics needed to provide a critique of the entire employability narrative, especially the Wood Commission on 'Developing Scotland's Young Workforce'. 'The profession' he added, 'must become more politicised'.

The final part of the discussion was titled, where now? I thought this meant, where now for CLD, but it was actually where now for this meeting – another meeting was suggested, or even a conference. There was consensus that we needed to improve attendance. 'I'm sorry to say this', said a public sector participant, but 'we need a voice and the Standards Council is not it'. 'We have no voice at a national level' she said. 'CLD is being marginalised and there is no resistance', said the local authority representative – I lost count of the amount of times she said this. 'Why are we not using community development approaches on ourselves' she asked. The Standards Council representative thanked

everyone for coming. He said that we need to clarify to Government what CLD does? A colleague said in private that earlier he said that the purpose of 'real' CLD was to challenge the government, and yet he argued that we need to clarify what we do to government. It sounded like a real contradiction they said.

NOTES END

### **Appendix 3: Preliminary Data Analysis**

The text below features extracts from a paper which I discussed at supervision entitled 'Preliminary Data Analysis'. The extract is included as an Appendix in order to highlight the ways in which important codes emerged from the data which were later developed into the key concepts of de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation. The paper also highlights the changing nature of my research questions and begins with a discussion on the background of the research and the context in which the research occurred.

#### *Background to Research*

The main focus of my research is on the ways in which processes and practices, understood in the literature review as 'managerialism', impact on community education participants working in local authority settings. At present the research questions are:

- Does managerialism have an impact on workforce morale?
- What is the relationship between managerialism and the professional identity of community education participants?
- What is the relationship between managerialism and the nature of the 'educational' intervention with individuals and communities?

In light of the preliminary analysis these questions may need revisiting, something I wish to discuss at supervision.

Research is taking place in 3 local authorities and it is important to note that in all 3 authorities community development/CLD is the subject of a series of internal reviews – the key features of the reviews include the following:

- The fragmentation of CLD across different local government departments - some practitioners refer to this as the 'breaking up' or 'splitting up of CLD'. For example, in one local authority adult learning now operates out of a new employability section.
- Job descriptions are being reviewed – in one local authority CLD is unlikely to exist as a distinct service with its own identity; CLD type work will take place in a Communities section and a Lifelong Learning, Employability and Positive Destinations section.

- One local authority has closed most of its community centres – at the time of writing 1 community centre is operated by CLD and is threatened with closure; in the nearby local authority, the CLD section manages 25 community centres – data for the other local authority is not known at this stage.
- In one local authority CLD positions are being deleted and the result is that CLD Workers are likely to have to apply for new posts, effectively creating competition between staff for jobs.
- All three local authorities have seen significant reductions in the numbers of both managers and professionals and this is expected to increase over time – a detailed breakdown might be worth considering?
- An emerging focus on employability and positive destinations.

30 participants have been interviewed thus far with 34 transcripts typed up (four participants have been interviewed twice – I am now conducting second interviews). The average transcript is around 4,000 words in length although I notice a trend over time for the length of transcripts to increase. Participants are interviewed on two, possibly three occasions. I propose that some participants are only interviewed once. My reasons for this are twofold; firstly substantial data has been obtained from the first interview, and secondly, I would like to focus the second and third interviews on my primary research arenas where my emphasis is quality over quantity.

### *Preliminary Outline of Analysis*

The preliminary analysis is based on 28 interview transcripts and 13 participant observation recording; each document was subjected to preliminary coding. I have provided selected comments from the transcripts in order to demonstrate that concepts were informed by chunks of data. Two concepts are emerging: first the codes suggest that practitioners are de-skilled and demoralised by the contemporary context which relates to themes in the literature relating to de-professionalisation. Second: I noted that some professionals embraced the new context and talked of upskilling or reskilling. I begin with de-professionalisation:

#### De-professionalisation

- Ambiguity or debate, sometimes reported as ‘confusion’ regarding the professional status of community education or CLD: the vast majority of participants have self-identified as professionals and compared themselves frequently to teachers and social workers (primarily

but not exclusively in terms of salary and degree entry qualification) - 'other professions don't debate if they are professions or not'; 'we are a unique profession with our own discreet skills and values. We need to fight for that'.

- Austerity driven reforms are hollowing out CE/CLD:

'When I started working for CLD in 2008 we had four teams and on top of that we had what we called 'thematic teams' for those who specialised in youth work, adult education and community development. However, after the first service review we lost the thematic teams, some staff and managers. Then we were cut from four teams down to two - more staff loses. Then another review came along which reduced us to one team. And now, after this review everybody knows what's going to happen...we will no longer be a CLD team but a new employability service', Peter, mid-years CLD Worker.

- The professional qualification is being devalued:

'You are either community education qualified or you are not and I want someone who is community education qualified - it's a stamp that they have the skills that I am looking for. For me, Community Education is a profession because to continue to have this debate about whether we are a profession or not or whether we employ professional workers or not, is just ludicrous', Margaret, later-years, CLD Manager.

'Currently, I would not employ anyone who does not have a Community Education qualification and this is something we wish to maintain...but I know we will have to fight for that. CLD should be seen as a profession in its own right', Julie, later-years, CLD Manager.

'We need to have some sort of sense of ourselves as a profession and if we don't have a sense of who we are, or our values, then we will cease to exist. The professional qualification helps to achieve that', Cathy, later-years CLD Worker.

- Demoralisation and deskilling is linked with performance management:

'You know the inspirational part of the work is going downhill. And that's back to deskilling'. Management information systems are described as a 'machines that are out of control and undermine professional autonomy'. The data on these themes is reaching saturation point.

- Policies framed around employability, positive destinations and co-production are fractious creating vertical and horizontal tensions, particularly employability and positive destinations; 'I didn't do a degree to do this' or 'I didn't study community education to work in a fucking job centre'. The emphasis here is on de-professionalisation and loss of autonomy to determine workload.
- Managers are blamed for de-professionalisation: 'I don't see them as CLD anymore' or managers are 'exceptionally ambitious. Lost sight of community education'. 'I don't see them as educators. Not anymore. They don't use the language of education. Never. They don't talk about groups – it's always outcomes'. I would like to develop this analysis further. For some participants, there is a tendency to 'blame' individual managers for cuts. This narrative is usually vertical; professionals blame their immediate managers whilst managers blame senior managers, directors and councillors. The narratives here are highly individualised.
- De-professionalisation is linked with loss of autonomy and a lack of space to explore alternatives: 'you are employed by the local authority so you have to adhere to the policies of the local authority' or 'If you are going to support something that is against the local authority then you put yourself at risk'. 'Officers who choose to work for local authorities have to work within a constrained framework'.

#### Re-professionalisation

- Professionalism is elitist and contested: 'It's more about the principles and philosophies rather than the qualification' or, 'the qualification has become divisive – we know better than you because we have the bit of paper'. 'I don't like the term professional, it smacks of elitism', 'CLD is not a profession yet, but it is becoming one'.
- Although deskilling is an issue a process of upskilling or reskilling is also emerging – this is interesting; 'CLD workers need to be trained how to use data and MIS systems'; 'we need to be part of the digital revolution'. 'I want workers with a proven track record of bringing in external funding'.

- The field is dominated by a technocratic, instrumental language linked with managerialism; some view this as 'jargon' and are self-conscious regarding its usage – they use it when required, whilst others appear to consciously embrace the language. Terms under consideration include, 'quality indicators', 'benchmarking good practice', 'outcomes', 'outputs', 'baselines', 'measurement' and 'impact statements'. Policy terms such as 'co-production', 'employability' and 'positive destinations' provoked interesting responses, from embracement to outright hostility – these are areas for further enquiry.
- New managerial techniques make the professions accountable; 'community education was a data free zone, now we are much more professional in how we explain what we do'. Note the use of the word professional in relation to performance management; the emphasis on performance management is seen as 'continual improvement', sometimes a 'necessary evil' or 'something which has to be done', yet framed as being a sign of professionalism. The concern is on evidence, impact and being able to demonstrate that CLD can deliver outcomes. The era which preceded computerised systems is referred to by some managers and professionals as 'the bad old days, when practitioners pretty much did as they want'.
- A cultural shift in public sector management is emerging, from 'consensus management' to more 'authoritarian management': managers need to be 'tough' and 'hard'; they need to be 'thick skinned'. Statements from one manager were very forthright - 'if you don't like the direction of travel, you can always chose to leave', managers are 'dictatorial' and 'make tough decisions', 'we work in a hierarchal structure and staff need to do what they are told'. One manager compared the structure to the Police and Army. Some managers struggle with their role, 'it goes against my principles and what I believe in', or 'I have real anxieties about the way things are going' or 'I came into management to make change only to discover that I don't have any autonomy whatsoever'.
- Managerial tasks have been devolved to CLD Workers due to various reorganisations; this has resulted in practitioners becoming more engaged in managerially defined work, including attending strategic meetings, managing staff and budgets and being located in Council headquarters and not communities.
- Political commitment appears to be less of a motivating factor with younger participants; some claimed to 'dislike politics'; another openly stated that they 'didn't understand

politics'; many were the first in their family to go to university. Political commitment would appear to be particularly stronger in one local authority than it is in the other two. The data suggests thus far that the more political a practitioner is the more likely they are to feel de-skilled/de-professionalised.

## References

Abbott, A, (1988), 'The System of the Professions', University of Chicago Press, London, UK.

Abbott, A, (1995), 'Boundaries of Social Work or Social Work of Boundaries', in 'Social Service Review', December 1995: 547-62.

Abramov, RN, (2012), 'Managerialism and the Academic Profession', in, 'Russian Education and Society', Vol. 54, No. 3, March 2012, pp. 63-80.

Ackroyd, S, Hughes, JA, and Soothill, K, (1989), 'Public Sector Services and their Management', in 'Journal of Management Studies', 26:6, November 1989.

Allan, A, and, Goddard, R, (2014), 'The Domestication of Foucault: Government, Critique, War', in, 'History of the Human Sciences', Vol. 27 (5), 26-53, 2014.

Allman, P, (2001), 'Critical Education against Global Capitalism: Karl Marx and Revolutionary Critical Education', Bergin and Garvey, London, UK.

Alvarez, S.E, (1999), 'Advocating Feminism: the Latin American Feminist NGO 'Boom'', in, 'International Feminist Journal of Politics', 1 (2): 181-209

Alvesson, M, and Johansson, AW, (2000), 'Professionalism and Politics in Management Consultancy Work', in, Clarke, T, and Finchman, R, (Eds.), 'Critical Consulting', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Alvesson, M, (2002), 'Postmodernism and Social Research', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Amselle, J.L, (2016), 'Michel Foucault and the Spiritualisation of Philosophy', in, Zamora, D, and Behrent, M.C, (2016), 'Foucault and Neoliberalism', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Anderson, (1998), 'Fundamentals of Educational Research', Routledge, London, UK.

Arendt, H, (1976), 'The Origins of Totalitarianism', Harvest, London, UK.

Atkinson, R, (2003), 'Addressing Urban Exclusion through Community Involvement in Urban Regeneration', in, Imre, R, and Raco, M, (Eds), (2003), 'Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community and Urban Policy', pp. 101-119, Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Atkinson, P, and Hammersley, M, (2006), 'Ethnography', Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Audier, S, (2015), 'Neoliberalism through Foucault's Eyes', in, 'History and Theory', 54, 404-418, 2015.

Audit Scotland, (2006), 'Community Planning: an Initial Review', Audit Scotland, Edinburgh, UK.

Audit Scotland, (2016), 'An Overview of Local Government in Scotland 2016', Audit Scotland, Edinburgh, UK.

Baeck, UDC, (2010), 'We are the Professionals: a Study of Teachers Views on Parental Involvement in School', in, 'British Journal of Education', Routledge, London, UK.

Bailey, N, Bramley, G, and Hastings, A, (2015), 'Local Responses to Austerity', Local Government Studies', 41:4.

Bailey, N, Besemer, K and Bramley, B, Gannon, M, Hastings, A, (2015), 'Coping with the Cuts? The Management of the Worst Financial Settlement in Living Memory', in, 'Local Government Studies', 41:4, 601-621.

Ball, S.J, (2003), 'The Teachers Soul and the Terrors of Performativity', in 'Journal of Education Policy', 18 (2), 215-28.

Ball, S, J, (2015), 'Accounting for a Sociological Life: Influences and Experiences on the Road from Welfarism to Neoliberalism', in, 'British Journal of Sociology of Education', 36:6, 817-831.

Ball, S.J, (2016), 'Subjectivity as a Site of Struggle', in, 'British Journal of Sociology of Education', 37:8, 1129-1146.

Ball, S.J, and Olmedo, A, (2013), 'Care of the Self, Resistance and Subjectivity under Neoliberal Governmentalities', in, 'Critical Studies in Education', 54:1, 85-96.

Bamber, J, (2010), 'Towards a Sufficiency Model in Teaching Non-traditional Students', in, Merrill, B, and Gonzalez, J, (2010), 'Educational Journeys and Changing Lives', University of Seville, Seville, Spain.

Bane, S, (2009), 'Professionalisation and Youth and Community Work', in Forde, C, Kiely, E and Meade R, (2009), 'Youth and Community Work in Ireland: Key Perspectives', Blackhall, Dublin, 151-174.

Banks, S, (2004), 'Ethics, Accountability and the Social Professions', Palgrave Macmillan, New York, US.

Banks, S, and Orton, A, (2005), 'The Grit in the Oyster: Community Development Workers in a Modernising Local Authority', in, 'Community Development Journal, 42, (1), 97-113).

Banks, S, Meade, R.R, and, Shaw, M, (Eds), (2016), 'Politics, Power and Community Development', Policy Press, University of Bristol, UK.

Barnett, N, (2003), 'Local Government, New Labour and Active Welfare: a Case of Self-Responsibilisation', in, 'Public Policy and Administration', 18 (3), 25-38.

Barr, A, (1991), 'Practising Community Development: Experiences in Strathclyde', Community Development Foundation, London, UK.

Barratt, E, (2001), 'Foucault, Foucauldianism and Human Resource Management', in, 'Personnel Review', Volume 31, Issue 2, pp. 189-204.

Barratt, E, (2003), 'Foucault, HRM and the Ethos of the Critical Management Scholar', in, 'Journal of Management Studies', 40:5, July 2003.

Bauman, Z, (1999), 'In Search of Politics', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Bauman, Z, (1997), 'Post Modernity and its Discontents', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bauman, Z, (2000), 'Liquid Modernity', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bauman, Z, (2002), 'Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bauman, Z, (2005), 'Modernity and the Holocaust', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Becker, G, (1973), 'A Theory of Marriage Part 1', in, 'Journal of Political Economy', 81 (4): 813-846.
- Becker, G, (1976), 'The Economic Approach to Human Behaviour', University of Chicago, Chicago, US.
- Becker, G, (1995), 'The Economic Way of Looking at Behaviour', in, Febrero, R, and Schwartz, P (Eds), 'The Essence of Becker', Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, US.
- Becker, G, Ewald, F, and Harcourt, B.E, (2012), 'American Neoliberalism and Michel Foucault's 1979 Birth of Biopolitics Lectures', in, 'Institute for Law and Economics', Working Paper, 654.
- Becker, H.S, (1973), 'Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance', Macmillan, New York, US.
- Beck, J, and Young, M, (2005), 'The Assault on the Professions and the Restructuring of Academic and Professional Identities: a Bernsteinian Analysis', in 'British Journal of Sociology of Education', 26:2, 183-197.
- Beck, U, (1992), 'Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.
- Behrent, M.C, (2009), 'Liberalism without Humanism: Michel Foucault and the Free Market Creed, 1976-1979, in, 'Modern Intellectual History', 6, pp. 539-568.
- Beetham, D, (1985), 'Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics', Polity Press, Oxford, UK.
- Bensaid, D, (2000), 'Marx for Our Times', Verso, London, UK.

Bentham, J, (1995), 'Panopticon Letters', in, Bozovic, M, (Ed), 'The Panopticon Writings', Verso, London, UK.

Bernstein, B, (2000), 'Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research and Critique', Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield.

Besley, T, and Peters, M, (2006), 'Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research', Peter Lang Publishers, New York, US.

Bevir, M, and O'Brien, D, (2001), 'New Labour and the Public Sector in Britain', in, 'Public Administration Review', 61, pp. 535-547.

Biesta, G, (2008), 'Good Education in an Age of Measurement: on the Need to Reconnect with the Question of Purpose in Education', University of Stirling, Stirling, UK.

Biebricher, T, (2013), 'Critical Theories of the State: Governmentality and the Strategic Relational Approach', in, 'Constellations', (2013), Volume 20, No. 3.

Biebricher, T, (2014), 'Power in Neoliberal Thought', in, 'Journal of Political Power', (2014), Vol. 7, No. 2, 193-210.

Blacke, F, (1992), 'But what is it you actually do? Competency Based Training in Community Education', in, 'Journal of Contemporary Community Education Practice and Theory', Vol. 2, No. 2, Moray House Institute, Edinburgh, UK.

Blanco, I, Griggs, S, and, Sullivan, H, (2014), 'Situating the Local in the Neoliberalisation and Transformation of Urban Governance', in, 'Urban Studies', (2014), Vo. 51 (15), 3129-3146.

Bolchover, D, (2005), 'The Living Dead: Switched Off, Zoned Out: the Shocking Truth about Office Life', Chichester, West Sussex, UK.

Bonefeld, W, (2012), 'The Crisis of Neoliberal Political Economy and the Return of the State: on the Theoretical Roots of Post-Neoliberalism in Adam Smith's Political Philosophy and the German Ordoliberalism Tradition', BISA, Annual Conference, University of Edinburgh, June 2012.

Borges, W, Clarke, H.D, Stewart, M.C, Sanders, D, and Whitley, P, (2013), 'The Emerging Political Economy of Austerity in Britain', in, 'Electoral Studies', 21, (2013), 396-403.

Bottery, M, (1996), 'The Challenge to Professionals from the New Public Management: Implications for the Teaching Profession', in, 'Oxford Review of Education', 22:2, 179-197.

Bourdieu, P, (1998), 'Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of our Time', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Bourdieu, P, (2000), 'The Essence of Neoliberalism', in 'Venezuela Analitica', trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro (2000).

Bourdieu, P, (2003), 'Firing Back: Against the Tyranny of the Market2', Verso, London, UK.

Bourdieu, P, (2005), 'Outline of a Theory of Practice', University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Boyne, G, (1999), 'Introduction: Processes, Performance and Best Value in Local Government', in 'Local Government Studies', 25 (2), Summer 1999.

Bradley, T and Walters, R, (2002), 'The Managerialisation of Crime Prevention and Community Safety', in, Hughes, G, McLaughlin, E, and, Muncie, J, (2002), 'Crime Prevention and Community Safety', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Brandsen, T, and, Pestov, V, (2006), 'Co-production, the Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services: an Introduction', in, 'Public Management Review', No. 4, 493-501.

Brandsen, T, and, Pestov, V, (2007), 'Co-production: the Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services', Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Braverman, H, (1998), 'Labour and Monopoly Capital: the Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century', in, 'Monthly Review', New York, US.

Brenner, N, and Theodore, N, (2002), 'Cities and the Geographies of Actually Existing Neoliberalism', in, 'Antipode', Blackwell, London, UK.

Bryman, A, (2001), 'Quantity and Quality in Social Research', Unwin Hyman Ltd, London, UK.

Buber, M, and, Meyer, M, (2013), 'In Search of Legitimacy: Managerialism and Legitimation in Civil Society Organisations', in, 'International Society for Third Sector Research', 2013, Vol 24, p. 167-193.

Bunt, L. Harris, M, and Westlake, S, (2010), 'Schumpeter Comes to Whitehall: Cuts and Innovation in Public Services', NESTA, London, UK.

Burnham, P, (2001), 'New Labour and the Politics of Depoliticisation', in 'British Journal of Politics and International Relations', Volume 3, No 2, June, pp. 127-149.

Burrell, G, (1988), 'Modernism, Post Modernism and Organisational Analysis 2: the Contribution of Michel Foucault', in, 'Organisation Studies', 9/2, 221-235, 1988.

Cahill, D, (2015), 'Review Essay: Representations of Neoliberalism', in, 'Forum for Social Economics', (2015), Vol. 44, No. 2, 201-210.

Callinicos, A, (1996), 'Against Post Modernism: A Marxist Critique', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Callinicos, A, (2003), 'An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Carter, N, Day, P, and Klein, R, (1995), 'How Organisations Measure Success: the Use of Performance Indicators in Government', Routledge, London, UK.

Casey, C, (1995), 'The Working Self: Socialisation and Self at Work', in, Casey, C, (1995), 'Work, Self and Society: After Industrialism', Routledge, London, UK.

Causser, G, and Exworthy, M, (1999), 'Professionals as Managers across the Public Sector', in, Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

- Cavalier, S, (2005), 'The Legal Legacy of the Miner's Strike', in, 'Capital and Class: Unions, Communities and the 1984-85 Miners Strike', Issue 87, Autumn 2005.
- CEVE Scotland, (1990), 'Pre-service Training for Community Education Work', Scottish Community Education Council, Edinburgh, UK.
- Chadbourne, R, and Ingvarson, L, (1998), 'Self-managing Schools and Professional Community: the Professional Recognition Programme in Victoria's Schools of the Future', in, 'Australian Educational Researcher', 25 (2), 61-94.
- Chan, JB, (2001), 'Governing Police Practice: Limits of the New Accountability', in, 'British Journal of Sociology', Vol. 50, No. 2 (June 1999), pp. 251-270.
- Charmaz, K, and Bryant, A, (2011), 'Grounded Theory and Credibility', in, Silverman, D (ed), 'Qualitative Research', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.
- Charmaz, K, (2014), 'Constructing Grounded Theory', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.
- Christensen, T, and Laegried, P, (2001), 'New Public Management: the Effects of Contractualism and Devolution on Political Control', in, 'Public Management Review Vol.3 Issue 1', Francis and Taylor Ltd.
- Clarke, J, and Newman, J, (1997), 'The Managerial State: Power Politics and Ideology in the Remaking of Social Welfare', Sage, London, UK.
- Clarke, J, (1998), 'Managerialism and Social Welfare', in Abbott, P, and Meerabeau, L, (eds), 'The Sociology of the Caring Professions', ICL Press, London, UK.
- Clarke, A, (2000), 'Leisure: Managerialism and Public Space', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.
- Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S, Hughes, G, and, Humphrey, J, (2000), 'Guarding the Public Interest? Auditing the Public Services', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Clarke, J, (2008), 'Living with/in and without Neoliberalism', in, 'Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology', 51, pp. 135-147.

Clarke, J, and Newman, J, (2016), 'The Politics of Deploying Community', in, Meade, R.R, Shaw, M, and Banks, S, (eds), 'Politics, Power and Community Development', Policy Press, University of Bristol, UK.

Clarke, S, (1991), 'The State Debate', Palgrave, London, UK.

CLD Managers Scotland Group, (2010), 'Doing Things Differently: Community Learning and Development helps to Deliver Change and Cut Social Policy Costs', CLD Managers Scotland Group, Glasgow, UK.

CLD Managers Scotland Group, (2010b), 'Let's Prove It: Providing Evidence on the Local and National Outcomes of Community Learning and Development Activities', (2010), CLD Managers Scotland Group, Glasgow UK.

CLD Managers Scotland Group, (2011), 'Evaluating the Impact of CLD on National and Local Outcomes', (2011), CLD Managers Scotland Group, Glasgow, UK.

CLD Managers Group Scotland, (2012), 'Community Learning and Development in Scottish Local Authorities: Changes and Pressures' (2012), CLD Managers Group Scotland, Glasgow, UK.

CLD Standards Council, (2009), 'The Competencies for Community Learning and Development', CLD Standards Council, Glasgow, UK.

Cleaver, F, (2001), 'Institutions, Agency and the Limitations of Participatory Approaches to Development', in, Cooke, B, and, Kothari, U, (2001), 'Participation: the New Tyranny?' Zed Books, London, UK.

Clegg, S, (2008), 'Bureaucracy, the Holocaust and Techniques of Power at Work', in, 'Management Review', 20 (4), 326-347.

- Cockburn, C, (1977), 'The Local State: Management of Cities and People', Pluto Press, London, UK.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L, and Morrison, K, (2011), 'Research Methods in Education', Rutledge, Abingdon, UK.
- Cochrane, A, (2000), 'Local Government: Managerialism and Modernisation', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.
- Community Development Project, (1977), 'Gilding the Ghetto: the State and Poverty Experiments', London: CDP, Inter-project Editorial Team, pp. 51-62.
- Connor, S, (2010), 'Promoting Employability: the Changing Subject of Welfare Reform in the UK', in, 'Critical Discourse Studies', Vol. 7, No. 1, February 2010, 41-54.
- Cooke, B, and Kothari, U, (2004), 'Participation: the New Tyranny', Zed Books, London, UK.
- Cooke, B, (2004), 'The Social Psychological Limits of Participation' in, Cooke, B, and, Kothari, U, (2001), 'Participation: the New Tyranny?' Zed Books, London, UK.
- Cooke, I, (1996), 'Whatever Happened to the Class of 68? – the Changing Context of Radical Community Work', in, Cooke, I, and Shaw, M, (1996), 'Radical Community Work: Perspectives from Practice in Scotland', Moray House Institute of Education, Edinburgh, UK.
- Cooke, I, and Shaw, M, (1996), 'Radical Community Work: Perspectives from Practice in Scotland', Moray House Institute of Education, Edinburgh, UK.
- Cooke, I, (2010), 'Trust in the Community?', in, 'Concept', Vol. 1, No. 2, 2010.
- Correia, T, (2013), 'The Interplay between Managerialism and Medical Professionalism in Hospital Organisations from the Doctors Perspective: a Comparison of Two Distinctive Medical Units', in 'Health Sociology Review', Volume 22, Issue 3, September 2013.
- Cousins, M, and Hussain, A, (1984), 'Michel Foucault', Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Cowell, R, (2004), 'Community Planning: Fostering Participation in the Congested State', in 'Local Government Studies', 30:4, 497-518.

Craig, G, (1989), 'Community Work and the State', in, 'Community Development Journal, Vol 24, No 1, 1989.

Craig, G, Popple, K, and Shaw, M, (2008), 'Community Development in Theory and Practice: an International Reader', Spokesman, Nottingham, UK.

Craig, G, (2011), 'Community Capacity Building: Something Old, Something New?', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Craig, G, (2011), 'Reflections on Community Development, Community Engagement and Community Capacity Building', in, 'Concept', Vol. 2, No. 2, Summer 2011.

Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Croft, S, and Beresford, P, (2011), 'The Politics of Participation', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Corkey, D, and Craig, G, (1978), 'CDP: Community Work or Class Politics?' in, Curno, P, (1978), 'Political Issues and Community Work', Routledge and Kegan Ltd, London, UK.

Crowther, J, and Moir, S, (2014), 'Learning for Employability? Ideas to Reassert a Critical Education in Communities', in, 'Cuestiones Pedagogicas', 23, 2014, pp. 43-64.

Crowther, J, and Shaw, M, (1995), 'Beyond Subversion', in, Mayo, M and Thompson, J, (Eds), (1995), 'Adult Learning, Critical Intelligence and Social Change', National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, Leicester, UK.

Crowther, J, and Shaw, M, (2013), 'Adult Education, Community Development and Democracy: Renegotiating the Terms of Engagement', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol 49, No 3, June 2014, pp. 390-406.

Crozier, M, (1975), 'The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governmentality of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission', (1975), New York, US.

Cunningham, I, (2001), 'Sweet Charity: Managing Employee Commitment in the UK Voluntary Sector', in, 'Employee Relations', Vol. 23, No. 3, 2001, pp. 225-239.

Curno, P, (1978), 'Political Issues and Community Work', Routledge and Kegan Ltd, London, UK.

Cuthbert, J, and Cuthbert, M, (2009), 'SNP Economic Strategy: Neoliberalism with a Heart', in, Hassan, G, (2009), 'The Modern SNP: From Protest to Power', Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, UK.

Cutler, T, and Waine, B, (2000), 'Managerialism Reformed? New Labour and Public Sector Management', in, 'Social Policy and Administration', Vol. 34, No. 3, 2000, pp. 318-332.

Daly, J, et al, (2014), 'Conducting Qualitative Research in the Context of Pre-Existing Peer and Collegial Relationships', in, 'Nurse Researcher', 21, 5, 28-33.

Darcy, M, (2002), 'Community Management: How Management Discourse Killed Participation', in, 'Critical Quarterly', Vol. 22, No. 4.

Dardot, P, and Laval, C, (2013), 'The New Way of the World: on Neoliberal Society', Verso, London, UK.

Darlington, R, (2005), 'There is no alternative: Exploring the Options in the 1984-85 Miners Strike', in, 'Capital and Class: Unions, Communities and the 1984-85 Miners Strike', Issue 87, Autumn 2005.

Davidson, N, (2010), 'Neoliberal Scotland: Class and Society in a Stateless Nation', Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, UK.

Davies, B, and Bansel, P, (2007), 'Neoliberalism and Education', in, 'International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education', 20:3, 247-259.

Davies, J.S, (2009), 'Localism', in, Flinders, M, Gamble, A, and Hay, C, (Eds), 'The Oxford Handbook of British Politics', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Davies, J, (2013), 'Rethinking Urban Power and the Local State: Hegemony, Domination and Resistance in Neoliberal Cities', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Davies, W, (2017), 'The Limits of Neoliberalism: Authority, Sovereignty and Logic of Competition', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Dean, M, (2010), 'Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, United Kingdom.

Dean, M, (2014), 'Michel Foucault's 'Apology' for Neoliberalism', in, 'Journal of Political Power', 7:3, 433-442.

Dean, M, (2016), 'Foucault, Ewald, Neoliberalism and the Left', in, Zamora, D, and Behrent, M.C, (2016), 'Foucault and Neoliberalism', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

De Bruijn, J.A, (2002), 'Managing Performance in the Public Sector', Routledge, London, UK.

De Dear, R, and Kim, J, (2013), 'Workspace Satisfaction: The Privacy-Communication Trade-Off in Open-Plan Offices', in 'Journal of Environmental Psychology', Vol. 36, December 2013, pp. 18-26

Deem, R, and Brehony, KJ, (2005), 'Management as Ideology: the Case of 'New Managerialism' in Higher Education', in 'Oxford Review of Education', Vol. 31, No. 2, June 2005, pp. 217-235, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

DeFilippis, J, (2008), 'Community Control and Development', in, DeFilippis, J and Saegert, S (eds), 'Community Development Reader', Routledge, New York, US.

Delamont, S, (2002), 'Fieldwork in Educational Settings', Routledge, London, UK.

Deleuze, G, (1986), 'Foucault', Minnesota University Press, Minnesota, US.

Deleuze, G, (1995), 'Negotiations', Columbia University Press, New York, US.

Denscombe, M, (2008), 'The Good Research Guide: For Small Scale Social Research Projects', Open University Press, Berkshire, UK.

Derber, C, (1983), 'Managing Professionals: Ideological Proletarianisation and Post Industrial Labour', in 'Theory and Society', 12 (3), pp. 309-41).

Desai, M, (2002), 'Marx's Revenge: The Resurgence of Capitalism and the Death of Statist Socialism', Verso, New York, United States.

Devine, T.M, (2012), 'The Scottish Nation: a Modern History', Penguin Books, London, UK.

Donald, B, Glasmeier, A, Gray, M, and Lobao, L, (2014), 'Austerity in the City: Economic Crisis and Urban Service Decline', in, 'Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society', 7, 3-15.

Drever, E, (2003), 'Using Semi-Structured Interviews in Small Scale Research', SCRE Centre, Edinburgh, UK.

Dunleavy, P, and Hood, C, (1994), 'From Old Public Administration to New Public Management', in 'Public Money and Management', July-September, pp. 9-16.

Durose, C, and, Richardson, L, (2015), 'Designing Public Policy for Co-Production: Theory, Practice and Change', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Du Gay, P, (2000), 'Entrepreneurial Governance and Public Management: the Anti-Bureaucrats', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Duyvendak, JW, and Knijn, T, and Kremer, T, (2006), 'Professionals between People and Policy', Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, Holland.

Elliot, P, (1972), 'The Sociology of the Professions', Macmillan, London, UK.

Elston, (1991), 'The Politics of Professional Power', in, Gabe, J, Calnan, M, and, Bury, M, (Eds.), 'The Sociology of the Health Service', Routledge, London, UK.

Emejulu, A, and MacLeod, M.A, (2014), 'Neoliberalism with a Community Face? A Critical Analysis of Asset Based Community Development in Scotland', in, 'Journal of Community Practice', Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 430-450.

Emejulu, A, (2015), 'Community Development as Micro Politics', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Evans, L, (2002), 'Reflexive Practice in Educational Research', Continuum, London, UK.

Evans, L, (2010), 'Professionalism, Professionalism and the Development of Education Professionals', in 'British Journal of Educational Studies', Routledge, London, UK.

Evans, L, (2013), 'The Professional Status of Educational Research: Professionalism and Developmentalism in Twenty First Century Working Life', in, 'British Journal of Educational Studies', 61:4, 471-490.

Evetts, J, (2003), 'The Sociological Analysis of Professionalism', in 'International Sociology', 18, 395-415.

Evetts, J, (2009), 'The Management of Professionalism: a Contemporary Paradox', in, Gerwitz, S, Mahony, A, Hextall, A, and Cribb, A (eds) (2009), 'Changing Teacher Professionalism: International Trends and Ways Forward', Routledge, London, UK.

Ewald, F, (1999), 'Foucault and the Contemporary Scene', in 'Philosophy and Social Criticism', Vol. 25, No 3, pp. 81-91.

Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Farnham, D, and Horton, S, (1993), (Eds), 'Managing the New Public Services', Macmillan, London, UK.

Farrell, C, and Morris, J, (2003), 'The Neo-Bureaucratic State: Professionals, Managers in Schools, General Practices and Social Work', in, *Organisation*, 10, 129-156.

Feulner, E.J, (1999), 'Intellectual Pilgrims: the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Mont Pelerin Society', Edward J. Feulner, Washington, US.

Fergusson, R, (2000), 'Modernising Managerialism in Education', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Firth, W, (2012), 'Tasking the Dinosaur: Managerialism in the National Health Service', in, *Critical Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 4.

Flynn, R, (1999), 'Managerialism, Professionalism and Quasi-Markets', Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Foster, A, Kerr, P, and Byrne, C, (2014), 'Rolling Back to Roll Forward: Depoliticisation and the Extension of Government', in, 'Policy and Politics', Vol 42, No 2, 225-241.

Foucault, M, (1982), 'The Subject and Power', in, Dreyfus, HL, and Rainbow, R, (Eds), 'Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics', Hemel Hempstead, Harvester, US.

Foucault, M, (1991), 'Governmentality', in, Burchell, G, Gordon, C, and Miller, P, (1991), 'The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality', University of Chicago, Chicago, US.

Foucault, M, (1995), 'Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison', Vintage, New York. US.

Foucault, M, (1998), 'The History of Sexuality: 1 – The Will to Knowledge', Penguin, London, UK.

Foucault, M, (2000), 'Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Volume 3', Penguin, London, UK.

Foucault, M, (2001), 'Madness and Civilisation', Routledge, London, UK.

Foucault, M, (2002), 'The Archaeology of Knowledge', Routledge, New York, US.

Foucault, M, (2002b), 'The Order of Things', Routledge, New York, US.

Foucault, M, (2003), 'Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France, 1975-76', Penguin, London, UK.

Foucault, M, (2008), 'The Birth of Bio-Politics: Lectures at the College De France, 1978-79', Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.

Foucault, M, (2009), 'Security, Territory and Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977-1978', Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.

Foucault, M, (2016), 'The Great Rage of Facts', in, Zamora, D, and Behrent, M.C, (2016), 'Foucault and Neoliberalism', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Fournier, V. (2000), 'Boundary Work and the (Un)-Making of the Professions', in N. Malin (ed.) 'Professionalism, Boundaries and the Workplace', London: Routledge, pp. 67-86.

Frank, T, (2000), 'One Market under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism and the End of Economic Democracy', Vintage, London, UK.

Fraser, N, (2003), 'From Discipline to Flexibilisation? Rereading Foucault in the Shadow of Globalisation', in, 'Constellations', Volume 10, No. 2, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK.

Freidman, M, and Freidman, R.D, (1998), 'Two Lucky People: Memoirs', University of Chicago Press, Chicago, US.

Freidman, M, (2002), 'Capitalism and Freedom', University of Chicago Press, Chicago, US.

Freidson, E, (1970), 'Professional Dominance', Altherton Press, New York, US.

Freidson, E, (1983), 'The Theory of Professions: State of the Art', in, Dingwall, R, and Lewis, P, (1983), 'The Sociology of Professions', Macmillan, London, UK.

Freidson, E, (2001), 'Professionalism: the Third Logic', Polity, Cambridge, UK.

Frost, D, and North, P, (2013), 'Militant Liverpool: a City on the Edge', Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, UK.

Fukunuyama, F, (1992), 'The End of History and the Last Man', Penguin Books, London, United Kingdom.

Fukuyama, F, (2001), 'Social Capital, Civil Society and Development', in, 'Third World Quarterly', 22 (1), 7-20.

Fyfe, I, and, Moir, S, (2013), 'Standing at the Crossroads: What Future for Youth Work?', in, 'Concept', Special Issue, 2013.

Gall, G, (2005), 'The Political Economy of Scotland', University of Wales Press, Cardiff, United Kingdom.

Gamble, A, (2001), 'Neo-Liberalism', in, 'Capital and Class', Issue 75, Autumn, 2001.

Gane, N, (2012), 'The Governmentalities of Neoliberalism: Panopticism, Post-Panopticism and Beyond', in, 'The Sociological Review', Vol. 60, 611-634, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.

Gane, N, (2012b), 'Trajectories of Liberalism and Neoliberalism', in, 'Theory, Culture and Society', (2015), Vol. 32 (1), 133-144

Gane, N, (2014), 'The Emergence of Neoliberalism: Thinking Through and Beyond Michel Foucault's Lectures on Biopolitics', in, 'Theory, Culture and Society', (2014), Vol. 31 (4), 3-27.

Gane, N, (2014b), 'Sociology and Neoliberalism: a Missing History', in, 'Sociology', (2014), Vol. 48(6), 1092-11-6.

Garland, D, (1997), 'Governmentality and the Problem of Crime: Foucault, Criminology, Sociology', in, 'Theoretical Criminology', 1 (2): 173-214.

Gershuny, J, (2005), 'Busyness as the New Badge of Honour for the New Super Co-ordinate Working Class', in, 'Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research', Paper 2005-09, University of Essex, Colchester, UK.

Gillingham, P, and Graham, P, (2016), 'Designing Electronic Information Systems for the Future: Social Workers and the Challenge of New Public Management', in, 'Critical Social Policy', 2016, Vol. 36 (2), 187-204.

Giroux, H.A, (2004), 'Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neoliberalism: Making the Political More Pedagogical', in, 'Policy Futures in Education', Volume 2, Numbers 3 and 4, 2004.

Glasser, B, and Strauss, A, (1999), 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory', Aldine Transaction, London, UK.

Goffman, E, (1989), 'On Fieldwork', in, 'Contemporary Journal of Ethnography', (18) 2: 123-32.

Goffman, E, (1990), 'The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life', Penguin Books, London, UK.

Goldstein, A, (2012), 'Revenge of the Managers: Cost Cutting and the Paradoxical Resurgence of Managerialism in the Shareholder Value Era, 1984-2001', in 'American Sociological Review' 77 (2), 268-294, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Gordon, C, (2015), 'Foucault, Neoliberalism, etc', in, 'Foucault News', January 2015.

Gorz, A, (1982), 'Farewell to the Working Class', Pluto Press, Chadlington, UK.

Griffiths, M, (1998), 'Educational Research for Social Justice: Getting off the Fence', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Griffin, M, Learmonth, M, and Elliott, C, (2014), 'Non-domination, Contestation and Freedom: the Contribution of Philip Pettit to Learning and Democracy in Organisations', in 'Management Learning', sagepub.co.uk/journals

Habermas, J, (1984), 'The Theory of Communicative Action Vol 1: Reason and the Rationalisation of Society', Beacon Press, Boston, US.

Habermas, J, (1988), 'On the Logic of the Social Sciences', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Halford, S, and Leonard, P, (1999), 'New Identities? Professionalism, Managerialism and the Construction of the Self', in, Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Hall, S, (2011), 'The Neoliberal Revolution', in, 'Cultural Studies', 25 (6), 705-728.

Hall, S, Massey, D, and Rustin, M, (2015), 'After Neo-liberalism: the Kilburn Manifesto', Soundings, Lawrence and Wishart Ltd, London, UK.

Hammersley, M, (2003), 'Recent Radical Criticism of Interview Studies: Any Implications for the Sociology of Education?' in, 'British Journal of Sociology of Education', Vol., 24, (1), pp. 119-126.

Hammersley, M, (2013), 'What is Qualitative Research?', (2013), Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, London, UK.

Hancock, L, Mooney, G and Neal, S, (2012), 'Crisis Social Policy and the Resilience of the Concept of Community', in 'Critical Social Policy', 32, 343.

Hardt, M, and Negri, A, (2000), 'Empire', Harvard University Press, Harvard, US.

Harris, J, (1998), 'Scientific Management, Bureau-Professionalism, New Managerialism: the Labour Process of State Social Work', in 'British Journal of Social Work', 28, 839-862, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

Harrison, S, (1999), 'Clinical Autonomy and Health Policy' in, Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Hart, C, (1998), 'Doing a Literature Review', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Harvey, D, (2005), 'A Brief History of Neo-Liberalism', Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Harvey, D, (2011), 'The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism', Profile Books Ltd, London, United Kingdom.

Hassan, G, and Shaw, E, (2012), 'The Strange Death of Labour Scotland', Edinburgh University Press Ltd, Edinburgh, UK.

Hassan, G, (2014), 'Caledonian Dreaming: the Quest for a Different Scotland', Luath Press Ltd, Edinburgh, UK.

Hayek, F.A, (1948), 'Individualism and Economic Order', University of Chicago Press, Chicago, US.

Hayek, F.A, (2001), 'The Road to Serfdom', Routledge, New York, US.

Hayek, F.A, (2006), 'The Constitution of Liberty', Routledge, New York, US.

Henderson, P, Jones, D, and Thomas, D, (2011), 'The Boundaries of Change in Community Work', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Helsby, G, (1999), 'Changing Teachers Work: the Reform of Secondary Schooling', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Hickey, S, and Mohan, G, (2005), 'Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development', in, Hickey, S, and Mohan, G, (2005), 'Development and Change', Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.

Hilgers, (2011), 'The Three Anthropological Approaches to Neoliberalism', Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK.

HMIE Scotland (2006) 'How Good Is Our Community Learning and Development 2', (2006), HMIE Scotland.

Hobsbawm, E, (1994), 'The Age of Extremes', 1914-1991', Michael Joseph, London, United Kingdom.

Hoggett, P (1987), 'Farewell to Mass Production', in, Hoggett, P, and Hambleton, R, (Eds.), 'Decentralisation and Democracy', School for Advanced Urban Studies, Bristol, UK.

Hoggett, P, (1991), 'A New Management in the Public Sector', in, 'Policy and Politics', 19 (4): 243-56.

Holman, B, (1993), 'A New Deal for Social Welfare', Lion, Oxford, UK.

Holman, D. V, (2014), 'The Relational Bent of Community Participation: the Challenge Social Network Analysis and Simmel Offer to Top-Down Prescriptions of Community', in, 'Community Development Journal, Vol. 50, No. 3, July 2015, pp. 418-432.

Holroyd, C, (2000), 'Are Assessors Professional', in 'Active Learning in Higher Education', 1 (1), 28-44.

Hood, C, (1991), 'A New Public Management for all Seasons', in, 'Public Administration Review', 69 (1), pp. 3-19.

Humphrey, C, (2012), 'Dilemmas in Doing Insider Research in Professional Education', in, 'Qualitative Social Work', 12 (5), 572-586.

Irvine, C, (2012), 'Taking on Best Practices: a Novel Response to Managerialism in Higher Education', in, 'Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Compulsion, and Culture', Volume 12, Number 3, Duke University Press.

Jeffer, T, and Smith, M.K, (1993), 'A Question of Competence', in, 'Journal of Contemporary Community Education Practice and Theory', Vol. 2, No. 2, Moray House Institute, Edinburgh, UK.

Jessop, B, (1999), 'The Changing Governance of Welfare: Recent Trends in its Primary Functions, Scale and Modes of Co-ordination', in, 'Social Policy and Administration', 33 (4), 348-359.

John, P, (2014), 'The Great Survivor: the Persistence and Resilience of English Local Government', in, 'Local Government Studies', 40, (5), 689-704.

Johnson, T, (1972), 'Professions and Power', Macmillan, London, UK.

Jones, C, (1999), 'Social Work: Regulation and Managerialism', in, Exworthy, M, and Halford, S, (1999), 'Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Jones, D.S, (2012), 'Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics', Princeton University Press, New Jersey, US.

Jones, O, (2011), 'Chavs: the Demonisation of the Working Class', Verso, London, UK.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation, (2015), 'The Cost of Cuts: the Impact on Local Government and Poorer Communities', Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York, UK.

Kawulich, B.W, (2005), 'Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method', in 'Qualitative Social Research', Volume 6, No. 2, May 2005.

Keating, M, (2010), 'The Government of Scotland', Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, UK.

Keevers, K, Sykes, C, and Treleaven, L, (2008), 'Partnership and Participation: Contradictions and Tensions in the Social Policy Place', in, 'Australian Journal of Social Issues', Vol. 43, No. 3, Spring 2008.

Kenny, S, (2010), 'Towards Unsettling Community Development', in, 'Community Development Journal', Oxford University Press, December 2010.

Kenny, S, (2016), 'Changing Community Development Roles: the Challenges of a Globalising World', in, Meade, R.R, Shaw, M, and Banks, S, (eds), 'Politics, Power and Community Development', Policy Press, University of Bristol, UK.

Kirkpatrick, I, Ackroyd, S, and, Walker, R, (2006, 'The New Managerialism and Public Service Provisions', Palgrave Macmillan, New York, US.

Klein, N, (2007), 'The Shock Doctrine: the Rise of Disaster Capitalism', Allen Lane, London, UK.

Koch, P, (2013), 'Bringing Power Back In: Collective and Distributive Forms of Power in Public Participation', in, 'Urban Studies', 50 (14), 2976-2992, 2013.

Kopecky, M, (2011), 'Foucault, Governmentality, Neoliberalism and Adult Education – Perspective on the Normalisation of Social Risk', in, 'Journal of Pedagogy', (2011), 2(2), 246-262.

Kothari, U, (2004), 'Power, Knowledge and Social Control in Participatory Development', in, Cooke, B, and, Kothari, U, (2001), 'Participation: the New Tyranny?' Zed Books, London, UK.

Kvale, S, (1996), 'Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Kvale, S, (2007), 'Doing Interviews', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Laing, RD, (1990), 'The Divided Self: an Existential Study in Sanity and Madness', Penguin Books, London, UK.

Lane, JE, (1993), 'The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Lane, J.E, (2001), 'New Public Management', Routledge, London, UK.

Ledwith, M, (2011), 'Community Development: a Radical Approach', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Langan, M, (2000), 'Social Services: Managing the Third Way', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Larner, (2000), 'Neoliberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality', in, 'Studies in Political Economy', 63, pp. 5-25.

Larner, W, and Butler, M, (2005), 'Governmentalities of Local Partnerships: the Rise of a 'Partnership State' in New Zealand', in, 'Studies in Political Economy', (75), 79-101.

Larson, M, (1977), 'The Rise of Professionalism: a Sociological Analysis', University of California Press, London, UK.

Lauerman, J, and Davidson, M, (2013), 'Negotiating Particularity in Neoliberalism Studies: Tracing Development Strategies across Neoliberal Urban Governance Projects', in, 'Antipode', Antipode Foundation Ltd.

Law, A, and Mooney, G, (2007), 'New Labour/Hard Labour? Restructuring and Resistance in the Welfare Industry', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Lazear, E.P, (2015), 'Gary Becker's Impact on Economics and Policy', in, 'American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings', 105 (5), 8—84, 2015.

Le Grand, J, (2003), 'Motivation, Agency and Public Policy', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Le Grand, J, (2007), 'The Other Invisible Hand', Princeton University Press, Princeton, US.

Lees, A, Edgar, M, and Rafferty, J, (2013), 'From Menzies to Munro: the Problem of Managerialism', in 'British Journal of Social Work', 43, 542-558, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Lemke, T, (2010), 'Foucault, Governmentality and Critique', in 'Rethinking Marxism', 14:3, 49-64.

Lemke, T, (2001), 'The Birth of Bio-politics: Michel Foucault's Lecture at the College De France on Neoliberal Governmentality', in, 'Education and Society', (2001), 30, 190-207.

Levitas, R, (2012), 'The Just's Umbrella: Austerity and the Big Society in Coalition Policy and Beyond', in, 'Critical Social Policy', 32, (3), 320-342.

Lifelong Learning UK, (2008), 'Profile of the Community Learning and Development Workforce in Scotland', Lifelong Learning UK, Edinburgh, UK.

Ling, T, (2000), 'Unpacking Partnership: the Case of Healthcare', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (Eds), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare?' SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Lloyd, M.G, (2008), 'Towards a Pooled Sovereignty in Community Planning in Scotland?', in 'Local Economy', Vol. 23, No. 1, February 2008, 58-68.

Locke, T, Vulliamy, G, Webb, R, and Hill, M, (2005), 'Being a 'Professional' Primary School Teacher at the Beginning of the 21st Century: a Comparative Analysis of Primary Teacher Professionalism in New Zealand and England', in 'Journal of Education Policy', 20: 5, 555-581.

London Weekend Return Group, (1980), 'In and Against the State', Pluto Press, London, UK.

Lowndes, V, and Pratchett, L, (2006), 'Local Political Participation: the Impact of Rules- in- Use', in, 'Public Administration', 84 (3), 539-561.

Lowndes, V, and Pratchett, (2012), 'Local Government under the Coalition Government: Austerity, Localism and the Big Society', in, 'Local Government Studies', 38 (1), 21-40.

Lowndes, V, and McCaughie, K, (2013), 'Weathering the Perfect Storm? Austerity and Institutional Resilience in Local Government', in, 'Politics and Policy', 41, 533-549.

Lunt, N, (2006), 'Employability and New Zealand Welfare Restructuring', in, 'Policy and Politics', 32 (3), 473-494.

MacAlpine, M, and, Marsh, S, (2008), 'Unpicking the Managerial Stitches: Strengthening Critical Action in the Workplace', in, 'Journal of Workplace Rights', Vol. 13 (2), 115-132, 2008.

MacDonald, K, (1995), 'The Sociology of the Professions', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

MacGregor, S, (1999), 'Welfare, Neoliberalism and New Paternalism: Three Ways for Social Policy in Late Capitalist Societies', in, 'Capital and Class', Issue 67, Spring 1999.

Mackie, G, Sercombe, H and Ryan, A, (2013), 'A Service or a 'Way of Working', or a Profession? A Discourse Analysis of Community Education/Community Learning and Development in Scotland', in, 'Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education', (2013), Vol. 34, No. 3, 394-410.

Mackinnon, D, (2000), 'Managerialism, Governmentality and the State: a neo-Foucauldian Approach to Local Economic Governance', in, 'Political Geography', 19, 293-314.

MacLure, M, (2003), 'Discourse in Educational and Social Research', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

MacLure, M, and Stronach, I, (1997), 'Educational Research Undone: the Postmodern Embrace', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Marston, G, and McDonald, C, (2012), 'Getting beyond 'Heroic Agency' in Conceptualising Social Workers as Policy Actors in the Twenty First Century', in, 'British Journal of Social Work', 42, 1022-1038.

Martin, I, (1980), 'Signposts to Nowhere', in, McConnell, C, (ed), (2002), 'Community Learning and Development: the Making of an Empowering Profession', Community Learning Scotland, West Calder, UK.

Martin, I, (1987), 'Community Education: Towards a Theoretical Analysis', in, Allen, G, Bastiani, J,

Martin, I and Richards, K, (1987), 'Community Education: an Agenda for Educational Reform', Open University Press, Milton Keynes, UK.

Martin, I, (2000), 'Reconstituting the Agora: Towards an Alternative Politics of Lifelong Learning', in 'Proceedings of the 41st Annual Adult Education Research Conference', Vancouver, Canada.

Martin, I, and Shaw, M, (2000), 'Community Work, Citizenship and Democracy: Remaking the Connections', in, 'Community Development Journal', 35 (4), pp. 401-4.

Massey, D, (2013), 'Vocabularies of the Economy', in, Hall, S, Massey, D, and Rustin, M, (2013), 'After Neoliberalism? The Kilburn Manifesto', Lawrence and Wishart Limited, London, UK.

Mason, J, (1996), 'Qualitative Researching', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Mayer, M, and Rankin, K.N, (2002), 'Social Capital and Community Development': a North/South Perspective', in 'Antipode', 34 (4), 804-808).

Mayo, M, (1997), 'Partnerships for Regeneration and Community Development: some Opportunities, Challenges and Constraints', in, 'Critical Social Policy', 17 (3), pp. 3-26.

Mayo, M, (1998), 'Community Work', in, Adams, R, Dominelli, L, and Payne, M, (Eds), 'Social Work: Themes, Issues and Critical Debates', Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Mayo, M, (2011), 'Community Development: a Radical Alternative', in Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Mayo, M, Hoggett, P, and Miller, C, (2007), 'Navigating the Contradictions of Public Service Modernisation: the Case of Community Engagement Officials', in, 'Policy and Politics', Vol. 35, No. 4, 667-81.

Mayo, M, and Shaw, M, (2016), 'Class, Inequality and Community Development: Editorial Introduction', in, Mayo, M and Shaw, S (Eds), 'Class, Inequality and Community Development', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

May, T, (2012), 'Power in Neoliberal Governmentality', in, 'Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology', Vol. 43, No. 1, January 2012.

McAfferty, P, and Mooney, G, (2010), 'Resisting the Modernisation of Public Services in Contemporary Scotland: the Case of the Public Sector', in, Davidson, N, (2010), 'Neoliberal Scotland: Class and Society in a Stateless Nation', Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, UK.

McConnell, C, (ed), (2002), 'Community Learning and Development: the Making of an Empowering Profession', Community Learning Scotland, West Calder, UK.

McCulloch, K, and Martin, I, (1997), 'Competence and Competencies: Towards a More Discriminating Epistemology', *Concept*, 7(1), 9-13.

McCulloch, K, and Tett, L, (1996), 'Performance Indicators as Quality Assurance: the Scottish Community Education PI Scheme', in, 'Quality Assurance in Education', Vol. 4, Issue 3, pp. 17-26.

McCulloch, K, and Tett, L, (2010), 'Ethics, Collaboration and the Organisational Context of Youth Work', in, Banks, S (Ed), (2010), 'Ethical Issues in Youth Work', Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

McDermid, J, et al, (2013), 'Conducting Qualitative Research in the Context of Pre-existing Peer and Collegial Relationships', in, 'Nurse Researcher', RCN Publishing, May 2014, Volume 21, Number 5.

McGarvey, N, (2012), 'Expectations, Assumptions and Realities: Scottish Local Government Post Devolution', in, 'British Journal of Politics and International Relations', Vol. 14, 153-174.

McGarvey, N, (2017), 'The SNP and Local Government', in, Barrow, S, and Hassan, G, (2017), 'A Nation Changed: the SNP and Scotland Ten Years On', Luath Press Ltd, Edinburgh, UK.

McGimpsey, I, (2017), 'Late Neoliberalism: Delineating a Policy Regime', in, 'Critical Social Policy', 2017, Vol. 37 (1), 64-84.

McGrath, B, (2015), 'Reflecting on 'Evidence' and Documentation Devices in 'Translating' Community Interventions', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol. 51, No. 2, 2016.

McWilliams, C, (2013), 'Planning for the Community? The Early Experiences of the Implementation of Edinburgh City Council's Community Plan', in, 'Local Economy', 28 (5), 512-524.

Meade, R.R, (2012), 'Government and Community Development in Ireland: the Contested Subjects of Professionalism and Expertise', in, 'Antipode', Vol. 44, No. 3, 2012.

Measor, L, (1985), 'Interviewing: a Strategy in Qualitative Research', in, Burgess, RG, (1985), 'Strategies of Educational Research', Falmer Press, Basingstoke, UK.

Mellet, R, (2012), 'Fiscal Austerity and Devolved Government in the UK', in, 'Scottish Affairs', No. 78, Winter 2012.

Meng, JCS, (2009), 'Saving the Teachers Soul: Exorcising the Terrors of Performativity', in 'London Review of Education', Vol. 7, No. 2, July 2009, 159-167, Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK.

Merriam, SB, (1998), 'Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education', Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, US,

Miller, C, and Ahmad, Y, (2011), 'Community Development at the Crossroads: a Way Forward', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Milburn, T, (1994) 'Community Education: a Case Study from Scotland', George Williams College, London, UK.

Milburn, T, and Wallace, D, (2003), 'Community Education, Community Learning and Development', in, Bryce, T.G.K and Humes, W.M, (Eds), 'Scottish Education: Post-Devolution', Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, UK.

Miliband, R, (2009), 'The State in Capitalist Society', Merlin Press Ltd, Pontypool, UK.

Miller, C, and Bryant, R, (1990), 'Community Work in the UK: Reflections on the 1980s', in, 'Community Development Journal', 23 (4), 315-323.

Miller, P, and Rose, N, (1990), 'Governing Economic Life', in, 'Economy and Society', 19, 1-31.

Mills, C.W, (2000), 'The Sociological Imagination', Oxford University Press, New York, US.

Mirowski, P, and Plehwe, D, (2009), 'The Road from Mont Pelerin: the Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective', Harvard University Press, New York, US.

Mirowski, P, (2014), 'Never Let a Serious Crisis Go To Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown', Verso, London, UK.

Mises, L.V, (1944), 'Bureaucracy', Yale University Press, New Haven, US.

Mises, L.V, (2005), 'Theory and History', Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, US.

Mises, L.V, (2007), 'Human Action: a Treatise on Economics', Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, US.

Mises, L.V, (2009), 'The Anti-Capitalistic Mentality', D. Van Nostrand Company, New York, US.

Mooney, G, and Scott, G, (Eds), (2012), 'Social Justice and Social Policy in Scotland Today', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Morrison, M and Scott, D, (2007), 'Key Ideas in Educational Research', Continuum, London, UK.

Mowbray, M, (2010), 'What Became of the Local State? Neoliberalism, Community Development and Local Government', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol. 46, No. S1, January 2011, pp. 32-53.

Mudge, S.L, (2008), 'The State of the Art: What is Neoliberalism', in, 'Socio-Economic Review', (6), 703-731.

Munro, I, (2012), 'The Management of Circulations: Biopolitical Variations after Foucault', in, 'International Journal of Management Reviews', Vol. 14, 345-362.

Muzio, D, Brock, DM and Suddaby, R, (2013), 'Professions and Institutional Change: Towards an Institutional Sociology of the Professions', in, 'Journal of Management Studies', July 2013, John Wiley and Sons Ltd, Oxford, UK.

National Audit Office, (2014), 'Financial Sustainability of Local Authorities 2014', Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General', London: DCLG.

Newheiser, D, (2016), 'Foucault, Gary Becker and the Critique of Neoliberalism', in, 'Theory, Culture and Society', 0 (0), 1-19.

Newman, J, (2000), 'Beyond the New Public Management? Modernising Public Services', in, Clarke, J, Gewirtz, S and McLaughlin, E, (2000), 'New Managerialism, New Welfare'? Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Newman, J, (2003), 'Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society', SAGE, London, UK.

Newman, J, (2011), 'The Involving Public Sector', in, 'Journal of Social Theory', 12:3, 331-341.

Newman, J, (2014), 'Landscapes of Antagonism: Local Governance, Neoliberalism and Austerity', in, 'Urban Studies', 51 (15), 3290-3305, November, 2014.

Newton, T, (1998), 'Theorising Subjectivity in Organisations: the Failure of Foucauldian Studies', in, 'Organisation Studies' 19 (3), 415-47.

Nichols, G.S (et al), (2015), 'Is the Asset Transfer of Public Leisure Facilities in England and Example of Associative Democracy', in, 'Administrative Sciences', 5 (2) pp. 71-87.

Nisbet, J, and Watt, J, (1994), 'Educational Disadvantage in Scotland: a 1990s Perspective', Scottish Community Education Council.

Noordegraaf, M, (2007), 'From "Pure" to "Hybrid" Professionalism: Present-Day Professionalism in Ambiguous Public Domains', in 'Administration and Society', Volume 39, Number 6, October 2007, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Noordegraaf, M, and De Wit, B, (2012), 'Responses to Managerialism: How Management Pressures Affect Managerial Relations and Loyalties in Education', in 'Public Administration', Vol. 90, No. 4, 957-973), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK.

Noordegraaf, M, and, Schinkel, W, (2011), 'Professional Capital Contested: A Bourdieusian Analysis of Conflicts between Professionals and Managers', in, 'Comparative Sociology', 10, (2011), 97-125.

North, P, and, Wilks-Heeg, S, (2002), 'Capacity Building and Community Control of Local Economic Assets', in, 'Local Economy', (2002), Vol. 17, No. 2, 147-169.

O' Donoghue, T, (2003), 'Qualitative Educational Research in Action: Doing and Reflecting', Routledge, London, UK.

Ong, A, (2007), 'Neoliberalism as a Mobile Technology', in, 'Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers', NS, 32, pp. 3-8.

O'Reilly, D, and, Reed, M, (2011), 'The Grit in the Oyster: Professionalism, Managerialism and Leaderism as Discourses of UK Public Services Modernisation', in, 'Organisation Studies', 32 (8), 1079-1101.

Orwell, G, (1986), 'Politics and the English Language', Penguin Books, Middlesex, UK.

Orwell, G, (2000), 'Nineteen Eighty Four', Penguin Books, London, UK.

Osborne, D, and Gaebler, T, (1992), 'Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector', Addison Wesley, Reading, UK.

Ozga, J, (1995), 'Deskilling a Profession: Professionalism, De-professionalisation, and the New Managerialism', in, Busher, H, and Saran, R, (Eds.), 'Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools', Kogan Page, London, UK.

Paisey, A, and Paisey, A, (1987), 'Effective Management in Primary Schools', Blackwell, Oxford, UK.

Patterson, B, (2015), 'Questioning the 'Common Sense': Was Scottish Independence Really an Alternative to UK Neoliberalism?', in, 'Capital and Class', Vol. 39 (3), 493-514.

Paulsen, R, (2014), 'Empty Labor: Idleness and Workplace Resistance', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Payne, G and Williams, M, (2005), 'Generalisation in Qualitative Research', in, 'Sociology, Vol. 1, 39, (2), pp. 295-314.

Peck, J, (2008), 'Remaking Laissez-faire', in, 'Progress in Human Geography', 32 (1), 3-43.

Peck, J, (2010), 'Constructions of Neoliberal Reason', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Perkin, H, (2006), 'The Rise of Professional Society', Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Piggott, L, and Grover, C, (2009), 'Retrenching Incapacity Benefit: Employment Support Allowance and Paid Work', in, 'Social Policy and Society', 8, 159-170.

Plant, R, (2011), 'Community as Fact and Value', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Pollitt, C, (1986), 'Beyond the Managerial Model: the Case for Broadening Performance Assessment in Government and the Public Services', in 'Financial Accountability and Management', Autumn, 1986.

Pollitt, C, (1996), 'Managerialism and the Public Services', Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK.

Pollitt, C, (1998), 'Managerialism Revisited', in Peters, B, Guy, S, and Donald, J, (eds), 'Taking Stock: Assessing Public Sector Reforms', McGill-Queens University Press, Montreal, Canada.

Pollitt, C, and Bouckaert, (2000), 'Public Management Reform', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Pollock, AM, (2004), 'NHS Plc: the Privatisation of Our Health Care', Verso, London, UK.

Pollock, V.L, and Sharp, J, (2012), 'Real Participation or the Tyranny of Participatory Practice: Public Art and Community Involvement in the Regeneration of the Raploch, Scotland', in, 'Urban Studies', 49 (14), 3063-3079, November 2012.

Poole, L, (2007), 'Working in the Non-Profit Welfare Sector: Contract Culture, Partnership, Compacts and the Shadow State', in, Law, A, and Mooney, G, (2007), 'New Labour/Hard Labour? Restructuring and Resistance in the Welfare Industry', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Popple, K, (1995), 'Analysing Community Work', Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.

Popple, K, and Redmond, M, (2000), 'Community Development and the Voluntary Sector in the New Millennium: the Implications of the Third Way in the UK', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol. 35, No. 4, October 2000, pp. 391-400.

Potts, A and Sikes, P, (Eds), (2008), 'Researching Education from the Inside', Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Power, M, (1997), 'The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification', Oxford University Press, London, UK.

Pring, R, (2000), 'Philosophy of Educational Research', Continuum, London, UK.

Radford, J, (1978), 'Don't Agonise – Organise', in, Curno, P, (1978), 'Political Issues and Community Work', Routledge and Kegan Ltd, London, UK.

Reed, M, (1992), 'The Sociology of Organisations: Themes, Perspectives and Prospects', Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, UK.

Rothe, P, et al (Eds), (2011), 'Deliberations in Community Development: Balancing on the Edge', Nova Science, New York, US.

Rose, N, and Miller, P, (1992), 'Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government', in, 'British Journal of Sociology', 43, 173-205.

Rose, N, (1999), 'Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Rose, N, O' Malley, P, and Valverde, M, (2006), 'Governmentality' in, 'Annual Review: Law, Society, Science', (2006), 2:83-104.

Schon, D, (1983), 'The Reflective Practitioner', Basic Books, New York, US.

Scottish Community Development Network, (2015), 'Community Development Practice in Scotland: the Reality behind the Rhetoric', SCDN Report, June 2015.

Scottish Government, (2007), 'Effective Self-Evaluation in Community Learning and Development: a Guide for Practitioners and Managers', (2007), Scottish Government, Edinburgh, UK.

Scottish Government, (2012), 'Strategic Guidance for Community Planning Partnerships', Scottish Government, Edinburgh, UK.

Scottish Education Department, (1975), 'Adult Education: the Challenge of Change', HMSO, Edinburgh, UK.

Scottish Education Department, (1977), 'Professional Education and Training for Community Education', HMSO, Edinburgh, UK.

Scottish Executive, (2004), 'The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 – Community Planning: Statutory Guidance', Scottish Executive, Edinburgh, UK.

Scottish Executive, (2004b), 'Working and Learning Together to Build Stronger Communities: Scottish Executive Guidance for Community Learning and Development', Scottish Executive, Edinburgh UK.

Scottish Office, (1998), 'Communities: Change Through Learning: Report of a Working Group on the Future of Community Education', Scottish Office, Edinburgh, UK.

Scott, M, (2010), 'Reflections on the Big Society', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol 46, No 1, January 2011, pp. 132-137.

Scott, K, (2012), 'Community Planning in Scotland: Dilemmas for Reconciling Policy and Practice in Community Development Work', in, Concept, Vol. 3, No. 1, Spring 2012.

Seale, C, (1999), 'The Quality of Qualitative Research', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Sennett, R, (1998), 'The Corrosion of Character: the Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism', W.W. Norton and Company, New York, US.

Shanks, E, Lundstrom, T, and Wiklund, S, (2014), 'Middle Managers in Social Work: Professional Identity and Management in a Marketised Welfare State', in 'British Journal of Social Work', Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Shaw, M, (2008), 'Community Development and the Politics of Community', in, 'Community Development Journal', Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 24-36.

Shaw, M, (2009), 'Repolicising Democracy, Community and the State', in, 'Concept', Vol. 1, No. 1, 2009.

Shaw, M, (2011), 'Stuck in the Middle? Community Development and the Dangerous Business of Learning for Democracy', in, 'Community Development Journal', 46 (52), 2011, pp. 128-146.

Shaw, M, (2013), 'Community Work Today: Competing Demands in Practice', in, 'Concept', Vol. 4, No. 2, Summer 2013.

Shaw, M, (2017), 'The Challenges of Community Planning for the Community and Voluntary Sector in the Current Climate: a Road Well Travelled?' in, 'Concept', Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring, 2017.

Silverman, D, (2010), 'Doing Qualitative Research', SAGE Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Simons, J, (1995), 'Foucault and the Political', Routledge, New York, US.

Simmons, R, and Thompson, R, (2011), 'NEET – Young People and Training for Work: Learning on the Margins', Trentham Books, Staffordshire, UK.

Siow, A, (2015), 'Gary Becker and the Art of Economics', in 'Journal of Demographic Economics', 81, 2015, 3-6.

Skidelsky, R, (2010), 'Keynes: The Return of the Master', Penguin, New York, United States.

Smith, C, Knights, D and Wilmott, H, (Eds), (1991), 'White Collar Work: the Non-Manual Labour Process', Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Smith, J, (1978), 'Hard Lines and Soft Options: a Criticism of Some Left Attitudes to Community Work' in, Curno, P, (1978), 'Political Issues and Community Work', Routledge and Kegan Ltd, London, UK.

Smith, M, (1999), 'After Managerialism: Towards a Conception of the School as an Educational Community', in 'Journal of Philosophy of Education', Volume 33, No 3, 1999.

Smout, T.C, (1986), 'A Century of the Scottish People', Collins, London, UK.

Sockett, H.T, (1996), 'Teachers for the 21st Century: Redefining Professionalism', in, 'NASSP Bulletin', May, 22-29.

Standing, G, (2014), 'The Precariat: the Dangerous New Class', Bloomsbury, London, UK.

Steeman, TM, (1975), 'Durkheim's Professional Ethics', Saint Anthony Shrine, Boston, US.

Stenson, K, and Watt, P, (1999), 'Governmentality and the Death of the Social? A Discourse Analysis of Local Government Texts in South East England', in, 'Urban Studies', Vol. 36, No. 1, 189-201.

Stephenson, C, and Wray, D, (2005), 'Emotional Regeneration through Community Action in Post Industrial Mining Communities: the New Herrington Miners Banner Partnership', in, 'Capital and Class: Unions, Communities and the 1984-85 Miners Strike', Issue 87, Autumn 2005.

Stewart, J, (2004), 'Taking Stock: Scottish Welfare Policy after Devolution', Policy Press, London, UK.

Stoker, G, (2003), 'Transforming Local Governance: from Thatcherism to New Labour', Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Stoker, G, (2012), 'The Political Environment and Localism: What Future?', in, Graham, S (Ed), (2012), 'Housing 2020: Six Views of the Future for Housing Associations', Orbit Group, Coventry, UK.

Taylor, M, (2007), 'Community Participation in the Real World', in, 'Urban Studies', Vol 44, No. 2, pp. 297-317.

Taylor, M, (2011), 'Public Policy in the Community', Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.

Taylor, M, and Presley, F, (1987), 'Community Work in the UK 1982-6', Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, London, UK.

Taylor-Gooby, P, and Stoker, G, (2010), 'The Coalition Programme: a New Vision for Britain or Politics as Usual', in, 'The Political Quarterly', 82 (1), 4-15.

Taylor-Gooby, P, (2011), 'Root and Branch Restructuring to Achieve Major Cuts: the Social Policy Programme of the 2010 UK Coalition Government', in, 'Social Policy and Administration', 46 (1), 1-22.

Taylor-Gooby, P, (2013), 'The Double Crisis of the Welfare State and What We Can Do About It', Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Teelken, C, (2012), 'Compliance or Pragmatism: How do Academics deal with Managerialism in Higher Education? A Comparative Study in Three Countries', in, 'Studies in Higher Education', Vol. 37, No. 3, May 2012, 271-290.

Teixeira, P.N, (2014), 'Gary Becker's Early Work on Human Capital – Collaborations and Distinctiveness', in, 'Journal of Labor Economics', (2014), 3:12.

Tett, L, (2007), 'Developing Competence: Early and Mid-Career in Community Learning and Development', University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

Tett, L, (2010), 'Community Education, Learning and Development', Dunedin Academic Press Ltd, Edinburgh, UK.

Thatcher, M, (1993), 'The Downing Street Years', HarperCollins, London, United Kingdom.

Thomas, D.N, (1983), 'The Making of Community Work', George Allen and Unwin, London, UK.

Thompson, J, (2011), 'When Active Citizenship becomes Mob Rule', in, Craig, G, Mayo, M, Popple, K, Shaw, M and Taylor, M, (2011), 'The Community Development Reader: History, Themes and Issues', Policy Press, Bristol, UK.

Thrupp, M, and Wilmott, R, (2003), 'Educational Management in Managerialist Times: Beyond the Textual Apologists', Open University Press, Maidenhead, UK.

Timmermans, S and Berg, M, (2003), 'The Gold Standard: the Challenge of Evidence-Based Medicine and Standardisation in Health Care', Temple University Press, Philadelphia, US.

Troman, G, (1996), 'The Rise of the New Professionals? The Re-structuring of Primary Teachers Work and Professionalism', in 'British Journal of Sociology of Education', 17 (4), 473-487.

Walsh, P, (2006), 'Narrowed Horizons and Impoverishment of Educational Discourse: Teaching, Learning and Performing Under the New Educational Bureaucracies', in 'Journal of Education Policy', 21: 1, 95-117.

Whitfield, D, (2012), 'In Place Of Austerity: Reconstructing the Economy, State and Public Services', Spokesman, Nottingham, UK.

Wiggan, J, (2012), 'Telling Stories of 21st Century Welfare: the UK Coalition Government and the Neoliberal Discourse of Worklessness and Dependency', in, 'Critical Social Policy', 32 (3): 1-23.

Wilmott, H, (1994), 'Theorising Agency: Power and Subjectivity in Organisation Studies', in, Hassard, J, and Parker, M, (eds), 'Towards a New Theory of Organisations, Routledge, New York, US.

Wills, J (2012), 'The Geography of Community and Political Organisation in London Today', in, 'Political Geography', 31 (2), pp. 114-126.

Youthlink Scotland, (2009), 'The Statement on the Nature and Purpose of Youth Work', Youthlink Scotland.

Zamora, D, (2016), 'Foucault, the Left, and the 1980s', in, Zamora, D, and Behrent, M.C, (2016), 'Foucault and Neoliberalism', Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.