Mass Intellectuality and Democratic Leadership in Higher Education

Edited by
Richard Hall and Joss Winn

Mass Intellectuality
and Democratic Leadership
in Higher Education

Perspectives on Leadership in Higher Education

Series Editors:
Camilla Erskine, Tanya Fitzgerald and Jon Nixon

Perspectives on Leadership in Higher Education provides a forum for distinctive, and sometimes divergent, ideas on what intellectual leadership means within the context of higher education as it develops within the twenty-first century. Authors from across a number of nation states critically explore these issues with reference to academic and research-informed practice and development, institutional management and governance, the remapping of knowledge as well as sector-wide policy development.

Forthcoming in the Perspectives on Leadership in Higher Education series
Leadership for Sustainability in Higher Education, Janet Haddock-Fraser, Peter Rands and Stephen Scoffham

Also available from Bloomsbury
Academic Identities in Higher Education, edited by Linda Evans and Jon Nixon
Academic Working Lives, edited by Lynne Gornall, Caryn Cook, Lyn Daunton, Jane Salisbury and Brychan Thomas
Cosmopolitan Perspectives on Academic Leadership in Higher Education, edited by Feng Su and Margaret Wood

Mass Intellectuality and Democratic Leadership in Higher Education

Edited by Richard Hall and Joss Winn

Contents

Series Editors' Foreword

What are universities for in the twenty-first century? This is a question that is now debated not only within universities themselves but also within wider society and across the political spectrum: we can no longer assume a consensus regarding the ends and purposes of higher education or the role of universities in fulfilling those ends and purposes. Consequently, leadership within higher education cannot simply be a matter of managing the *status quo*: leadership necessarily involves an understanding as well as analysis of the twenty-first-century world and of how the university might contribute to the economic, social, cultural and political challenges that we face. In short, it requires leadership that is both visionary and programmatic: visionary in its understanding of the past as well as present and future impacts of globalization and programmatic in its grasp of how universities might respond to that impact.

What might such leadership look like? This series aims to address that question with reference to academic practice and development, institutional management and governance, the remapping of knowledge and sector-wide policy development. Central to each of these areas of concern is the importance of interconnectivity in a context of increasing institutional and global complexity: interconnectivity within and across institutions, regions and cognate fields. The gathering of agreement is one of the prerequisites of leadership at every level – and that requires an understanding of different viewpoints and opinions some of which may be in direct conflict with others. The capacity to balance, respect and contain these differences is what constitutes leadership. This inevitably raises important ethical questions regarding leadership in a more complex and subtle setting, where leadership goes beyond the 'command' model of telling others what to do and expecting them to do it. The twin themes of interconnectivity and ethics cut across the series as a whole.

Mass Intellectuality and Democratic Leadership in Higher Education focuses these twin themes on the notion of *democratic* leadership as developed in a variety of higher education settings and extra-mural contexts. The central argument of the book is that the institutions comprising the higher education sector have become increasingly financialized and marketized; that the idea of 'the public university' is – as a result – under severe threat; and that the practice of 'mass education' needs, therefore, to be re-imagined. That re-imagining, argue the contributors to this book, requires new and emergent forms of academic leadership that may as yet be embryonic, but could – given the political will – revitalise the higher education sector as a whole, re-energise those working and studying within it, and lead to a radical reconceptualization of the higher education curriculum.

Richard Hall and Joss Winn have brought together a group of authors whose work is theoretically informed and challenging, whose ideas are grounded in innovative forms of institutional and pedagogical practice, and whose agenda for change is clearly

articulated and evidenced. The book points to a renewed vision for 'mass' higher education: a vision that places collaborative ways of working and cooperative modes of pedagogical practice as its focal point of concern. Neither the editors nor the authors are starry-eyed regarding the problems they face in realising that vision. But the arguments they put forward for the radical democratisation of higher education – and the critique of the *status quo* upon which those arguments are premised – are of vital importance in any consideration of what leadership means in the rapidly changing landscape of higher education.

Notes on Contributors

Gordon Asher is an educator/learner, researcher/writer, editor/proofreader, 'activist' and cultural worker based in Glasgow, UK. A member of the burgeoning academic precariat, his main employment is as a Learning and Curriculum Developer at the University of the West of Scotland, UK. He studied for a Master's degree in Adult Education at the University of Glasgow, UK, and is currently working towards a PhD by publication, within a broad framing – 'In, Against and Beyond the Neoliberal University'; linking critical educational theories and practices within the academy with radical education outwith the academy. Amongst other commitments outwith the university he is the co-editor of Variant magazine(http://www.variant.org.uk/), a board member of Strickland Distribution (http://strickdistro.org/), a member of the Social Science Centre (http://socialsciencecentre.org.uk/) and a founder member of the Centre for Transformational Learning and Culture (http://utlc2016.wix.com/home). His 'bag' is critical pedagogy/popular education/critical academic literacies for radical democracy/eco-social justice.

Birmingham Autonomous University is an independent group of a dozen university students, graduates, activists and workers committed to developing viable popular and radical education programmes in the city of Birmingham, UK. Founded in 2013, BAU has delivered talks, workshops and critiques to students in movement, and is keen to build links with pedagogues engaged in struggle. Its sessions have focused on unorthodox Marxism, and its members have co-organized participatory events with the British Sociological Association 'Activism in Sociology Forum'. BAU is also interested in the initiative to develop a sustainable social, legal and business model for Co-operative Higher Education, and in the longer-term project of developing intellectual capacities and critical faculties beyond capitalism.

Joyce E. Canaan is Professor of Sociology at Birmingham City University, UK, and Visiting Professor of Applied Linguistics at UECE, the State University of Ceará in Fortaleza, Brazil. Her research and writing has focused on critical pedagogy and popular education in and outside the neoliberal university. As capitalism devours more of the planet and immiserates its people, Joyce is engaged with creative activists and popular educators, in nurturing bottom up activism at home. She is also learning with and from Brazilian popular educators and cultural workers.

Jonathan Owen Clark is an artist and academic, and currently Head of Research at Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, UK. He has previously held lecturing positions at the University of Newcastle, UK, and Brunel University, UK, and has research interests in critical theory and aesthetics.

Martin Paul Eve is Professor of Literature, Technology and Publishing at Birkbeck, University of London, UK. In addition to many journal articles, he is the author of four books – *Pynchon and Philosophy* (2014), *Open Access and the Humanities* (2014), *Password: A Cultural History* (Bloomsbury, 2016), and *Literature Against Criticism* (2016). Martin is also heavily involved in policy debates around open-access to research work and is a founder and co-director of the Open Library of Humanities.

Richard Hall is Professor of Education and Technology at De Montfort University, Leicester, UK. At DMU he is Co-Director of the Institute for Education Futures. Richard is a UK National Teaching Fellow, a co-operator at the Social Science Centre in Lincoln, UK, and a Trustee of the Open Library of Humanities. He writes about life in higher education at: http://richard-hall.org.

Thomas Henfrey is senior research fellow at the Schumacher Institute (Bristol, UK) and research fellow in the Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Change at Lisbon University. His main current role is providing research support to the ECOLISE network of European community-led sustainability initiatives. This builds on prior work at the interface of research and practical action for sustainability, equity and social justice, particularly within the permaculture and Transition movements.

Louise H. Jackson is Head of Learning Enhancement at Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, UK, and is a National Teaching Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy. Her areas of interest in research include how Widening Participation enacts and promotes notions of Neoliberalism, and the development of Educational Fundamentalism within Music in Higher Education.

Joel Lazarus completed his PhD at St Anthony's College, University of Oxford, in 2011. Since then, he has joined the ranks of the 'precariat' academic, teaching on short-term contractual bases at Oxford, Reading University and SOAS. Over this period, his research focus has gradually metamorphosed from the political economy of democracy promotion to critical pedagogy and social transformation through radical popular education.

Sara C. Motta is a mother, feminist writer, critical educator and currently senior lecturer in Politics, University of Newcastle, Australia. She is committed to the co-creation of an emancipatory autonomous and decolonising politics for the twenty-first century. She has run numerous women's empowerment workshops working particularly with the power of the body, art and the sacred for personal and collective transformation and worked as a critical educator with women's and other movements in Latin America and Europe. She has also written extensively on the reimagining of emancipatory politics in the twenty-first century, in relation to Latin America, and more globally. Her most recent books are *Education and Social Change in Latin America* (ed. with Mike Cole) (2013) and *Constructing Twenty-First Century Socialism: The Role of Radical Education* (with Mike Cole) (2014). She is currently writing a decolonial feminist book *Liminal Subjects: Weaving Our Liberation* exploring such a reimagining in theory and practice.

Mike Neary is Professor of Sociology in the School of Political and Social Sciences, University of Lincoln, UK. He held a senior management and leadership role at Lincoln, where he was the Dean of Teaching and Learning 2007–2014. Mike's research is informed by Marxist value theory of labour. His current writing applies this theory to a higher education context, with a focus on student and academic labour. Mike was made an honorary life member of the University of Lincoln's Students' Union in 2014 for his work with students. He is a founding member of the Social Science Centre, Lincoln, a co-operative providing free public higher education since 2011.

Jenny Pearce is Research Professor in the Latin American and Caribbean Centre, London School of Economics. Previously, she was Professor of Latin American Politics in Peace Studies, University of Bradford. Jenny has worked for many years on issues of violence and social change in Latin America and written extensively on these topics. She has also tried to bring this learning about social change and action from the global South to the global North, particularly to work with communities in Bradford District.

Gary Saunders is a Criminology Lecturer at the University of Lincoln, UK. Part of Gary's research focuses on teaching and learning in higher education, especially assessment feedback and the design of the learning landscape. He is currently writing up his PhD thesis, 'Re-imaging the idea of the university for a post-capitalist society', which is based on research conducted with education experiments that emerged out of the student protests in 2010 to provide alternative forms of 'higher education'.

Eurig Scandrett is Senior Lecturer and Programme leader in Public Sociology at Queen Margaret University, UK, with research interests in social movement learning in environmental justice struggles. After an initial career as an environmental scientist, he spent fifteen years in adult education and community development, including as Head of Community Action at Friends of the Earth Scotland. He is an active environmentalist and trade union representative, currently co-chair of Friends of the Earth Scotland and the Bhopal Medical Appeal and elected Vice-President for Scotland of University and College Union.

Stevphen Shukaitis is Senior Lecturer at the University of Essex, UK Centre for Work and Organization, and a member of the Autonomedia editorial collective. Since 2009 he has coordinated and edited Minor Compositions (http://www.minorcompositions. info). He is the author of *Imaginal Machines: Autonomy & Self-Organization in the Revolutions of Everyday Day* (2009) and *The Composition of Movements to Come: Aesthetics and Cultural Labor After the Avant-Garde* (2016), and editor (with Erika Biddle and David Graeber) of *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations // Collective Theorization* (2007). His research focuses on the emergence of collective imagination in social movements and the changing compositions of cultural and artistic labour.

Joss Winn is Senior Lecturer and Programme Leader in Education at the University of Lincoln, UK. His research focuses on co-operative education, workplace democracy, academic labour and alternative forms of higher education. In 2011, he co-founded the

Social Science Centre, Lincoln, a co-operative for higher education and is a Director of the Lincolnshire Co-operative Development Agency.

Tom Woodin is a reader in the social history of education at the UCL Institute of Education, UK, where he is the programme leader for the History of Education MA. He has written on worker writers and community publishing in the UK since the 1970s and is currently producing on a book on the topic to be published in 2017. He researches co-operation and education and recently edited *Co-operation, Learning and Co-operative Values* (2015) and led a Joseph Rowntree Foundation project on the history of community and mutual ownership which resulted in a report on the topic: http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/community-mutual-ownership. With Gary McCulloch and Steve Cowan, he wrote *Secondary Education and the Raising of the School Leaving Age – Coming of Age?* (2013). His other research interests include the social history of learning and the history of social and labour movements. He co-edits *History of Education*.

Mass Intellectuality and Democratic Leadership in Higher Education

Richard Hall and Joss Winn

Introduction

A series of global economic crises rooted in debt-saturation and the increasing deregulation of globalized financial markets, culminating in the Great Crash of 2008 and persistent stagnation, have formed a critical moment of contention that reframes the role of leadership within the management and governance of higher education (HE). These crises have emerged imminent to the transnational mobility and flexibility of capital, which has subsequently dispersed neoliberal governance models across the globe (Clarke 2005). They have also tended to swamp socio-environmental and sociocultural crises that have disproportionately affected the global South, and which have amplified the impacts of the ongoing coloniality and patriarchy of power.

Collectively, these form an ongoing, transnational crisis of social reproduction that amplify the tensions between leadership both as status (or metaphor) and function, alongside its relationship to vertical and horizontal forms of governance. These tensions have affected responses to the increasingly financialized and marketized idea of HE, which are conditioned by the restructuring of the university as space in which associations of transnational actors have a stake. These actors include finance capital, such as private equity firms and hedge funds, which are leveraging both student and institutional debt, for instance through the issuing of public and private bonds; technology firms and publishers, which are seeking to extract surpluses through a rentier economy; policymakers, who are attempting to reshape the terrain of HE *for-profit*; think tanks and consultancies seeking to widen the space for the market through evidence-based practice; philanthrocapitalists, who use charitable foundations to promote the virtues of the market and entrepreneurial activity to stimulate outcome-based practices; and finally, university senior managers, effectively acting as chief executive officers rather than as *primus inter pares*.

In spite of restructuring, transnational capital has been unable to reassert stable forms of accumulation (Bellamy Foster and Yates 2014; Cleaver 1993). The result has been persistent recession with low levels of growth, weak aggregate demand and high levels of underemployment or unemployment. Beyond the economy, this

has amplified social divisions and tensions, including inside the HE sector. Here, antagonistic forces have emerged in opposition to: increased student fees; rising levels of student and institutional debt; increased performance management within and across institutions, through the imposition of teaching and research metrics; a lack of transparency and accountability from managers to the students and academics who labour inside the universities; the corporatization of the university and the diminution of its potential social agenda beyond the market; historic pedagogic practices that emerged from inside the public, liberal university and which are bound up with colonial power; and ideologies of students as purchasers of services (Hall 2015b; Hall and Smyth 2016).

In this context, it is clear that HE is in crisis. The idea of the public university is under assault (Bailey and Freedman 2011), and both the future of the sector and its relationship to society are being gambled (McGettigan 2013). HE is increasingly unaffordable, its historic institutions are becoming untenable, and their purpose is overwhelmingly instrumental. What and who have led us to this crisis? What are the alternatives? To whom do we look for leadership in revealing those alternatives?

This book brings together critical analyses of 'intellectual leadership' inside and outside the university and documents ongoing efforts from around the world to create alternative models for organizing HE and the production of knowledge. Its authors offer their experience and views from inside and beyond the structures of mainstream HE, to reflect critically on efforts to create really existing alternatives. In the process, the book asks whether it is possible to reimagine the university democratically and co-operatively? If so, what are the implications for leadership not just within the university but also in terms of HE's relationship to societies?

The positions taken in the book are plural, emerging from critical feminism and radical pedagogy, alongside the politics of subaltern resistance, as well as from critical theory that is informed by Marxism and anarchism. However, as a whole, the book takes forward a programme that is deliberately counter-hegemonic in conception and theoretical framing. While utilizing a number of different theoretical positions, in its analysis, the book provides a collective voice that calls for a radically different engagement with intellectual leadership. Throughout the book, such an engagement can be categorized politically as being from the left. However, in its intention, the focus of the book is on forms of leadership for social justice and liberation.

Thus, a number of the authors argue that mass HE is at the point where it no longer reflects the needs, capacities and long-term interests of global society. An alternative role and purpose are engaged with critically based upon 'mass intellectuality': the real possibility of democracy in learning and the production of knowledge, including the ways in which we know ourselves and our relationships with others.

Mass intellectuality

Throughout this book, the authors engage with the critical concept of 'mass intellectuality' from multiple perspectives. The origins of the term 'mass intellectuality' can be found within the Autonomist Marxist tradition, building on Marx's notion of

the 'general intellect' (Dyer-Witheford 1999; Manzerolle 2010; Marx 1993; Virno and Hardt 1996). Marx (1993: 694) argued that the dynamics of capitalism meant

> the accumulation of knowledge and of skill, of the general productive forces of the social brain, is thus absorbed into capital, as opposed to labour, and hence appears as an attribute of capital, and more specifically of fixed capital [machinery].

Through innovation and competition, the technical and skilled work of the social individual, operating in factories, corporations or schools, is absorbed into the things she produces. Therefore, the 'general intellect' of society, that is, its general capacity for *science* in the broadest sense, is absorbed into capitalized technologies and techniques, to reduce labour costs and increase productivity. As a result, 'the human being comes to relate more as a watchman and regulator to the production process itself' (Marx 1993: 705).

With the crisis of funding, regulation and governance of HE, there is a need to understand: first, the mechanisms through which the general intellect is directed, absorbed or co-opted into the total social production process of value, to which universities contribute; and second, how leadership enables this as 'watchman and regulator', or resists such co-option. Addressing the crisis of HE in this way calls attention to the proliferation of alternative educational practices, which are themselves reimaginings of the idea of the university as a site for the production of knowledge. These alternatives are rooted in the desire and potential for reclaiming the knowledge, skills, practices and techniques that form the general intellect, to produce and circulate new forms of socially useful knowledge or ways of knowing, being in and creating the world. From this reclaiming or liberation of the general intellect, away from the valorization of capital, emerges 'mass intellectuality' as a direct, cognitive and social force of production that exists as an increasingly diffuse form of intellectuality. In this form, it circulates as a 'commons' that is pregnant with critical and practical potential but still remains marginal in the face of general commodity production (Smith 2013). As a result, it is constantly being recuperated by capital in the form of the 'knowledge economy' or 'cognitive capitalism'. Virno (2001) argues:

> Mass intellectuality is the prominent form in which the general intellect is manifest today. The scientific erudition of the individual labourer is not under question here. Rather, all the more generic attitudes of the mind gain primary status as productive resources; these are the faculty of language, the disposition to learn, memory, the power of abstraction and relation and the tendency towards self-reflexivity.

It should be made clear that the concept of mass intellectuality refers to knowledge and forms of knowing that can be and are being valorized by capital, but also refers to that same knowledge's immanent (negative) and prefigurative (positive) critical and reconstructive potential for new forms of sociality. In this way, mass intellectuality implies a struggle over the proletarianization of cognitive and affective forms of labour,

and its emancipatory implications, as the embodiment of the cumulative history of science.

An engagement with the concept of mass intellectuality therefore implies a critique of subjectivity, in its relationship to the prevalent mode of (knowledge) production, the institutions where it is sited and the oversight, management and leadership that arises from these spaces. The process of liberating and reclaiming the knowledge, skills, practices and techniques that are produced inside higher educational contexts is central to moving beyond exploitation and valorization in the market, and in creating democratic, co-operative alternatives. As a result, mass intellectuality is an important concept in the critique of existing approaches to intellectual leadership, because it suggests that critical-practical solutions to global, socio-environmental problems need not be framed around economic growth and business-as-usual. It enables a refocusing on the potential for the democratic or co-operative reproduction of the university, and a level of productive, scientific and social knowledge that exists as an immanent, transgressive potential across capitalist societies.

The case studies and models of analysis in this book argue that the democratization of HE as an emancipatory project must reappropriate the means of knowledge production in the labour process (Postone 1993), and engage with leadership models that nurture the co-operation of academic and student scholarship and work. This includes questioning these relationships, alongside the forms of thought and being that they constitute and through which they are constituted. The authors ask: What kind of 'leadership' in the academy and beyond can support the liberation of the general intellect? They question whether the idea and institutions of the university can be freed from the market, to generate the kind of leadership which is self-challenging and capable of enabling the knowledge production process of others. To do the latter, it has to respect the knowledge of others and potential problem-solving through co-production, co-critique and evidential exploration. We argue that society needs 'leaders' who do not seek 'followers', but who are themselves rooted in the philosophy and ethics of mass intellectuality. By uncovering widespread, objective conditions for the alienation of the products and processes of HE from their social utility, this book also identifies the already-existing material conditions for new democratic models of knowledge production and education. It is on the basis of these objective conditions and the potential of this social subjectivity that the authors in this book engage critically with the idea of 'intellectual leadership'.

The literature on academic leadership

The translation of the crisis of capitalism into the terrain of HE has forced the sector to consider its structure and forms, alongside its regulation and governance models, with knock-on implications for leadership, in its dual nature as status and function. Reflecting the outcomes of a global literature review, Dopson et al. (2016: 7) argued that 'the current literature on leadership development approaches in UK [United Kingdom] HE appears small scale, fragmented and often theoretically weak, with many different models, approaches and methods co-existing with little clear pattern of consensus

formation'. A central issue is the effect of externalities, such as socio-economic crises and demands for impact, on the ability of institutional and sectoral leaders to develop leadership capacity and capability, for instance through leadership development programmes (Marshall 2012; Pepper and Giles 2015).

For Day et al. (2014) where leadership is instrumentalized as a process that can be measured, using status or position to analyse leadership is problematic, and this may hinder any engagement with uncertainty (Barnett 2012; see also, Evans et al. 2013 for a discussion of leadership issues relating to the professoriate). The response of policymakers and senior staff has been to refocus upon organizational development agendas and performance management, which foreclose on alternative possibilities. In the global North, this has highlighted a disconnect between leading and leadership, precisely because the ideal of the university as a self-critical community of academic and student scholars with high levels of autonomy (Neary and Saunders 2011) is being disciplined by a dominant corporate agenda that incentivizes specific, impactful behaviours (Alvesson and Spicer 2012). There is also a separate question about whether these agendas should be globally generalized and whether binaries about what the university was or might be are culturally relevant.

The literature attempts to interpret the practices of effective leaders. A tension emerges between critical theory and the idea of leadership (Western 2008; Zoller and Fairhurst 2007), especially in relation to ideas of power. One mechanism that has been critiqued in relation to power is the idea that leadership can be exerted in a distributed manner through network governance. For Davies (2011), the idea of the network society is complex and contested and rests on claims about: the inability of effective command management, given the fragmentary nature of capitalist modernity; the decentred opportunities that exist for intersectional interests to challenge hegemonic power and elites; and how ubiquitous communications technology provides an infrastructure for such global connections. These precepts underpin horizontalism, as the belief that we live in a world that can only be understood if we apply network-theoretical, cybernetic concepts (Miller Medina 2005).[1]

However, what emerge are fluidly organized, technology-rich, hegemonic governance networks, rather than new forms of democratic, network governance. As a result, ethical virtues, such as trust and empowered reflexivity, are co-opted by hierarchies for command management and the anti-ethical closure of horizons. Governance becomes based on consent through coercion, and the latter demands forms of performance management and governmentality, for instance in the relentless focus on curriculum performance data or in the production of knowledge transfer (Ball 2009; Davies 2011). The distributed forms of leadership that are claimed through network governance theory (Hoppe and Reinelt 2010; Jarvis et al. 2013; King and Nesbitt 2015) ignore that networks are prone to resolving into hierarchies and incremental closure, that they reproduce and crystallize inequalities and that distrust is common.

The idea that leadership can be cultivated and distributed so that networks can be amplified connects to the entrepreneurial development of leadership as a form of human capital. This risks breeding the idea of the leader as superhero, with identifiable traits capable of generating the space and time for the accumulation of social capital by distributed others (Bolden et al. 2003). The development of coaching and mentoring

practices, reflexivity, risk management, ethical leadership and so on, then tend to crystallize the idea that leadership can be instrumentalized (Morrison et al. 2003) and internalized.

Such instrumentalization downplays the gendered and racialized nature of leadership (Avolio et al. 2009) and instead emphasizes: control and transaction; accountability; individual persistence; personal performance management; self-development (rather than collective); psychometric development and so on (Fischer et al. 2015; Simmonds and Tsui 2010; Turnbull and Edwards 2005). In contrast, Deem et al. (2007) have argued for reflective leadership practices that are appropriate to both the management of knowledge workers and the public purpose of the university. The pressures on subjects who are female, feminized and/or racialized, who are attempting to lead in workplaces that have traditionally functioned as white and male, are especially problematic (Gallant 2014; James 2013; Johnson 2015; Loke 2015; Mirza 2015), and signal one of the ways in which leadership may fail to provide solutions to ongoing socio-economic or environmental crises (Bryman 2007).

These tensions reveal a further examination of the boundaries of academic leadership (Bolden et al. 2009; Noble and Pym 1970). One response is to address the scope of academic leadership in terms of citizenship (Bolden et al. 2014), as an attempt to analyse it as a bottom-up process that might become sustainable by starting from established values of collegiality and academic autonomy, rather than fetishizing missions, visions, shared goals and followership. This is important in addressing 'leadership' through the possibilities opened up by 'mass intellectuality' as a reframing of social relationships and processes. The idea of citizenship enables leadership to be analysed as a social process 'in which it is considered to be relationally constructed and embedded within communities' (Bolden et al. 2014: 756).

Thus, it is possible to see leadership as an activity rather than a form of status, and as a deliberative, social service (Macfarlane 2007, 2013) grounded in self-governance, self-regulation and self-directedness. Here, communal rights and responsibilities are immanent to one another, and the health of the organization is strengthened through institutional connections to traditional communities grounded in academic values. As a result, the university might be a site for renewed, collective, civic engagement that is negotiated communally and that may take many forms. For Bolden et al. (2014: 765), this enables individuals 'to recognise their own part within power relationships and find ways of articulating their anxieties about academic life'.

For Alvesson and Spicer (2012), dissolving the boundaries between academic leadership as a process and civil society, in order that crises can more appropriately be addressed, demands new forms of critical performativity. This moves beyond functionalist and interpretive analyses of scientific or socially constructed leadership activities, to reposition them reflexively. The concept of critical performativity questions dominant positions through: circumspect care for the views of those who are leading; progressive pragmatism in working with accepted academic discourses for emancipatory ends and uncovering present potentialities or a sense of what could be (Alvesson and Spicer 2012: 376, 377).

As a result, academic leadership is related to specific local contexts and mindful of the structural limitations of power. This enables critical performative leadership to

mitigate the risk that outright resistance to, or rejection of, leadership leads to the further imposition of authority alongside the refusal to countenance democratic organizational engagement. Critical performativity recognizes leadership as a terrain of struggle that reveals and questions established and emergent social relations and forces of production inside the university. It thereby offers the space for alternatives that are co-operative and democratic.

We might then question how academic leadership restructures the everyday educational and pedagogical realities of academics and students. This demands a return to the idea of intellectual leadership as a form of mass intellectuality, to reveal the politicized and elitist (rather than normative or interpretive) nature of academic practices (Kautsky 1903). A further question is whether leadership reflects or reproduces the abstract nature of social relations (Eacott 2013), and how it might be analysed in relation to its concrete contexts, in order that crises of social reproduction might be overcome or addressed at the level of society, rather than in relation to the market. This is the purpose of the chapters that follow.

The structure of the book

Our alternative framing of intellectual leadership emerges through three sections that situate HE against the ongoing crisis of capitalism, with responses to it from inside and outside the university. This articulates the limits of formal HE, including the binaries of public and private, in a range of national contexts. Here, there is a connection to traditions of critical pedagogy in which critical knowing has always been existential, collective and transformative, to challenge the hegemonic framing of learning as separate from society and everyday life. The opening section focuses on *Power, History and Authority* inside formal HE. It asks what and who has led us to this crisis of HE? What forms of resistance are taking place inside the university and how are these being led? This section seeks to situate certain functions of the university against distributed leadership at the level of society, rather than it being rooted in a professional cadre. Stevphen Shukaitis begins this work with an analysis of struggles inside the classroom over the labour of students and academics and the potential responses that are enabled through critical pedagogy. Shukaitis situates this against networked or free labour and enables an exploration of the idea that academic labour becomes a form of self-exploiting entrepreneurship. This in-turn needs critique if the university is to be repurposed for wider, communal benefits. Tom Woodin then situates these emergent realities historically, through the lessons to be taken from the development of co-operative HE. This enables an alternative analysis that emerges from the specific historical context of public versus private educational provision in the UK.

This historical and material focus has implications for academic leadership on a transnational scale, and this is addressed through Mike Neary's analysis of the voices of those who both work inside the university and who have opposed the subsumption of academic labour to financialization and the market. Neary's interviews with those who have demonstrated leadership in resisting the neoliberal restructuring

of HE in the global North begin to articulate a theoretical understanding of public intellectualism, as a form of mass intellectuality. To extend this cultural, public intellectual analysis and in similar transnational contexts, Martin Eve then explores the ways in which positive rhetorics and projects that extend the open and public reach of HE research have been recuperated by neoliberal governance systems. By addressing the co-option of open access, the section ends by questioning the societal value of business-as-usual models for public HE, and what forms of leadership practice might enable alternatives to emerge.

The second section examines *Potentialities* for change and radical experiment in various transnational contexts, alongside their ramifications for reimagining leadership as a distributed, democratic activity. This section asks whether it is possible to reimagine the university democratically and co-operatively? If so, what are the implications for leadership not just within the university but also in terms of HE's relationship to society? Joyce Canaan outlines her engagement with Brazilian resistance to extreme neoliberalism in the pedagogic practices of the Landless Movement. She uses this to discuss the impossibility of being an intellectual worker in the neoliberal university and questions whether the concept of mass intellectuality enables a meaningful analysis of democratic leadership outside the global North. The argument then moves to examine social movements rooted in pedagogy, through forms of resistance inside the university. Eurig Scandrett questions the specific, enhancement-driven space of Scottish HE with reference to case studies of environmental justice, resistance to gender-based violence and trades union activity. Scandrett situates the experience of the knowledge worker against that emerging from within social movements, to address the possibilities for alternative forms of leadership.

Developing this approach, the section then looks at the germination of two specific strands of academic leadership as forms of struggle to reclaim HE. In the first, Jenny Pearce engages with strands of mass intellectuality as they emerged historically in Bradford University's Peace Studies curriculum and the CommUNIty project, as they were infused with a material and cultural analysis of sociability in Latin America. In this work, Pearce questions the relationships between academics and social movements, revealed through the curriculum and the possibilities that emerge. Clark and Jackson then develop a theoretical/practical case study grounded in performing arts, which questions the place of HE in the production of artistic and cultural leadership. This analysis develops the meaning and purpose of arts education in its relationship to societal leadership as it emerges in the global North.

The final section is rooted in *Praxis* and looks at practical, alternative initiatives that are rooted in critical pedagogy and physical places beyond the university. It asks whether a focus on mass intellectuality as a form of distributed, democratic leadership enables alternative reimaginings of HE. The section begins with the Birmingham Autonomous University's (BAU) six theses on the collective failings of the hegemonic university, and the possibility that exists for creating a co-operative form of societal engagement. The Birmingham, UK, collective shapes its response as a means of striking against the methodological university. Joel Lazarus then develops an auto-ethnography of an alternative education project in Oxford, UK, which looks at leadership and managerialism, framed by the idea of the organic intellectual in society.

Lazarus uses the experience of the People's Political Economy (PPE) as a case study of what might be achieved.

The wider global and transnational context of resistance to marketization and financialization in HE is then situated against a critique of the Lincoln Social Science Centre, UK, by Gary Saunders. This is an established alternative that offers a means of analysing the governing principles and leadership modes of other, transnational alternatives, to frame questions about their co-operative and democratic, practical and theoretical viability. Tom Henfrey then develops the idea of alternative responses to leadership in the face of global, socio-environmental crises, through an eco-critical, thematic approach to mass intellectuality, rooted in the ethics of environmentalism. This enables the alternatives discussed in this book to connect to a wider environmental and transition/resilience agenda and its relationship to formal HE. The section then concludes with Sara Motta's comparative analysis of indigenous communities and women of colour in the Escuela Política de Mujeres Pazifica (Political School of Pazifica women) in Cali, Colombia, and the Family Inclusion Strategy Hunger (FISH) collective based in the Hunter Valley, Australia. This analysis specifically relates co-operative, inclusive educational practices of creating ourselves, our relationships and communities differently. It challenges the coloniality of knowing-being as it is reproduced in the geopolitics of knowledge production of contemporary capitalism and Higher Education. The potential for mass intellectuality to be decolonized by feminized and racialized subjects on the margins enables a unique analysis of educational leadership that is embedded within political-pedagogical, emancipatory horizons.

Finally, the book is rounded off with an evaluation and systematic critique of the collaborative approach adopted in its production. Gordon Asher analyses the ways in which co-operative writing and publishing inside the university might enable voices to be heard that are against and beyond the valorization of academic labour. Uncovering the production processes of this book and the methods through which its ways of knowing the world are articulated, then becomes a mechanism for analysing the possibility for distributed leadership. Here, co-production, deliberation and negotiation in and through writing are potentially a form of mass intellectuality that affects our perceptions of democratic leadership.

A thematic critique of leadership

These chapters also connect with a series of themes related to the critical study of academic leadership.

The relationship between hegemonic leadership and academic labour

In enabling an exploration of this hegemony, Shukaitis focuses upon the development and management of pedagogical labour, to articulate how education reproduces a specific social field, in particular through free labour and entrepreneurialism. Meanwhile, Neary focuses upon dissent and the articulation of academic freedom

that emerges in response to a perceived lack of senior leadership and sector-wide fragmentation. For Eve, this fragmentation is amplified through open access, by corporate finance and the instantiation of capitalist social relations across academia, in his case through the commodity form of research material.

For BAU, the exploitation of academic labour by managers and the potential for engaging in struggles within the university related to overwork are central. This is situated through a project of reimagining independent, working-class education against the methodological university. This is echoed by Lazarus, in his focus on *post*-capitalist, critical HE that can be prefigured in the ends *and* means of public HE projects. Motta problematizes this space of struggle, by asking us to consider who is silenced and who is spoken-for and what kind of knowing-subjectivities are reproduced and curtailed. In attempting to describe this struggle, Clark and Jackson identify how theory relates to practice, and they couple the teaching of technique with both critical thinking and sociocultural awareness.

The realities of hegemonic leadership

For Canaan, there is a risk that the dominant discourses about HE catalyse forms of leadership and governance that 'kettle' or predefine subjectivity. Clark and Jackson analyse this in terms of the development of sites for the production of the 'cultural entrepreneur' or 'artistic leader', as alternatives. Saunders argues that such sites demand new approaches to the university governance, in its structures and organizational cultures, as a response to new public management. This involves a redistribution of power through a negative rather than an affirmational critique that exposes or unmasks elite perceptions.

Alternative models of leadership as forms of counter-hegemony

Shukaitis highlights the importance of articulating multiple positions inside the classroom and enables an appreciation of the impact of pedagogical struggles on normative leadership discourses. This is situated inside the relationship between counter-hegemony and critical pedagogy, as a process of decolonizing the classroom. Neary then describes the relationship between counter-hegemony and public intellectuals, to open up a space to discuss the dualities of abstract/academic and concrete/intellectual. For Canaan, the Brazilian landless movement offers a way to move beyond imposed 'fences', for instance those related to literacy, and to imagine new models for leading. She argues the need to address concrete experiences, rather than to impose abstracted models of leading from the global North.

In terms of developing new forms of leading as a social process, BAU argue for militant research and the importance of workers' enquiry, to nurture the Commons. Both Scandrett and Pearce look at historical and material spaces for resistance that enable the reproduction of liberating praxis in the university. They argue, akin to Canaan and Motta, that these come from the margins and position intellectual leadership in its interface with dialogic emancipatory movements. Where this coalesces, it might start to build a counter-narrative. For Clark and Jackson, this counter-narrative connects

to the idea of a suitable 'aesthetic education' and the 'artistic leader', which requires a whole context of critical thinking as its accompaniment.

Lazarus uses the case study of the PPE to link alternative models to social movements and community projects that are engaged in participative action research. Saunders argues that these kinds of methodologies also enact democratic pedagogy and democratic self-organization, which also expose the contradictions of the current model of HE. He positions the Social Science Centre somewhere between reform and revolution, as a moment of popular education that creates the possibility of a social, co-operative university. Henfrey views permaculture as a separate form of popular education with potentially transformative power for formal education and wider society, through its celebration and practical use of diversity. Motta uses the examples of FISH and the Escuela, as social movements that are committed to practices of epistemological prefiguration, to expose the epistemological blindness of coloniality reproduced in the concept of Mass Intellectuality itself.

The attributes of counter-hegemonic leadership

Neary argues that intellectual leadership and public intellectualism are moments of resistance to dominant forms of cultural conformity among academics. He positions this against the efficacy of student protest, to develop the idea of public intellectuality. For Eve, this work rests on ideas of co-production and the mutual harnessing of intellectual labour, while for Scandrett, the experience of engagement with social movements promotes dialogic characteristics in leading problem-solving. From these different contexts, there emerges a moment of leadership, rather than a focus on leaders, that is rooted in a critique of consent through conflict.

Pearce also highlights the importance of academics contributing to a process that aspires to generate democratic exchange between the academy and the community. This is a form of experimentation with 'horizontal' rather than 'higher' education. The BAU's theses connect to this idea of democratic exchange through mutual recognition, good conversation and practical reflexivity, as the basis for a new 'sensibility'. Such reflexivity underpins Henfrey's focus on highly distributed and networked contributions to communal educational projects. This collective work questions the methods and institutional forms that are appropriate, and is a moment of subversion in developing and operating alternatives with explicit ethical roots. Motta also sees a commitment to deep epistemological listening that implies a disruption of the established coloniality of knowing. Storytelling using multiple literacies forms a part of this and can be an active process of developing subjectivity and critical epistemological practice that is transformative.

Articulating the problems with alternative forms of leadership

Shukaitis argues that there is a tendency towards the gifting of free labour across networks based on distributed leadership, such that individuals become self-exploiting. Pearce situates her analysis of CommUNIty around the tensions that exist in the multiple motivations, expectations and backgrounds of participants. These are heightened

through the subjective effects of the prevailing knowledge production system, which can be both empowering and disempowering. She argues for an 'articulating movement' that can acknowledge and repurpose the knowledge that emerges from experience. For Lazarus and Saunders, sustaining alternatives is impeded by the very foundational constituents of capitalist reality – space, money, personal energy and particularly time.

Contradictions in developing mass intellectuality as form of resistance

For Scandrett, mass intellectuality emerges through resistance-as-praxis. This is especially important because in the ongoing crisis, universities are spaces in which the structural contradictions of neoliberal capital are so explicitly being played out. Clark and Jackson see one response as being a return to curricula and practices that stress the underlying features of human perceptive capability. For Lazarus, meaningful engagements with crisis lie beyond the simple emancipation of academic labour, since intellectuality is a component of all labour and of all humanity. He argues that the democratization of the general intellect necessitates the cultivation of mass intellectuality across society.

Eve argues that capitalism transforms academic labour into productive labour, and that any democratic hopes for open access tend to be subsumed by its co-option and recuperation, for instance inside systems of individualized incentivization. In Lazarus's terms, this opens up the immanent contradiction between *mass* intellectuality as a useful form of practice and *higher* education as a positional good with exchange-value. Canaan and Motta argue that the concrete contexts that generate new forms of human capacity and collective agency need to be viewed from the perspective of the global South. Motta also argues that new emancipatory subjects emerge out of the historic and contemporary experiences in which they are produced as the non-subjects of modernity. Their critique as living and lived praxis thus decentres the knowing-subjectivity enmeshed within the public university, opening our horizons to other onto-epistemological visions of mass intellectuality.

Our final, crucial question for academics and students who labour inside the university then becomes, what is to be done? Neary argues for a new form of higher learning that emerges out of the negative dysfunctionality of the capitalist university. He asks 'what do we wish for?' and this forces us to consider how the corporate university disables self-direction and self-governance. Motta wishes to see emerge the conditions for participants' reoccupation of their colonized selves, as the space from which decolonizing emancipatory practices of mass intellectuality might flourish. She argues however that these experiences, also, shine a light on the ways in which we are all wounded in differentiated ways by coloniality and thus open possibilities for alternative intellectual practices more generally. Pearce shapes her answer to this through shared and co-operative 'public' spaces and forms of provision, which align with the BAU demand for the abolition of the methodological university. Both Lazarus and Saunders situate such an abolition against the generation of a social, co-operative university. This is a space that serves a democratic, emancipatory agenda, rooted in collective ownership and co-operative participatory governance. This is founded on a radical reconceptualization of labour.

Institutionalizing democratic leadership

We conclude this chapter by addressing the 'crucial question' posed by the book ourselves: What is to be done? One critical response discussed in some of the chapters and already found in both the global North and global South focuses on the co-operative. This is a constitutionally democratic organizational form with a long history in progressive international politics and that holds education as one of its core principles. Since the mid-nineteenth century, 'Co-operators' have built a worldwide social movement of member-led organizations based on the common ownership of property and its democratic governance (Yeo 1988). Education has always been a core principle, alongside open membership, autonomy and independence, solidarity with other co-operatives and concern for community. The internationally agreed co-operative values are self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity (MacPherson 2007).

Since 2010, a growing body of research into co-operative HE (Winn 2015a) has emerged that points to three routes to a 'co-operative university': first, the formal *conversion* of existing universities into co-operatives through legal and constitutional means; second, the *dissolution* of our institutions into de facto co-operatives by constituting research centres as co-operatives, embedding co-operative values and principles into institutional strategies and leadership roles, establishing taught programmes of study along co-operative values and principles and so on; and third, the *creation* of new co-operative forms of HE alongside the existing system of universities. Whichever route that might be opted for – and we should pursue them all – there are no quick fixes. Co-operatives are not a panacea for the forces of neoliberalism or the personal ambitions of some academics, managers and administrators. However, there are deep historical and social resources to draw upon within the co-operative movement that can help us rethink the way our universities are run, the institutional form that they take and the nature and role of leadership within a democratic organization.

Critics of the 'co-operative university' might question our commitment to the idea of the 'public university'. Indeed, co-operatives are antithesis, but they also exceed the idea of 'public ownership' with that of 'common ownership', a social form of property that is the anti-thesis of the right of free alienability which distinguishes capitalist private property. In short, co-operative HE is entirely compatible with the idea of the 'public' if we reconceive it as a 'commons': an academic commons, democratically controlled by academic and support staff, students and others.

Although the co-operative form of member-owned and democratically controlled organization has historically been adopted primarily for the benefits of an exclusive single member type (e.g. workers or consumers), a more recent form of co-operative that is becoming widely adopted around the world is that of 'social co-operatives' (also called 'solidarity' or 'multi-stakeholder' co-ops). This historically recent form of association emerged in the 1970s has been gradually obtaining legal status in different nation states. In 2011, the 'World Standards of Social Co-operatives' was ratified after a two-year global consultation process. We emphasize that this is a new form of association, one that was not available to the founders of most twentieth-