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Terms and definitions

Associate Dean

Associate Dean in this thesis refers to the Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching), a role which is variously called: Director of Teaching Quality, Assistant or Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning), Associate Dean (Learning or Curriculum) and Dean (Teaching and Learning) (Lines, 2000). These positions were introduced to lead and manage improvements in learning and teaching at a local (institutional) level.

Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC)

The ALTC was established in 2008 as a general government sector agency to enhance the learning experience of higher education students by supporting quality teaching through a range of initiatives. The ALTC replaced the Carrick Institute (See Carrick Institute).

Australian Qualification Framework (AQF)

The Australian Qualification Framework (http://www.aqf.edu.au/) is Australia’s national quality assured framework of qualifications in universities. As of 1 January 2015, all academic qualifications needed to meet the requirements of the AQF.

Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA)

The Australian Universities Quality Agency was established in 2000 to promote, audit, and report on quality assurance in Australian higher education. It was a national agency that undertook quality audits of self-accrediting institutions based on a university self-assessment and a site visit. All operations were transferred to the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) in 2011.

Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice

Theory of Practice, as conceptualised by Bourdieu (1984), is the result of the complex, relational interplay between the three main concepts of Field, Capital, and Habitus (See Field, Capital and Habitus). In this thesis, theory of practice was constructed by looking at the interplay between the Field, the Capital and the Habitus of the Associate Deans. Through this interplay, the practice of the Associate Dean is made visible.

Capital

Capital, as conceptualised by Bourdieu (1986) and used in this study, refers to the assets which Associate Deans bring to and develop in their role and which enable them to operate optimally in the role. There are four areas of Capital: Economic, Social, Symbolic and Cultural Capital, with Cultural Capital having three strands, Embodied, Objectified and Institutionalised Capital. Bourdieu thus extends the concept of capital beyond financial assets to other forms of advantage. Capital gives one ‘agent’ ascendency over another ‘agent’ in the ‘game’, that is: in power relationships in the Field.

Carrick Institute

The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education was established in August 2004 as part of the then Government’s higher education reform package – Our Universities: Backing
Australia’s Future – to provide a national focus for the enhancement of learning and teaching in Australian higher education institutions.

createED

createED was a project funded by the Office for Learning and Teaching (2009-2011) to set up a network that would facilitate those in learning and teaching leadership roles in the Creative Arts to work together in a national strategic knowledge network. The aims of the createED network were to enhance leadership capability, to address issues of learning and teaching importance and to publish about learning and teaching leadership in the context of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). The createED network transferred its membership to the Creative Arts Learning and Teaching Network in 2012.

Creative Arts Learning and Teaching Network (CALTN)

The Creative Arts Learning and Teaching Network was funded by the Office for Learning and Teaching in 2012 as a learning and teaching network under the guidance of a Council of Deans and Directors of Colleges, Faculties and Schools of Creative Arts. It initially investigated and reported on pedagogic developments in performance-based training as a priority area.

Dean

A Dean in Australian universities refers to the Head of a grouping of schools to whom usually Associate Deans and Heads of School report. Depending on the scale and the institutional nomenclature, the Dean is variously known as Pro Vice-Chancellor or Executive Dean. This position is on the university executive and is responsible with the Vice Chancellor and other Deans for strategic leadership of the university.

Deans of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (DASSH)

The Australasian Council of Deans of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (http://dassh.edu.au/) is the authoritative agency on research, teaching and learning for the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (ASSH) for Australian and New Zealand universities. In 2009, an Associate Dean Network of DASSH was established to provide Associate Deans with professional development, relationships with colleagues in similar roles, and the means to advocate and influence public policy regarding issues of education, teaching and learning.

Discourse

Discourse, with a capital “D” as conceptualised by Gee (1990) and used in this thesis, is the enculturation of an individual in a particular way of seeing the world from being immersed in a culture or, in the case of this study, a discipline for a number of years. At a university, this could be a medical doctor, a biologist, an artist, an architect, or an historian and so on. It is a deep internalised process which forms their identity as part of this group. The ways they use language, thinking, feeling, believing, dressing, valuing and acting within the Discourse gives them identity and a sense of belonging to particular groups.

Doxa

Doxa, as conceptualised by Bourdieu (1984) and used in this thesis, refers to the unstated, taken-for-granted assumptions that people accept in their everyday worlds, sometimes referred to as common belief or popular opinion. This can come in the forms of beliefs which the individuals within the Field
accept without question or the structures and processes within which they work that are never questioned.

Expert Associate Dean

A prototype (see Prototype) of the Expert Associate Dean in this study was created by identifying from the literature the capabilities or hallmarks needed for strategic leadership, while recognising that the institutional context also provides hallmarks which enhance the strategic leadership capabilities of the Associate Dean.

Faculty

Faculty is a grouping of a number of academic disciplines or sub-disciplines commonly referred to as schools or departments in a university’s organizational structure. Depending on the scale and the institutional nomenclature, faculties are variously called Colleges, Divisions, or Groups and are led by Dean (See Dean).

Field

Field, as conceptualised by Bourdieu (1984) and used in this thesis, is a concept referring to a setting in which agents and their social positions are located. The social agents (or players) who inhabit the Field engage in transforming or conserving authority within it. The Field constructed in the thesis is that of the Associate Dean.

Habitus

Habitus as conceptualised by Bourdieu (1984) is a concept referring to the intrinsic characteristics (personal dispositions) of an individual that have been determined by prior experience in life (Primary Habitus). Habitus can change, to some extent, if there is social change or an individual enacts change through reflection. An individual can acquire new aspects of Habitus as they move through new contexts but always keeping much of their original way of seeing and being in the world.

Hallmark

A hallmark in this study is drawn from a characteristic identified in the literature as representative of one of the central tendencies of the prototype of the Expert Associate Dean. Each hallmark of the prototype of the Expert Associate Dean contributes to the Capital needed by them in their strategic leadership role. A hallmark is a defining characteristic for success.

Head of School

A Head of School is responsible for leading an academic discipline or sub-discipline as an organisational unit in a faculty (See Faculty).

Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA)

The Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (herdsa.org.au) is a scholarly society committed to the advancement of higher and tertiary education, encouraging and disseminating research on teaching and learning and higher education development. It was formally founded in 1972 to promote the development of higher education policy, practice and the study of teaching and learning.
Layer

The analytic framework for exploring the leadership of learning and teaching by the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts comprises four layers – the Associate Dean, the University, the higher education sector and the Global Context. While the layers of the Field are separated for simplicity of presentation, in reality, the role of the Associate Dean is affected concurrently by all layers.

Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT)

The Office for Learning and Teaching was established in 2011 by the Australian Government to promote and support change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching. The OLT replaced the ALTC which in turn replaced the Carrick Institute. In 2016, it was proposed to be replaced by a new learning and teaching institute, however it was subsequently closed by the presiding government.

Prototype

A Prototype is created by identifying the central tendencies of a set of objects that are seen to be similar or fit together, in a category. A prototype embodies the typical exemplar of a category and as such serves as a basis for category membership. Constructing an Expert Prototype View provides a foundation for understanding the “general factors” or “central tendencies” of expertise, given that “[e]xperts bear a family resemblance to one another and it is their resemblance to one another that structures the category ‘expert’” (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995).

Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoLT)

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), involves research into practices of teaching, and learning and curriculum in disciplines. SoTL thus includes analysing, critiquing, documenting, sharing and sometimes publishing the results of investigations into student learning.

Senior Academic Leadership

Senior Academic Leadership refers to those in positions of leadership and authority over tertiary academic disciplines and can include Vice Chancellor, Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellors and Deans, depending on the scale and the organisational governance structure of an institution. Senior academic leaders set the directions for the university, and set up partnerships, expansions, and strategic initiatives.

Strategic leadership of learning and teaching

Strategic learning and teaching leadership refers to a type of leadership that goes beyond traditional leadership of a group of people in a school to using well considered strategies to bring about change and transform expectations within a whole university, and its sub-division, the faculty (Ling, 2005). This includes establishing a vision and direction, communicating it and aligning stakeholders to it and enabling, motivating and inspiring academics to participate, engage and contribute to its realisation. The Associate Dean has a formal position to lead learning and teaching strategically in the Faculty.

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency is Australia's independent national regulator of the higher education sector. TEQSA registers and evaluates the performance of higher education providers against the Higher Education Standards Framework - specifically, the Threshold Standards.
It also oversees the new Australian Qualification Framework (AQF) of qualifications in universities. As of 1 January 2015, all qualifications must meet the requirements of the AQF.
Abstract

Enhancing learning and teaching practice is increasingly important in Australian universities. Since university education has become available to a larger and more diverse cross-section of the population, and the world has become more change reliant, learning and teaching practices have needed and continue to need to be improved.

Over time, universities have been pushed by successive governments to enhance learning and teaching quality by transforming traditional university pedagogical practices and encouraging strong learning and teaching leadership. The role of Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) has emerged in this context with the aim of creating a strategic focus for the development of learning and teaching within universities. But the role of the Associate Dean, as found in this study, continues to be undermined by entrenched behaviours within institutions. These are expressed, for example, through the appointment of people who do not necessarily have the personal assets for success in the role, and through inadequate institutional support for the role. In the context of Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, personal assets and institutional support contribute to the Capital required to succeed in the Field.

The aim of the study is to understand better the leadership capabilities of Associate Deans in their strategic leadership role for the Creative Arts in Australian universities. It explores what personal and contextual characteristics are needed to equip them for the role, and suggests ways of strengthening leadership in the future. A social constructivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm underpin the study, using Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice as both a methodology and a critical lens, to explore the complexity at the individual and the multi-relational and contextual levels in which Associate Deans work. The study is the first to focus in depth on Associate Deans as leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts. It looks at the capabilities, or hallmarks, identified in the literature as needed for strategic leadership, and develops an exemplar, or prototype, of the “expert” Associate Dean, recognising the institutional context in which strategic leadership is enabled. Associate Deans who participated in the study are assessed against the prototype. The results indicate the degree to which participants are equipped for strategic leadership. Whilst Associate Deans, as reflected in this study, may be interested and passionate about what they do, the findings demonstrate that the majority were not fully equipped to provide strategic leadership of learning and teaching. While several personal aspects were identified which prevent the majority of Associate Deans from operating with optimum success, perhaps more limiting for the strategic leadership role are the contextual aspects within universities which restrict the authority of the Associate Dean, making exercising strategic leadership extremely difficult.

Through analysis of the key factors affecting strategic leadership by the Associate Dean, this study suggests leverage points for the higher education sector, universities and Associate Deans through which strategic leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts can be enhanced. Ultimately, unless a radical change occurs that disrupts the status quo of the traditional university, the present limitations on strategic learning and teaching leadership of many Associate Deans will continue. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be of benefit to those seeking a transformation of the strategic leadership of learning and teaching by the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts.
Introduction and Context for the Study

The task is “...to uncover the most profoundly buried structures of the various social roles which constitute the social universe as well as ‘mechanisms’ which tend to ensure their reproduction or their transformation” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 7).

This Chapter introduces and provides an overview of the study. It describes the pathway into the study, the rationale, aims and research questions. The research design is briefly outlined, followed by the context of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary of how the thesis is organised.

As Australia’s higher education system becomes increasingly sophisticated, corporatised, competitive, technology-enabled and global, university leadership of learning and teaching remains an area that requires significant focus, as well as research and investment, if it is to respond to the national and global demands made upon it (Barber, Donnelly, & Rizvi, 2013; Marshall, Orrell, Cameron, Bosanquet, & Thomas, 2011; Holt, Bennett, Challis, Falk, Huon, & Jones, 2010; Fullan & Scott, 2009; Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008; Southwell, West, & Scoufis, 2008a; Norton, Sonnemann, & Cherastidtham, 2013; Pricewaterhouse Coopers Australia, 2016). In particular, strategic leadership of learning and teaching in universities requires aligned strategies across all faculties/divisions/colleges/departments (“faculties” hereon), including those with Creative Arts disciplines. This is to ensure high quality experiences for students and transference of strategies, enabling students to become critical, conceptual and creative thinkers, who can build knowledge and skills in inter-, trans-, and multi-disciplinary ways in new contexts. The Associate Dean has a significant role in the strategic leadership of learning and teaching across schools in university faculties. However, it is reported in the literature that Associate Deans experience many difficulties when they attempt to exercise strategic leadership (Lines, 2000; Kift, 2004; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a; Bullen, Gibbings & Brodie, 2010; Marshall et al., 2011). In addition, recommendations from these cited studies aimed at addressing these difficulties have not been taken up in a systematic way across the university sector.

The aim of this study is to better understand the leadership capability of the Associate Dean in their strategic leadership of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts in Australian universities and how it could be strengthened. Associate Deans in the study are situated at the faculty level, the majority with responsibility for learning and teaching across multiple disciplines, including Creative Arts. Specifically, the study uses a Bourdieusian (Bourdieu, 1984; Bourdieu & Wacqant, 1992) lens to explore the Field – or setting – in which Associate Deans and their roles are located in universities, and the personal or contextual Cultural, Social and Economic Capital – or assets – which Associate Deans either bring to the role or which are afforded by the university and/or broader higher education sector context. Bourdieu calls the combination of these forms of Capital, Symbolic Capital. The findings of the study provide insight into how university processes, structures and interactions, as well as the personal attributes of Associate Deans, interact to contribute to or detract from this Symbolic Capital, thus influencing the Associate Dean’s strategic leadership capability.

This Bourdieusian analysis reveals the complexity of the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean and the challenges they face in realising that role. A number of capabilities or hallmarks, both personal and contextual, which are reported as necessary for strategic leadership of learning and teaching are drawn from the literature, including research on leadership, learning and teaching

*Consistent with current common practice, ‘they’ and ‘their’ are treated as both singular and plural pronouns in this study.
leadership, university management and organisational change. Hallmarks are categorised into the three types of Capital – Cultural, Social and Economic and are then aggregated in this study to develop a “...prototype-based categorization” (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995, p.9) or prototype view of the “expert” Associate Dean. A prototype embodies the typical exemplar of a category and as such serves as a basis for category membership and represents high Symbolic Capital in the Field. Constructing an Expert Prototype View in a Field provides a foundation for understanding the “general factors” or “central tendencies” of expertise of the Associate Dean, given that “[e]xperts bear a family resemblance to one another and it is their resemblance to one another that structures the category ‘expert’” (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995).

In Chapter 4, Associate Deans participating in this study are assessed against a prototype of the ‘expert’ Associate Dean. The majority are found not to be fully equipped, or capable, to meet the expert category. To provide a broad descriptive categorisation, a typology of strategic leadership capability is developed in Chapter 5 comprising “Stars”, “Rising Stars”, “Copers” and “Strugglers”. Each Associate Dean is assessed as aligning to a respective category in the typology. From this analysis, recommendations, or leverage points, as they are named in this study, are developed and offer a pathway to strengthen the strategic leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans responsible for the Creative Arts.

This study is important and timely given the learning and teaching challenges faced by universities and the Creative Arts disciplines in an increasingly globalised higher education sector. The outcomes of the study, including the notions of an exemplar prototype and a typology of capability for strategic leadership, may be used by others to examine other leadership roles of learning and teaching in the Australian higher education sector. The study also demonstrates how Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice can be used to map the relationships of different hierarchies of “players” (Bourdieu, 2005a, p.43) in organisational contexts.

The study extends previous exploration into the leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans. It focuses specifically on Associate Deans with Creative Arts in their remit, undertaking a holistic exploration of their leadership of learning and teaching which involves both the specific disciplinary needs of the Creative Arts and the learning and teaching leadership role of the Associate Dean. The study concentrates on the interplay of individual, institutional, sectoral and global influences on leadership to create a rich picture of the individual and collective leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans across the Australian higher education sector. It is one of struggle for identity for the Associate Dean amidst a traditional academic culture which is often focused on promoting research rather than teaching,

What may appear as a sort of collective defence organized by the professorial body is nothing more than the aggregated result of thousands of independent but orchestrated strategies of reproduction, thousands of acts which contribute effectively to the preservation of that body [traditional academic culture] because they are the product of the sort of social conservation instinct that is the habitus of the members of the dominant group. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 151),

In the next section, I describe how I found my way into this PhD study.

Pathway into the Study
This study arose through my role as Project Manager and co-leader of createED from 2009 – 2011, a national Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) funded project (de la Harpe & Peterson, 2009). The project focused on strengthening strategic leadership of learning and teaching across Creative Arts disciplines through the design and implementation of a national, multidisciplinary, cross-institutional, strategic knowledge network. The project was designed to create a network, using both a face-to-face and an online approach, for those in learning and teaching leadership roles, Associate Deans or equivalent, across the Creative Arts disciplines, including Architecture, Art, Creative Writing, Design, and Performing Arts (Dance, Drama and Music).

The createED project was initiated because it was recognised that while strategic learning and teaching leadership in universities in the Creative Arts was critical to the future of the disciplines, it is not strongly implemented. Few studies exist that directly address learning and teaching leadership in the Creative Arts (Blackmore, 2007; Ostwald & Williams, 2008; Zehner, Forsyth, Musgrave, Neale, de la Harpe, Peterson, Frankham, Wilson, Watson, 2009; Drew, 2005) and none focus specifically on the Associate Dean role in this leadership, apart from the recent research by de la Harpe, Mason and Peterson (2011) which was generated by the createED project (de la Harpe & Peterson, 2009).

As the project unfolded, however, each of the core assumptions that underpinned the createED project about the role of the Associate Dean, in relation to leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts was challenged. These included that Associate Deans were the strategic leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts; opportunities for professional development and working in multi-, cross- and trans-disciplinary ways would be enthusiastically embraced by Associate Deans on the network site; the purpose of and direction for the online network would be collectively determined; and, both online and face-to-face and disciplinary and local level member engagement would be forthcoming and make the network successful (see Appendix 1.1). The most fundamental of these assumptions was that a group of Associate Deans was active in strategically leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts and that they would welcome the opportunity to develop their understanding and belong to a network which would give added strength to their collective “voice”. In reality, there appeared to be no definitive group of Associate Deans who identified themselves as strategic leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts and many were not interested in joining such a network (de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson, 2011).

For me, in my project manager and co-leader role, exploring the research on virtual communities indicated that building an online community was difficult. Regardless, the reluctance of learning and teaching leaders to take up the invitation to join the createED network and the forwarding on to other staff of emails rather than responding themselves could not be rationalised as simply a reluctance to communicate virtually. Similarly, the face-to-face elements of the project faced the same issues, if less pronounced. This led to asking the question “Why is this the case”?

Uncertainties began to arise around who was leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts. If it was not the Associate Deans, what prevented them from providing leadership? In response, the project leaders conducted informal interviews with 11 Associate Deans during the second year of the project. These interviews revealed that there were issues for the Associate Deans around leadership of learning and teaching. Dilemmas uncovered included varying titles and roles, differing time fractions and workloads, changing university contexts, dispersed disciplines, varying role perceptions, complex relationships with disciplines and communication difficulties (de la Harpe & Mason, 2012).

A professional network was not going to resolve the issues outlined above. What had been taken for granted – Associate Deans leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts – was found only to
exist in a fragmented way. This awakening provided the springboard for my exploration into the strategic learning and teaching leadership of the Associate Dean for the Creative Arts.

**Rationale for the study**

To understand the rationale for a study such as this, it is necessary to go back in time, starting in the 1950s. Over time, universities and faculties have grown bigger, student cohorts more diverse, including students from other countries, disciplines have become more hybridised and new technologies, such as online learning, have taken hold. As well, governments and employers increasingly demand better student learning outcomes (Martens & Prosser, 1998; Guthrie & Neumann, 2006; Doyle, 2006; Hayford, 2003; Chalmers, 2007). As a result, by the 1990s local faculty strategic leadership became an increasingly important component of realising institutional learning and teaching change imperatives.

The development of the Associate Dean role as leader of strategic change began to emerge in some universities as early as the 1990s, although many Associate Dean positions were not created until the 2000s (Southwell et al., 2008a). Roles were typically situated within a matrix organisational structure model underpinned by a collaborative paradigm (Kift, 2004; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a; Bullen et al., 2010). Roles were, however, often ill-defined, and were created alongside central, university-wide teaching and learning units (established in universities in the 60s, 70s and 80s), and sat within the faculty and outside the discipline-based hierarchical structure. Titles for the role varied, such as Director of Teaching Quality, Assistant or Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning or Curriculum) and Dean (Teaching and Learning) (Lines, 2000) at a time when faculty level strategic leadership was becoming an increasingly important component of realising institutional learning and teaching change imperatives.

The Associate Dean role or equivalent was created to lead and manage improvements in learning and teaching strategically at a faculty level or as a “…catalyst for change…[with responsibility for] strategic planning...as well as upwards and sideways management...[and was] expected to be...a representative of faculty at university level” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 50). It was also developed to be the conduit for university policy between central university leadership and schools in faculties and to provide “…hands-on and operational support” to those locally (Radlof, 2005, p.75). Strategic learning and teaching leadership by an Associate Dean refers to a type of leadership that uses well considered strategies to bring about change and transform expectations within a whole faculty, and its sub-divisions. This means supporting schools within a faculty to align themselves in their goals to university directions.

Leadership of the Associate Dean in this context was based on “authority” embedded in the individual’s personal characteristics and expertise and requiring an ability to win “followership” in the collegiate culture of the academy (Scott et al., 2008, p. 4). Marshall (2006) showed the subtlety of such nuanced leadership through the leader having “…the knowledge and skills necessary to increase the “favourableness” of the situations in which [formal learning and teaching leaders] must lead” (p.2). Increasingly, however, over the last twenty years, as the quality assurance measurements increased in stringency; they have become increasingly the “stick” of accountability to bring about change.

The very few studies on Associate Deans that have pointed out the challenges or “symptoms” associated with the role have not explored the personal and contextual aspects contributing to the success of the Associate Dean role, as this study does. This is the first to explore in depth the strategic leadership role of Associate Deans in leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. Further, the study is not simply a review of the challenges faced by the Associate Deans for the
Creative Arts since the 1990s when the role was first developed. It goes further back in time, from the late 1950s onwards, to reveal the contexts which shaped the role and the challenges faced.

There are two major Australian studies that have focused on the leadership of learning and teaching and have included Associate Deans, Learning and Teaching. The studies are: *Caught between a Rock and Several Hard Places* (Southwell et al., 2008a) and *Learning Leaders in times of change* (Scott et al., 2008). Both studies were supported and funded by the Australian Government under the then Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in higher education which became the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Priority Project schemes.

*Caught between a Rock and Several Hard Places: Cultivating the roles of the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) and the Course Coordinator* (Southwell et al., 2008a) focuses on developing a framework for an institutional leadership teaching and learning program to enhance the leadership capacity of Associate Deans and Course Coordinators across three institutions (Queensland University of Technology, University of New South Wales and Charles Darwin University). The aim of the project was to “…identify a set of strategies that would build leadership capacity for excellence in teaching and learning at the Associate Dean and Course Coordinators level. The emphasis was on system and institutional level themes and strategies” (Southwell et al., 2008b, p.5). They identified a gap: that there were “few programs specifically designed to develop the leadership skills of university staff with responsibility for teaching and learning. Most training models come from the management literature and are based on executive coaching and management” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 7) and the project focused on addressing the area of professional development to address these absences.

The Associate Deans in Southwell et al.’s (2008a) study found leadership the most problematic aspect of their role. While there is an extensive body of work exploring leadership generally (Collins, 2004; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002; Jossey-Bass, 2007; Heifetz, 1994; Kotter, 2012), this literature often focuses “…on managerial/business models, which [are] context specific and difficult to apply to the higher education sector” particularly when there are many leaders who operate often through a dispersed leadership model (Southwell, et al., 2008a, p. 5). Literature on learning and teaching leadership is also less common (Jameson, 2006; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Debowski & Blake, 2004; Marshall, et al., 2011; Scott, et al. 2008). What literature there is “…mainly focuses on the Vice-Chancellor (President), Faculty Deans and Heads of School (Department Chairs) (Amey, 2006; Huntley-Moore & Panter 2003)” (Southwell, et al., 2008a, p.20) rather than Associate Deans. From the year 2000, however, describing the role of the Associate Dean attracted a little more attention.

Southwell et al., (2008a) use a “servant” leadership model to develop the influencing nature of the leadership role of the Associate Dean, “[t]his idea of the leader as servant draws on a very different set of characteristics, including social skills, empathy, awareness, stewardship, foresight, persuasion and a commitment to community building (Greenleaf, 2003)” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 23). Whilst there is a case for suggesting that change is related to getting others on side and that being able to relate well to staff is critical for this, the model is also problematic because it places Associate Deans in a “servant” relationship in a hierarchical structure and the findings of the study include that “…the effectiveness of the role [is] dependent upon recognition and utilisation of the role by faculty and school heads” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 103) and that role clarity is central to the effective participation of Associate Deans and Course Coordinators. The recommendations of their study relating to these points were not followed up across universities.

*Learning Leaders in times of change* (Scott, et al., 2008) centres on the formal leadership roles for learning and teaching in universities. Implicit in his study is that there is a dispersed leadership of learning and teaching which relies on each position having an understanding of its particular role.
The learning and teaching leadership positions include the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Dean, Associate Dean, Head of School, Head of Program to the Director of Study. The study involved 300 learning leaders from twenty universities across Australia. The study included defining academic leaders’ roles; identifying the meaning of leadership in an academic context; opening up the daily challenges faced by these leaders and exploring the question of effective performance; finding out from leaders what capabilities and support they needed to carry out their differing roles and identifying key similarities and differences between the roles.

Table 0.1 Areas of work focus ranked by importance
(Source: Scott et al., 2008, p.54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work focus</th>
<th>DVC</th>
<th>PVC</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Assoc/ Asst’t/ Head</th>
<th>Head of School/ Dept</th>
<th>Program Head/ Coord</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Assoc/ Asst’t Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing relationships with senior staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying new opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing other staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing teaching activities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on student matters</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing learning programs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within the University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly research</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing organisational processes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own professional development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to ad hoc requests</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering presentations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaising with external constituencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with complaints</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing reports</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing peoples performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget management</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional research</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were invited to rate from 1 – 26 their leadership responsibilities in order of importance against broad terms such as “reviewing teaching activities”, “strategic planning” or “staff development” (See Table 1.1).

Associate Deans ranked their top five responsibilities as strategic planning, developing policy, reviewing teaching activities, participating in meetings and developing organisational processes (see Table 1.1) but because there were no definitions of what these aspects of roles were, it is difficult to draw conclusions as to the actual role of the Associate Dean in relation to other leaders. The study also identified a set of leaderships capabilities believed to be required for all leaders of learning and teaching (See Figure 1.1).

![Academic leadership capability framework](Redrawn from: Scott et al., 2008, p.18)

The capability identified by Scott et al as most important for the Associate Dean was persuasion and personal interaction or emotional intelligence. Exercising emotional intelligence in leading others is required to integrate with other key capabilities. This suggests that up-to-date knowledge and skills; being self-aware, decisive, committed and able to empathise with and influence a wide diversity of people; and being cognitively flexible and deft at diagnosis and strategy formation are required for effective leadership. The study points out that those in learning and teaching leadership roles, such as the Associate Dean, often found themselves grappling with the role, that the role was not easy, and that they had to “…develop the skills of ‘leading through influence’ and leveraging collegiality to engage staff in necessary change” (p. vii).

In Scott et al.’s (2008) recommendations, priority was given to developing exact descriptions of the Associate Dean role in relation to other leaders of learning and teaching in the faculty. This recommendation, as well as other recommendations in the study, and in Southwell et al.’s (2008a) study, have not been systematically adopted across the university sector. The findings reported here will contribute to understanding the complexity of the problem and provide some insight into causes and possible solutions for its intransigence.
Aims of the study

The aim of the study is to understand better the strategic leadership capability of the Associate Dean for the Creative Arts in Australian universities in a complex, contested and constantly changing cultural terrain and how it could be strengthened. In order to examine the complex role of the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts, the following research questions are explored.

Research questions

1. What personal and contextual characteristics equip an Associate Dean to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts and what does expertise look like?

2. To what extent are Associate Deans in Australian universities equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

In addition to these research questions, based on the findings, a further issue to be addressed is namely,

How the strategic leadership of Associate Deans can be strengthened to enhance their leadership role in learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

Research design

The complexity of relationships in a university and the influences of structures, processes, and expectations on the Associate Dean are explored using a social constructivist epistemology and Critical Theory paradigm, with a mixed methods methodology. The study uses Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice (1984) as a theoretical framework. Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice was chosen because it is able to explore the relationships and interrelationships within a complex organisational framework with its accompanying structures of power. It also recognises the subjectivity of the reflexive researcher and that the present is always influenced by history although it may appear hidden. In choosing this critical lens I was conscious that it reflected my own ontological positioning as a subjective and reflexive researcher (See Chapter 3). The Theory of Practice specifically focuses at the level of the individual Associate Dean to explore the assets or their economic, cultural, or social Capital. Such Capital is either intrinsic to the individual Associate Dean or afforded to them by the broader context or Field. Collectively, this Capital is referred to as Symbolic Capital and is the source of authority for Associate Deans in the university. Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice is based on the complex, relational interplay between the three main concepts of Field, Capital, and Habitus. Each of these terms is now explained.

The Field of the Associate Dean refers to the setting in which Associate Deans work. The Associate Deans together with other “players” who inhabit that same Field or setting engage in transforming or conserving authority within it. The Associate Deans capacity to “play” in this Field is dependent on their Symbolic Capital in relation to the Symbolic Capital of others. Capital refers to the assets which Associate Deans bring to or develop in their role or which are afforded to the role by the university and which enable them to operate – either optimally or otherwise. The amount of Symbolic Capital possessed by different people or “players” in the university or within the Field gives “...player[s] ascendency over other ‘player[s] in the ‘game’”. The third concept of Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice is Habitus which refers to the intrinsic characteristics, or personal dispositions, of an individual that have been determined by prior experience in life (Primary Habitus). In this study, the Theory of Practice is used to explore the interplay between the Associate Dean and the Field. Through this exploration, the practice of strategic leadership by the Associate Dean is made manifest. The
methodology reveals the personal and contextual factors, which either challenge or enable the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean both overtly and covertly.

One of the key strategies adopted to facilitate the study was to give structure to the overall Field of the Associate Dean, allowing for close analysis of each layer. This permits issues of Capital to be assessed in the context of their respective Fields. The analytical framework in Figure 1.2 was developed to both focus the research and present the findings in a coherent way. However, while the chosen layers of the Field are separated for simplicity of presentation, in reality, all layers simultaneously affect the role of the Associate Dean.

![The Field of the Associate Dean](image)

**Figure 0.2** The analytic framework for exploring the leadership of learning and teaching by the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts.

The framework comprises four layers to encompass what equips the Associate Dean for their leadership of learning and teaching, namely:

**Layer 1:** the **Associate Deans** themselves, focuses on the personal assets that they bring to their role

**Layer 2:** the **University** context, comprises the context in which the role of the Associate Dean is situated, including relationships, processes and structures within the university

**Layer 3:** the **Higher Education Sector**, focuses on the external context of the Associate Dean outside of the university, including Government policies, external networks, grants and award bodies
Layer 4: the Global Context, covers the global trends that influence the leadership role of the Associate Dean, such as globalisation, internationalisation and technology.

An in-depth literature analysis has been undertaken to determine what features of strategic leadership of the Associate Dean are critical to their role. These have been identified as hallmarks which when aggregated allow for a prototype view of the expert Associate Dean to be developed (Rosch, 1973; Sternberg & Horvath, 1995). Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) underpins the research design through the setting of the survey questions to the analysis of the findings. Data analysis includes both bottom-up (data driven) and top-down (theory driven) thematic analysis approaches (Merriam, 2009).

For the top-down analysis, Marshall et al.’s Dimensions of Leadership and Management (Marshall et al., 2011) is used given they are current and specific to the leadership of learning and teaching in the Australian context and have been validated through a recognised peer review process (Marshall et al., 2011). In addition, the Structured Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy (Biggs & Collis, 1982) is utilised as it measures the conceptual understanding of the respondents to the broad area of leadership in learning and teaching. The ability to evaluate open-ended responses “…retrospectively in an objective and systematic way that is also easily understandable” (Biggs & Collis, 1982, p. xi) was desirable. The SOLO taxonomy is academically robust, evidence-based and well-established and was described by Hattie (2012) as “…the most powerful model for understanding these levels [of understanding]”. This was the reason it was chosen above other models such as the Approaches to Teaching Inventory, developed by Trigwell and Prosser (2004) or Kember’s Conceptions of Teaching (1997).

The Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work (Goleman, 2004) was chosen because emotional intelligence was reported as being critical for the role of the Associate Dean (Southwell et al., 2008; Scott et al., 2008) and because Goleman’s theory of emotional intelligence is used extensively in the learning and teaching leadership literature (Fullan, 2006; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008). Lastly, the Degrees of (disciplinary) Integration (Miller and Boix-Mansilla, 2004) was chosen to measure the capacity of the Associate Deans to comprehend, or at the highest level, to enculturate disciplinary differences. This work “…builds on knowledge and modes of thinking that have survived the scrutiny of expert communities using commonly agreed upon methods and validation standards” (Boix Mansilla & Duraising, 2007, p.219). Using this critical mixed methods research approach, a rich picture emerges of the leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans for the Creative Arts.

In order to gather data from Associate Deans about their strategic leadership of learning and teaching, semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with 25 Associate Deans from 20 Australian universities which offer Creative Arts disciplines. Associate Deans were identified through university websites and all Associate Deans (N=55) in Australian universities with Creative Art disciplines in their remit were invited by email to be interviewed. Semi-structured interviews allowed the interview to be guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, yet at the same time were open-ended enough to allow respondents to take the questions in their own direction (Merriam, 2009). Interview data was supplemented by information from university websites, such as university organisational structures and research focus and publications of the Associate Dean.

The next section addresses in some detail the context in which this study of the Associate Dean role was conceived. It includes six key discrete power struggles that operate together in the university sector to create the cultural context which affects all staff who work within the university. These struggles have influenced both the conception and the ongoing framing of the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean leading to its current positioning and effectiveness.
Research context

The accumulated history of learning and teaching interventions within Australian universities laid both the foundations and built the structures or “generative matrix” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 19) through which the Associate Dean role was conceived and has evolved since. The past is important because “…histories matter…they inform and remain embedded in the present” (Threadgold, 2007, p. 14). A complex, contested and constantly changing cultural terrain with many factors, both historical and contemporary, affect the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean. Struggles for dominance within the context of the university have impacted the role and six of these struggles have particular relevance for their capacity to exercise strategic leadership. These are: 1) the struggle between the Australian Federal Government’s push for enhancing learning and teaching quality and the established Australian university culture; 2) the struggle between the corporatisation of universities and traditional academic leadership; 3) the struggle between the traditional university culture and the Creative Arts disciplines; 4) the struggle between generic learning and teaching leadership and the importance of disciplinarity in learning and teaching leadership; 5) the struggle between new paradigms of learning and teaching and traditional pedagogical approaches to teaching; 6) the struggle between what is required for strategically leading learning and teaching and the reality of structures and processes on the ground. Each of the struggles is discussed in turn, below, followed by the implications of these struggles for the leadership role of the Associate Dean.

1. The struggle between the Australian Government push for enhancing learning and teaching quality and the established Australian university culture

In Australia, there has been, and still is, a struggle between the traditional university culture and the desire by successive federal governments for greater accountability in the quality of teaching and learning governance and policies. The demand by governments to increase quality in learning and teaching in universities began in earnest in the late nineteen fifties. Successive reviews (Murray, 1957; Martin, 1964; West, 1998; Nelson, 2002; Bradley, 2008), policy changes (free university, 1974; Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS), 1987), and globalisation brought about change in the tertiary sector. Through this mechanism governments started to intervene more earnestly in university education. Interventions over the years emphasised the quality of learning and teaching and the measurement of outcomes. This brought about the creation of centralised learning and teaching units and the need for specialised learning and teaching leadership roles, since reviews revealed the need for improvement of quality assurance processes in universities as a whole, as well as for learning and teaching practices by academics in the disciplines. While the reviews created tension between the university sector and the Australian Government, they are important in the history of the role of the Associate Dean.

The Murray review (1957) was the first to set the scene for changes to learning and teaching across the higher education sector. Since the establishment of universities in the mid-19th century there had been virtually no control or influence applied by governments. The review was the first national and extensive investigation of Australian university education and heralded the beginning of government influence on higher education. The review included a focus related to undergraduate and postgraduate education, including issues associated with university policy formulation and administration. A significant matter recognised in the report was that while Australia needed
“sufficient graduates” this need was not being met due to high failure rates of students. The failure rate in 1957 was 58 percent, with first year students showing the highest dropout rate. Universities were found not to be well equipped for the influx of diverse learners that were demanding entry to university. The report concluded that failing students was “…one of the most disturbing aspects of university education in Australia...a national extravagance which can be ill afforded” (Murray, 1957, p.35). Serious questions began to be asked about the role of universities in the Australian community and recommendations from the report included increased expenditure so that universities could focus on increasing graduation rates for a more diverse student body, highlighting that universities were now not only for the privileged few. At this time, student demand was fuelled by increasing migration, a post-war explosion in birth rate, and the need by employers for a more highly qualified workforce (Marginson, 1997).

The Martin Review (1964) into higher education echoes the Murray Report in relation to student failure rates. It also makes several references to the importance of universities meeting the learning needs of students through improved approaches to teaching pointing out that,

...[there is] much evidence that teaching methods have not kept pace with advances in knowledge, and that insufficient attention is being given to the possibility of less formal lecturing, more and improved tutorials, and independent study programs which may include some vacation study. (p. 55).

The Martin Review suggests that teaching could be improved and calls for universities to address failure rates through research into a teaching pedagogy that allows for a more “active” participation of students in their learning (Martin, 1964, p.55). However Anderson (2008, p.35), points out many university senior leaders blame the failure rate on poorly prepared students, “…assuming that the cause of failure was in the nature of students rather than in the environment of learning and teaching...[and suggesting that] only those who were going to pass should be admitted”. Student attrition and retention became a politically sensitive issue.

As a consequence, some universities began setting up central units that focused on building a system of student evaluation, providing courses dealing with learning and teaching, and researching student attrition. The University of Melbourne was the first to set-up such a central unit in Australia, under the leadership of Barbara Falk. The unit focused on providing programs of induction and in-service training to academic staff, and confidential student feedback on a voluntary basis. Given the review findings of high failure rates of university students, it also set about investigating student selection “…in the confident expectation that all potential failures and border-liners among the applicants could be identified and rejected” (Anderson, 2008, p.35).

Martin advocated for the Creative Arts disciplines to be included in the university sector, as indeed Architecture and Music already were in a minority of universities, however political factors related to funding and the identification of Creative Arts with Technology interfered with this inclusion. The government consequently formed specialised Creative Arts Colleges for these disciplines which later became Colleges of Advanced Education within the new binary system of education (Martin, 1965). By keeping the Creative Arts disciplines separate from universities at this time meant that there was not a major review of Art and Design education as there was in the United Kingdom (Coldstream, 1960; Summerson, 1961). When the Creative Arts did later merge, the absence of a review of curriculum and teaching approaches may explain why there was no explicit recognition of disciplinary differences between the Creative Arts and the more traditional university disciplines. This has led subsequently to continuing struggles between the traditional university culture and the Creative Arts.
Change in the university sector continued unabated, however. In 1974 the Australian Government introduced free university education for all undergraduate students which generated an increase in the number of students enrolled into universities. Tertiary student numbers grew significantly from 32,000 in 1948 (Laming, 2001, p. 242) to 69,500 in 1963 (Martin, 1964, p. 33), with 125,000 predicted by 1975 in the Martin Review in 1964. In 1971 the actual number of full-time and part-time students in higher education in Australia was 195,250 and in 1975 enrolments had grown to 273,137 (Marginson, 1997, p.16). This figure was more than double the estimated number predicted for 1975 in the Martin Report. The increased student numbers put more strain on learning and teaching practices because the types of student coming into university were more varied.

As student numbers grew, more and more emphasis was placed on universities to enhance learning and teaching practices. Many academics were reported to “…merely read their prepared lecture notes that had been handed down from one generation to the next” (Falk, 2008, p. 26) and needed help to learn to interact with students and manage their learning to a greater extent. As a result, through the 1960s and 70s, many central university teaching research units expanded their focus to include support for academics to enhance their teaching practice, through voluntary projects or courses, and projects for conducting research into student learning began to be set up. Central units, such as that at the University of Melbourne, were reported to have “…put teaching ‘on the agenda’” (Lee, Manathunga & Kandlbinder, 2008, p. 16) in the university. Activism by students in the 70s about the quality of their education, continued pressure on universities to act in order to improve student learning and teaching experiences (Falk, 2008).

The Australian Universities Commission recommended In 1972, a decade after the first central learning and teaching units were voluntarily established in the 60s, that “…all universities should operate such units” (Australian Universities Commission, 1972) and that,

> [t]he Commission supports the establishment of such units. Student representatives who met the Commission stressed repeatedly their belief in the importance of such units as contributing to improved teaching. The Commission believes that all universities should operate such units. Their cost is not great in relation to total expenditure on teaching and research and there is evidence that considerable benefits flow from them. (p.102)

By the mid-seventies, most Australian universities had complied with this recommendation as shown in Table 1.2.

These teaching and learning centres pioneered research into higher education student learning and teaching, and published their findings, notably through HERDSA, however they found it difficult to establish a generic “place” (Lee, Manathunga & Kandlbinder, 2008) across the traditional university for the recognition of the discipline of higher education learning and teaching.

Over time the central units came up against the traditional university culture and despite the imperative of being charged with improving learning and teaching, they often suffered a lack of purpose around their role as they were marginalised by the universities. As Boud (2008, p. 61) pointed out, “[w]hen I first went to TERC [Tertiary Education Research Centre, University of New South Wales] almost everything we did was project-based and there was very little sense of strategic priority to any of it”. Buckridge (2008) from Griffith University echoed that, “[y]ou would have to say we were very navel gazing in CALT…something to do with being peripheral” (p. 147). Similarly, Nightingale (2008, p. 73) commented, “[t]here were never any real instructions about what the University of New South Wales university would like us to do. We would sit around and try to define for ourselves exactly how we functioned” (p. 147).
In addition, academic staff working in central learning and teaching units were often perceived by academics in schools as outsiders. Professional development for academic staff in faculties was voluntary in nature and advice and support from those in central units was sought out by only the committed few (Powell, 2008). The central learning and teaching unit was often diminished by those in the traditional academic heartland as Falk at the University of Melbourne recalled, "...our work to improve the standard of teaching and learning was regarded very much as a joke". (Falk, 2008, p. 30) Boud at the University of New South Wales pointed out that the "...biggest challenge at TERC was legitimacy" (Boud, 2008, p. 61), a sentiment reflected in the meeting of directors of central learning and teaching units held at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of unit</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Date of inception (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE)</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education Research Centre (TERC)</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Research Unit (ERU)</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Advisory and Research Unit (HEARU)</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Research Unit</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for advancement of Learning and Teaching (CALT)</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Centre for University Education</td>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services and Teaching Resources Unit</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Research and Services Unit (HERSU)</td>
<td>University of Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Research Unit</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education Institute (TEDI)</td>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Research and Advisory Centre</td>
<td>The University of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Unit in University Education</td>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conference, where they despaired about the things going on in their institutions and provided moral support for one another,

[t]here was a real sense that we [directors of central learning and teaching centers] were all pretty unloved and that it was nice to come together with people who could tell you it wasn’t what you did that created this but it was a common denominator in the style of our work. (p. 66).

An accidental symbol perhaps of the growing isolation of central units from the mainstream university was that of the learning and teaching unit at the University of New South Wales, which was housed in former World War II morgue huts whilst the new buildings of the university went up around them (Boud, 2008). Additionally, centres were also often questioned about both the financial cost and return on investment as follows, “…one of our biggest problems was that the Deans were always fighting for money. Very often they saw academic development as a waste of time and money” (Hore & Thomas, 2008, p. 87).

There is some suggestion that central units and academic directors or developers themselves needed to be better equipped to bring about learning and teaching change in order to be effective in their roles (Hicks, 1997; Brew, 2002; Hicks, 1999; Blackmore & Blackwell, 2006). It may have been seen that some of those charged with learning and teaching change in these central learning and teaching units did not have all the requisite knowledge and skills for the role and, therefore, this may have affected the traction or effectiveness of the central unit within the university as a whole (Fraser, 2001; Hicks, 2007; Land, 2001; Holmes, Manathunga, Potter & Wuetherick, 2012).

Regardless, learning and teaching units were often ignored or marginalised by the traditional academic culture in universities despite being implemented at the behest of the federal government. The trend of central units across the sector points to a collective struggle to find acceptance and a legitimate place in the traditional university culture and they have been largely limited in their response to the changing university landscape, fuelled by a sense of a growing lack of purpose and indifference from many school leaders and disciplinary academics.

The tentative and fragile positioning of centres and a stark reliance on senior leaders, such as the Vice Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellor as well as those in other senior leadership positions, for their authority and purpose within the university is highlighted below,

[w]here the Vice-Chancellor and Professoriate were supportive, the agenda of the centres and the institutions were seamless and congruent. In institutions where it was absent...the narratives reveal a deep sense of marginalisation, struggle for academic identity, disjunctions between institutions and the centres and questioning ambiguity of mission and purpose”. (Orrell, 2008, p.171)

In this context, despite the aspirational beginnings by the Government of the day, the marginalisation and lack of effectiveness of central learning and teaching units in the university over time may be indicative of the undermining and opposition which operated implicitly and silently, and which may have affected their position of authority within the university. It appears that from their inception these central learning and teaching units were set-up with no real authority and little support to bring about the significant change in learning and teaching quality required, and as envisaged by the university in their establishing them in response to government intervention. Their lack of purpose and authority led to them determining their own remit and mostly working “…with individual teachers rather than with the institution as a whole and [they] were rarely involved in
central policy-making or decision-making” (Gibbs, Habeshaw & Yorke, 2000, p. 352). They also found it difficult to collaborate with the learning and teaching efforts of academics because they were working against the entrenched, traditional culture of universities to improve learning and teaching. They were dependent for authority on senior management and as a consequence, were very vulnerable to changes in senior management.

As argued above, what started out as a significant change effort over the six decades ago to enhance and support learning and teaching quality under the presiding Government’s recommendations came up against the established Australian university culture. The marginalisation of central learning and teaching units revealed how learning and teaching expertise and support remained positioned outside the “traditional” academic culture. This trend continues since it has been reported that central learning and teaching units continue to be plagued by “...change and uncertainty...[and that] a majority of centres appear to have undergone, or are undergoing, significant change” (Holt et al., 2010, CADAD, 2009).

It was into this context, that the Associate Dean role would be introduced. A context that had a history where learning and teaching expertise and support was marginalised and its value, utility and impact questioned and resisted. This situation reflects Bourdieu’s position on cultural attitudes towards non-dominant groups in a Field such that, “...[o]rganisations have cultures which ‘take root, grow, evolve, and silently control the attitudes and behaviours of members even if no one is paying attention’” (Beattie, Thornton, Laden and Brackett, 2013, p. 62).

The next section explores the struggle between the corporatisation of universities and traditional collegial academic leadership.

2. The struggle between the corporatisation of universities and traditional academic leadership

Through the eighties and into the nineties, government initiated changes to education continued to be implemented with the most radical suite of reforms, referred to as the Dawkins Revolution, introduced in 1987–92. The reforms focused on higher education quality, diversity, equity and competitiveness. Government led changes focused specifically on enhancing equity of access to university and increasing the quality of learning and teaching, as well as improving the competitiveness of Australian universities in the international arena. The Dawkins reforms established the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) which “…strengthened a consumer culture by encouraging student evaluation of teaching and a focus on the employability of graduates” (Marginson, 1993b cited in Marginson, 1997, p. 233). The impact of the reforms resulted in stronger mandates for compliance and accountability, increased sizes of institutions through amalgamations, increased diversity of program offerings, rising international student enrolments, and diminished government funding, all of which forced universities to become more entrepreneurial and corporate.

Further Australian Government policy changes through the nineties made university public operating funding contingent on having an annually updated strategic plan that included information specific to learning and teaching directions (DEEWR, 2008). Universities were required to have clearly articulated strategic directions for learning and teaching aligned to university policy, rather than learning and teaching initiatives being introduced in ad hoc ways and this required strategic leadership. Initially, in many higher education institutions, Heads of School were given the task of leading and managing the federally mandated learning and teaching quality assurance requirements, but this proved unworkable. Heads of School came under severe stress having to administer, monitor and report on quality assurance processes and the new expectation was reported as straining inter-leadership relationships between Heads of School and Deans (Scott et al., 2008).
As a result, beginning in the nineties, the role of the Associate Dean was introduced into university structures to lead and manage improvements in learning and teaching strategically at a faculty level. This was a strategic leadership position which focused on educational development and change at an executive level,

> Approaches to educational development may be seen as falling into various schools...teaching oriented approaches, [and]...learning oriented approaches...these approaches to educational development continue in the current context but they are joined by strategic approaches, adopted by universities with an executive leadership that sidelines old collegial structures (Margison and Considine 2000) (Ling, 2005, p. 14).

Faculty leadership was becoming an increasingly important component of realising institutional learning and teaching change imperatives as these roles not only acted as a “…catalyst for change...[with responsibility for strategic planning]...as well as upwards and sideways management...[but] were expected to be...a representative of faculty at university level” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p.50), …and provide “…hands-on and operational support” (Radloff & de la Harpe, 2007, p.75) to those locally (p. 50).

The Hoare Report (1995) in the mid-nineties nominated the use of these strategic plans to manage performance and motivate staff as a key requirement to modernise Australian university management and governance. Within universities this put pressure on Faculty and school initiatives to be aligned to newly-developed, university-wide strategic plans and to take heed of centrally determined learning and teaching initiatives which universities were required to implement in an increasingly competitive global context. These accountability measures by government made quality assurance of learning and teaching central to university funding.

The West Review (1998) in the late nineties focused on developing a policy and financing framework for the sector to meet the nation’s social and economic needs for the next two decades. It identified that the existing funding framework resulted in universities having more incentive to invest in research than quality teaching, concluding that “[w]ith centrally-determined targets, there was little incentive for universities to be innovative in teaching” (Department of Education and Training, 2015, p. 14). Report recommendations, therefore, heralded a move towards a “student-centred” approach. The Australian Government, however, did not formally respond to the West Review and funding for learning and teaching remained largely unchanged.

The Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) was established in 2000, to promote, audit and report on quality assurance in Australian higher education. Audits were conducted to assess institutional quality assurance arrangements in teaching and learning, and research and management, as well as of overseas activities. The maintenance of standards consistent with university education in Australia were also assessed, through quality assurance and an increasing need for management and strategic leadership of learning and teaching across the university. The emphasis on assessment increased with “[q]uality assessment, quality assurance and quality enhancement...[receiving] greater attention within Australia and worldwide...” (Martens & Prosser, 1998, p. 28).

The Nelson discussion paper (2002) in the early 2000’s, outlined significant areas for tertiary reform including external governance by Government agencies. However, no changes were formally implemented and the control of university governance stayed within the remit of universities.
The Bradley Report (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008) recommended: the deregulation of the number of places a university could offer; the opportunity for students to take their government funding to the university they wished to attend; the stipulation that universities should take a specific percentage of low Socio-Economic Status applicants; and the development of a more stringent federal university accountability system through the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). This ensured that government interventions that advocated for the student continued to put pressure on the university in relation to learning and teaching.

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) replaced AUQA in 2008, and the strengthened Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) continued the focus on quality over subsequent years. Enhanced leadership and management for learning and teaching improvements remained critical in evolving university contexts. Pressure from the Government to foster better practices in learning and teaching and even “…the concept of the traditional university itself [was] coming under pressure and the various functions it serve[d] [were] unbundled…” (Barber et al., 2013, p.1).

Initially, there was a backlash to the ongoing Government interventions into universities outlined above with changes opposed by university Vice-Chancellors. Senior university leadership, however, could not continue to reject ongoing government reforms, “[h]igher education around the world [at this time] embodie[d] the paradox of resisting change and preserving enduring values while undergoing permanent transformation” as pointed out by Green (cited in Scott et al., 2008, p.14). Eventually government pressures, including diminished funding, made senior academic leaders accept some change and over time the relentless Government reforms “…outmanoeuvred Vice-Chancellors, academic staff, and student groups” (Croucher, Marginson, Norton, & Wells, 2014) with the style of senior academic leadership and governance inside universities changing to a more corporatised one. The leadership of universities between 1977 and 1997 showed that whilst the composition of the executive in universities did not change from the professoriate, their output of journal articles declined indicating that managerial functions were beginning to dominate (DEST, 2003).

The impact of the rise of managerialism rippled through universities, with Preston and Price, (2012, p. 41) observing that “…we are moving from academia being, as it were conceptualised as a self-governing commonwealth, into something which is more managerial, yet most people who are senior are people who grew up in the Commonwealth of Academia”. The relentless and ongoing reforms of successive governments brought to the surface the simmering tensions between academics, who had historically presided over the leadership of universities, and Government changes which were increasingly seeking to influence and bring about change to university governance and directions. Managing quality assurance was a significant change from past practice in universities and as universities expanded and changed, there was a perception that the collegial model from the past was under attack by a corporate model of university where the university and Government struggled over governance (DEST, 2003; Davis, 2008).

This resulted in a tension for those in leadership positions struggling with their former loyalty to collegiality and the new management paradigm. Deans, in particular, were torn when managing faculty who were firmly embedded in the traditional academic culture and central directions aimed at bringing about a change in culture,

...the situation puts Deans in the middle between two battling giants, [with] neither one eager, in most cases, to back down. (Wolverton, Wolverton, Gmelch, & Walter, 1999, p. 12)
Harman (2003) recalled that “[t]his was a contentious time...with academics attacking the new directions as instrumentalism, driven by economic rationalism and managerialism and undermining traditional collegial culture” (DEST, 2003, p. 14), cautioning that this corporate approach to university management could eventually weaken the academic influence on university culture and that administration would take precedence over academic integrity. He stated that “[t]his raises issues about decisions on future academic directions of institutions and also about the future of the academic profession” (p.69). Biggs (2002, p. 216) went even further suggesting that the rhetoric of the corporate university is “dismantling” and “reassembling” excellence in teaching and research “…to serve the competitive world of business”.

Despite oppositional voices to many of the elements of corporatisation, such as learning and teaching plans, university audits, performance reviews, and student feedback processes, from academics, these were nevertheless introduced systematically in institutions usually using a “…one size fits all approach” (Anderson, 2008, p.40). Now, engagement with teaching and learning by academics was not so much a voluntary activity as it was with the early central learning and teaching units, although few of them had volunteered in the past; instead, participation was becoming one of compliance.

The focus on quality was met with hostility by most academics. It was reported that “[i]n the minds of many...the quality systems have come to be associated with central control, relentless measurement, and ever increasing demands for more accountability to the system” (Patrick & Lines, 2005, p. 31). Some academics in faculties believed that quality assurance was a way to embed “…surveillance...in performance appraisals” (Anderson, 2006, p.163). Such rejection was widespread, with,

[the quality agenda has not been embraced by all in the sector, with many academic staff at best ambivalent and at worst hostile, to what is perceived to be increasing managerialism within universities and unreasonable external pressures from governments and their agents (Chalmers, 2007, p.12).

The result of the growing corporatisation of universities was that cracks started to appear in the collegial solidarity of universities. Academics within schools became increasingly frustrated by change and senior academic leadership, which they saw as adopting the corporate line, impacting their academic freedom to teach as they wanted and supporting the quality assurance which they loathed (Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure and Meek, 2011). Gibb, Haskin and Robinson (2009) reported that “…the strong sense of academic independence rooted in departments...[was proving a challenge for]...innovative leadership throughout the organisation” (p. 22).

In this context, whilst successive Government reports emphasised the significance of learning and teaching and lifted the profile and importance of the Associate Dean in leading learning and teaching in universities, making learning and teaching enhancement a focus, the downside was that it associated the Associate Dean with government red tape. Many academics perceived the push for quality as simply compliance driven, creating “busy work” (Radloff, 2008, p. 289) and the literature reflects that it did not impact the learning and teaching culture. This had repercussions for the Associate Dean who was often seen as the face of this new change-focused, managerial and corporatised approach and as a result they suffered not only from resistance from academic staff in the schools but also from the conflicting loyalties of the Dean’s collegiality with academics and the strategic change mandates and quality assurance framework which they were expected to drive,
[t]hese discipline-based academics [Associate Deans] shoulder the dichotomous responsibilities of supporting and promoting the top-level quality agenda (for example, by championing ongoing L&T [learning and teaching] innovation, improvement and evaluation), while simultaneously endeavouring to enable and support a growing minority of enthusiastic innovators in tandem with persuading the cynical spectators and the spoilers/obstructionists, about what is doable in pedagogy and why it should be done. (Kift, 2004, p. 8).

Thus, whilst the new quality assurance strategies may have strengthened the role of Associate Deans as formal learning and teaching leaders, legitimising the necessity for their position, it also provided a wedge between them and the academic staff in schools. The Associate Dean role became more and more focused on auditing learning and teaching practices and to effect the quality changes at the heart of this growing corporatisation and globalisation of learning and teaching. Thus, whilst, the Associate Dean’s role of management of quality assurance was strengthened by these Governmental changes, the role of strategic leadership of learning and teaching pedagogy and practice relied on the support of the Dean, who, as has been argued, often had divided loyalties. This added significant tension and pressure to the Associate Dean role.

As argued above, quality assurance processes and practices were central to the new managerial culture. It was into this context that the history and forces around the conceptualisation of the Associate Dean role both shaped and undermined it. While the need for a role to lead and manage quality assurance was evident, attitudes by academics to quality assurance immediately positioned the Associate Deans as “outsiders”. As the Associate Deans sought to find a place, they tried to fit in to the culture, and often compromised their role in order to do so. In the undermining of their own strategic leadership, they progressively became similar to the learning and teaching centres which preceded them. This reflects Bourdieu’s position in that they became victims of symbolic violence, where “…violence [is] wielded with tacit complicity between its victims and its agents insofar as both remain unconscious of submitting to or wielding it” (Bourdieu, 1998, p.17).

In the next section the struggle between the traditional university and the amalgamation of the Creative Arts disciplines into universities is explored.

3. The struggle between the traditional university and the Creative Arts disciplines

As part of the amalgamations by Dawkins’ in the late 80s and early 90s, the Creative Arts disciplines, many of which had previously been in technical colleges or Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs), were moved into the remit of universities. These amalgamations brought great changes that impacted on both the university and the Creative Arts disciplines.

The positives for the university were having Creative Arts disciplines linking with the community, through their galleries, theatres and auditoriums, exhibitions and performances. There was also a broader range of disciplines for students to study. The positives for the Creative Arts disciplines were that they had expanded facilities with more opportunities for both staff and students to diversify their studies, and they gained increased status as a result of being part of a university (Strand, 1998).

There were also, however, many negative aspects to the amalgamations. The negative aspects for the university included having disciplines that did not have a history or expectation of research, staff who did not generally have a higher education postgraduate research qualification and a studio teaching model that required cross-subsidisation to maintain its place in the university. The studio pedagogy of the Creative Arts was seen as different from the pedagogies of other university disciplines, notably the sciences and engineering. The model was associated with high costs, small class sizes, specialised equipment and high teacher contact hours which made the Creative Arts
disciplines “...marginally viable, and/or under threat” (Zehner et al., 2009, p. 24). The approach to research and teaching in the Creative Arts was diametrically opposed to the traditional ways of researching and teaching in the dominant science disciplines at university. Senior university academic leaders were reported as expressing concern that the amalgamations would bring about the “...erosion of academic standards...a decrease in the importance of basic research and the role of research in universities, and...the possible reduction of emphasis of international scholarly academic links” (Harman, 1991, p. 195). Questions continued over the years as to how these Creative Arts disciplines “...might reconfigure themselves for the knowledge economy” (Bullen, Robb & Kenway, 2004).

The negative aspects for the Creative Arts disciplines included a loss of autonomy and visibility, greater bureaucracy, studio teaching and assessment models seen as increasingly unaffordable as student numbers grew and budgets reduced in line with diminishing university funding (Strand, 1998). Despite this the studio model continued to be seen by Creative Arts as critical for its authenticity. While the reduction in university funding required an increase in student numbers, the Creative Arts disciplines resisted the increase and argued for the need to retain small class sizes given the studio mode of teaching.

Studio is perceived by academics in the Creative Arts to be central to all Creative Arts disciplines (Zehner et al., 2009). Studio draws from the atelier model – a master and apprentice approach to learning by project. The distinctive nature of studio integrates context, curriculum and assessment for learning in the Creative Arts. This “signature pedagogy” (Shulman, 2005; Sims, Shreeve & Trowler, 2010; Sims & Shreeve, 2011) embodies the values and ways of thinking of the Creative Arts disciplines which see creativity as emanating from the unconscious. A “...looser and more playful way of working” (Durling, Cross & Johnson, 1996, p. 6) is typical in studio, where

...students must begin designing before they know what it means to do so. They quickly discover that their instructors cannot tell them what designing is, or that they cannot learn what their instructors mean by what they do say, until they have plunged into designing...in the early stages of design studio, confusion and mystery reign. (Schön, 1988, p.2)

The creation of an artefact is core and requires this open approach, enabling the creator to re-conceptualise ways of feeling/thinking within the development of the task to create an original work. This is underpinned by creativity, “...the ability to transform an existing conceptual space in such a way that produces a design that we have not encountered before and redefines our expectations of designs within that space” (Maher, 2011, p. 93).

Learning comes about when the teacher “...models for (the student), displaying for her the competences he [sic] would like her to acquire” (Schön, 1983, p. 81). Student understanding develops by “reflecting-in-action” and part of that reflection comes about through feedback from the teacher which is embedded in the studio model in an “intuitive” and “unconscious” way (Schön, 1983).

Whilst studio is seen as core to the discipline and practitioners within cling to it, there are some criticisms. Major criticisms include a lack of autonomy for the student since the “sitting-by-nellie” approach is seen as involving mainly the teacher in improving the work of the student (Swann, 1986, p. 18) and a “design crit” culture that works against good feedback given the power position of the teacher over the student which is often identified as a factor in preventing listening and dialogue (Blair, 2006; Devas, 2004; Sara & Parnell, 2004). There is also a recognition that studio is not the same for all Creative Arts disciplines,
...although much is shared, there are also differences in studios with each of the broad differences of Art, Architecture and Design...[and that] despite widespread usage of the term [studio] there is divergence in intentions and meaning within disciplines, across disciplines and within institutions. (Zehner et al., 2010, p. 8).

The ongoing formative assessment and the small group context in which learning takes place makes studio teaching difficult to transfer into an online environment. This mode is more expensive to run as only small numbers of students participate in each class and assessing individual creative artefacts and the process of learning is also more intensive and complex to document, unlike many mainstream university teaching and learning approaches.

In this context, the amalgamation of the Creative Arts into universities may have indirectly impacted the role of the Associate Dean, as Associate Deans with Creative Arts in their remit had to negotiate between both the Creative Arts with its very distinctive and fiercely defended practices and senior university leaders with a more traditional outlook on university learning and teaching practices.

As argued above, the reality of diminished funding and the expansion of the global university were forcing disciplines in the Creative Arts to re-think their pedagogy (Ostwald & Williams, 2008; Zehner et al., 2009). Battles about studio pedagogy and how the studio model “fits” into the modern entrepreneurial global university continue to this day (Budge, 2012, Zehner et al., 2009).

This situation reflects Bourdieu’s position on how,

...the faculties which are dominant in the political order have the function of training executives able to put into practice without questioning or doubting, within the limits of a given social order, the techniques and recipes of a body of knowledge which they claim neither to produce nor to transform; on the contrary, the faculties which are dominant in the cultural order are destined to arrogate themselves (Bourdieu, 1984, p.63)

It was not simply that the disciplines were taught in very different ways, but the distinctive nature of the disciplines required a distinctive pedagogy rather than one that was generic.

4. The struggle between generic learning and teaching leadership and the importance of disciplinarity

There is a long tradition and body of literature that argues the importance of disciplinary differences in teaching and learning and that these disciplinary differences matter (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Becher, 1989; Biglan, 1973; Donald, 2002; Drew, 2008; Kreber, 2010; Trowler, 2008). Disciplinarity, according to Blackmore (2007) “...is one of the most important aspects, because of the nature and purpose of a university, the knowledge-based nature of its core functions, and the basis upon which staff, particularly faculty, are recruited” (p. 228).

It is suggested that the learning and teaching aspects of a discipline are integrally connected to their Discourse, with a capital “D” (Gee, 1990). Gee argues that the way we dress, the way we conduct ourselves, the words we use, and the values we hold dear all sit within Discourses and refers to this as,

...a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’, or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role’. (p. 143)
Discourses are “’ideological’...[and] involve values and viewpoints...One must speak and act, and at least appear to think and feel, in terms of these values and viewpoints” (Gee, 1990, p. 143). Each discipline has a Discourse which is “…integratedly connected (actually “married”) to complex and technical ways of thinking. [Discourses] are tools through which certain types of content...are thought about and acted upon” (Gee, 2004, p. 3). In so doing, “…it is not individuals who speak and act, but rather that historically and socially defined Discourses speak to each other through individuals” (Gee, 1990, p.145). Thus, it is not only the concepts of the discipline but everything connected with it, including the way it is taught, that is central to its functioning.

There is a view that the approach adopted in learning and teaching leadership in universities is generic and does not allow for the uniqueness of the disciplines (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Blackmore, 2007; Gee, 1990; Neumann, 2001), resulting in a “one size fits all” model (Blackmore, 2007; Neumann, 2001). This view has been reinforced in universities since they have increasingly standardised leadership practices that are top-down and centrally-based (Blackmore, 2007; Chalmers, 2007).

It has been shown that academics in disciplines are much more receptive to learning and teaching change initiatives when they come from inside the discipline area. For example, Blackmore (2007) argues that “…it is possible that beneath apparently similar practices may lie some very significant differences and that requirements for homogeneity produce a token rather than an actual compliance” (p. 227).

Similarly, paying attention to disciplinarity is important for collaboration and career progression in universities, as a “…[l]ack of attention to disciplinarity may make cross-disciplinary working, whether in senior management teams or in research projects, more problematic and less successful. It may also inhibit talented faculty from moving into senior positions. For all these reasons, paying attention to disciplinarity seems vital” (Blackmore, 2007, p.237). Thus, leaders of learning and teaching at the more central university level need to work closely with the disciplines, since,

...a coherent and supportive faculty and institutional approach to learning and teaching and its development is required for departmental leadership to be effective. (Marshall et al., 2011, p. 8)

In this context, leadership of learning and teaching by the Associate Dean is more effective if it considers the perspectives of the disciplines and demonstrates a deep understanding of the importance of disciplinary differences. It is in the context of a central “generic” leadership of learning and teaching approach versus the desire for a more disciplinary-focused one that the Associate Dean role operates.

Challenges to a model of generic leadership of learning and teaching from those in the disciplines created a dilemma for the Associate Dean charged with bringing about change across a faculty. The Associate Dean with Creative Arts in their remit was expected to lead learning and teaching and negotiate between the Creative Arts disciplines whilst navigating university learning and teaching plans. As a leader trying to bring about change they were caught between two very different cultures which made the role all the more complicated and requiring deft leadership skills. They were also caught in an impossible situation. To understand the discipline, they needed years of apprenticeship in its behaviours but at the same time they had several disciplines in the faculty. This situation reflects Bourdieu’s position that,
The principle of the dynamics of a field lies in the form of its structure and, in particular, in the distance, the gaps, the asymmetries between the various specific forces that confront one another. (Bourdieu & Wacqant, 1992, p. 101)

Such a position requires either that the Associate Dean has entry points to work with a range of disciplines, which is unlikely, or a staffing structure which enables the strategic learning and teaching positioning of the university to be translated into the various disciplinary schools.

The focus on disciplinary or generic approaches to learning and teaching is also complicated by the struggle between the call for a more contemporary approach to learning and teaching than what was traditionally being enacted in universities in both the Creative Arts and other disciplines.

5. The struggle between new paradigms of learning and teaching and traditional approaches to teaching

For at least the last two decades, as outlined above, there has been a call for all academics to enhance their learning and teaching approaches significantly and for universities to facilitate this change in response to shifting paradigms, technological change and global student mobility.

In the late 80s and early 90s the calls for a move to a student-centred learning paradigm became prominent (Biggs, 2002; Barr & Tagg, 1995; Ramsden, 1992, Kember, 1993; Trigwell, Prosser & Waterhouse, 1999; Shuell, 1986). The focus was moving from the teacher and their teaching to the student and their active participation in learning. During this time “[t]he teacher-focused/transmission of information formats, such as lecturing, began to be criticised and this...paved the way for a widespread growth of ‘student–centred learning’ as an alternative approach” (O’Neill & McMahon, 2005, p.27). For academics, this meant moving from a position of being the repository of knowledge to being required to adopt pedagogies that facilitated student learning through the action of building it. This approach focused on enabling “...independent, autonomous learners who assume[d] responsibility for their own learning” (Weimer, 2002, p. 15). The growing recognition of the need for student agency in their own learning – learning was not about a set curriculum, but about students conceptualising the discipline and being able to apply it and to extend it in other contexts (Bok, 2006; Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998; 2013; Chalmers, 2007; Fink, 2003; Meyers, 2012; Southwell et al., 2008a; Tagg, 2003) started to be signalled. The view was that “[t]eaching methods have to change. We can’t rely on delivering content anymore — it’s all about contextualisation, ways of thinking, and the student experience - University Provost “(Ernst & Young, 2012, p. 7). This paradigm shift away from being teacher-centred to an emphasis on active learning by the student in higher education demanded pedagogical change and challenged many academics to revise their practices considerably.

Additionally, in the early 2000s, the potential of technology to enhance learning and teaching was taking hold (Sandholtz, 1997; Jonassen, Mayes, & McAlleese, 1993). Whilst this direction obviously had economic and expansionary benefits, the growing technological advances, for example, the advent of Learning Management Systems (LMSs) provided new opportunities for engaging students in their learning and this put further pressure on the educational models and frameworks traditionally used by academics.

There were also extraordinary changes to the demographics of students in Australian universities. In 2007, “...over 26% of enrolments”, that is, over 250,000 students, came from overseas and were full fee paying students (Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure & Meek, 2011, p. 132). The growing international student cohort added pressure on academics to diversify and modernise their curriculum and pedagogy to connect with international cohorts and the greatly expanded world in
which all students participated. Curricula required internationalisation and hybrid curriculums to respond to global changes. As de la Harpe (1997, p.9) pointed out early in this change “...the need to offer curricula relevant to local and international students, to give students the cultural understanding and sensitivity they need as global citizens and to give staff and students the chance to participate in an international environment” became important.

In response, the assumption that academics could intuitively teach in this dynamic environment was beginning to be questioned by some since “[a]lthough university lecturers are usually strong in content knowledge relating to their discipline, many have limited knowledge of theories of learning and strategies of teaching” (Ballantyne, Bain, & Packer, 1999, p. 237). As pointed out by Norton et al. (2013),

...historically, academics have had little or no preparation for teaching. The student population’s increasing diversity and technology-based learning make teaching a more complex task. Staff need a sound understanding of learning theories and how to apply them in their work...it is ironic that the very institutions that exist to provide training for key professions do not yet require similar standards for their own staff. (p.62)

Regardless, the resistance from academics to calls to make changes to their teaching practices has been enormous (O’Neill & McMahon, 2005; Barber, Donnelly & Rizvi, 2013; Norton, Sonnemann, & Cherastidtham, 2013; Pricewaterhouse Coopers Australia, 2016, Ernst & Young, 2012). As Tagg (2012) points out for academics in biology education,

[t]he general perception is that while there are pockets of change driven by individual faculty, there is little evidence that the majority of our faculty members are reconsidering their approach to teaching, despite dozens of formal policy documents calling for reform.

Bringing about academic change in teaching practice is difficult. Support for making positive changes to learning and teaching practices is frequently rejected by the very constituencies they are intended to serve - academic teaching staff (Radloff & de la Harpe, 2007). Engaging academics in professional learning comes up against significant barriers and beliefs that academics hold (de la Harpe, Mason, McPherson, Koethe & Faulker, 2014) and “…many university teachers choose to ignore both the theory and research, and stick with traditional teacher centred models” (Sparrow, Sparrow, & Swan, 2000).

As argued above, moving to student-centred teaching pedagogies, embracing new technology and teaching a more diverse cohort was challenged. Universities faced a tension between the continual push for change and the reluctance of academics to focus on changing their teaching. In line with Bourdieu, most critical was the dominant traditional university culture with its “...traditions and power influencing hierarchies and pressure groups (Bourdieu, 1999) [which] play[ed] a major role in both constraining and shaping the nature of higher education institutions and their capacity to adapt to change” (Gibb, Haskins & Robertson, 2009, p. 11).

In this context, the Associate Dean was expected to play a significant role in leading academics in schools to change their curriculum and pedagogy. The assumption that the Associate Dean role could lead change in individual academic pedagogical practice could be seen as a significant expectation of the Associate Dean role from the outset, demanding of them extraordinary knowledge, skill and capacity to enact such change. Academics in schools continued to reflect Bourdieu’s position in that,
[w]hen habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a “fish in water”: it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted. (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 127)

In the next section the struggle between what was needed to succeed in the role versus what was enacted on the ground is explored.

6. The struggle between the perceived strategic role of leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans and the reality on the ground

Fundamental to effective leadership including of learning and teaching is having a clear purpose and role. However, as early as 2000, it was reported that Associate Dean Learning and Teaching roles suffered a lack of clarity, in that “[t]he roles tended to be very broadly described in relation to improving the quality of teaching and learning and include[d] anything to do with teaching and learning environments that nobody knows what to do with” (Lines, 2000, p.44). In 2004, Kift confirms this vagueness in relation to the Associate Dean role describing it as “…interspersed between top-level university management structures on the one hand and the overcrowded classroom and the overburdened teacher on the other”, placing the role between “…a rock and several hard places” (Kift, 2004, p. 8). Similarly Associate Deans in the study by Scott et al., (2008, p. 59) report the “[f]uzziness of the role” as amongst the five most challenging or least satisfying aspects of their role, while Southwell et al. (2008) identifies a lack of clarity and weak conceptualisation of the Associate Dean role, including a role description that is ill-defined, pointing out there is,

...not even a common position description for an Assistant Dean role across the faculties...the incongruity of the Assistant Dean (T&L) appointments married with an unclear position description that was interpreted in a myriad of ways...culminated in a double-edged sword; a position that was innovative and an important step in the teaching and learning areas, yet problematic in its structure due to anomalies around accountability, authority, and responsibility. (p.61)

Recommendations to improve the clarity of the role of the Associate Dean generally are reported by Bullen et al., (2010), Kift (2004), Radloff (2005) and Southwell et al., (2008a) and definitions of what the role should be have continued to be written, suggesting the underlying fuzziness of the role.

Bullen, et al. (2010) describes the role of the Associate Dean as being expected to “…assimilate, integrate, distil, interpret and implement operational and strategic learning and teaching plans through effective leadership and thus is arguably the key position for providing leadership in [Engineering] learning and teaching” (p.3). Marshall et al. (2011), concur and place the Associate Dean role in the ‘meso’ structure of the university which gives the Associate Dean a precise role to “…interpret institutional priorities, translate them into faculty – or department-level actions and encourage staff to support these...[and]...to create a culture where teaching [was] supported” (p. 99).

Further adding to the confusion about the role is an absence of induction and ongoing professional development. For the Associate Dean role there has been little induction or ongoing professional learning offered (Kift, 2004; Southwell et al., 2008a; Bullen et al., 2010). Current induction practices include a limited or general induction to the role or no induction at all. Ongoing professional development of the Associate Dean is also reported in the literature as an issue for the Associate Dean role, with most having to learn,
...through trial and error in (and by surviving) their leadership and management experiences...there appear to be few programs specifically designed to develop the leadership skills of university staff with responsibility for teaching and learning. (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 7)

Bullen et al. (2010) confirm this when they write about Associate Deans Learning and Teaching in Engineering, “[t]he successful applicant is not often prepared for the new role and learns through a combination of advice from colleagues and the successes and failures of their leadership and management experiences” (Bullen et al., 2010, p. 4). The difficulty of developing a professional learning program that fits within the dynamic role of the Associate Dean is identified by Preston and Price (2012), who report that a professional development program they attended on leadership did not realise the nature of the Associate Dean role, in that,

...those who attended the first one [Academic Leadership Program] felt this failed to hit the mark, largely because those who designed the course seemed to be unclear as to what the role of AD actually was. (p. 415).

It is concluded that an essential component of appointment to the role requires “…an induction process that addresses the leadership role and how this role fits within the specific university context policies and vision documents” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 9).

One of the challenges of the role is that of managing or bringing about change (Scott et al., 2008), which has at its heart the need to “...challenge and transform followers’ expectations” (Marshall, 2006, p.7 For Radloff (2005), in a Faculty of Life Sciences, the Associate Dean role includes a focus on change management, “These are senior academic positions with responsibility for leading educational change, and enhancing and assuring the quality of teaching and learning across all programs within a faculty” (p.74).

However, changing ways of thinking and behaving is challenging. Senge (1999, p. 149) argued that managing change is one of the most difficult and complex processes for any leader and is “…like trying to rebuild a large sea vessel while sailing it through unknown waters. With everything in flux, there’s no solid place to stand”. University contexts are challenging environments in which to bring about change (Fullan and Scott, 2009, p. 33-35) and are characterised by,

- cultures which are change averse or which seek to white-ant out necessary reform
- structural planning, review and administrative processes which are unresponsive, unnecessarily bureaucratic, unfocused, and which do not add value
- decision making, accountability, funding, and reward systems which are inefficient or unaligned
- patchiness and inconsistent quality in the delivery of core activities of learning, research, and engagement and the associated services which underpin them
- change implementation strategies which are either unproductive or non-existent
- inappropriate approaches to leadership selection, development and performance management.

A major frustration for the Associate Dean reported by Lines (2000) is the difficulty of enforcing strategic initiatives, and finding it problematic to achieve change,

[we] kind of write it [learning and teaching policy] and it hits a vacuum at the Faculties. There isn’t a coordinated way of making it happen. (p. 12).
This finding is echoed by Southwell et al. (2008a),

...leading and implementing change, was the area where [Associate Deans] considered themselves to be least prepared and least able to have a meaningful impact. (p.21).

Yet its importance is reinforced by Scott et al. (2008),

Managing change requires a significant set of capabilities. These include: personal capability, including self-regulation and decisiveness; interpersonal capability, including empathising and influencing; cognitive capability, including diagnosis, strategy, flexibility and responsiveness; and finally leadership competency in learning and teaching, including learning and teaching knowledge, university operations, and self-organisation (Scott et al., 2008). Associate Deans in common with other educational leaders indicate ...that improvement in their capacity to bring change successfully into practice is their highest priority for professional development and personal improvement...Associate Deans...provided the highest ratings for this area. (p. 94-95)

In short, for the Associate Dean role, bringing about change is very difficult and is not simply about convincing people of new directions but helping them to “unlearn” what they have internalised (Scott al, 2008, p.xiv). Thus, senior managers and Human Resources need to link leadership capabilities, including capabilities to bring about change to recruitment and appraisal processes for the role of the Associate Dean. Scott et al. (2008) made a specific recommendation for linking requisite leadership capabilities with the recruitment of learning leaders and their development and review once in the role.

Important too for the Associate Dean is having underpinning knowledge of learning and teaching since the appointment of an Associate Dean could be made without any evidence of formal or informal knowledge of learning and teaching theory or pedagogical content knowledge (Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a). For example, Southwell et al. (2008a, p. 151) point to the position description of the Associate Dean Education at UNSW observing that, “…expertise in teaching and learning, curriculum development and review, and evidence of prior leadership in teaching and learning are not prerequisites”.

Having authority to carry out the leadership role of the Associate Dean is critical. However, a lack of authority in the Associate Dean role has been reported (Bullen et al., 2010; Preston & Price 2012; Scott, et al., 2008; Southwell et al, 2008a). For example, “[t]here is emerging evidence that the people in these roles [Associate Deans] lacked the power to make or manage change effectively” and that “...initiating change... [is] seen as too difficult without authority” and that Associate Deans “...do not have...any direct authority over those with operational responsibility for teaching and learning” (Southwell, et al., 2008a, p. 21, p. 100, p. 151).

This lack of authority is reported as being problematic for Associate Deans since they are held accountable for implementing strategies and these are often dependent on successful interactions with other leaders, such as Heads of School. The challenges to the authority of the Associate Dean for leading and teaching are also reported as being exacerbated by the processes and structures through which they work, since the Associate Dean role is one that has “horizontal” influence (Scott et al., 2008, p. 68) and is positioned outside the line management structure. Rather than having clear line management responsibilities, the Associate Dean role is situated in a parallel structure, in which Deans and Heads of School had line management, recruitment and budget oversight, while Associate Deans are expected to generate collaborative directions through the use of persuasion (Kift, 2004; Bullen et al., 2010; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a; de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson, 2011).
Hence, the role of the Associate Dean, could be alienated from the faculty, as pointed out by Southwell et al. (2008a),

Associate Deans (T&L) are positioned outside the departmental culture. Some have established successful working relationships with their faculty’s heads of department. Others are in a power struggle over which agenda was to be followed with both sides thinking they are disadvantaged. (p. 29).

The relationship between the Head of School and the Associate Dean has been consistently reported in the literature to be difficult “...it has been a common experience to find Heads of School quite resistant to the [Associate Dean] role” (Lines, 2000, p. 46). Bullen et al. (2010) confirm ten years later that the Heads of Department were still the ones most resistant to changes in learning and teaching leadership in a Faculty of Engineering.

A central factor in the resistance of academic staff in schools to change in learning and teaching is their perception that research is more important than teaching (Norton 2013). This is also supported by the literature which suggests a lack of the valuing of teaching and learning equally to research in universities (Anderson et al., 2011; Barnett, 2011; Chalmers, 2011; Macfarlane, 2011; Probert, 2016). It is variously reported that teaching in universities is “...rarely judged and appreciated from the outside and often only minimally from within” (Anderson et al., 2011, p.152). Furthermore, “[t]he reward systems at research universities heavily weight efforts of many professors toward research at the expense of teaching...[s]ome institutions even award professors “teaching release” as an acknowledgement of their research accomplishments and success at raising outside research funds” (Anderson et al., 2011, p.152). Even the more recent attempts to recognise and reward teaching have been seen as unhelpful to advancing the standing of learning and teaching, since “…the tokenistic all-must-win-prizes world of teaching awards and teaching fellowships...have become a key feature of the patronising culture standing in stark contrast with the harder edged and more competitive realities of advancement through research” (Macfarlane, 2011, p.128). The ongoing and long-standing battle for recognition and acknowledgement of learning and teaching is highlighted below,

[f]or more than 20 years there have been growing and widely expressed concerns that teaching is not sufficiently rewarded and recognised in universities, particularly in comparison to research...during much of the 20th Century, promotion and career progression were contingent on achieving success in disciplinary research in universities. (Chalmers, 2011, p.25)

The criticality of the context in which Associate Deans work becomes an important factor on their authority.

Over time, the leader’s capability is shaped by the top team’s quality and by the capabilities of the full organisation. These can either provide invaluable support for the changes a leader wants to make or render these changes impossible. (Scott et al., 2008, p.xx).

The lack of clarity in the role, differing conceptions of the responsibilities of the role, including the requirement for agreed underpinning theoretical pedagogical content knowledge leads to appointments with role descriptions in relation to leadership which often do not work optimally on the ground. A lack of, or inadequacy in, induction and ongoing professional development cements the lack of clarity. The marginalisation of the role in university structures and the emphasis and privileging of research over teaching all challenge the role of the Associate Dean, contributing to a
gap between what is required for leading learning and teaching and what can be achievable on the ground.

When asked about their role in a comprehensive study of 513 leaders of learning and teaching by Scott et al. (2008, p.54) Associate Deans themselves rank the following areas of Quality Management (QM) and Leadership (L) as their top ten areas of work focus:

1. Strategic Planning (L)
2. Developing and Implementing policy (L & QM)
3. Reviewing teaching activities (QM)
4. Participating in meetings (L+QM)
5. Developing organisational processes (QM)
6. Working on student matters (QM)
7. Managing relationships with senior staff (L)
8. Chairing meetings (QM)
9. Identifying new opportunities (L)
10. Developing learning programs (L+QM)

These areas of focus for Associate Deans suggest that Associate Deans are involved in both quality management and leading change and that these dual aspects are intertwined, or form an “...integrated system of activities” (Marshall et al, 2011, p. 100) but too often the management aspects of the role do not inform the strategic leadership.

As this discussion has shown, Associate Deans face significant challenges that are fundamental in their ability to lead learning and teaching effectively in practice (Lines, 2000; Kift, 2004; Southwell et al., 2008a; Bullen et al., 2010; Radloff, 2005; de la Harpe & Radloff, 2006). This struggle reflects Bourdieu’s position that “…relations of power which form the structure [of the Field] provide the underpinnings of both resistance to domination and resistance to subversion” (Bourdieu & Wacqant, 1992, p. 90).

**Overview of the study**

Chapter 1 introduces the study and provides the context in which the Associate Dean role is developed. Chapter 2 provides a targeted literature review to identify the Hallmarks of strategic learning and teaching leadership capability, drawing upon the literature to look at personal attributes and contextual features which contribute to the Symbolic Capital of the expert Associate Dean. In Chapter 3, the research methodology and design is presented, discussing Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice and how other methodologies are used in the analysis of the findings. Chapter 4 presents the findings assessed against the Hallmarks developed in Chapter 2. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the findings, the development of an expert prototype of the Associate Dean and a resulting typology for Associate Deans delineated by the hallmarks they possess into four categories: “Stars”, “Rising Stars”, “Copers” and “Strugglers”. This is followed by suggested leverage points to strengthen the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean. The conclusion of Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, discusses its contribution to research, its limitations, its significance, and suggests possible directions to develop the research further.

**Next chapter**

In the next chapter, the literature review is presented.
Literature Review

The structure of the university field is only, at any moment in time, the state of the power relations between the agents, or more precisely, between the power they wield in their own right and above all through the institutions to which they belong; positions held in this structure are what motivate strategies aiming to transform it, or to preserve it by modifying or maintaining the relative forces of the different powers, that is, in other words, the systems of equivalence established between the different kinds of capital. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 128-129)

In this Chapter the hallmarks or ‘central tendencies’ from the literature needed by an Associate Dean to lead learning and teaching are developed. These hallmarks are contended to be those most likely to equip Associate Deans for their leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts and the data derived from the Associate Dean participants can then be considered against these hallmarks of leadership capability. A hallmark in this study is drawn from a characteristic identified in the literature as representative of one of the central tendencies of the prototype of the Expert Associate Dean. Each hallmark of the prototype of the Expert Associate Dean contributes to the Capital needed by them in their strategic leadership role (Horvath & Sternberg, 1995). Using Hallmarks to identify characteristics of the Expert Associate Dean echoes the work of Horvath & Sternberg in identifying the Expert Teacher but in this study it is extended to identify Hallmarks in the context in which Associate Deans work which enable or disable efficacy. The literature included revolves around leadership generally, leadership of learning and teaching by the Associate Dean, university management and organisational change. Using the analytic framework presented in Chapter 1, these hallmarks are identified at the individual, institutional, sectoral and global layers, and categorised under the forms of Capital (Economic, Social and Cultural).

Within each of the four layers and the different forms of Capital, there may be more than one characteristic or attribute of the Associate Dean that is relevant to assessing capability for leadership of learning and teaching. For example, in Layer 1 (see below) two attributes are identified within the personal cultural capital category and eight within the embodied cultural capital category. In the former, the level of academic achievement (L1.1.1) is distinct from the breadth of academic study and experience (L1.1.2). Attributes within each of these subcategories can be ranked as indicating the greatest, some, little or least Capital for success in the role. A Hallmark is identified with the greatest Capital within that subcategory.

The overarching aim of this Chapter is to address the following research question:

1. What personal and contextual characteristics equip an Associate Dean to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts and what does expertise look like?

Layer 1: Personal (Associate Dean) level (Cultural Capital, 10 Hallmarks)

In Layer 1, that is, at the individual Dean level, there are a number of Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Institutionalised and Embodied States) that contribute to the leadership of the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching. Although Social Capital and Economic Capital, as they relate to the individual Associate Deans as personal attributes, are present, these types of Capital are discussed in Layers 2, 3 and 4 where Social and Economic Capital become operable.
The Hallmarks indicative of Cultural Capital at the personal level identified from the literature that are most likely to equip leaders of learning and teaching are as follows.

**L1.1 Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Layer 1, Personal, 10 Hallmarks)**

*Institutionalised State (2 Hallmarks)*

Cultural Capital in the Institutionalised state in Layer 1 includes credentials, formally conferred, that symbolise cultural competence and “expert” authority in the area. For the Associate Dean role, Cultural Capital in this state may include a PhD and/or a qualification in both Creative Arts and Education or higher education Learning and Teaching disciplines.

**L1.1.1 Hallmark: A PhD gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role.**

Completing a PhD is associated with the highest level of learning or conceptual understanding in a Field. Other gains include growing personally, increasing confidence levels, gaining research experience, developing writing skills, forming friendships, making professional contacts and building an international outlook (Neumann, 2005). Moreover, a PhD is increasingly recognised in the literature as a fundamental entry requirement for employment in most disciplines in universities.

It would be difficult to argue that the PhD and its association with research is not highly valued in contemporary universities (Anderson et al., 2011; Chalmers, 2011), including for the Creative Arts despite them being “…relatively new to doctoral study…which pose challenges in terms of doctoral pedagogy and scholarship” (Evans, Macauley, Pearson, & Tregenza, 2003, p. 1). When the Creative Arts were amalgamated into universities there was an expectation that academics in these disciplines would gain a PhD in order to be on an equal footing with expectations of academics in most existing university disciplines (Strand, 1998).

It is, therefore, contended from the literature that having a PhD gives Associate Deans the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role because it represents higher learning and meets expectations traditional to the university sector.

**L1.1.2 Hallmark: A formal qualification in both Creative Arts and Education or higher education Learning and Teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Institutional Capital for the role.**

There is a growing importance in the literature that having both disciplinary content knowledge as well as pedagogical content knowledge is central to the efficacy of leadership in learning and teaching (Cochran, 1991; Kleikmann, Richter, Kunter, Elsner, Besser, Krauss & Baumert, 2013; Scott et al., 2008; Shulman, 1986; 1987; Southwell et al., 2008a). It is contended that the combination of these two, when used strategically, supports the best leadership of learning and teaching.

A qualification in a Creative Arts discipline provides disciplinary content knowledge, including knowing subject matter concepts and the ways of using language and of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing and acting that are part of the Discourse. A qualification in Education/higher education provides pedagogical content knowledge, including how students learn (Ball, 2002; Ball & Bass, 2000; Ball, Lubinski, & Mewborn, 2001) and the theories that underpin learning and teaching including principles, components and theoretical frameworks (Ballantyne, Bain, & Packer, 1999; Pearson & Trevitt, 2005).

It is reported that completing a graduate certificate in higher education learning and teaching is associated with feelings of increased competence in teaching, greater reflectivity and the use of a
more student-centred approach (Chadha, 2015). A study of the effectiveness of the impact of training on university teaching involving 22 universities in 8 countries, found that there was “…evidence of a range of positive changes in teachers in the training group, and in their students, and a contrasting lack of change, or negative changes, in untrained teachers from the control group (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004, p.87-88). A formal qualification in Education and/or higher education learning and teaching is becoming more and more prevalent in higher education institutions worldwide as a way to gain and demonstrate expertise in learning and teaching (Shulman, 2000; Blackmore, 2007; Kreber, 2002; Gibb, Haskin, & Robertson, 2009, Scott et al., 2008).

For the Associate Dean, having knowledge of learning and teaching is considered critical for providing support to academics and for leading change in learning and teaching, since without knowledge in learning and teaching it might be more difficult “…to plan, develop, implement and evaluate [learning and teaching] strategy (i.e., the capacity to fulfil the tasks of leadership)” (Marshall, 2011, p. 4). It, thus, seems fundamental that those responsible for formally leading learning and teaching should have a sound basis in both disciplinary content knowledge and learning theory to equip them for their role.

It is, therefore, contended that having both a qualification in Creative Arts and a formal qualification in Education and/or higher education Learning and Teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State) because it gives them the requisite disciplinary content for the Creative Arts and theoretical pedagogical content knowledge for their educational role.

Next, the Hallmarks of Cultural Capital in the Embodied State in Layer 1 identified in the literature are explored.

**Embodied State (8 Hallmarks)**

The Embodied state in Layer 1 requires personal effort and investment over time for self-improvement, and/or personal experiences, skills, capabilities, beliefs and attributes (consciously acquired or passively inherited). For the Associate Dean these include learning and teaching publications, interest in influencing change, a focus on leadership as well as management, a highly sophisticated conception of learning and teaching, a highly sophisticated understanding of disciplinary differences, being male and a sense of satisfaction with the role.

**L1.1.3 Hallmark: Publications in higher education Learning and Teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.**

Conducting research that focuses on personal practice or on areas of educational research more generally has been shown in the literature to impact positively on knowledge about learning and teaching, and personal conceptions of learning and pedagogical content knowledge (Boyer, Moser, Ream, & Braxton, 2015; Kreber, 2012, 2013; Shulman, 1986, 2012). Personal outcomes of conducting research include, enhancing critical questioning of own beliefs and practices, improving problem solving and making decisions from an evidence-based position, developing communication and reasoning skills, and growing as a critical and independent thinker (Anderson, 2001; Richardson, 1994). Additionally, a track record in high quality teaching and learning research builds reputation and credibility in the Field of learning and teaching. It also signals leadership in the Field and is associated with high levels of respect from others. The general pervading view is that that having recognition in a Field of research,

...can profoundly affect your prospects for employment, for winning research grants, for climbing the academic ladder, for having a teaching load that doesn’t absorb all your time,
for winning academic prizes and fellowships, and for gaining the respect of your peers.
(Laurance, Useche, Bradshaw & Laurance, 2013)

It is, therefore, contended that having publications in higher education Learning and Teaching gives Associate Deans the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because it enhances their knowledge about learning and teaching and their standing in the Field.

L1.1.4 Hallmark: Interest in influencing change gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature points out that fundamental to bringing about positive change is a desire by the leader to influence or persuade others to align with a new direction and vision (Marshall, 2008; Marshall et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a, Kift, 2004). Leadership is about movement and change, where leaders “…establish direction, align people and motivate them...leadership foresees and enables people to adapt rather than resist it” (Kotter, 1990, p.108). In addition, “[t]he ways leaders approached problems, the attitudes they displayed, their dispositions and their commitments powerfully influenced the change initiative” (Eckel, Green & Hill, 2001, p.14). Having an interest in influencing change is, thus, crucial and institutions which were successful in transformation had,

...leaders who framed the change agenda in positive ways...stated the compelling reasons for undertaking the journey of change, focusing on improvement and not blaming any particular group. These leaders realized that key constituents must recognize the necessity for action before they willingly participate. (Eckel, Green & Hill, 2001, p.19)

It is, therefore, contended that an interest in influencing change gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because they have a desire to make a difference and to persuade others to come along.

L1.1.5 Hallmark: A focus on leadership as well as management gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature suggests that leadership and management are integrated activities and reinforces the need for a focus on both leadership and management (Jameson, 2006; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Debowski & Blake, 2004; Marshall, et al., 2011; Scott, et al. 2008). Leadership focuses on vision and direction setting, influencing and motivating, as well aligning and persuading, while management focuses on organising and coordinating activities such as planning, controlling and directing resources and making decisions in order to achieve defined outcomes (Kotter, 1990). According to Kotter (1990, p. 7-8), “…strong management without much leadership can turn bureaucratic and stifling, producing order for order’s sake” while on the other hand “[s]trong leadership without much management can become messianic and cult-like, providing change for change’s sake - even if movement is in a totally insane direction”. Thus, a focus on both is important, and it is only when leadership is conjoined with management that there will be an appropriate focus on the big picture and longer-term, as well as alignment, integration, empowerment, calculated risk-taking, fit-for-purpose rules and compliance, as well as expansion, innovation and growth.

It is, therefore, contended that a focus on leadership as well as management gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because leadership and management are integrated activities and a focus on only management is limiting.
L1.1.6 Hallmark: A highly sophisticated conceptualisation of leadership of learning and teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature shows that if leaders of learning and teaching are going to influence those whom they are to lead, they require a highly sophisticated conceptualisation of leadership of learning and teaching. As a senior academic pointed out in an Australian University in the study by Ramsden (1998, p.123), “[y]ou have to have appropriate academic credentials AND particular kinds of intellectual training if people are going to place reliance on your judgement where it bears upon academic matters”. Being able to articulate a high-level, sophisticated understanding of learning and teaching leadership comprises relating and integrating conceptions of leadership, making generalisations, hypothesising and reflecting, theorising and generating new understandings, as well as making connections that go beyond the immediate to generalise, theorise and reflect on the concept (Biggs & Collis, 1982).

It is, therefore, contended that having a highly sophisticated conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because they are seen as experts by academic staff.

L1.1.7 Hallmark: A highly sophisticated degree of understanding of how disciplines integrate gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature suggests that in order to be able to innovate in a discipline domain, a person needs to see the domain at a “meta-level” and be able to “…move[s] beyond collaboration in heterogeneous groups” to a new version that requires immersion and metacognition (Miller & Boix-Mansilla, 2004, p. 15). Working across different disciplines provides both a challenge and a reward, since disciplines with,

...their different questions, foci, languages and senses of what “counts” as a trustworthy insight, often impede collaboration across disciplinary boundaries. At the same time, such differences account for the synergistic solutions found when individuals can come to think in qualitatively new ways or discover the solution to a problem unlocked by the insights housed in a neighboring domain. (Miller & Boix-Mansilla, 2004, p. 3)

Having an internalised understanding of a discipline facilitates the valuing of disciplinary differences and of other ways of knowing. Blackmore (2007) argues that “…teaching quality is endangered if it is seen as a generic activity and separate from disciplines” and if seen this way may “not connect with the reality of disciplines” (Shulman cited in Blackmore, p. 13). An advanced degree of integration is, thus, necessary for the Associate Dean role and is even more so if they are not from a Creative Arts discipline.

It is, therefore, contended that having a highly sophisticated degree of disciplinary integration gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because leading strategic learning and teaching changes to disciplinary pedagogies requires an understanding of the discipline.

L1.1.8 Hallmark: Being male gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

In Australian universities statistics show that more males hold senior leadership roles than women (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Currie, Thiele, & Harris, 2002; Fitzgerald & Wilkinson, 2010; Pyke, 2009). As pointed out by Simpson and Fitzgerald (2014),

[a]cross the higher education sector, there is a marked absence of women in positions of power or prestige, particularly in high status institutions. The more senior the position and
the more prestigious the institution, the less likely women will be employed. Their ability to influence their organization as well as the higher education sector is therefore constrained as a consequence of their gender (p. 34).

They also suggest that when women do have leadership roles in the university they tend to be in “…areas of work that can broadly be termed ‘institutional housekeeping’; that is, keeping the institutions, its policies and procedures current and applicable” (p.33). Similarly, White, Carvalho & Riordan (2011) concluded that while “…women as senior managers have an increased capacity to impact on decision-making in managerial universities, mainly related to ‘soft’ management skills, these were not valued in a competitive management culture strongly focused on research output” (p.179). The report (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012) on women in leadership points out that,

[d]espite aspirations for more women in senior leadership roles, progress over the last 10 years has been slow. While in 2011-12 women represented close to half of the labour force as a whole (46%), and 45% of Professionals, women remain under-represented at senior levels within both the private and public sector.

It is, therefore, contended that an Associate Dean who is male has the greater Cultural Capital in the role because women in the higher education sector remain under-represented.

L1.1.9 Hallmark: Satisfaction with the role gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Job satisfaction has been found in the literature to be linked to an optimistic attitude towards work and enhanced organisational commitment (Linz, 2002). Job satisfaction results from a perception that the job focus and environment aligns with the things that are seen as valuable (Singh, 2012). Being satisfied with a job is associated with roles that provide flexibility, variety, opportunities for decision making, good colleagues and high autonomy (Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon & de Menezes, 2012). Job satisfaction is shown to,...enhance the quality of individuals’ working lives and their well-being and performance, and consequently the performance of organizations (Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon & de Menezes, 2012, p. 420).

Job satisfaction is related to the context of the organisation. As pointed out by Singh (2012), "[o]rganizationally speaking, high level of job satisfaction reflects a highly favorable organizational climate resulting in attracting and retaining better workers". If the organisation values the role, and develops structures, processes, and relationships to support optimal performance then the role is experienced positively as a result of a sense of the work being valued by the organisation (Locke, 1976).

It is, therefore, contended that a sense of high job satisfaction gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital in the role because they experience higher levels of optimism and greater commitment to the role.

L1.1.10 Hallmark: A high degree of Emotional Intelligence gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature shows that core to the development of relationships with others in work contexts is possessing high levels of emotional intelligence or EQ (Goleman, 2004). According to Goleman, emotional intelligence at work comprises five components, namely, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills.
Positive self-awareness involves being able to understand one’s own emotions and the ability to see oneself change over time. Being self-aware includes self-confidence, a capacity for realistic self-assessment, and a capacity to joke about oneself in a “...self-deprecating” manner. It is not simply having an understanding of oneself at a particular moment in time. Self-awareness is an important component of leadership, since “[r]esonant leaders use self-awareness to gauge their own moods accurately, and they intuitively know how they are affecting others” (Goleman, Boyatzis, & Mckee, 2002).

Self-regulation involves being able to control emotions and impulses that may potentially be disruptive. It involves being open to change, being comfortable with ambiguity and maintaining trustworthiness and integrity. Self-regulation is an important component of emotional intelligence and according to Goleman (1998, p. 6) “…often does not get its due. People who have mastered their emotions are able to roll with the changes...sometimes they can even lead the way”.

Motivation is showing commitment, drive and optimism, even in the face of apparent failure. Leaders who display motivation show “...an unflagging energy to do things better. People with such energy often seem restless with the status quo. They are persistent with their questions about why things are done one way rather than another; they are eager to explore new approaches to their work” (Goleman, 1998, p. 7).

Empathy “…means thoughtfully considering [others] feelings - along with other factors - in the process of making intelligent decision...leaders with empathy do more than sympathize with people around them: They use their knowledge to improve their companies in subtle but important ways” (Goleman, 1998, p. 7). Empathy requires expertise in building and retaining talent, cross-cultural sensitivity and service to clients and customers. To be a leader requires the ability to understand the emotional makeup of others.

Social skills involve “…friendliness with a purpose: moving people in the direction you desire” (Goleman, 1998, p. 9) and those with well-developed social skills are able to find “…a common ground with people of all kinds – a knack for building rapport” (Goleman, 1998, p. 9). Social skills are important for developing friendships and for building a strong social support network.

Overall, possessing the five components of emotional intelligence is reported in the literature to be a significant capability required for a learning leader (Fullan, 2001; Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a). It is argued that those with emotional intelligence intuitively know when to make suggestions, to use appropriate methods to approach others and to establish rapport, which enables them or spurs them to action. All of the components of emotional intelligence are required for optimal relationships with others and, thus, bringing about effective change, since...

...emotional intelligence is the sine qua non of leadership. Without it, a person can have the best training in the world, an incisive, analytical mind, and an endless supply of smart ideas, but he still won’t make a great leader. (Goleman, 1998)

It is, therefore, contended that having high levels of Emotional Intelligence including, positive self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills gives the Associate Dean more Social Capital for the role because they are able to see how their behaviour affects others and are more able to control their emotions and impulses, they are more driven, committed, persistent and optimistic, and they understand the position of and are able to work more easily with others.
Summary of Layer 1, Personal (Associate Dean)

In the section above, a number of Hallmarks are identified, the possession of which it is contended are likely to result in the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised and Embodied) for the Associate Dean and equip them for leadership of learning and teaching of the Creative Arts.

Hallmarks include: A PhD; A formal qualification in both Creative Arts and in Education/Learning and Teaching; Publications in higher education learning and teaching; An interest in influencing change; A focus on leadership as well as management; A sophisticated conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership; A high degree of understanding of the importance of disciplinary integration; Being male in a university setting; A high level of job satisfaction, and A high level of emotional intelligence (See Figure 2.1). (Note: colour coding by type of capital in the following figures and tables matches Table 4.13.)

Figure 0.1 Hallmarks of Capital in Layer 1, Associate Dean layer, of the conceptual framework.

In the next section, Layer 2 of the Conceptual framework is explored. This layer focuses on the institutional assets (Economic, Social and Cultural Capital) that the literature suggests equips the Associate Dean with the greatest Capital required for leadership of learning and teaching.

Layer 2: University level (Cultural, Social and Economic Capital, 19 Hallmarks)

Whilst Layer 1 of the conceptual framework focused on the personal assets of the Associate Dean, Layer 2, the University level, focuses on the assets afforded the Associate Dean by the institutional context in which they work. The University context plays a part in the Capital of the Associate Dean, and, thus, impacts their leadership of learning and teaching. In Layer 2, all three types of Capital (Cultural, Social and Economic) apply.
The Hallmarks indicative of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital at the University level identified in the literature to most likely equip leaders of leading learning and teaching are identified and discussed below.

L2.1 Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Layer 2, University, 5 Hallmarks)

**Institutionalised state (1 Hallmark)**

In Layer 2, University level, Cultural Capital in the Institutionalised state, refers to the Cultural Capital obtained through the basis of honour, prestige or recognition and that symbolize cultural competence and authority, such as being a full Professor.

L2.1.1 Hallmark: Being a full Professor gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role.

Achieving a professorial title is the highest level of achievement bestowed on academics in Universities and is associated with significant status and prestige, for both the individual and the institution. According to Farrell (2009),

> [t]here is consensus among universities’ policies regarding the key characteristics for the conferral of the title: all expect their professors to demonstrate leadership, eminence and distinction...Conferment of the title ‘Professor’ is of mutual benefit to individuals and institutions: an individual receives an elevation in their personal status both within the sector and in the broader community while a university may garner prestige through an increase in its professoriate. (p. 2).

It is, therefore, contended that being a Professor gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital because this represents recognition of significant standing in the Field.

**Embodied State (4 Hallmarks)**

In Layer 2, University level, Cultural Capital in the Embodied state refers to the Cultural Capital that is incorporated and acquired over time by the individual, either consciously or passively through the university context. For the Associate Dean this includes prior experience in related areas of learning and teaching; a formal induction to the role; more time in the Associate Dean role; and possessing institutional knowledge.

L2.1.2 Hallmark: Prior experience in related areas of learning and teaching, other than teaching in own discipline, gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Having past experiences in different but related areas is reported as beneficial for building adaptive expertise. Adaptive expertise allows individuals to perform “...at a high level in the face of changing job tasks and work methods” (Carbonell, Stalmeijer, Konings, Segers, van Merrienboer, 2014, p.14). Having experiences in related learning and teaching areas, different to teaching in one’s own discipline, for example, chairing or membership of a formal university learning and teaching committee, working in the central learning and teaching area or student services or being a member or leading a national learning and teaching project, is more likely to enable the individual to see how their own teaching pedagogy is a construction and how learning and teaching can be approached in other ways (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; Gee, 2004). Having experience in related learning and teaching areas, therefore, would enhance the expertise of the Associate Dean and their ability to use constructivist processes (Daley, 1999, p. 133). Thus, Associate Deans, who have prior experience in
different learning and teaching areas would enhance their adaptive expertise as “...learning is a continuous process grounded in experience” (Kolb, 1984).

It is, therefore, contended that experience in related learning and teaching areas prior to taking on the Associate Dean role gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because they are more able to draw on diverse and multiple experiences.

L2.1.3 Hallmark: A formal induction to the role gives an Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

The literature suggests that “…induction is a very important part of settling into a new role and contributes positively to employees becoming more efficient and active workers [more quickly]” (Le, 2015, p. 2). Completing a comprehensive formal induction, including that of the procedures and policy areas related to the role, builds personal knowledge of the institution and how it operates and helps in navigating the many complex rules and regulations (Chidambaram, Ramachandran & Thevar, 2013; Foot & Hook, 2008; What is Induction and Orientation and Why is it Needed?, n.d). The benefits to a staff member of an induction program include:

- Feeling welcomed and supported, beginning the process of successful integration into their new workplace.
- Gaining a positive perception of the University and local workplace.
- Gaining access to essential information about the University in general and their workplace, role and responsibilities.
- Being well positioned to confirm their decision to join the University.
- Early understanding of the purpose of their position and how it fits into the University's mission and strategic goals

An appropriate induction has also been found to impact positively on the retention of employees (Le, 2015).

It is, therefore, contended that a formal induction gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) because it develops their personal knowledge, enhances their feelings of belonging and contributes to their retention.

L2.1.4 Hallmark: More time in the Associate Dean role gives an Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

It is reported in the literature that learning takes place over time through the exigencies of practice, drawing on expertise that is constructed and accessed in response to need. Many studies have found that ‘informal’ or ‘on-the-job’ learning is a powerful way to learn, with “[s]tudy after study finding that [this is how] at least 80% of workers learn to do their jobs” (Cross, 2010, p. 46). In addition, engaging in problem-solving activities in which the individual tackles challenges that progressively extend their existing capabilities and learning with and from one another, appears to be an excellent form of naturalist development (Boud & Hager, 2012, p.22). This applies equally to leadership capability development, as Ramsden (1998), points out,

[Leadership is a balancing act. We might wish it were systematic and predictable; in reality it is disordered and episodic: and each leader’s history is scattered with omissions, confusion and failures...This task cannot be taught. It can only be learned by doing the job, seeking feedback and instruction from colleagues, actively interpreting that information, and doing the job again. (p. 95).]
Having more experience in the role exposes the Associate Dean to finding solutions to the ongoing challenges and problems that arise in learning and teaching leadership on the ground, assisting them to develop their capacity and to build their individual knowledge and skills.

It is, therefore, contended that having more time in the Associate Dean role leading learning and teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) because they have extended over time their repertoire of experiences from which to draw.

L2.1.5 Hallmark: Possessing institutional knowledge gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

According to Campbell (2004), institutions “...consist of formal and informal rules, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, and systems of meaning that define the context within which individuals, corporations, labor unions, nation-states, and other organizations operate and interact with each other” (p. 1). Learning about an organisation is a complex process but “...because knowledge enables effective action, one must know such norms and beliefs in order to act appropriately, and hence to compete effectively” (Nissen, 2007, p. 212).

Navigating institutions requires significant explicit and tacit institutional knowledge. Explicit knowledge is easier to acquire than tacit knowledge as it is usually publicly available through various media, such as websites or policy documents, since tacit knowledge is more ephemeral and difficult to acquire. As such, “...explicit knowledge may enable appropriate actions often, but where such organization seeks to integrate its activities with those embedded within this culture, explicit knowledge becomes inadequate, and tacit knowledge becomes essential” (Nissen, 2007, p. 212). Thus, it is important for those in learning and teaching leadership roles to gain “…the knowledge and skills associated with university operations, in which managing competitive pressures, institutional change capacity and external accountabilities all appear to play a role.” (Scott et al., 2008, p.78).

It is, therefore, contended that gaining institutional knowledge, both explicit and tacit, gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role because it builds their personal knowledge of how the university works and for operating effectively within it.

In the next section the Social Capital of the Associate Deans and the associated Prototype Hallmarks for Layer 2 are explored.

L2.2 Hallmarks of Social Capital (Layer 2, University, 13 Hallmarks)

In Layer 2, University level, Social Capital, as described in Chapter 3, refers to the Capital that comes through relationships with others, either individually or in groups or through the interrelationships of groups, which can be leveraged and gives individuals access to and influence over others. The degree of Social Capital that an individual has depends on the size of the networks and the types of connections they can leverage. For the Associate Dean, social Capital includes belonging to an Associate Dean group within the university; being strategically aligned and having a useful relationship with the central learning and teaching unit; having line management of learning and teaching staff and/or academics; having a supportive Dean; a positive working relationship with the Head of School; Successfully implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools; leading university learning and teaching strategic projects for the Creative Arts; appointment through a rigorous recruitment and selection process; a full-time role; a university that values learning and teaching; responsible for a larger faculty and/or with more discipline areas.
**L2.2.1 Hallmark: Belonging to an Associate Dean group across the university gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.**

Building and developing successful and effective strategic networks is reported as a critical factor for effective leadership (Brown & Duguid, 2002; Creech & Willard, 2001; Zaheer, Gulati, & Nohria, 2000; Jarillo, 1988; Lavie, 2007; Wasko & Faraj, 2005; Senge, 1999; Wenger, 1998). Strategic networking provides opportunities for individuals to join forces to (re)position, promote, enhance and influence institutional and discipline-specific learning and teaching practices. It assists in bridge-building between the Creative Arts disciplines and formal learning and teaching leaders and benefits learning and teaching within the Creative Arts. Networks were reported as important to forge an identity, be at the cutting edge of learning and teaching innovation, solve problems, grow leadership, find inspiration, spread great ideas, advance careers, be heard and mix with like-minded people. They were seen as an important part “...of organizational learning and the main places where knowledge develops” (Cohen & Prusak, 2001, p.55). They were critical to an emerging collective identity (de la Harpe, Mason, McPherson, Koethe & Faulkner, 2014).

Opportunities to network emerged as important for Associate Deans in both Southwell et al. (2008) and Scott et al.’s (2008) studies. It is, thus, concluded that for learning and teaching leaders of the Creative Arts, building and developing successful and effective strategic networks is an important component of their leadership role (de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson, 2011; de la Harpe, Mason & Brien, 2013; de la Harpe & Mason, 2012).

It is also contended that belonging to an internal network of Associate Deans gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role because they have a group to whom they can turn for advice and support, grow intellectually, provide advocacy and develop collective identity.

**L2.2.2 Hallmark: A strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning and Teaching Unit gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.**

A component of the typical remit of central learning and teaching units is to support academic staff with strategies to improve their teaching, as well as for researching learning and teaching. These units work across the university to bring about strategic change (Lee, Manathunga & Kandlbinder, 2008; Holt et al., 2010). Since this is in direct alignment with areas of the Associate Dean role, it is suggested that it is imperative that efforts are made to work together and align in ways that are strategically connected (Gray & Radloff, 2006; de la Harpe & Radloff, 2006; Holt et al., 2010). This is especially important, since, as pointed out by Holt et al. (2010),

> [t]he leadership and management of centres must work closely with senior university management and faculty leadership in designing and implementing strategically focused operational plans, and in developing the effective relationships required through the network of key parties involved in enhancing teaching and learning performance through the organisation. (p.6)

It is, therefore, contended that having a strategically connected relationship with the central learning and teaching unit gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital in the role because working collaboratively strengthens the contributions of both to the realisation of the strategic learning and teaching intentions of the university.
**L2.2.3 Hallmark:** Having line management of academic and/or staff in learning and teaching support roles gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

Having a team of staff working together in a common pursuit is reported as resulting in increased work power (human Capital), enhanced ability to pool and share resources, improved capacity to target important and impactful areas, and greater diversity of expertise on which to draw. Line management of staff is associated with an increased ability to positively influence others, since line managers are responsible for day-to-day people management, allocating or delegating work, monitoring outputs, providing feedback, measuring performance (Currie & Procter, 2001).

Line managers are also shown in the literature to play an important role in ensuring that those they “...manage are supported to develop and apply knowledge and skills in judging standards, monitoring and evaluating the quality of teaching and learning, and leading sustainable development of their department or team” (The National Strategies, 2008, p.2). Since, as pointed out by Ashkenas, (2012) “[n]o longer is [a line manager’s] primary function to aggregate work done by subordinates and control their activities; rather it is to foster teamwork and communication, while providing inspiration and direction”. This contributes to accomplishing both greater and more superior outcomes (Aube, Rousseau & Tremblay, 2011). Having line management is, therefore, crucial in influencing change in an organisation, driving a vision and ensuring staff are supported to work as effectively and efficiently as possible.

It is, therefore, contended that line management of academic staff and/or of learning and teaching support staff gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital because they have more human resources and capacity to positively influencing strategic directions.

**L2.2.4 Hallmark:** A supportive Dean gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

The Associate Dean role is situated in a structure where they are expected to promote learning and teaching transformation using internal networking, community building, collaboration and persuasion. They normally report to a Dean who has line management responsibility over Heads of School as well as Associate Deans and also has overall budget oversight (Bullen et al., 2010; de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson, 2011; Kift, 2004; Scott et al., 2008; Senge, 1996; Southwell et al., 2008a). Since Associate Deans are expected to lead through influence and “…leverage collegiality to engage staff in necessary change” (Scott et al., 2008, p. vii) it is critical that they have the support of their Dean (or line manager) in order to achieve their priorities. A supportive leader, 

...share(s) the purpose, vision and constraints of the work, and...give(s) the team the authority to do the work while providing the resources necessary to be successful. Finally, the job of the Supportive Leader is to smooth the path by removing obstacles in the way of the team. (Flahiff, 2015).

A supportive leader lends authority to those who report to them. Those who report experiencing a supportive leadership style are more likely to “…feel better about themselves” (Van Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, & Stride, 2004, p. 173), in turn reporting higher levels of well-being, job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Newton & Maierhofer, 2005).

It is, therefore, contended that a supportive Dean gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital in the role because it enhances their authority and legitimacy, as well as contributing to heightened job satisfaction.
L2.2.5 Hallmark: A positive working relationship with the Head(s) of School of Creative Arts gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

The Head of School has been identified in the literature as being a critical player in influencing learning and teaching transformation and change in local disciplinary contexts. Over two decades ago, Heads of School or Departments, along with Deans, were reported as “...the single most important factor in supporting improvement of learning and teaching (Wright and O'Neill, 1995, p. 76). Surveys of academics in Canada, the USA, the UK and Australasia recognised the potential of the leadership of the Dean or Departmental Head as significant in improving the quality of teaching (Martin, Trigwell, Prosser, & Ramsden, 2003). However, Southwell et al. (2008a) point out a variation in the relationship between Heads of School and Associate Deans, where,

[s]ome had established successful working relationships with their faculty’s heads of department. Others were in a power struggle over which agenda was to be followed with both sides thinking they were disadvantaged. (p. 29).

It is important that Associate Deans have a positive relationship with Heads of School, since “...the head’s attitude to education[al] development becomes pivotal in determining what support will be provided at a school level” (Radloff, 2005, p. 87).

It is, therefore, contended that a positive working relationship with Heads of School gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role because working collaboratively with the Head of School enhances support for change in disciplinary contexts at the local level.

L2.2.6 Hallmark: Recognising themselves as leading learning and teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role

Leadership in learning and teaching is essential to bring about change and “[e]ffective leaders know who they are and where they are going...They know themselves as leaders” (Howe, 2013, p. 1). To be a leader of learning and teaching an Associate Dean needs to,

- establish a direction or a vision for L&T (including a sense of purpose, values, principles, strategies, outcomes to be associated with L&T programmes and processes.
- Communicate the vision and aligning stakeholders (staff, students and others), strategy (curriculum) and resources with that vision, and
- Enable, motivate and inspire stakeholders to engage with the vision. (Marshall et al., 2011, pp. 99-100).

It is argued that “[w]hen leadership is understood, it’s easy to see yourself as a leader, to be seen as a leader and to access better leadership” (Howe, 2012, p. 2). In addition, others will see you as a leader too as “…the power of leadership oozes outwards, impacting everyone around” (Howe, 2012, p. 1).

It is, therefore, contended that for Associate Deans to recognise themselves as strategic leaders of learning and teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital in the role because it enhances their sense of purpose, authority and legitimacy.
L2.2.7 Hallmark: Strategically implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

Effectively implementing positive learning and teaching initiatives at a school level builds the reputation of the Associate Dean as a person who is able to ‘get things done’ in the minds of those who count. Or in the words of Kotter (1990, p. 223) being able to “walk the talk”, since doing is more believable and important than saying. Similarly, Zinko, Ferris, Humphrey, Meyer & Aime (2012, p.172) point out that “…being an expert is not enough to gain increased independence in a position; an individual must be ‘known’ as an expert”.

A reputation is “...a deep and durable concept, and something to be earned over time” (Suomi, Kuoppakangas, Hytti, Hampden-Turner & Kangaslhti, 2014) and is what people say ‘behind your back’. Reputation is reported in the literature, as one of the most important features of a professional’s life (Brown, 2016). It is based on both personal actions, as well as what others say about those actions to others. A reputation includes having requisite skills and being seen as competent and helpful in the role over time, recognised as important others, seen to have standing and authority in the minds of significant others, and having backing from a network of supporters (Brown, 2016; Zinko, et al., 2012). At work, a reputation is most likely to be built on “...issues related to individuals’ capacity to perform their jobs effectively, and to be cooperative and helpful towards others” (Zinko et al., 2012, p. 156).

It is, therefore, contended that strategically implementing learning and teaching initiatives at a school level gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role, because it builds their reputation as being effective at supporting others on the ground and achieving successful outcomes.

L2.2.8 Hallmark: Leading university learning and teaching strategic projects for the Creative Arts gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

The literature suggests that the discipline is an ideal place for exploration and engagement in projects that focus on learning and teaching, given how central the discipline is to the identity of academics (Fanghanel, McGowan, Parker, McConnell, Potter, Locke & Healey, 2015). For example, in the Creative Arts, studio is perceived by academics to be core to the discipline (Zehner et al., 2009). Since it is consistently reported that the primary allegiance of academic staff is to their discipline, rather than to the organisation (Cronin, 2000; Becher & Trowler, 2001), academics in disciplines are much more interested and receptive to initiatives when they are about or located within the discipline area (Blackmore, 2007).

Thus, for the Associate Dean, engaging in authentic discipline-based university learning and teaching projects is an effective way to build and strengthen discipline and local alliances, as well as to forge deeper relationships (Fanghanel et al., 2016). Engaging with Creative Arts academics provides opportunities to bring people together to work on learning and teaching issues that matter to them and, in so doing, strengthening their credence from those in the Creative Arts disciplines. It has been reported that in the Creative Arts “…engaging members in [learning and teaching] projects is a tangible way [for the Associate Dean] to build cohesion, trust and collaboration” (de la Harpe, Mason & Brien, 2011, p.47).

It is, therefore, contended that leading and/or supporting university learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role because it results in strengthening relationships, building trust, credence and influence.
L2.2.9 Hallmark: Appointment through a rigorous recruitment and selection process gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

Fundamental to contemporary recruitment and selection processes is the use of an effective, fair and equitable way to appoint the best person for the role, in line with a well-developed position description and selection criteria (Kristof, 1996; Sutherland & Wocke, 2011; Schuler, Farr & Smith, 2013). In terms of selection, according to Armstrong and Taylor (2014),

\[ \text{[t]he aim of selection is to assess the suitability of candidates by predicting the extent to which they will be able to carry out a role successfully. It involves decision on the degree to which the characteristics of applicants in terms of their KSAs, competencies, experience, qualifications, education and training match the person specification…} \ (p. 236) \]

Core to selection is determining the Person-Job fit (knowledge, skills and abilities) and the Person-Organisation fit (congruence of personality traits, beliefs and values with the organisation culture, strategic needs, norms and values) (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee & McMurrian, 1997). Similarly, Kurz and Bartram (2002), point out that paying attention to pre-requisite expertise and competency potential is critical. Pre-requisite or “enabling” expertise is what the person is required to possess for the role and includes prior qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills, while competency potential includes personal characteristics as well as evidence of abilities to develop the capabilities required for the new situation.

There are many benefits to ensuring a rigorous recruitment and selection process outlined in the literature (Campbell & Knapp, 2013; AHRI, n.d.). These include, enhancing organisational competitive advantage, as well as building capability and strengthening organisational-fit. On the other hand, outcomes of a poor process include workplace disruption, reduced productivity and difficulties with interpersonal interactions. These issues can contribute significant financial costs to an organisation. Sutherland and Wocke (2011, p. 30) found that in many organisations “....appointment errors end in a termination and/or continued poor performance 80% of the time”.

In terms of teaching and learning leadership positions, Marshall (2006) argues that appropriate recruitment and selection processes for learning and teaching leadership positions are critical for universities. He contends that it is important that universities “…ensure that leadership in learning and teaching features in the job descriptions, position classification standards, recruitment and selection criteria, performance indicators, [and] promotion criteria of all academic staff” (p. 11).

It is, therefore, contended that a rigorous recruitment and selection process gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital because this recognises their fitness for the role and enhances credibility in the role.

L2.2.10 Hallmark: A full-time fraction gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

In relation to the university sector, a Canadian research study found that full-time faculty have higher levels of job satisfaction than those in fractional appointments (Gopaul, Jones, & Weinrib, 2013). Being full-time in a role is more likely to encourage greater engagement with others, the expansion of professional networks, greater willingness to innovate and experiment and to engage in new learning. Above all, it allows time for strategic planning and thinking rather than having time to only manage operational exigencies.
It is, therefore, contended that a full-time role fraction gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital because it increases job satisfaction allows a focus on all aspects of the role and signals the value of the role in the university.

L2.2.11 Hallmark: A university that values learning and teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

It is widely documented in the literature that a sense of value and appreciation are fundamental to workforce well-being (Adler & Seligman, 2016; Chan, 2014; Tehrani, Humpage, Willmott & Haslam, 2007). Significant research on workplace wellbeing confirms that intrinsic rewards such as having a purpose, recognition, accomplishment, responsibility, autonomy, mastery, progress, social interaction and feeling appreciated, are more important to workers than are extrinsic ones such as remuneration and benefits (Stumpf, Tymon, Favorito & Smith, 2013). A recent report on Brazil’s workforce, that included over 11,000 survey responses, found that respondents ranked being appreciated for work as the most important job element they cared most about (Cardoso, Hypólito, Orglmeister, Strack & von der Linden, 2016). The report suggested that this was a globally emerging trend.

It is, however, widely reported in the literature and anecdotally that in university settings research is seen to matter more than teaching (Diamond, 2002; Huber, 2004; Chalmers, 2011), despite “[a]ctivities connected with teaching and research [being] assumed to be the chief reasons why universities exist” (Simpson & Fitzgerald, 2014, p. 29). Research has persistently been seen as the major factor in career progression and promotion,

during much of the twentieth century, promotion and career progression were contingent on achieving success in disciplinary research in universities. Academics choosing to pursue research into teaching and learning and directing their attention to the learning of their students risked career progression and access to tenure and promotion. (Chalmers, 2011, p. 25).

Similarly, Anderson et al., (2011, p.152) states that “[t]he reward systems at research universities heavily weight efforts of many professors toward research at the expense of teaching...[s]ome institutions even award professors “teaching release” as an acknowledgement of their research accomplishments and success at raising outside research funds”. Whilst research has been acknowledged globally by peers, teaching “…is rarely judged and appreciated from the outside and often only minimally from within” (Anderson et al., 2011, p.152). In fact, Macfarlane (2011, p.128) argues that “…the tokenistic all-must-win-prizes world of teaching awards and teaching fellowships...have become a key feature of the patronising culture standing in stark contrast with the harder edged and more competitive realities of advancement through research”.

Being in an area that is valued and appreciated at work is core to a sense of satisfaction, empowerment and contributes to greater feelings of happiness, joy, flow and fulfilment (Bradbury-Jones, Sambrook & Irvine, 2011).

It is, therefore, contended that universities in which learning and teaching is valued gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role because it signals the importance of and appreciation for the area which in turn contributes to well-being at work.

L2.2.12 Hallmark: A larger faculty gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.
Outcomes reported in the literature concerning the amalgamations in the late 80s and early 90s of Creative Arts disciplines into University settings, showed that for most this resulted in being variably placed in faculties alongside other disciplines (Marginson, 1997; Strand, 1998). Since this time, ongoing internal re-structures in universities across the sector are favouring larger arrangements. The rationale for this is that this results in economies of scale in higher education providing operating efficiencies, streamlined business models, more targeted resources, greater scope for students and lower costs (Ernst & Young, 2012; Pricewaterhouse Coopers Australia, 2016).

It is suggested by O’Meara and Bloomgarden (2011, p.4) that the bigger the faculty the more prestige it affords those who work within it, since

...[e]vidence suggests smaller institutions [or faculties] exhibit striving behavior in part because of their demonstrated vulnerability to market trends, their need of the resources greater prestige promises, and because their small size makes them vulnerable to shifts in mission and goals when leadership changes.

It is, therefore, contended that a larger faculty gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital because they have more resources at their disposal and lead a larger group of academic staff, which is seen as more prestigious.

L2.2.13 Hallmark: A faculty with more discipline areas gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

A greater focus on the convergence of the disciplines appeared in the literature in the 2000’s. The act of bringing together two or more disciplines that cross “…the boundaries of disciplines, borrowing tools concepts and methodologies, combining them in new relationships” (Davies, Davies, Devlin and Tight, 2010, p.56) is known as interdisciplinarity. In the 2000s, “[t]alk of interdisciplinarity seem[ed] to be everywhere in higher education - no matter what the discipline, profession or Field of inquiry” (Peseta, Manathunga & Jones, cited in Davies, Davies, Devlin and Tight, 2010, p. xiii).

The rationale for the call for greater interdisciplinarity is that interdisciplinary opportunities “…can expand possibilities for research [and teaching], [and that] would-be collaborators can learn lessons invaluable to cooperation, communication, and ultimate understanding” (Borrego & Newswander, 2008, p. 123). In addition, inter-disciplinary projects can “…spark industrial innovation, [and] creative academic alliances [can] address complex social and scientific problems” (Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004, p. 461). As pointed out by Associate Deans in a study that included exploring their perspectives on having multiple disciplines in their faculty (de la Harpe & Mason, 2012, p.10),

...you know all these creative areas are becoming more successful because in fact we are bringing together a range of groups and in fact we are starting to complement each other.

Disparate disciplines and ideas can come together to create something new.

It is, therefore, contended that more disciplines in the faculty gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital because they are able to connect a range of staff in disciplines to work on interdisciplinary initiatives which is a valuable and more contemporary way of working for the future.

In the next section, the Economic Capital of the Associate Deans and associated Hallmarks for Layer 2 are explored.
L2.3 Hallmarks of Economic Capital (Layer 2, University, 1 Hallmark)

In Layer 2, the University level, Economic Capital, as described in Chapter 3, includes having access to financial resources (budget or internal/external grant income) and infrastructure resources (office space and equipment) from the University. For the Associate Deans this included having a budget.

L2.3.1 Hallmark: Having a budget gives the Associate Dean the greatest Economic Capital for the role.

The literature suggests that “[m]easures of departmental power in a university are found to be significantly related to the proportion of the budget received” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974, p.135). A budget, or a lack thereof, significantly contributes to the decision making power of a leader in a university, as pointed out by Amaral, Jones and Karseth (2013),

[t]he budget structure of an institution parallels the overall decision making structure; the budget-making process becomes a mechanism through which some of the most important decisions affecting the operation of the institution are made. (p. 92).

Budgeting in an organisation is a political process, since “…budgets result from internal power struggles with the outcomes favouring the most powerful subunits” (Schick, Birch & Tripp, 1986, p.41). Having access to a budget enforces planning and thinking about the future, guides actions, promotes communication and coordination, allows performance evaluation and is an integral part of control and review processes (Walther & Skousen, 2014). Associate Deans who have their own discretionary budget are able to formulate projects to bring about strategic change or provide funding if an academic staff member develops an idea for innovation in a school, allowing them to provide financial support to buy-out time or fund extra resources.

It is, therefore, contended that having a budget gives the Associate Dean the greatest Economic Capital because they have access and control of discretionary funding and access to resources.

Summary of Layer 2 - University

In the sections above for Layer 2, the University level, the Hallmarks of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital identified from the literature as most likely to equip Associate Deans for their leadership of learning and teaching of the Creative Arts are outlined. These Hallmarks contribute to the Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean, see Figure 2.2.

Hallmarks include being a full Professor; prior experience in the area of learning and teaching; having a formal induction; time in the Associate Dean role; possessing institutional knowledge; belonging to an Associate Dean group within the university; being strategically aligned and having a useful relationship with the central learning and teaching unit; having line management of learning and teaching staff and/or academics; having a supportive Dean; having a positive working relationship with the Head of School; successfully implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools; leading university learning and teaching strategic projects for the Creative Arts; appointment through a rigorous recruitment and selection process; having a full-time role; working in a university that values learning and teaching; being responsible for a larger faculty and/or with more discipline areas; and having a budget.
In the next section, Layer 3, the higher education sector level of the conceptual framework is explored. This layer focuses on the higher education assets (Cultural and Social Capital) that the literature suggests is likely to equip the Associate Dean for leadership of learning and teaching.

**Layer 3 – Sectoral level (Cultural, Social and Economic Capital, 4 Hallmarks)**

In Layer 3, higher education sector level, the Cultural, Social and Economic Capital afforded by the sector is explored since the Capital of the Associate Dean is shaped by the broader higher education Context in which the role operates. Layer 3 focuses on the Hallmarks of Capital (Cultural, Social and Economic) at the sectoral level identified from the literature that equips the Associate Dean for leadership of learning and teaching.

The Hallmarks indicative of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital at the sectoral level that are most likely to equip leaders of learning and teaching for their leadership role are identified and discussed below.

**L3.1 Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State) (Layer 3, Sector, 1 Hallmark)**

In Layer 3, the higher education sector level, Cultural Capital in the Institutionalised state, as described in Chapter 3, refers to the Cultural Capital afforded by the sector that is conferred on the
basis of honour, prestige or recognition. For the Associate Dean, these include receiving an Office for Learning and Teaching award, citation or fellowship, and leading or belonging to a sector network group.

_Institutionalised state (1 Hallmark)_

**L3.1.1 Hallmark:** Receiving an OLT teaching award, citation or fellowship gives Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State) for the role.

The literature suggests that participating in an award process enhances professional identity and is associated with an increased sense of professional regard, self-esteem and purpose (Galbally, 2002; Harrison & Jepsen, 2015; Kalis & Kirschenbaum, 2008; Layton & Brown, 2011; Skelton, 2004; Chism, 2006). The receipt of an award is reported as enhancing credibility and can be used as a way of differentiating them from others (Harrison & Jepson, 2015). Additionally, the Australian Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) state that through citations and awards, “[it] is intended that recipients, with the support of their institutions, will contribute to systemic change in learning and teaching through ongoing knowledge sharing and dissemination” (http://olt.gov.au/awards, 2015). Receiving a national teaching award, citation or fellowship, thus, signifies that the recipient is formally recognised for their contribution to learning and teaching by peers across the sector.

It is, therefore, contended that having an OLT award, citation or fellowship gives Associate Deans the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State) since it results in enhanced status, recognition and prestige.

Next, the Hallmarks of Social Capital identified in the literature for Layer 3 are explored.

**L3.2 Hallmarks of Social Capital (Layer 3, Sector, 2 Hallmarks)**

In Layer 3, higher education sector level, Social Capital, as described in Chapter 3, refers to the Capital that accrues through relationships developed with individuals, groups or through the interrelationship of groups i.e. from durable networks, institutional relationships or membership of groups. Social Capital can be leveraged and provides access to and influence over others. The degree of social Capital accumulated depends on the size of networks and the types of connections that can be leveraged. For the Associate Dean, these include using quality assurance processes positively for enhancement and being on an external board or an active member of an external network.

**L3.2.1 Hallmark:** Being on an external board or an active member of an external network gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.

The opportunities for networking provided through board and network membership have been identified in the literature as extremely beneficial for developing strategic knowledge and practice, and enhancing standing in an area (Fullan 1993, 1999, 2006; Hill & Lineback 2011; Scott et al. 2008, Marshall, 2006). The benefits of networking include, raising profiles, building opportunities to connect with others, collaborating on initiatives, benchmarking best practices, acquiring and sharing knowledge, having a positive influence on outcomes, increasing confidence and enhancing feelings of satisfaction through helping others (Baird, 2016; Brown & Duguid, 2000; Creech & Willard, 2001; Gulati, 2007; Zaheer, Gulati, & Nohria, 2000; Jarillo, 1988; Lavie, 2007; Wasko & Faraj, 2000; Senge, 1996; Wenger, 1998, Scott et al 2008; Southwell et al 2008a).

For Associate Deans, the need for formal learning and teaching leaders to have opportunities to “…network, meet with colleagues from other universities (as well as their own institution) and share
ideas about their T&L roles within the higher education sector” are emphasised by Southwell et al. (2008a, p. 42). Such opportunities become particularly pertinent as the global knowledge economy continues to grow since membership of boards and networks has the potential to link people from across the world.

It is, therefore, contended that being on the executive of an external board or being an active member of an external network gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital because it provides opportunities to build strategic connections and is seen as prestigious by others.

Next, the Hallmarks of Economic Capital identified in the literature for Layer 3 are explored.

**L3.3 Hallmarks of Economic Capital (Layer 3, higher education sector, 1 Hallmark)**

In Layer 3, higher education sector level, Economic Capital, as described in Chapter 3, includes gaining access to financial resources, for example from having a budget and/or income from an internal or external grant, or control over infrastructure resources, for example office space and/or equipment from higher education sector sources. For the Associate Dean, this includes leading an OLT project.

**3.3.1 Hallmark: Leading an OLT project gives the Associate Dean Economic Capital for the role.**

Receiving an OLT grant has been seen as significant in the higher education sector and especially since they became “Category One” grants alongside the Australian Research Council (ARC) grants. ARC grants are seen as one of the “...most prestigious funding bodies in the country” (O’Daly, 2007, http://www.canberra.edu.au/monitor/2007/oct/20071004_grants). Through grants, the OLT aimed to “…provide critical information to policymakers and politicians [and]...play an active role in enhancing teaching excellence in our institutions” (Pitman & Bennett, 2016). Sitting alongside ARC grants brought greater recognition of the OLT grant’s value in universities.

A grant provides access to discretionary funding and increased prestige, credibility and public exposure for recipients. Funding enabled through a grant allows a number of activities to be supported, such as bringing particular expertise to a project, developing frameworks for practice and employing resources, building leadership capacity and spending time on and progressing scholarship of teaching and learning (UNSW, https://teaching.unsw.edu.au/grants).

It is, therefore, contended that leading an OLT project gives the Associate Dean the greatest Economic Capital for the role because it gives them access to a discretionary budget to focus on specific areas of learning and teaching enhancement.

**3.3.2 Hallmark: Using quality assurance processes positively for enhancement gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital for the role.**

In the 90’s the Federal Government commissioned the development of performance indicators to assess the quality of higher education. Indicators included the “...quality of teaching, student progress and achievement, and graduate employment” (Chalmers, 2007, p.13). The introduction of these indicators was reported as not simply about driving economic efficiency, but as a result of a desire to develop world class educational opportunities (Chalmers, 2007) and to ensure the reputation of sector offerings (Siemens, Dawson & Lynch, 2013). It was recognised that the focus on quality within the Australian higher education sector was about change and improvement,
...government reforms, changes in external operating environment, internal changes in the university as a result of reviews together with external audits have been a driver for change and improvement. (Shah, Nair & Wilson, 2011, p. 482).

In line with this, internal quality processes, which were seen as critical to achieving quality learning and teaching, were implemented in university settings. According to the literature, working in “...a culture that involves cooperation, open communications, flexibility and external orientation and the close involvement of quality management in the regular work of staff” (Kleijnen, Dolmans, Willems & Hout, 2014, p.103) is the most effective way to improve quality. One way to do this is to find a balance between Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Enhancement (QE), where assurance is more focused on assessing compliance, monitoring and reporting, while enhancement is focused on improving and developing strengths (Elassy, 2015). Thus, focusing more on enhancement rather than compliance is central to improving quality, as noted by Shah and Jarzabkowski (2013),

[t]he challenge for institutions is to implement a hybrid model of quality assurance that focuses on compliance and improvements with increased emphasis on internal enhancements and active engagement of all staff. (p. 102). 

It is, therefore, contended that applying external quality assurance practices as quality enhancement initiatives gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role because it is seen to bring about deep and lasting changes to learning and teaching rather than merely enforcing compliance.

**Summary of Layer 3 – higher education sector level**

In the sections above for Layer 3, higher education sector level, the Hallmarks of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital identified from the literature as most likely to equip Associate Deans for their leadership of learning and teaching of the Creative Arts are identified. These Hallmarks contribute to the Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean, see Figure 2.3.
Figure 0.3 Hallmarks of Capital in Layer 3, Higher education layer, of the conceptual framework.

Hallmarks include receiving an OLT award, citation or fellowship; using quality assurance processes to focus on quality enhancement; being on an external Board or an active member of an external network; and leading an OLT grant.

Layer 4 – Global level (Cultural, Social and Economic Capital, 3 Hallmarks)

In Layer 4, Global level, the Cultural, Social and Economic Capital afforded by global trends is explored, since the Capital of the Associate Dean is shaped by emerging developments in the world that connect with and exert influence on the context in which the role operates. Layer 4 focuses on the hallmarks of Capital (Cultural, Social and Economic) identified from the literature that are as a result of the influence of global trends and that equip the Associate Dean for leadership of learning and teaching.

The Hallmarks indicative of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital influenced by global trends that equip leaders of learning and teaching are identified and discussed below.

L4.1 Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Layer 4, Global, 1 Hallmark)

In Layer 4, global level layer, Cultural Capital (Embodied State) refers to the experience, skills and capabilities that the Associate Dean develops, through expending effort and over time, in response to the influence of global trends in learning and teaching. For the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied State) includes developing technology skills and capacities.

Embodied State (1 Hallmark)

L4.1.1 Hallmark: Developing technology skills and capacities gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied State) for the role.

Embracing learning and teaching technology and having an open mind about how technology might benefit learning and teaching are essential in higher education since “…[j]ust as globalisation and technology have transformed other huge sectors of the economy in the past 20 years, in the next 20 years universities face transformation” (Barber et al. 2013, p.4). Technological innovation has been reported in the literature as “…changing the very way that universities teach and students learn…Distance education, sophisticated learning-management systems and the opportunity to collaborate with research partners from around the world are just some of the transformational benefits that universities are embracing” (Glenn, & D’Agostino., 2008, p. 4). Students themselves have access to the knowledge that academics teach and transmission of information only is not sufficient learning and teaching practice within a contemporary university. It is well-recognised in universities that,

[...]

Putting time and effort into keeping abreast of technological changes in learning and teaching ensures competitiveness in the global marketplace and builds the personal skill-set needed for thriving in the future workforce (Glenn, & D’Agostino, 2008).
It is, therefore, contended that developing technology skills and capabilities gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied State) for the role because they develop the expertise needed for leading learning and teaching practices of the future.

Next, the Hallmarks of Social Capital identified in the literature in Layer 4 are explored.

**L4.2 Hallmarks for Social Capital (Layer 4, Global, 1 Hallmark)**

In Layer 4, Global Trends level, Social Capital refers to the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group and are gained through relationships formed from durable networks, institutional relationships or membership of a group, and from which recognition and status is derived. Social Capital can be leveraged and provides access to and influence over others. For the Associate Dean, Social Capital includes engaging in partnerships with industry.

**L4.2.1 Hallmark: Engaging in partnership with industry gives the Associate Dean the greatest Social Capital for the role.**

One emerging global trend is the push for universities to develop stronger and greater partnerships with industry. Engaging in initiatives with industry is seen as an opportunity for enhancing impact, and entrepreneurial and innovative activity. It is now becoming more and more accepted that,

...successful innovation necessarily involves a highly interactive process of engagement between universities, industry and government...It assumes that entrepreneurs will work in the university and academic staff in the company, that the partnership may also link with other sources of funding and that there will be clear patterns of co-ordination. (Gibb, Haskin & Robertson, 2009, p.12)

It is argued in the literature that universities need to form such partnerships with businesses and other bodies which will contribute to increasing the competitiveness of Australia (Barber et al., 2013). As such, “...a knowledge-hub university embodies a wide range of human skills and capabilities, occupational classifications, and learning modes to populate and motivate the multiple missions” (Youtie & Shapira, 2008, p. 1199). This will require “... interactive learning supported by talented people with a high level of skills, training and experience” (Bramwell & Wolfe, 2008, p. 1177).

It is, therefore, contended that engaging in the development of partnerships with industry gives Associate Deans the greatest Social Capital for the role because through actively engaging with industry in innovative learning and teaching approaches they build strategic connections and grow recognition and standing.

Next, the Hallmarks of Economic Capital identified in the literature for Layer 4 are explored.

**L4.3 Hallmarks of Economic Capital (Layer 4, Global level, 1 Hallmark)**

In Layer 4, the Global level, Economic Capital, as described in Chapter 3, includes gaining access to financial resources (for example external grant income) from global level sources. For the Associate Dean in Layer 4, Economic Capital includes receiving an international grant.
L4.3.1 Hallmark: Leading a globally funded project gives the Associate Dean the greatest Economic Capital for the role.

Many universities as mentioned previously are expanding local engagement by seeking out global funding opportunities to further research and learning and teaching projects (Altbach, 2015; Barber et al., 2013; Gibb et al. 2009). This is a growing trend across the higher education sector, where

[t]here has been a movement away from a system that was at one time nearly total central or regional public funding, to a situation where a growing proportion of finance has to be sought from non-direct public sources including fees, research grants, local development monies, alumni, industry and social enterprise, contract research and philanthropy. (Gibb et al., 2009)

Institutions are now turning to international funding bodies or organisations, such as Google or the Bill Gates Foundation, for example, which are keen to support such initiatives. In addition, crowdfunding for higher education institutions is growing in universities with academics being encouraged to embrace the “...power of social networks and the voice of your students to engage alumni [that can] win new donors for your university.” (USEED, http://useed.org/why-crowdfunding-for-universities-and-colleges/).

It is, therefore, contended that receiving funding from an international funding body gives Associate Deans the greatest Economic Capital for the role because it gives them a discretionary budget and are seen as innovative and entrepreneurial.

Summary of Layer 4 – Global level

In the sections above for Layer 4, Global level, the Hallmarks of Cultural (Embodied State), Social and Economic Capital identified from the literature as most likely to equip Associate Deans for their leadership of learning and teaching of the Creative Arts are identified. These Hallmarks contribute to the Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean, see Figure 2.4.

Hallmarks include embracing changes in technology for learning and teaching; engaging in partnerships with industry and and/or global approaches to learning and teaching.
Summary of Chapter 2

In Table 2.1 (over page) the Hallmarks of leadership capability from Layers 1, 2, 3 and 4 identified in the literature are presented. These hallmarks are contended to be those most likely to equip Associate Deans for their leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

In this study, the data derived from the Associate Dean participants is considered against the hallmarks of leadership capability identified in the literature as likely to equip them well in their leadership role of learning and teaching. In Layer 1, Hallmarks include having a PhD; a formal qualification in both Creative Arts and in Education/Learning and Teaching; Publications in higher education learning and teaching; an interest in influencing change; a focus on leadership as well as management; a sophisticated conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership; a high degree of understanding of the importance of disciplinary integration; being male in a university setting; a high level of job satisfaction, and a high level of emotional intelligence.

In Layer 2, Hallmarks include being a full Professor; prior experience in the area of learning and teaching; having a formal induction; time in the Associate Dean role; possessing institutional knowledge; belonging to an Associate Dean group within the university; being strategically aligned and having a useful relationship with the central learning and teaching unit; having line management of learning and teaching staff and/or academics; having a supportive Dean; having a positive working relationship with the Head of School; successfully implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools; leading university learning and teaching strategic projects for the Creative Arts; appointment through a rigorous recruitment and selection process; having a full-time role; working in a university that values learning and teaching; being responsible for a larger faculty and/or with more discipline areas; and having a budget.

In Layer 3, Hallmarks include receiving an OLT award, citation or fellowship; using quality assurance processes to focus on quality enhancement; being on an external Board or an active member of an external network; and leading an OLT grant. And finally, in Layer 4, Hallmarks include embracing changes in technology for learning and teaching; engaging in partnerships with industry and and/or global approaches to learning and teaching.

Through these Hallmarks, an exemplar or prototype view of the Expert Associate Dean is established. The exemplar of the expert Associate Dean can “…contribute in important ways to the dialogue on expert [strategic leadership]…provid[ing] a basis for understanding apparent “general features” in [learning and teaching leadership] expertise… and understanding and anticipating social judgements about [it]” (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995, p.9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Institutionalised State</th>
<th>Embodied State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Personal (Associate Dean)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PhD</strong></td>
<td>● Publications in higher education Learning and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Formal qualification in Creative Arts and Education or Higher Education</td>
<td>● Interest in influencing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus on leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● High conception of learning and teaching leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● High understanding of disciplinary differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Satisfaction with the role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Sophisticated level of emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Full Professor</strong></td>
<td>● Prior experience in related learning and teaching areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Formal induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● More time in the Associate Dean role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● High institutional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Member of university Associate Dean group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning and Teaching Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Line management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Supportive Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Positive relationship with Head(s) of School of Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Strategically implementing initiatives at a School level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Budget for leading learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Leading learning and teaching projects in Creative Arts
- Rigorous recruitment
- Full-time fraction
- University values learning and teaching
- Larger faculty
- Many discipline areas

---

**Table 2.1, continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher education sector</td>
<td><em>Institutionalised State</em></td>
<td>Quality assurance processes used positively for enhancement</td>
<td>Leader or participant in an OLT learning and teaching grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- OLT award, citation or fellowship</td>
<td>- Member of external network, either on the executive or as active participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Global</td>
<td><em>Embodied State</em></td>
<td>Engaged in partnerships with industry</td>
<td>Leading an international project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Engaged with technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next Chapter, the methodology for the study is presented.
Methodology and Research Design

To be able to see and describe the world as it is, you have to be ready to be always dealing with things which are complicated, confused, impure, uncertain, all of which runs counter to the usual idea of intellectual rigour. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 83)

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology and research design that underpins this study. The study adopts a critical theory paradigm and mixed methods methodological approach. It includes interviews with 25 Associate Deans from 20 Universities across Australia to explore how equipped Associate Deans are in their strategic leadership and how leadership of learning and teaching might be strengthened. It focuses specifically on the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts to uncover their individual Capital and that afforded to them by the context in which they worked.

Chapter 1 outlined the rationale for the study and provided the context from which the Associate Dean role evolved. Chapter 2 drew on the relevant literature to develop the hallmarks of leadership capability. This is followed up in this chapter by an explanation of the research design and includes an outline of the data gathering method. To begin, an overview of Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice is presented as the theoretical framework underpinning the study. A description of the research tools and how they are used to analyse the data follows. The chapter ends with a discussion of the ethical considerations of the study.

Research Design

A social constructivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm underpins the study and a mixed methods methodological approach and methods are used to explore the leadership of learning and teaching of the Associate Dean in the role for the Creative Arts. A critical theory paradigm provides “...a firm and consistent basis for the design and implementation of research” (Ling & Ling, 2017, p.1). In the Table 3.1 below, the epistemology and paradigm, and the methodology and methods which were used are outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Theoretical Paradigm</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The human experience is a process of</td>
<td>Critical Theory - goal is to critique,</td>
<td>Mixed methods - integrating quantitative and</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a critical theory paradigm allows for a critique of the learning and teaching leadership by Associate Deans. It facilitates going beyond simply describing the situation to question and challenge the “natural state” in order to inform and prompt change (Crotty, 1998; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Moreover, it provides a framework from which leverage points can be extrapolated in line with Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice with the expectation that action on these leverage points would be able to persuade people to see the traditional university culture differently. It is an ideal theory to use when focusing on relations between individuals, groups, structures and processes, all of which influence the role of the Associate Dean, as

…power dynamics are at the heart of critical research. Questions are asked about who has power, how it’s negotiated, what structures in society reinforce the current distribution of power…It also assumes that people unconsciously accept things the way they are, and in so doing, reinforce the status quo…power in combination with hegemonic social structures results in the marginalisation and oppression of those without power. (Merriam, 2009, p. 35)

Participants in the study include twenty-five Associate Deans, 12 female and 13 males, who were interviewed (45% response rate). Fifty five Associate Deans in Universities in 6 states and 1 territory were invited via email to a face-to-face interview. Eleven interviews were conducted in November/December 2012 and 14 in April/May 2013. The interviews (face-to-face or telephonically) lasted for about one hour and were recorded with permission of the participants. Interviews were held in offices, meeting rooms or boardrooms.

A semi-structured (standardised, open-ended) interview format comprising 50 questions was used for the interviews with Associate Deans (see Appendix 3.1). The fifty questions focused on the following areas:

**Self** - discipline area, undergraduate degree and postgraduate degree, learning and teaching qualification, area of research and publication, understanding of leadership of learning and teaching (L&T)

**Personal leadership of L&T** – role and responsibilities, interest in L&T, number of disciplines, time in role, time allocation, line management, what they did, induction/professional development, aspects most confident about, personal qualities, network memberships, barriers/frustrations

**L&T leadership in the university** – structure, value of L&T, communication flow, L&T committee operation, membership of L&T committees, interaction with central learning and teaching unit

**L&T leadership of the Creative Arts** - dispersed or co-located, changes to structure or disciplines, issues facing the Creative Arts, operation of leadership of learning and teaching, responsibility and role in leading Creative Arts L&T, personal power or influence, projects or initiatives, relationship with the Heads of Schools and academics
Strengthening the role – qualities a learning and teacher needs, kinds of support structures, knowledge and skills that would be helpful, time fraction the role requires, line management potential, induction/ongoing professional learning for the role, changes to the role, better alignment around learning and teaching initiatives, a way to strengthen leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts, networks

Participants were asked the same questions and in the same order, but a question was skipped if it had been answered in response to a previous one (Patton, 2002). This approach allows for pre-selected topics to be covered by all interviewees. At the same time, it also provides opportunities to explore further views (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Guthrie, 2010). The use of semi-structured interviews where the interviewee is enabled to talk more freely than in a structured interview is critical to allow for understanding as fully as possible the context within which the person is situated. Interviews are based on Kvale’s (1996) ‘Seven stages of conducting in-depth interviews’:

1. **Thematising**: Formulate the purpose of the investigation and describe the concept of the topic to be investigated before the interviews start.

   *Purpose*: To explore the leadership of learning and teaching by Associate Deans in the Creative Arts in their role and what equipped them in their leadership and to see how the role could be strengthened.

2. **Designing**: Plan the design of the study, taking into consideration all seven stages, before the interview starts.

   *Plan*: This was based on Boyce and Neale’s (2006) Sample Stakeholder Interview Guide and includes a ‘Facesheet’ with the time, date and place of interview and demographic information about the interviewees and their role in the organisational context.

   Questions focused on Associate Deans’ perceptions of their leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts within the university system, both as it was at the time of interview and how it could be improved for the future. Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice informs the survey and prompts relating to Habitus, Capital and Field are explicitly teased out. That is, questions were asked about the nature of the Associate Dean role aligned to the different layers in the Field.

   Such an approach enabled the gaining of information about the Associate Deans.

3. **Interviewing**: Conduct interviews based on an interview guide and with a reflective approach to questioning.

   *Interviewing*: Interviews were conducted either face-to-face or via telephone. With the participant’s consent the interviews were taped. Interviews were friendly. A rapport was established with the interviewee so that they felt at ease to share their experiences in the Associate Dean role and themselves. All responses were kept confidential and the researcher was conscious of the ethical dimensions involved in interviewing, such as not leading the interviewee and not being judgemental.

4. **Transcribing**: Prepare material for analysis, including a transcription from oral speech to written text.

   *Transcriptions*: The data was recorded using a LiveScribe pen and this recording was transcribed by an independent transcription company. This meant that the full dialogue of the interview was captured which enabled the researcher to read the interviews many times
and for a detailed analysis to follow. The transcription also allowed for the 25 voices to be quoted in the study to give it validity and reliability.

5. **Analysing**: Decide which methods of analysis are appropriate based on the topic and nature of interview material.

   **Analysis**: The mixed methods research data was imported into nVivo and coded into questions and hallmarks of an expert enabled leader developed using both a ‘bottom-up’ approach as outlined in Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle (2006) and a top-down approach as outlined in Merriam (2009). The richness of the interview data allowed the researcher to revisit and gain new insights as the analysis was undertaken.

6. **Verifying**: Ascertain the generalisability, reliability, and validity of the interview findings. Reliability depends on the consistency of the researcher and validity is whether an interview study authentically investigates what is intended to be investigated.

   **Verification**: This was done through the use of multiple data sources and interviewee profile information on websites. Representative quotes were taken from the data to support the analysis and in turn supported the validity and reliability of the findings.

7. **Reporting**: Communicate the findings of the study precisely and accurately, including the methods applied and taking into account the ethical aspects of the study.

   **Report**: This occurred through the writing up of the thesis and providing a report to all interviewees who requested a copy.

In the next section, Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), the theoretical framework that underpinned the study is presented.

**Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice as a theoretical framework**

Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice is described as a Grand Theory (Mills, 1959). A Grand Theory comprises a set of interrelated concepts that are used to describe, explain and predict how society and its parts are related to one another. Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice is a relational framework providing a “deep” way of interrogating a situation at a point in time and as a way of exploring power relationships. Battling for dominance in the Field is the game which is not always played consciously, especially when the complex context of the Field which the players have to navigate has often formed imperceptibly over time (Barnett, 1999). This game often results in a de facto imbalance of power. It focusses on universal aspects of social processes or problems, offering a theoretical approach that is flexible and based on abstract elements (ideas and concepts) rather than on case specific evidence. It can be applied to different situations and areas of research (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Walther & Skousen, 2014).

Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice was chosen as a critical lens or theoretical framework for this study since it was seen as ideally suited to exploring deeply the complexity and the ‘messiness’ of the leadership of learning and teaching of the Associate Dean in their role. Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice offered a way to uncover the influences of the university structures and processes that had formed historically through struggles for dominance on the Associate Dean role, and the matrix of structures, processes, relationships and Doxa (or the taken-for-granted truths) which operated within the Associate Dean context or Field.
Bourdieu argues that unless structures and processes are revealed, change cannot occur. As mentioned, his theory of practice is capable of teasing out the underlying cultural constructions which shape players within a complex interrelated context and enables analysis of how the players collude with, or reject, those constructions. This is directly relevant to the aims of this study, since as pointed out by Wittgenstein (1992, p.1),

[get]ting hold of the difficulty deep down is what is hard. Because if it is grasped near the surface, it simply remains the difficulty it was. It has to be pulled out by the roots; and that involves our beginning to think in a new way.

There are three ‘thinking tools’ that make up the triad of Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, namely Capital, Habitus and Field. Each is described below.

**Capital**

According to Bourdieu, Capital is what gives an individual or group power over another individual or group. For example, there are many historical processes and structures, as well as habitual relationships, which give some players Capital (inherited Capital) and, thereby, dominance over others. Bourdieu splits Capital into four areas: Cultural, Social and Economic, as well as Symbolic Capital. Cultural Capital has three states, Embodied, Objectified and Institutionalised (See Figure 3.2). Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice assumes that each player in the Field has some of these forms of Capital to a lesser or greater degree which they use to forge their identity or dominance. Capital in this study referred to the assets which Associate Deans brought to their role and which enabled them to operate with authority in the role.

![Figure 0.1 Types of Capital*](image)

*The colour coding of Figure 3.1 is used throughout.

A description of each of the types of Capital is provided below.

**Cultural Capital**

Cultural Capital includes any advantage that a person has or acquires over time and which gives them a higher status in society, for example: knowledge, skills and education. Cultural Capital exists in three states, namely, Embodied, Objectified and Institutionalised (Bourdieu, 1986):
The Embodied state consists of either passively inherited Capital which comes through socialisation, otherwise known as culture, cultivation, or standing in society, or consciously sought after Capital where individuals make particular choices to acquire Capital, for example through education.

The Objectified state consists of physical objects or cultural goods that are owned, such as works of art and can include material items that have “cultural” value, rather than economic value, such as a theatre or library. These objects can be bought and/or sold.

The Institutionalised state consists of Capital that is conferred on the basis of honour, prestige or recognition, for example academic credentials or qualifications or a title of honour.

For the Associate Dean, Cultural Capital may result from attending a private school, having a PhD, or becoming a Professor.

**Social Capital**

Social Capital is the Capital that comes through relationships with others, either individually, through groups or through the interrelationship of groups (from durable networks, institutional relationships or membership of a group) which gives individual players access and influence to and over others (Bourdieu, 1986). The amount of Social Capital that an individual has depends on the size of the networks and the types of connections they can leverage. For the Associate Dean, Social Capital may result from being on prestigious or powerful committees.

**Economic Capital**

Economic Capital includes control over economic resources, such as cash or assets, which can buy material resources (Bourdieu, 1986). These financial resources may be obtained from being in a position of power, through relationships of influence and support or through networks, as well as by having the capacity to grow additional resources. In a university setting, grants that come from the university, or external to the university, are examples of Economic Capital for an Associate Dean.

**Symbolic Capital**

Symbolic Capital is the Capital that comes from a combination of all of the other forms of Capital, including Economic, Social and Cultural Capital. When these types of Capital combine and are perceived and recognized as legitimate and prestigious, they afford “Symbolic Capital” or power to an individual or group in the Field (Bourdieu, 1986), thus,

...the honor and prestige inherent in symbolic Capital is the outcome of the conversion of other forms of Capital...hence...symbolic Capital is not a different form of Capital, but rather should be seen as the legitimated, recognized form of the other Capitals. (Lawler, 2011, p. 1418)

The Symbolic Capital that an Associate Dean has, therefore, is the sum of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital.

**Habitus**
Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice assumes that individuals have been socialised by their own personal and professional trajectory to form an intrinsic set of beliefs, values and behaviours that Bourdieu calls Habitus. Habitus is largely stable and often not questioned by the individual, who takes for granted that what they have experienced is the way the world works. Habitus is, therefore, the “…relatively durable principles of judgment and practice generated by an [individual’s] early life experiences and modified (to a greater or a lesser degree) later in life” (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008, p.4). For example, growing up in Australia is different from growing up in France, growing up middle class is different from growing up in a working class. Whilst influences from birth shape the way each individual experiences, sees the world, and acts within it, as individuals experience different cultural contexts they develop their Habitus further, even though they perceive that new culture within the prism of their own socialisation. Habitus leads to the notion that there are entrenched forces and habits which may seek consciously or unconsciously through individuals or custom to dominate and marginalise particular groups or agents in a particular ‘Field’. It is only through radical change or a major disruption or self-reflection that Habitus can be altered (Bourdieu, 1986; 2005b).

**Field**

Bourdieu’s definition of Field is one which refers to all the influences that impact on an individual and on which they have influence. Bourdieu refers to individuals as “players” in that Field who become part of a competition or a ‘game’ in the Field with varying ‘Capital’ and ‘Habitus’ and vie for power. For Bourdieu, the Field of the individual can be defined only in relation to their Habitus and Capital. The strength of the Capital of individual ‘players’ gives them positional authority in the Field only if the Field is amenable to the kinds of Habitus and Capital they can offer. The Field must value the Capital which each player has. As Emirbayer and Johnson (2008, p. 6) point out “[a]ny such Field [can] be conceived of as a terrain of contestation between occupants of positions differentially endowed with the resources necessary for gaining and safeguarding an ascendant position within that terrain”.

Thus, the player’s Habitus – that is their internalised and longstanding dispositions which have come about from their previous socialisation and the Capital they have acquired to some extent determine what authority or power they have in the current distribution of power within the Field. The resulting power relationships embedded in the Field have a ‘double life’, both in the distribution of resources – the dominating groups get more of them - and in the thought habits, structures and processes of the Field, some historical, which favour the dominating group,

> [t]hey [ways in which the dominating groups are privileged] exist twice...by the distribution of material resources and means of appropriation of socially scarce goods and values...and in the form of classification, the mental and bodily schemata that function as *symbolic* templates for the practical activities – conduct, thoughts, feelings and judgements of social agents...human beings make meaningful the world which makes them. (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.8)

That said, the Field is not simply all cut-throat and competitive. Alliances and collusion are more likely than confrontation. The Field simply recognises that everyone wants to succeed in what they are doing and, therefore, will defend their area or seek for its elevation when they can. These actions can be done cooperatively and are often largely unconscious. Sometimes, the doxa of a Field - the unstated, taken-for-granted assumptions that people accept in their everyday worlds - and the Capital of others in a Field becomes too strong for an individual player and they internalise the external determinants of the Field as follows,
[c]umulative exposure to certain social conditions instils in individuals an ensemble of durable and transposable dispositions that internalize the necessities of the extant social environment, inscribing inside the organism the patterned inertia and constraints of external reality... (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.12).

Those, however, who “give in” to dominance and put their own needs last become victims of “symbolic violence”, which is the violence “...exercised on a social [individual] with his or her complicity” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 167). Bourdieu believes that it is the individual’s acceptance of the status quo, without questioning it, which confirms the ascendancy of what works against him or her. As Bourdieu and Wacquant highlight, “[o]f all forms of ‘hidden persuasion’, the most implacable is the one exerted, quite simply, by the order of things” (1992, p. 168).

Bourdieu makes clear that applying the Theory of Practice is subjective. It is not an objective theory which produces “truth” for all time. It requires a reflexive practitioner. This is discussed in the next section.

**The Reflexive Researcher**

Exploring Habitus, Capital and Field have implications for the researcher because any research is subjective. As much as the players within the Field play a part in constructing the Field, so too the researcher plays a part consciously or unconsciously in constructing the lenses with which he or she observes and participates in the Field – what is perceived, what is explored, what is valued, and what is ignored. Generating the questions of the research and how it is analysed and how that analysis is presented are all choices made by the researcher who has been enculturated in a particular way of seeing the world and has their own particular Habitus. As Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992, p. 35) point out,

> [e]ven the most empirical operation – the choice of a scale of measurement, a coding decision, the construction of an indicator, or the inclusion of an item in a questionnaire – involves theoretical choices, conscious or unconscious, while the most abstract conceptual puzzle cannot be fully clarified without systematic engagement with empirical reality.

The notion of the completely objective researcher is, therefore, rejected by Bourdieu. For Bourdieu, the reflexive perception of the subjective researcher, that is, reflecting both on and in action, is important as it offers authenticity to the research. He never assumes that any researcher can see the whole truth or that such truth will stand for all time. Any research is merely part of the journey of discovery and the more reflexive the practitioner, the more likely meaningful data will emerge. Critical to Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, therefore, is the collapsing of the objective/subjective distinction. In order to limit subjectivity, Bourdieu argues that the researcher must become reflexive.

These comments by Bourdieu on the importance and criticality of the reflexive researcher drove me to think about the biases that I was aware of in myself and these are discussed in the next section.

**My own Habitus**

In many ways I grew up at the intersection of two different ways of thinking. My father is a physicist and privileges logic, while my mother is an English educator and privileges creativity - although that is somewhat reductive of the way they think. I did Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, English, Graphic Design, Home Economics and German at high school and went on to do a Bachelor of Arts, majoring
in English Literature, with a minor in Visual Arts at university. My Masters was in Multimedia which although practice-based required theoretical underpinnings. I also did a Graduate Diploma in Education, majoring in English and Media. I am an Anglo-Saxon female, middle-class and a product of Generation X, living in Melbourne Australia. I recognise that this gives me all kinds of frames with which I view the world. However, I try hard now to see how “habit” frames my perception and the assumptions I make; for example, when I did a teaching round in my Graduate Diploma in Education in a school which was anything but middle class and where both parents and students did not seem to value education for many reasons, I was made very aware of how insulated my world had been up to then. Such inoculation from “other realities” helped me to recognise that all “realities” are constructions of the world even if they feel real. That is one of the most critical things which I bring to this research, that is, a real attempt to try to practice reflexivity, trying hard to move out of the way I see the world or my reality to be able to perceive other constructions of reality from the perception of others.

I too have beliefs which structure the way I went about this research. I am a social constructivist in my approach to learning and teaching, and believe that students need knowledge and action frameworks to be effective users of knowledge in whatever Field they choose, but I do recognise that the way to get to this autonomous level for the learner varies enormously. The interview questions I decided to focus on and my analysis of the findings reflect my beliefs, both conscious and unconscious, although I was also careful to ask myself the question: “What am I not seeing?”. Bourdieu calls this sociological bias. This is the “...most obvious bias and, thus, the more readily controlled one by means of mutual or self-criticism” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 39). Again, though there will be things that I did not see and that escaped me.

A second type of bias is “...linked to the position that the analyst occupies ...in the microcosm of the academic Field” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 329). I am not an Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) nor a Head of School, nor a Deputy Dean, nor a Creative Arts academic, so I see those roles and how they interact as an outsider, although I have had work or study experience within them. I have tried to remain open to possibilities by ensuring that the semi-structured interview questions enabled the Associate Deans to put their point of view forward, and I adopted a conversational tone so that there was a freer format when we worked through the interview questions. My work as an academic advisor has put me in contact with lots of different university disciplines and I have recognised their differences and am familiar then with how both habit and different kinds of thinking could co-exist in both the Creative Arts and in the faculty learning and teaching areas in the university. I can also see the communication difficulties individual roles may have in talking to one another. This is the background which I brought to this study and which informed the subjective lens through which I looked at the data.

A third type of bias is intellectual bias which pushes the researcher to objectify and see the research as a “...spectacle, as a set of significations to be interpreted rather than as concrete problems to be solved practically” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.39). Bourdieu cautions that if the researcher does this they “...risk collapsing practical logic into theoretical logic” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, pp. 39-40). Whilst the interviews can now be seen as objects, they are not simply words on a page, they are conjoined with my interaction with the individuals who talked with me. More than mere words, they are referents to expressions, movements, moods and were expressed in terms of my response to them. As such, I am reminded of the Associate Deans and their roles as I read them and I find my own reflective practice intertwined with their observations and changing as my understanding of the situation of the Associate Dean deepens. The study offers insights to a continuing story at one point in time. I have tried to go beyond description to critique the learning and teaching leadership of the Associate Dean and to offer practical ways to solve the problems identified rather than merely objectifying them.
Throughout this PhD I have reflected on the above biases and how they have influenced my research design, data collection and analysis. One way that I have overcome these prejudices is quite pragmatic. I have let the research journey develop and added other methodologies to strengthen the research design as they seemed appropriate. The use of other methodologies, such as Dimensions of Leadership of Learning and Teaching (Marshall et al., 2011), Structured Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy (Biggs & Collis, 1982) and The Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work (Goleman, 2004), the Prototype View of Expert Teaching (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995), and the Degree of Disciplinary Integration (Miller and Boix-Mansilla, 2004) all added different subjective dimensions and supported the multi-critical reflection needed for the study, but I cannot deny that I chose them. I did not however approach this study with any preconceived conclusions and I have also been surprised as I have read and reflected on the interviews at the new insights which I have gained. In addition, deep and challenging, philosophical conversations with my supervisors have also alerted me to aspects which I had missed. My epistemological and ontological stance therefore is constructivist and broadly interpretive (Crotty, 1998); a stance which works well within the conceptual framework of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice. In listening to the “voices” of the Associate Deans I was able to grasp their meanings and then reconstruct their meanings through my own interpretive lens.

**Criticisms of and difficulties in using Bourdieu’s ‘Theory of Practice’**

A number of criticisms have been levelled at Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice. The theory has been criticised as lacking in conceptual clarity. However, others argue that it is exactly because of this lack of clarity that it has been so widely used and applied in many research studies (Sullivan, 2002). Criticism has also been levelled that the Theory, and in particular the notions of Habitus and cultural Capital, leave no place for individual agency or individual consciousness - with destined predetermined, distinctive and predictable outcomes, although other critics see this criticism as unfounded (Maxwell, 2009). Whilst Bourdieu discusses the stability of Habitus and its accompanying Capital, he does agree that Habitus can change when the certainties around the agent changes, e.g. in times of social upheaval. He suggests that Habitus can be modified when the player in an organisation becomes reflexive. Although the beginning Habitus of the player is a constant, the way in which they perceive the Field and their agency within it can move.

The first difficulty for researchers in using Bourdieu’s concepts is using them collectively and accurately. Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) point out how often researchers use ‘Field’ and ‘Capital’ separately from ‘Habitus’. In fact, they are very critical about the omission of ‘Habitus’ from much research. All three concepts were used in this study, although Habitus was the least explored as the backgrounds of the Associate Deans prior to appointment were only explored within their educational experience.

The second difficulty is that defining the Field is not simple and needs to be done in the act of exploring it. Teasing out the parameters of the Field is perhaps among,

...the most difficult and challenging of all phases of research...Guided at first by a basic knowledge of the Field...one seeks to identify the most pertinent indicators, properties, or principles of division within that Field...[and they] are put to the empirical test and gradually refined until they yield an objective space, defined perhaps according to criteria quite different from those that had originally guided the study. (Emirbayer & Johnson 2008, p. 7)

In this study the Field of each Associate Dean was obviously slightly different. However, there is enough similarity to develop a generic Field for the Associate Deans across universities.
The third difficulty concerns the complexity of the subjective researcher. Bourdieu does not believe that perceiving ‘reality’ is a possibility, but believes that research which offers itself as subjective is nearer to the truth than pretend ‘objective’ analyses,

[to be able to see and describe the world as it is, you have to be ready to be always dealing with things which are complicated, confused, impure, uncertain, all of which runs counter to the usual idea of intellectual rigour...(Bourdieu, Chamboredon & Passeron, 1991, p. 259 cited in Jenkins, 1992, p. 180)

Whilst there are difficulties with using Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, and I certainly have grappled with his work, ideas and the density of his language, however, I believe that The Theory of Practice offers relational insights that are not available in other methodologies, as pointed out by Jenkins (1992),

Bourdieu is enormously stimulating; he is ‘good to think with’. There are at least two reasons why...his reluctance to theorise other than through a research based engagement with the complexities of social life (and)...his ever-present reflection on the engagement: upon the effects which doing research in specific ways and contexts have on the theorised products of the research process....[Bourdieu never] allows the reader to forget, not for a moment, that what he or she is reading is not reality, but an account,...and what is more, an account which is constructed in particular and specific ways. (pp. 176-177).

It is with this spirit that I use Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice to explore the Field of learning and teaching leadership by Associate Deans in the Creative Arts in this study through my subjective lenses and biases.

In addition to the theoretical framework that guided the study a number of research tools were used to analyse the data.

Data analysis

Interview recordings were transcribed and were analysed using a combination of top-down or theory driven, and a bottom-up or data-driven methods. Including multiple methods is in line with Bourdieusian Theory of Practice as Bourdieu was supportive of using other theories, frameworks, approaches or practices that worked with his own because he believed it enabled a reflexive check on the use of only one approach. Indeed, Bourdieu suggested that it was important that multiple methods were used, believing that using one was reductive of research,

[the tendency of social scientific researchers to specialise in this or that methodology...all too often leads to the thoughtless imposition of a single method at the expense of all others and regardless to its suitability to the construction and analysis of the object. No methodological approach should be ruled out in advance as the researcher tacks back and forth between the construction of the object and the production of the data necessary for construction of the object. (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008, p. 33)

The top-down methods used to analyse the data are discussed below.

Top-down analysis

A number of top-down frameworks are used to analyse the data, including An Expert Prototype View (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995), Dimensions of Leadership and Management (Marshall et al., 2011),
Structured Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy (Biggs & Collis, 1982), Degrees of Integration (Miller & Boix-Mansilla, 2004) and Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work (Goleman, 2004).

The top-down analysis frameworks that are used are described next.

**An Expert Prototype View**

In this study, Sternberg and Horvath’s (1995) methodology is used to develop a prototype of the expert Associate Dean for the Creative Arts. The expert prototype view of Sternberg and Horvath, focuses only on individual characteristics, and in this study it is extended to include Hallmarks from the university, sectoral and global contexts which enable the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean to flourish.

In Chapter 2, a review of the literature led to the identification of a set of Hallmarks indicative of the types of Capital needed by Associate Deans in their strategic leadership role. Taken together, these represent the central tendencies of the expert prototype against which Associate Deans are scored and compared in Chapter 4. Using these ‘scores’, a typology of “Stars”, “Rising Stars”, “Copers” and “Strugglers” is introduced in Chapter 5 to provide a broad indication of capability in the strategic leadership role.

**Dimensions of Leadership and Management of Learning and Teaching**

In this study, Marshall et al.’s (2011) six Dimensions of Leadership and Management of Learning and Teaching are used to determine the focus that Associate Deans place on leadership and/or management aspects in their roles. The three leadership dimensions included,

1. Establishing a direction or a vision for L&T (including a sense of purpose, values, principles, strategies, outcomes to be associated with L&T programmes and processes.
2. Communicating the vision and aligning stakeholders (staff, students and others), strategy (curriculum) and resources with that vision
3. Enabling, motivating and inspiring stakeholders to engage with the vision.

The three management dimensions included,

1. Developing strategic and operational plans and budgeting for learning and teaching
2. Organising staff to support effective learning and teaching change, and

(Marshall et al., 2011, pp. 99-100.)

Marshall et al.’s (2011) leadership and management dimensions are used given they are current, specific to the leadership of learning and teaching in Australian contexts, have been validated through a recognised peer review process, and thus are highly relevant to the study of leadership of Associate Deans. Using these dimensions in the present study allows the balance between leadership and management aspects in the enactment of the Associate Dean role to be identified.

Six of the interview questions are coded using a top-down approach against the six leadership and management dimensions. The questions are:

1. What is your understanding of leadership of learning and teaching?
2. What aspects of the role are you most confident about and why?
3. What particular qualities does a learning and teaching leader need in the role?
4. What particular qualities do you think you bring to the leadership of learning and teaching in your role?
5. Can you describe your role and what you were responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?
6. How do you see leadership of learning and teaching currently operating in the creative arts?

Interview questions are analysed together to allow participants enough scope to articulate their views through not only one direct question, but also through additional questions that explore how they approach their work, what leadership tools they deploy and what human characteristics and values they see as important. This provides greater opportunity for respondents to mention their leadership and management conceptions fully.

SOLO Taxonomy

In this study, the SOLO taxonomy developed by Biggs and Collis (1982) is used to determine the Associate Deans conceptual understanding of learning and teaching leadership. The SOLO taxonomy comprises five levels of increasing sophistication, from pre-structural to extended abstract (see Figure 3.2). The levels of the SOLO taxonomy are seen as hierarchical with each level building on the previous one. Pre-structural to multi-structural levels are seen as quantitative, focusing on volume of detail. For relational and extended abstract, there is a shift to being qualitative, with a focus on integration, structuring and/or theorising. There is, thus, a distinction between the lower levels of knowledge and the upper levels of integrating and restructuring knowledge.

Figure 0.2 SOLO Taxonomy showing 5 levels of understanding from pre-structural to extended abstract.

Source: With permission from J. Biggs and C. Tang (2011), Figure 5.1 A Hierarchy of verbs that may be used to form intended learning outcomes, p. 91.

The taxonomy is adapted for use in the analysis of Associate Deans’ views on learning and teaching leadership as outlined below:
Pre-structural: missed the point, used tautology to cover lack of understanding or knowledge, did not mention any of Marshall and colleagues’ leadership conceptions (the focus was often only on management conceptions)

Unistructural: one leadership conception defined, other important attributes missed, not related to an overall picture of leadership; simple and obvious connections identified, but their significance not grasped

Multistructural: two or more leadership conceptions mentioned but not structured, the meta-connections missed and their significance not grasped (sees the parts but misses the whole)

Relational: all leadership conceptions compared, explained, related, analysed and integrated (significance of the parts seen in relation to the whole)

Extended abstract: not only were conceptions of leadership related and integrated but also hypotheses made, together with reflection, theorising and the generation of new understandings; connections made going beyond the immediate to generalise, theorise and reflect on the concept

The same six interview questions listed above were coded top-down using the SOLO Taxonomy. Use of the SOLO taxonomy (Biggs & Collis, 1982) adds a deeper qualitative level of analysis by providing a picture of the levels of understanding of the Associate Deans.

**Degrees of Integration**

In this study, Miller and Boix-Mansilla’s (2004) Degrees of Integration model is used to determine the level of understanding of disciplinary difference by Associate Deans. The model comprises four modes of increasing understanding of disciplinary differences, including Mutual Ignorance, Stereotyping, Perspective-Taking and Merging. How the model is adapted for use in the analysis of Associate Deans’ degree of disciplinary integration is outlined below:

**Mutual Ignorance:** is demonstrated by “…a lack of familiarity with, or even hostility toward, other disciplinary perspectives” (p.13). In this mode, Associate Deans do not see disciplines as different and believe that learning and teaching pedagogies could be applied uniformly to all disciplines

**Stereotyping:** is when “…individuals show an awareness of other perspectives and even a curiosity about them. Still, there is a stereotypical quality to the representation of the other’s discipline” (p. 13). In this mode, Associate Deans recognise difference but cannot find a relationship between what they know and the discipline. Other disciplines are siloed from them

**Perspective-taking:** is when “…individuals can play the role of, sympathize with, and anticipate the other’s way of thinking” (p.13). In this mode, Associate Deans recognise other disciplines and show an understanding of their ways of thinking and behaving. When the Associate Dean work closely with someone in the disciplinary areas so that strategic initiatives can be translated into the language of the discipline the Associate Dean is at the perspective-taking level of understanding disciplinary differences
Merging: is when “…perspectives have been mutually revised to the point that they are a new hybrid way of thinking, and it is difficult to distinguish separate disciplinary perspectives in the new hybrid” (p.13). In this mode, Associate Deans bring disciplinary understanding together with learning and teaching to build new knowledge and insights. Merging occurs when the Associate Dean is able to integrate disciplines and learning and teaching.

The following questions were coded top-down using the Degrees of Integration model:

7. Can you describe your role and what you were responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?
38. How do you see leadership of L&T currently operating in the Creative Arts?
39. Who do you think is responsible for leading learning and teaching for the Creative Art?
40. What power or influences do think you have in your role in relation to the Creative Arts disciplines?
41. Can you describe a way to strengthen the leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts?
42. What is your relationship with your Head of School or Deputy Dean in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?
43. What is your relationship with other informal learning and teaching leaders and academics in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?

Using the model provides a framework to explore how the Associate Dean is interacting with and understanding the disciplines within and across the Creative Arts.

**Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at work**

In this study, Goleman’s Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work (Goleman, 2004) is used to determine the degree of emotional intelligence demonstrated by Associate Deans. The importance of emotional intelligence for the Associate Dean role was emphasised by Scott et al. (2008), Southwell et al., (2008a) and Marshall (2007). The Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work include self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill (See Fig. 3.4).

**Table 0.2 The Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work**
(Source: Goleman, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Hallmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-awareness</strong></td>
<td>The ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as their effect on others</td>
<td>Self-confidence, realistic self-assessment, self-deprecating sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-regulation</strong></td>
<td>The ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods. The propensity to suspend judgement – to think before acting</td>
<td>Trustworthiness and integrity, comfort with ambiguity, openness to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>A passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status. A propensity to pursue goals with</td>
<td>Strong drive to achieve, optimism, even in the face of failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Energy and persistence

Organizational commitment

Empathy

The ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people
Skill in treating people according to their emotional reactions

Expertise in building and retaining talent
Cross-cultural sensitivity
Service to clients and customers

Social skill

Proficiency in managing relationships and building networks
An ability to find common ground and build rapport

Effectiveness in leading change
Persuasiveness
Expertise in building and leading teams

The whole interview is coded top-down using the Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work. Using Goleman’s Five Components of Emotional Intelligence at Work (2004) provides a detailed understanding of the types of emotional intelligence displayed by the Associate Deans as they talked about their role.

In the section below the ethical considerations, including the approval needed for the study, are described.

Ethical considerations

The research obtained ethics approval from the RMIT University Design and Social Context College Human Ethics Advisory Network. Formal approval was granted on September 7, 2012 CHEAN A-2000303-02/10 (refer to Appendix 3.2) for face-to-face interviews with Associate Deans or those in an equivalent role. The research is classified as Low Risk (Risk Level 2). A plain language statement was provided to participants and informed consent was sought and granted for all interviewees.

As participants are dispersed across Australia and easily identifiable in these senior leadership positions, particular care is taken throughout the analysis and reporting of findings to ensure the anonymity of participants and the universities to which they belonged. As a staff member at RMIT University, it was not appropriate to interview my line manager who was then in the role of Associate Dean with oversight of the Creative Arts disciplines.

Next chapter

In the next Chapter, Hallmarks from Layers 1, 2, 3 and 4 that are most likely to equip the Associate Dean for their leadership role are brought together to form the Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean (representative of High Symbolic Capital) and Associate Deans in the study are assessed against the prototype.
Findings

The Field must value the Capital which the Associate Dean has to be effective as “…Capital does not exist and function except in relation to a Field” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.101).

This Chapter assesses the leadership interview data from the 25 Associate Deans in this study against the Hallmarks of leadership capability and in turn reveals the extent to which they are equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts in Australian universities. Being equipped with the capabilities of leadership can be a personal attribute or can be bestowed by the context in which the Associate Dean operates.

The following Research Question is addressed in this Chapter:

Research Question 2: To what extent are Associate Deans in Australian universities equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

The Hallmarks for each Layer identified from the literature and presented below are summarised in Figure 4.1.
In the sections below, an analysis of the interview data from the 25 Associate Deans by Layer and Prototype Hallmarks of Capital, including Cultural (Institutionalised and embodied), Social and Economic is presented. As mentioned in Chapter 3, particular care is taken throughout the analysis and reporting of findings to ensure the anonymity of participants and the universities to which they belonged. Each Associate Dean was measured against the Hallmarks and ranked as having the Greatest Capital, Some Capital, Little Capital or the Least Capital.

**Layer 1: Personal level**

In the sections and tables below an analysis of the data against the 10 Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Institutionalised 2 and Embodied States 8) in Layer 1 is presented. In the Tables an outright majority denotes having more than 50% in one category. When there was no outright majority, a majority was determined from/ by combining the Greatest and Some Capital categories and the Little and the Least Capital categories. In this way, the number of Associate Deans in each category is determined.

**Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State, 2 Hallmarks)**

In Table 4.1, the outcomes of the analysis of the Hallmarks of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, including PhD and a qualification in both Creative Arts and Education or higher education Learning and Teaching are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The four questions analysed were:

1. What was your background discipline?
2. What was your undergraduate degree in?
3. Do you have a PhD. If yes, what did it focus on?
4. Do you have a learning and teaching qualification?

**Table 0.1 Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Institutionalised Cultural Capital by Hallmarks in Layer 1 (N=25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Institutionalised Cultural Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD (Q3)</td>
<td>19 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts and L&amp;T qualification (Q1, 2, 4)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A score of 3 was designated the most Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used. The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.*

As shown in Table 4.1, for the Hallmark of having a PhD qualification, the outright majority of Associate Deans (19 or 76%) demonstrated the greatest Institutionalised Cultural Capital. Of the six (24%) with no PhD, four had a background in the Creative Arts, one had a background in Engineering and one had a background in both Creative Arts and Tertiary Education (see Appendix 4.2).

Not having a PhD is reported by some Associate Deans as creating feelings of being under-qualified for the role or leading to being disparaged by colleagues, as illustrated by the following quotes,

No, I don’t [have a PhD]. So I am under-qualified [8]
I do not [have a PhD], no...one of my colleagues who was a pompous fool kept claiming [pointing out] that I didn’t have a doctorate... [5]

This finding is in line with the literature since having a PhD is now seen as an “...academic norm” (Hinshaw, 2001, p.1) and “...most university faculty positions demand a doctorate” (Allan & Aldebron, 2008, p.287). That Creative Arts academics are more likely not to have a PhD (of the six academics who did not have a PhD background, five are from the Creative Arts) may be as a result of the Creative Arts disciplines having moved from CAEs in the amalgamations where having a PhD was not expected as part of their disciplinary identity (Anderson et al., 2011; Chalmers, 2011).

In contrast, for the Hallmark of having a formal qualification in both Creative Arts and Education or Tertiary Learning and Teaching, the majority of Associate Deans (15 or 60%) have Little or the Least Capital and, thus, are not fully equipped. Those with Little Capital (9 or 36%) have a Creative Arts qualification only and those with the Least Capital (6 or 24%) have a qualification in Humanities, Science, Business or Engineering. The minority of Associate Deans have the Greatest Institutionallised Cultural Capital (3 or 12%), fully equipping them to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

Of the ten Associate Deans with formal educational or learning and teaching qualifications (10 or 40%), two had doctorates in Education, three had Masters in Education, while the remaining five have either a graduate diploma or a graduate certificate in learning and teaching. Those with a formal educational or learning and teaching qualification emphasise having learning and teaching knowledge is required for the role, as illustrated by the quote below,

...you need to know teaching and learning backwards, because you have to be able to argue your position for why you’re doing what you’re doing so certainly in terms of learning and teaching theory, use of IT in teaching in teaching and learning...those are the things [in which] I’m most confident [11]

Those without a formal educational or learning and teaching qualification (15 or 60%) indicate that they rely on other learning and teaching leaders for learning and teaching expertise or operate from their own prior experience, as illustrated by the quotes below,

I do have the great benefit of having a Director of Learning and Teaching. And X actually does have Learning and Teaching qualifications, so in some ways I collaborate with her a lot to ensure that whilst my position is more the leadership one, I make sure I get the appropriate support from a Learning and Teaching professional [21]

...from the beginning...I have been as a volunteer, in anything to do with curriculum, curriculum design... ...but I have no qualifications as such...[9]

That over half of the Associate Deans (15) did not have an Education or Tertiary Learning and Teaching qualification is not surprising, since learning and teaching qualifications are not required or valued in university settings, as illustrated by Sword (2014, p. 788) who in her interviews with 39 staff found that,

[d]espite their individual enthusiasm, however, several informants [academic participants] voiced their concern that the postgraduate certificate remains a ‘boutique’ course that is not fully supported by university administrators.

Equally, under half of the Associate Deans (12 or 48%) have a background in the Creative Arts and, therefore, enculturation in the studio model of education (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; Miller & Boix-Mansilla, 2004; Budge 2012) Of those, nine of the 12 Associate Deans did not have an educational
credential either. This means that the majority (22 or 88%) of the Associate Deans in this study did not have the requisite “disciplinary content knowledge” and the “pedagogical content knowledge” to lead learning and teaching in a multi-disciplinary faculty (Cochran, 1991; Kleickmann et al., 2013; Scott et al., 2008; Shulman, 1986, 1987).

Summary of Hallmarks for Institutionalised Cultural Capital in Layer 1

1. Hallmark, PhD: the outright majority of Associate Deans were fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

2. Hallmark, formal qualification in both Creative Arts and Education or Educational/Learning and teaching qualification: the majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts, and even less so for those with a Creative Arts background.

Cultural Capital (Embodied State, 8 Hallmarks)

In Table 4.2, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital, including area of research, a focus on leadership as well as management, high conception of learning and teaching leadership, high understanding of disciplinary differences, being male, and high satisfaction with the role are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The 17 questions analysed were:

5. What area do you research and publish in?
6. What is your understanding of leadership of learning and teaching?
7. Can you describe your role and what you were responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?
9. What made you interested in the area of learning and teaching?
11. How long have you been in your learning and teaching leadership role?
18. What aspects of the role are you most confident about and why?
19. What particular qualities does a learning and teaching leader need in the role?
20. What particular qualities do you think you bring to the leadership of L&T in your role?
23. What barriers or frustrations do you face in your role?
38. How do you see leadership of L&T currently operating in the Creative Arts?
39. Who do you think is responsible for leading learning and teaching for the Creative Art?
40. What power or influences do think you have in your role in relation to the Creative Arts disciplines?
41. Can you describe a way to strengthen the leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts?
42. What is your relationship with your Head of School or Deputy Dean in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?
43. What is your relationship with other informal learning and teaching leaders and academics in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?
44. Thinking about your position, would you recommend this role to a colleague?
45. Would you re-apply for this position when your term comes to an end?
Table 0.2  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Greatest (3)</th>
<th>Some (2)</th>
<th>Little (1)</th>
<th>Least (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications in L&amp;T (Q5)</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in influencing change (Q9)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on leadership as well as management (Q6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 38)</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High conceptualisation of L&amp;T leadership (Q6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 38)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High understanding of disciplinary difference (Q7, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being male</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with role (Q23, 44 &amp; 45)</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated level of Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A score of 3 was designated the greatest Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used. The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total in the group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.*

As shown in Table 4.2, for the Hallmark of having publications in higher education Learning and Teaching, the outright majority (16 or 64%) were not fully equipped for their leadership role, demonstrating the Least Capital by not having publications in learning and teaching. Associate Deans with a Creative Arts background were less likely than those from other disciplines to publish in either, learning and teaching or in their own discipline, with four of the five Associate Deans who did not publish having a background in the Creative Arts (See Appendix 4.2).

Those who did not publish in learning and teaching highlighted that publications in learning and teaching should be acknowledged equally to disciplinary publications, and that continuing to publish in disciplines is important for promotion and/or for returning to their discipline homes, as illustrated by the following quotes,

> I think it’d be getting recognition for the importance of learning and teaching research to maybe get some acknowledgement that it’s as much research as traditional research is... [19]

> There is that tension within higher education where [disciplinary] research, particularly from a promotional point of view, is seen to be very important [3]

> I was very conscious that I was going to have to go back into my discipline and if I lost touch in that, in fact I was backing myself into a corner...I made a conscious decision that I needed
to keep up my more practice embedded research if I was going to go anywhere research wise [16]

It has been found that conducting research that focuses on either individual practice or on areas of educational research more generally develops knowledge about learning and teaching or pedagogical content knowledge (Boyer et al., 2015; Kreber, 2012; 2013; Shulman, 1986; 2012). Regardless, in this study the majority of Associate Deans publish in their disciplinary area rather than in the discipline of learning and teaching, supporting Blackmore’s (2007) view that the majority of academics strongly identify with their primary discipline.

**For the Hallmark of having an interest in influencing change in learning and teaching** as their primary interest in taking on the role, the majority of Associate Deans (22 or 88%) were not fully equipped for their leadership role, since they indicated as their main reason for taking on the role either Little Capital, a passion and/or enjoyment in learning and teaching (11 or 44%) or the Least Capital, being approached and/or concerned about who else might be appointed (11 or 44%). The overwhelming minority (3 or 12%) were fully equipped demonstrating the Greatest Embodied Cultural Capital with a desire to bring about change in learning and teaching.

Taking on the role because of a desire and interest in bringing about change is illustrated by the quote below,

> There’s always ways you’d like to change things. I’d like to see a strengthening of the recognition of learning and teaching in the sector…and I think in terms of helping people scaffold to succeed – both the staff and students [7]

Taking on the role because of a passion and enjoyment for learning and teaching, or because they are concerned about who else might get the role are illustrated by the following quotes,

> Well, I really enjoy teaching…I’ve just found teaching quite empowering and I was really passionate about it, so that tended to be where I spent a lot of my time at work, being on teaching and learning committees or policy development stuff or doing guest lectures or whatever… [1]

> ...so it was more an accident and more a fact that the position opened up and I thought, well rather than not go through it and then be perhaps disillusioned with whoever did get the role, I thought I’d rather do it myself (if I was accepted) [18]

A focus on change management is considered one of the core functions of leaders of learning and teaching in universities, given that much work is required in learning and teaching that has at its heart the need to “…challenge and transform followers’ expectations” (Marshall, 2006, p.7). A teacher-centred or transmission view of learning and teaching rather than a student centred-one is still the norm in universities (O’Neill & McMahon, 2005; Norton et al., 2013). Whilst important, a passion for learning and teaching may not be directive enough to enact change and does not necessarily translate into a capacity for re-conceptualising learning and teaching in the disciplinary area (Radloff, 2005; Scott et al., 2008).

**For the Hallmark of having an equal focus on leadership and management**, the majority of Associate Deans (14 or 56%) were equipped for the role since, this represented those with the Greatest Capital (7 or 28%) l, mentioning leadership and management dimensions equally and Some Capital (7 or 28%), mentioning more leadership than management dimensions The remaining (11 or
44%) were not fully equipped, demonstrating Little Capital, mentioning only leadership dimensions (2 or 8%) or the Least Capital, mentioning only management dimensions (9 or 36%).

An emphasis on both leadership and management is illustrated in the quote below,

...I think at the faculty level the ADTL role also has a crucial leadership role as a kind of mediator or translator of university-wide initiatives on teaching and learning as well as sector wide ones because the role means that one has to not only manage the expectations and work of the faculty in that area but also be able to translate policy or protocol shifts that are coming from the university centre, many of which are imposed externally by government [18]

An emphasis on management only, or more management than leadership dimensions, is illustrated by the following quotes,

...I would give structural advice, the standards expected by the university and by the AQF. I would review it to make sure it was up to scratch...I'm just sort of giving final approval... [15]

...as the Associate Dean [I am] involved with a number of processes by which we attempt to ensure quality both in terms of what is called an “annual course monitoring” approach [and] at each five years all courses undertake a comprehensive course review [3]

A quote by an Associate Dean who reflected on the prevalence of the management aspects of the role is illustrated in the quote below,

...the curious thing is that Associate Dean roles have really shifted in the last 15 years and now...reside more on the Governance and quality assurance side than it used to [8]

The finding that the majority of Associate Deans are equipped in the Hallmark of leadership and management may be as a result of the increasing importance being reported in the literature on managerialism and the need for developing leadership capacity (Southwell et al., 2008a; Marshall et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2008). Even though leadership and management dimensions are ‘discrete’, they are ‘integrated’ and are both integral to the Associate Dean role in practice (Marshall et al., 2011). However, whilst Associate Deans may have reported in the interviews more of a leadership role, many also mentioned that organisational tasks took over from their learning and teaching strategic leadership time describing their role as often revolving around quality assurance management (See Appendix 4.6). This focus on quality assurance management is likely to be due to the successive Government interventions and policy reform of learning and teaching in universities to enhance learning and teaching quality (Chalmers, 2007).

**For the Hallmark of demonstrating a highly sophisticated conception of learning and teaching leadership** the outright majority of Associate Deans (13 or 52%) are not fully equipped for their strategic leadership role. They, demonstrate the Least Capital with a low (uni or pre structural) conception of leadership of learning and teaching, characterised by mentioning only one leadership dimension, missing important attributes, not relating elements to an overall picture of leadership and providing simple and obvious connections without grasping their significance (uni-structural); or missing the point, using tautology to cover their lack of understanding or knowledge, focusing often only on management conceptions (pre-structural). The remaining Associate Deans (12 or 48%) demonstrate either Some Capital (4 or 16%), with a relational conception, characterised by comparing, explaining, relating, analysing and/or integrating, with the significance of the parts seen
in relation to the whole; Little Capital (6 or 24%), or a multi-structural conception, characterised by two or more leadership dimensions mentioned but not structured, the meta-connections missed and their significance not grasped; or the Greatest Capital (2 or 8%), or extended abstract conception, characterised by not only relating and integrating conceptions of leadership, but also hypothesising, reflecting, theorising and generating new understandings.

A sophisticated or extended abstract conception of leadership, is illustrated by the quote below,

...so leaders have to think through beyond the day to day operational thing in a very visionary way about well theorised, well conceptualised, evidence based approaches to learning and teaching...So leadership to me says well we go about our course and programs the day to day ministry of operations stuff that leadership means what’s happening internationally, but more than a helicopter vision, it’s a satellite vision with international perspectives of the digital futures, agenda, what does the student experience look like? How can it be better? How do we know and think strategically? [7]

A low or pre- or uni-structural conception of leadership is illustrated by the quote below in relation to a question about what teaching and learning leadership is,

I’m not really quite sure what to answer. We could say an awful lot or very little. In principle I think my aim is really, finally, to just enthuse people with the subjects I teach and enhance their enjoyment and their knowledge and their understanding... but I can’t say I begin with outcomes in mind [3]

Associate Deans with only a Creative Arts background are more likely to have the lowest conceptual understanding of learning and teaching leadership, with 7 out of the 12 (58%) demonstrating a pre-structural or uni-structural conception.

If leaders of learning and teaching are to influence others, they require a highly sophisticated understanding of learning and teaching leadership to be used flexibly according to the context in which they operate (Ramsden, 1988; Scott et al., 2008). Being able to articulate a high level or sophisticated understanding of learning and teaching leadership requires theorising and generating new understandings (Biggs and Collis, 1982). Having a high conceptual understanding of learning and teaching leadership relies on Associate Deans having both the “...academic credentials AND particular kinds of intellectual training if people are going to place reliance on [their] judgement when it bears on academic matters” (Ramsden, 1998, p. 123).

For the Hallmark of high understanding of disciplinary differences, the majority of Associate Deans (15 or 60%) were not fully equipped for their leadership role since when combined, they demonstrated either Little Capital with a ‘Stereotyping’ degree of integration (6 or 24%) or the Least Capital with a ‘Mutual Ignorance’ degree of integration (9 or 36%). The minority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Greatest Capital or a ‘Merging’ degree of disciplinary understanding (4 or 16%).

Having a ‘Stereotyping’ degree of integration, characterised by being aware of other perspectives but with a stereotypical quality to the picture of others’ disciplines, is illustrated in the quote below,

Ok, hmmm. Creative arts, well the staff that I have to deal with in creative arts, always see themselves as the exception to the rule. And I probably don’t have as much knowledge of their area to be able to say ‘no, you’re not the exception to the rule’ – you still have to at least obey – so when I started looking at things like ensuring that the standards are the same across all the campuses, they’re very, very creative about proving – with inverted commas
around proving – “proving” that they have the same standard even though they’re doing something totally different to one another, and things like that. So if there was somebody maybe more attuned to the discipline they might know better... [24]

Having a ‘Mutual Ignorance’ degree of integration, characterised by a lack of familiarity with other disciplines, other than their own background discipline, is illustrated by the quotes below,

I think it’s a discipline specific aspect and it would just draw too much of my time away from ensuring that the faculty as a whole has the appropriate support... [17]

...I don’t really get involved in the disciplines so much...But I can certainly put things in place that ensure quality... [11]

Having a Merging degree of disciplinary understanding, characterised by disciplinary perspectives being hybridised, is illustrated by the quote below,

...even in those subdivisions there are enormously different ways in the way they want to behave and develop teaching and learning and different systemologies of work and so it’s very hard to just clump them all into one, if you are attempting to bring change to the faculty [2]

Having a Perspective-taking degree of disciplinary understanding, characterised by sympathizing with, and anticipating others’ ways of thinking and taking different approaches to a task into account), is illustrated in the quote below,

Like I said, we don’t really distinguish the Creative Arts from Philosophy or Sociology; it all falls into the barrel of the Faculty. And there’s probably some work to be done in teasing out the distinctiveness and providing further encouragement based on that distinctiveness to perhaps individuals [21]

It is critical that Associate Deans responsible for the Creative Arts recognise that leadership of different disciplines requires specialised learning and teaching and disciplinary pedagogical knowledge as generic strategies are often a bad fit. Moreover, as “[l]ack of attention to disciplinarity may make cross-disciplinary working, whether in senior management teams or in research projects, more problematic and less successful. It may also inhibit talented faculty from moving into senior positions. For all these reasons, paying attention to disciplinarity seems vital (Blackmore, 2007, p.237). Therefore, if “…[Associate Deans] are to think in qualitatively new ways or discover the solution to a problem unlocked by the insights housed in a neighbouring domain” (Miller & Boix-Mansilla, 2004, p. 3), Associate Deans need a high understanding of disciplinary differences and to work alongside disciplinary experts in various Fields. This may mean working within a team of disciplinary experts rather than they, themselves, having to encompass the disciplinary Field of all the disciplines an Associate Dean might lead.

For the Hallmark of being male, the outright majority of Associate Deans (13 or 52%) being male were fully equipped for their leadership role, demonstrating the greatest Embodied Cultural Capital. Just under half of the Associate Deans were female (12 or 48%).

An awareness of being a female minority in a male dominated university leadership environment is illustrated by the following quote,
...but until this year all three heads of school were men so they used to go out for lunches...one head of school in the most male dominated school is [now] female...[16]

Statistics show that men in senior roles in universities still markedly outnumber women (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Currie, Thiele, & Harris, 2002; Fitzgerald & Wilkinson, 2010; Pyke, 2009; Simpson and Fitzgerald, 2014). For example, in the UK between 2013-14 only 22 per cent of professors (4,415 out of 19,750) were women despite women comprising 45% of the total academic workforce. In addition, only a third of senior academic staff, excluding professors, were women (Staff in Higher Education Report, 2013-14). In Australia, too, only 29.29% of women held positions at Senior Lecturer and above in 2014 compared to 70.1% of men who held above senior lecturer Faculty positions (Catalyst, 2015).

It is, therefore, unusual that just under half of the Associate Deans were female. That there were almost equal numbers of men and women in the Associate Dean role in this study may suggest that there is a feminisation of the role occurring in comparison to other senior positions in the university and that the role itself may be becoming or being perceived as more administrative, since women are reported to be in more managerial or administrative leadership roles in universities (Simpson & Fitzgerald, 2014; White, Carvalho & Riordan, 2011).

**For the Hallmark of being highly satisfied with the role**, the majority of Associate Deans (19 or 76%) were equipped for their leadership role, since when combined, they demonstrated either the Greatest Embodied Cultural Capital (8 or 32%) being highly satisfied with the role or Some Embodied Cultural Capital, being mostly satisfied with the role (11 or 44%). High satisfaction with the role is illustrated by the quote below,

> ...love it, it gives me enormous pleasure and much as I love teaching and after doing it do I want to go back into after this to teaching? No. [16]

Being mostly satisfied with the role is illustrated by the quote below,

> ...it’s a role that’s interesting, you can become a bit of a target, you know, when decisions are made that you are particularly seen by the rank in file as part of the university bureaucracy. I’ve found that to be a little bit challenging because I’m trying to get on well with most people... [3]

Being the least satisfied with the role is illustrated by the quote below,

> The amount of time it takes to get things happening sometimes can be a problem. I feel very much meat in the sandwich kind of person...I find that quite frustrating. [11]

The onerous administrative load in the role, often without any administrative assistance, mentioned by Associate Deans is illustrated by the quote below,

> ...it’s the paperwork that is the killer. The forms are getting more and more complicated as they try and simplify it [15]

According to the literature, having an optimistic attitude towards work and enhanced organisational commitment job satisfaction is linked with job satisfaction. Such satisfaction not only comes from the job but from the context in which the Associate Dean works (Singh, 2012). As Associate Deans were fully equipped in aspects such as having a PhD, high institutional knowledge, high emotional intelligence, belonging to an Associate Dean group and having a supportive Dean, these may all contribute to the context in which the Associate Deans finds satisfaction.
For the **Hallmark of Emotional Intelligence**, the majority of Associate Deans (18 or 76%) were equipped for their leadership role, since when combined, they demonstrated either the Greatest Embodied Cultural Capital (11 or 44%), displaying four or five components of emotional intelligence or Some Capital (7 or 28%) showing three components of emotional intelligence. The remaining Associate Deans (7 or 28%) demonstrated Little Capital, showing two components of emotional intelligence (5 or 20%) or the Least Capital showing one or no components of emotional intelligence (2 or 8%).

The components of emotional intelligence shown the most by Associate Deans were social skills, empathy, motivation and self-awareness, with self-regulation shown the least (See Appendix 5.7).

Social skills, empathy, motivation and self-awareness are illustrated by the quotes below,

> ....and not to make it political, but based on best practice, based on the right decision...to work with people well [10] [Social skills]

> ...well, you know the pressures that [academics] feel under and those sorts of things, and supporting them when they’re developing a new project or whatever...and understanding the work that they do within the disciplines, that grass roots understanding [12] [Empathy]

> ...it’s an exciting, challenging role that is important because we need to meet the needs of students [3] [Motivation]

> ...so when we get to a functional area, I’ve got enough of a psychology background to know how to work with my team and be aware of when I should back off [2] [Self-awareness]

The finding that the majority of the Associate Deans were equipped for the role in terms of their emotional intelligence is promising since having high emotional intelligence is reported as core to effective strategic leadership, yet often reported as the area most lacking in leaders (Goleman, 2004; Goleman et al., 2002). This is in line with the capability reported in the study of learning and teaching leaders by Scott et al. (2008) which considered the notion of emotional intelligence, encompassing persuasion and personal interaction, as most important for the Associate Dean role.

**Summary of 8 Hallmarks for Embodied Cultural Capital in Layer 1**

1. Hallmark, publications in higher education Learning and Teaching: *the outright majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts, and even less so for those with a background in the Creative Arts.
2. Hallmark, an interest in influencing change: *the majority of Associate Deans were equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
3. Hallmark, a focus on leadership and management: *the majority of Associate Deans were equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
4. Hallmark, a high conception of learning and teaching leadership: *the outright majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts, and even less so for those with a background in the Creative Arts.
5. Hallmark, a highly sophisticated understanding of disciplinary differences: *the majority of Associate Deans were equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
6. Hallmark, being male: *the outright majority of Associate Deans were fully equipped (in the sense here defined)* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
7. Hallmark, satisfaction with the role: *the majority of Associate Deans were equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
8. Hallmark, emotional intelligence: *the majority of Associate Deans were equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
Overview of the ten Hallmarks in Layer 1

_Institutionalised Cultural Capital_

For the two Hallmarks of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, there was only one (having a PhD) for which the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

_Embodied Cultural Capital_

For the eight Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital, there was only one (being male) for which the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

In addition, there were 2 Hallmarks where the outright majority were not equipped. These include having publications in higher education Learning and Teaching and a high conception of learning and teaching leadership.

In the next section, the Hallmarks for Layer 2, the University level are considered.

Layer 2: University level

In the sections below an analysis of the interview data against the 18 Prototype Hallmarks, of Cultural Capital (Institutionalised and Embodied States), Social Capital and Economic Capital, in Layer 2 is presented.

_Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State, 1 Hallmark)_

In Table 4.3, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmark of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, namely a full Professorship, is presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Greatest (3)</th>
<th>Some (2)</th>
<th>Little (1)</th>
<th>Least (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professorship</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
<td>16 (64)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A score of 3 was designated the most Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used. The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.

As shown in Table 4.3, for the Hallmark of being a Professor, the majority (21 or 84%) are equipped for their strategic leadership role since when combined, they demonstrate either the Greatest
Institutionalised Cultural Capital (5 or 20%) with a Professorship or Some Institutionalised Cultural Capital (16 or 68%) at the level of Associate Professor.

An Associate Dean commented that leadership roles in learning and teaching were not attracting full professors which was in contrast to research leadership roles, as illustrated by the quote below,

...people who put up their hand for research, most of them were members of the professoriate – so for the group research committee, they were professors. For the learning and teaching committee two were associate professors, one was a lecturer B and the other were lecturers C, senior lecturers [7]

The finding that while overall the Associate Deans were equipped, the outright majority (16 or 64%) were at the Associate Professor level, with only 5 or 20% full Professors. Whilst the majority of Associate Deans had an Associate Professor status, it may be that academics already at the professorial level are not attracted to the role (Farrell, 2009).

Summary for the Hallmark of Institutionalised Cultural Capital in Layer 2

1. Hallmark, Professorship: the majority of Associate Deans were equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Cultural Capital (Embodied State, 5 Hallmarks)

In Table 4.4, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital, including having experience in other learning and teaching roles prior to being Associate Dean, having an induction to the role, having time in the Associate Dean role and having high institutional knowledge are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The five questions analysed were:

11. How long have you been in your learning and teaching leadership role?
12. Is your role full-time or part-time?
16. What kind of induction or professional development did you have before you came into your role?
18. What aspects of the role are you most confident about and why?
20. What particular qualities do you think you bring to the leadership of L&T in your role?

Table 0.4 Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Embodied Cultural Capital by Hallmarks in Layer 2 (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Greatest (3)</th>
<th>Some (2)</th>
<th>Little (1)</th>
<th>Least (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior experience in related L&amp;T areas</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>7(28)</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal induction</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time in Associate Dean role</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>22 (88)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High institutional knowledge</td>
<td>20 (80)</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising themselves as a leader L&amp;T in the Creative Arts</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14 (56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.4, for the Hallmark of having prior experience in related learning and teaching areas, other than teaching in own discipline before taking on the Associate Dean role, the majority of Associate Deans (17 or 68%) are not fully equipped since when combined, they demonstrate either Little Capital (7 or 28%) with less than 5 years of related experience or the Least Capital (10 or 40%) with no experience in the area of learning and teaching prior to the role. The minority of the Associate Deans (6 or 24%) demonstrate the greatest Embodied Cultural Capital having experience in a different but related area.

Examples of prior experience in the area of learning and teaching are illustrated by the quotes below,

I did a lot of work...in access programmes, equity and access programmes, and I used to work in student services as a learning consultant [12]

I spent a lot of my time at work, being on teaching and learning committees or policy development stuff [1]

The benefit of having prior experience in the area of learning and teaching is illustrated by the quote below,

I think I’ve been fortunate that I’ve had a good background grounding before I got to the role, so I have a lot of my co-Associate Deans are people that have just been a teacher in their particular area and have had the mantle thrust upon them [2]

Having different experiences in the area of learning and teaching enables Associate Deans to build expertise in learning and teaching and to recognise disciplinary discourses of pedagogy and to use them selectively and appropriately in new contexts (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008; Miller and Boix-Mansilla, 2004). The findings suggest that the majority of the Associate Deans did not have prior experience and this may weaken their adaptive expertise in the role since “...learning is a continuous process grounded in experience” (Kolb, 1984). In addition, the lack of related learning and teaching experience may be indicative of a limited set of opportunities or a defined career path for the as Associate Dean role, as pointed out by James et al. (2015, p. 20),

[i]t is important to acknowledge that these [learning and teaching roles] are credible career paths in themselves and to support purposeful planning of career trajectories in teaching and learning leadership. This includes equipping staff with the management and quality assurance skills required and providing administrative support, along with the career paths and recognition systems that are key to sustainability and succession planning.

For the Hallmark of having a formal induction for the role of Associate Dean, the outright majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped for the role since they demonstrated the Least Capital (22 or 88%) having no induction, The remaining minority (3 or 12%) reported having an induction, for example a handover, shadowing or attending a course on leadership.

The importance of an induction to gain relevant knowledge and understanding of processes, systems and responsibilities, is illustrated by the quotes below,

I have to say that there are a number of things that I really am still struggling to get up to speed with that I could have done with some prior orientation about. I’ll tell you, AQF not
being the least of those... it’s been a very steep learning curve for me to be able to deal with questions and provide staff with the information they need [13]

...it really did feel like being thrown in the deep end and I actually think an induction, an explanation of some of the processes and committees (especially the ones that are beyond the faculty) would have been really useful, explanations of the timelines: things that I’ve had to work out myself... [18]

I think induction is really critically important...I think an induction program that helps around policies and processes, something like that would be very important [7]

Grappling in the face of having no formal induction, is illustrated by the following quote,

An induction?...that would have been nice. I grabbed hold of the previous guy before he left and said, “I have no idea.” So he took me out for lunch and all he did was tell me the gossip [16]

The literature consistently highlights that induction is needed for Associate Deans and that there is a “...need for an induction process that addresses the leadership role and how this role fits within the specific university context policies and vision documents” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 9).

From the findings above, familiarisation with Quality Assurance processes and an introduction to the committee structures and processes is seen as extremely helpful and yet this is not in place for the majority of Associate Deans. A number of studies recommend that for consistency in the role and taking into account the kinds of expertise required to lead learning and teaching (Marshall et al., 2011), an induction is critical. Similarly, an OLT funded project developed a program framework which included a “[c]omprehensive induction to, and mentoring in, the role of curriculum leader in teaching and learning” (Southwell et al., 2008a, p. 5). There is no evidence of the implementation of any of these initiatives in the interviews with the Associate Deans.

For the Hallmark of having more time in the Associate Dean role, the outright majority (21 or 84%) of Associate Deans are not fully equipped since they demonstrate Little Capital with less than five years of experience. The overwhelming minority of Associate Deans (1 or 4%) reported having the greatest Embodied Cultural Capital with ten or more years of experience.

The value of having more time in the role provided for a deep understanding of the role and a sense of confidence, as illustrated by the quote below,

...I guess there is nothing that I’m not confident but if I’ve been in the role for 10 years you’d probably expect somebody like me to say that [17]

The typical three year contract period for the Associate Dean role was mentioned as contributing to not having time to develop fully in the role, as illustrated by the quote below,

...in the normal course of events, this would be a three year role and there would be a new amateur who comes in who would take a year and a half to work out what they want to do and then slot in another slightly enthusiastic amateur [once they get going] [8]

Of the 21 Associate Deans who mentioned their future in the role, six (6 or 24%) report that they wanted to go back to their substantive position and pick up their research. Two (2 or 8%) were hoping to retire and two (2 or 8%) are in the midst of a reshuffle at their university. The remainder (12 or 48%) indicate that they are happy to continue in the role. Since the interviews were conducted
with this group of Associate Deans in 2012, seven Associate Deans (7 or 28%) are no longer in these positions. The contractual nature of the Associate Dean role and the degree of turnover in the role means that it is less likely that an Associate will extend their leadership knowledge over time and build their repertoire of experiences from which to draw that a longer period in the role would facilitate (Boud & Hager, 2012, Ramsden, 1998, Southwell et al., 2008a).

**For the Hallmark of having high institutional knowledge,** the outright majority of Associate Deans (20 or 80%) demonstrated a thorough knowledge of their institution or the Greatest Capital, while the remaining minority demonstrated the Least Capital (5 or 20%).

The importance of having high institutional knowledge, that is knowing who to ask, how to chair a meeting, what the policies are, what to do and what questions to ask, is critical in enabling Associate Deans to carry out their role effectively and efficiently, as illustrated by the quote below,

> I feel very confident, because I know a lot of people across the university, and who can answer certain things, and who can help, and who’s the best. So I’m confident from that perspective, from a university perspective. So who does what around the university, and what their expertise is, and who does best practice. So I think that’s really important too. It’s been so valuable for me, starting a new role, if I didn’t know that I think I would have found it much more difficult [10]

The “…[i]nterpersonal dynamics, institutional workings and the relationship between power, knowledge and control” have been the focus of significant number of studies (Gillies & Lucey, 2007, p.1). These reveal that being able to navigate the formal and informal rules or ‘hidden curriculum’ is critical for Associate Deans and is seen as essential to gaining power or traction in an organisation (Nissen, 2007). For example, as pointed out by Scott et al., (2008, p. 78), institutional knowledge is seen to be critical to managing complexity in an organisation, in that “…the most striking contextual influences operate on the knowledge and skills associated with university operations, in which managing competitive pressures, institutional change capacity and external accountabilities all appear to play a role”. The finding that the Associate Deans in this study were well equipped in this area is positive.

**For the Hallmark of recognising themselves as a leader of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts,** the outright majority are not equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting the Least Capital (14 or 56%) believing that the leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts were the academics (8 or 32%), the Dean (1 or 4%), nobody (3 or 12%) or that they did not know who the leader was (2 or 8%). The minority have the Greatest Social Capital (11 or 44%) reporting that they are the leaders of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts, either individually (5 or 20%) or collaboratively (6 or 24%).

Associate Deans leading learning individually or in collaboration with others is illustrated by the quotes below,

> In terms of the learning and teaching space, it would be me [24]

> ...the Associate Heads of School...the Head of School obviously has to take a responsibility for that as well and then the Associate Dean...[also the] individual academic who’s well developed, who’s well-rounded, who gets what they’re doing actually going out there and instigating a project or making an innovation or taking an initiative...[11]
The notion of a dispersed leadership model is implicit in the work of Scott et al. (2008) given that there are so many staff members involved in leadership of learning and teaching, but the lack of formal role descriptions that dovetail the positions point to an absence, often, of leadership.

A belief that leadership of learning and teaching lay elsewhere or that nobody was leading, is illustrated by the quotes below,

I think the staff in the schools themselves. I think the people who have that rich discipline knowledge...I think in terms of the discipline; they’re the experts [8]

Everyone’s responsible for it but nobody – I’d like to think they were...I think the problem is we’re all doing our own little thing...some of us are writing on it, some of us are discussing it, some people are getting together and doing projects [but] it doesn’t sort of work enough. [14]

I don’t think anybody is...I just think a loose conglomeration of crazy cats is probably the best we are ever going to get. [2]

The finding that over half of the Associate Deans in this study report that learning and teaching in the Creative Arts is being led by the academics in schools or not being led at all, is of concern, since, the literature argues that “[e]ffective leaders know who they are and where they are going...” (Howe, 2012, p. 1). However, this finding may also be due to the attitudes by some Creative Arts academics that their leadership and approach to learning and teaching from Associate Deans does not account for disciplinary differences and therefore they are not recognised by them as leaders (Blackmore, 2007; Neumann, 2001).

Summary of Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital in Layer 2:

1. Hallmark, prior experience in related learning and teaching areas: the majority of Associate Deans are not equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts
2. Hallmark, formal induction: the outright majority of Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts
3. Hallmark, more time in Associate Dean role: the majority of Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts
4. Hallmark, high institutional knowledge: the outright majority of Associate Deans are fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts
5. Hallmark, perception of self as leader of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Social Capital, 12 Hallmarks

In Table 4.5, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Social Capital, including internal networks of the Associate Deans, a relationship with the central learning and teaching group, line management of staff, a supportive Dean and good relationship with the Heads of School, demonstrating active leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts through implementing new initiatives at an operational level or leading learning and teaching projects; the recruitment and selection process, the time fraction of their role, whether learning and teaching is valued in the university, the size of the faculty and the grouping of disciplines in a faculty, is presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The 13 questions analysed were:
9. What made you interested in the area of L&T?
10. How many disciplines are your responsible for leading learning and teaching and how much time do you spend with each?
12. Is your role full-time or part-time?
14. Do you have any line management responsibility?
22. Do you belong to any networks and how do they help you in your role?
25. Can you please draw the learning and teaching structure at your university?
26. How valued is learning and teaching in your University?
29. Can you identify any projects or initiatives in the Creative Arts over the past two years in which you have been involved?
33. How does the central learning and teaching unit interact with you and your faculty?
39. Who do you think is responsible for leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?
40. What power or influence do you think you have in your role in relation to the Creative Arts disciplines?
42. What is your relationship with your Head of School or Deputy Dean in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?
42a. Do they support or collaborate with you?

### Table 0.5 Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Social Capital by Hallmarks in Layer 2 (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Associate Dean group</td>
<td>15 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically connected relationship with central L&amp;T</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Dean</td>
<td>23 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship with Head of School</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at School level</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading learning and teaching projects in Creative Arts</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigorous recruitment</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time fraction</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University that values learning and teaching</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger faculty</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many discipline areas in faculty</td>
<td>18 (72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A score of 3 was designated the most Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used.
The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean. It needs to acknowledged that the organisational structure of the Dean and the Heads of School might vary in different universities and might not apply consistently in all cases.

As shown in Table 4.5, for the Hallmark of belonging to an Associate Dean group across the university, the outright majority are equipped to lead learning and teaching having the Greatest Social Capital (15 or 60%), reporting meeting regularly with other Associate Deans in a formalised way in their university. The remaining Associate Deans had the Least Capital (10 or 40%) reporting no meetings with others.

The value of participation in a network in providing intelligence about the whole university, as a support and power and advocacy base, as well as a place of belonging, is illustrated by the quotes below,

We’ve formed a really good network, the moment one of us doesn’t know how to do something or says, ‘Has anyone had this problem before?’...You send an email round it comes straight back [16]

...in reality, the ADE group is far more significant than any other committee or board...a group of people who actually know what they are talking about. None [of us] are amateurs. You know we are all professionally working in the same Field [8]

Having opportunities to engage in effective strategic networks is reported as an important way to build effective leadership as well as future knowledge and learning in organisations (Ibarra & Hunter, 2007; Partanen & Möller, 2012). The majority of Associate Deans in this study found an Associate Dean network valuable and this finding aligns with Southwell et al.’s (2008a) study where Associate Deans mentioned networking as one of the important ways they felt connected within the university.

As well, the study by de la Harpe & Peterson (2009) showed that implementing a strategic knowledge network for Associate Deans built connections across the university and also provided advocacy and knowledge support for the Associate Deans.

For the Hallmark of having a strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning and Teaching Unit, the outright majority were not equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting the Least Capital (18 or 72%) with no strategic connection with the central learning and teaching unit. The remaining minority reported having the Greatest Social Capital (7 or 28%) with a useful relationship.

The central learning and teaching unit not being connected or relevant, is illustrated by the quote below,

...they tend to be a little bit separate from the faculties, a little bit removed from what they’re doing. They tend to manage things like Blackboard...they do the professional development and those types of things [11]

A close working relationship with the central learning and teaching unit, is illustrated by the quote below,

...beyond the faculty the university is pretty good in having a number of areas that are really supportive. I work very closely with people in [the central learning and teaching unit] area which is really the university central office for supporting teaching and learning in every faculty, so there’re good people there [18]
Since their inception, academic staff in central learning and teaching units have often been perceived by schools as outsiders and have struggled to find acceptance by the majority of academics in the university (Lee, Manathunga & Kandlbinder, 2008). This aligns with the findings of this study which found that the majority of the Associate Deans and central learning and teaching units did not have strong relationships, despite the need for these two leadership groups to be united around strategic learning and teaching plans which required “…effective relationships…through[out] the organisation” (Holt et al., 2010, p. 6).

For the Hallmark of having line management of academic and/or staff in learning and teaching support, the majority of Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching since when combined, they had either Little Capital (20% or 5), with one to three direct reports, or the Least Capital (12 or 48%), with no line management responsibility. The overwhelming minority have the Greatest Social Capital (3 or 12%) with line management of academic staff in schools or direct line management of learning and teaching staff.

The positive aspects of having line management are illustrated by the quote below,

[...line management] would make it much easier... it just would tighten things up a lot and make things a lot quicker and more efficient [14]

The importance and value of having line management is reported in the literature, since line management of staff is associated with an increased ability to positively influence others, since line managers are responsible for day-to-day people management, allocating or delegating work, monitoring outputs, providing feedback, measuring performance (Currie & Proctor, 2001).

The finding in this study that the majority of the Associate Deans did not have line management of academic staff or learning and teaching staff is not surprising, since the role is described in the literature as one with no direct line authority and, therefore, having to work through persuasion, (Kift, 2004; Lines, 2000; Radloff, 2005; Bullen et al., 2010, Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a; Marshall et al., 2011) and relying on referential and expert power (Bullen et al., 2010) to enact change. This is confirmed, too, by de la Harpe & Mason (2012, p. 7) where Associate Deans in their study “…were working hard to action their role through influence and persuasion through senior line managers, committee structures and personal relationships. Roles were often dependent on senior management for legitimacy”.

For the Hallmark of having a supportive Dean, the outright majority of Associate Deans are fully equipped to lead learning and teaching, reporting the Greatest Social Capital (23 or 92%) with a supportive Dean.

Having the support of the Dean to enable initiatives is illustrated by the quotes below,

[Change] will happen potentially at my suggestion, but requiring the support of Executive Dean if you know what I mean. Often some of the initiatives wouldn’t be possible without either Executive Dean support or broader institutional support [21]

The Associate Dean role is kind of an interesting one because we don’t really have any authority per se. Often some of the initiatives wouldn’t be possible without either Executive Dean support...Occasionally I’ll need the imprimatur of the Executive Dean to make change happen [21]
The finding in this study that the majority of Associate Deans report that they were enabled in their leadership position by having a supportive Dean is positive, since being in a supportive context is critical to the full enactment of the role, given that,

...the effectiveness of leaders depends, more than is generally realized, on the context around them. Over time, the leader’s capability is shaped by the top team’s quality, and by the capabilities of the full organization. These can either provide invaluable support for the changes a leader wants to make or render those changes impossible (Scott et al., 2008, p. xv)

However, the finding sits somewhat in contrast to other literature, where it is reported that Deans can be erratic in their support of the Associate Dean, as Sloat (2014, p. 250) describes below,

I worked hard to craft a difficult compromise with colleagues. I was discouraged when the Dean overruled the decision – because I had thought that I had authority to negotiate the deal. My faculty colleagues noticed what happened, and they are now avoiding me and bringing everything to the dean since clearly no decision matters until it comes from the dean directly.

For the Hallmark of having a positive working relationship with Head(s) of School of Creative Arts, the majority of Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching, since they report either the Greatest Social Capital (8 or 32%) with a good working relationship with the Head(s) of School of Creative Arts or Some Capital (8 or 32%) working in the School on learning and teaching administrative processes, such as aligning assessment or curriculum. The remaining Associate Deans demonstrate Little Capital (3 or 12%), reporting a strained relationship with the Head, or the Least Capital (6 or 24%) reporting no relationship with the Head.

The influence of the Head of School is illustrated by the quotes below,

....it was the Head of School that really ran things rather than me. I was just brought in to troubleshoot and everything which was a bit irritating. It would have been good if I had been involved from the word go [14]

...I’m a bit careful in creative arts, I always talk through the Head of School and she protects her staff by not allowing me to put too much on them, if you know what I mean [12]

The finding that the majority of Associate Deans reported a positive relationship with the Heads of School of Creative Arts is encouraging, since, “[t]here is evidence that Faculty Deans and Department or School Heads are the single most important factor in supporting improvement of learning and teaching” (Wright & O’Neill, 1995, p. 76). The Head of School and Associate Dean each bring different skill sets which can complement each other. It is critical that the Associate Dean recognises the Head of School role as part of the ‘disciplinary’ picture that informs learning and teaching and that the Head of School recognises the Associate Dean as critical in enabling the implementation of learning and teaching change at the school level (Marshall et al., 2011). However, the finding was not an outright majority for the Associate Deans. To strengthen further this relationship, it has been argued that research is needed to identify “…the similarities and differences between learning and teaching leaders and those in other roles” (Scott et al., 2008, p. xix).

For the Hallmark of strategically implementing initiatives at a School level, the outright majority of Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting the Least Capital (17 or 68%) working in ad hoc ways on the implementation of initiatives, while the remaining minority
demonstrate the Greatest Social Capital (8 or 32%) reporting that they are successfully implementing initiatives.

Strategically implementing initiatives at a school level is illustrated by the quotes below,

One of the first things I wanted to do was to establish our divisional teaching and learning plan...and that was a really good exercise because that involved me taking the university-wide learning and teaching strategy and then, against each of the objectives of the five different areas of that strategy, to actually feed in what schools are doing...[13]

...each school has a director of T and L. And I really count on them...So any communication I have goes through those directors...and so there are some schools where you might spend some time with assessment item or a student appeal that has to really go into policy and look at that. [10]

The finding that the outright majority of Associate Deans were not implementing learning and teaching initiatives at a school level is of concern, since if change is to happen in learning and teaching it must happen on the ground (Ramsden 1998; Fullan & Scott, 2009).

For the Hallmark leading learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts, the majority (14 or 56%) of Associate Deans are not equipped to lead learning and teaching, since they had either Little Capital (2 or 8%), working on program/course reviews or the Least Capital (12 or 48%) with no involvement in projects in the Creative Arts. The minority of Associate Deans have the Greatest Social Capital (4 or 20%) reporting that they were leading specific and focused learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts.

Initiating a contextualised project in a Creative Arts School that engages academics in new practices and is linked by working relationships, is illustrated by the quotes below,

I’ve got half a dozen people looking at what’s the pedagogy in a musical ensemble? Do we just do it as we’ve always done? Just sit behind the music stand and play the music, or is there something else to it? So I’m trying to get my colleagues to think about what it means to be a teacher in that circumstance. And also at the same time working with the student association...[2]

...we develop exemplars of practice. And we do this via whatever projects we can get funding for, get our hands on and develop...we will enable the use of that particular pedagogy or technology in a project, and then support them [Creative Arts academics] in ways that they otherwise were not possibly supported. So there’s a project based exemplar of leadership opportunity [21]

That this study found that the minority of Associate Deans are leading projects in the Creative Arts is of concern since, “…engaging members in (learning and teaching) projects is a tangible way [for the Associate Dean] to build cohesion, trust and collaboration” (de la Harpe & Mason, 2014, p. 47).

For the Hallmark of being recruited through a rigorous process, the outright majority of Associate Deans are not equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting Little Capital (16 or 64%), since they were approached to take on the role without a competitive process. The remaining minority have the Greatest Social Capital (9 or 36%) being appointed through an internal process or through an external advertisement.
Being approached rather than applying for the role, is illustrated by the quotes below,

I never intended to do this job...I got called down on the Monday to see [the Dean] about something [and] she offered me it...” [16]

It was an accident...I had a child [in]...childcare at the University. Which meant that whenever I had childcare I had to go to work. Which meant that I was in the office a lot. Which meant that when my Head of Department needed someone to sit on (it was called something else at the time), Teaching and Learning Committee, I happened to be in the office at the time and so I ended up on that Committee...The University then restructured into Faculties. And three divisions became one Faculty... the Dean at the time looked around and said, “Oh, you used to be an Associate Dean...you should do that” [21]

The importance of having a rigorous appointment processes in place is to ensure that those appointed to the role have the requisite knowledge, skills and attitudes, and in the case of the Associate Dean role, learning and teaching knowledge and understanding of leadership (Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a; Marshall et al., 2011). The finding of this study that the majority of Associate Deans are not appointed through an appropriate process is of concern. It may suggest that the underlying learning and teaching leadership criteria necessary for the role are not seen as critical or valued in strategically leading learning and teaching or may indicate that there are simply very few candidates who meet the criteria for the Associate Dean role and who demonstrate the kinds of qualities and credentials that are required.

**For the Hallmark of full-time fraction**, the majority of Associate Deans (14 or 56%) are equipped to lead learning and teaching, since they reported either the Greatest Social Capital (10 or 40%) being in full-time roles or Some Capital (16% or 4) with a 0.5 – 0.9 time fraction for the role. The remaining Associate Deans demonstrated Little Capital (44% or 11) with less than 0.4 time fraction for the role. Full-time appointments are more common in larger faculties (< 300+ academic staff).

The time pressure experienced as a result of a part-time fraction, is illustrated in the quotes below,

I’m .25...so time management and things competing for one’s attention [are an issue]. Lack of ability to research...With a full time load we don’t expect to be able to do that [22]

You know what the biggest problem with this job is? You literally spend your day in back to back meetings. So actually every meeting generates more work so you’re not getting your day’s work done yet your day’s work is creating more work. So you go home having achieved nothing but the work load has got bigger. So you end up working at home and working at weekends... [16]

The finding that the majority of Associate Deans are in, or close to, full-time role is positive. Being full-time allows Associate Deans time for strategic thinking and planning and is likely to increase their sense of wellbeing (Gopaul, Jones, & Weinrib, 2013). In the main, the larger the faculty, the more likely the Associate Dean is to be full-time. However, in the small to medium sized faculties, nine Associate Deans had other roles as well as the role of Associate Dean one. These other roles sometimes made the role easier because they may have had line management of academic staff in those roles. However, some Associate Deans report frustration in having two roles, as they are often torn by different role directions.

**For the Hallmark of university valuing learning and teaching**, the outright majority of Associate Deans report the Least Capital (16 or 64%) with a belief that learning and teaching is not valued
highly in their university. The minority of Associate Deans have the Greatest Social Capital (9 or 36%) reporting that they believe that their institutions value learning and teaching.

The sense of a lack of valuing of learning and teaching and the Associate Dean role is illustrated by the quotes below,

...we’re told all the time that learning and teaching is valued as much as research but if you are a really good researcher, as a reward they take the teaching away from you, and if you’re not getting as much research output then you get more teaching responsibility so it’s a punishment, but it’s very subtle, it’s never overtly said [7]

I think the university at times doesn’t realise quite how much this job takes up, quite how much it impacts on your future career because it takes away your research, your clinical research...you’ve got to know when to either jump out of it or be willing to step up and go higher. Because there aren’t that many – Associate Deans of Teaching and Learning don’t get Dean, let’s be clear - Associate Deans of Research do [16]

The debate between whether teaching and learning is more important than research and vice versa has been reported for decades as an issue in universities (Chalmers, 2011; Anderson et al., 2011; Macfarlane, 2011) and it is one where “…the predominance of discipline based research as the traditional vehicle for promotion seemed to overshadow any consideration of SOTL affiliated activities” (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p.10). The findings of this study indicate that the privileging of disciplinary research over teaching or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the broader university is still the dominant view.

For the Hallmark of being in a larger faculty, the majority (15 or 60%) are equipped to lead learning and teaching, since they report either the Greatest Social Capital (4 or 16%) with more than 300 academic staff in their faculty or Some Capital (11 or 44%) with a faculty of between 100 and 299 academic staff members. The remaining Associate Deans demonstrate Little Capital (10 or 40%) with fewer than 100 academic staff. The size of the faculties vary with the two extremes being an Associate Dean responsible for over 300 staff to one responsible for a group of 20 staff.

Seeing the potential of being in a larger faculty is illustrated by the quote below,

...so when you look at the size of the business school here, which is one of the largest in Australia, all the disciplines are in one big school...But there’s lots of interesting potential I think, in this faculty [10]

Whilst having a larger faculty may give the Associate Dean prestige (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999; Zemsky, Wegner & Massy, 2005), the findings of this study show that there is still significant variation in faculty sizes and therefore roles. Researchers have called for more consistency in learning and teaching roles across sector (Marshall, 2006; Marshall et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2008) in order to ensure “the mobility and recognition of our learning and teaching leaders” (Scott et al., 2008, p. xvi), but despite these recommendations, these issues have not been addressed across the sector.

For the Hallmark of having responsibility for many discipline areas, the outright majority of Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting the Greatest Social Capital (18 or 72%) responsible for a mix of Creative Arts and other disciplines. The remaining Associate Deans are divided between Some Capital (5 or 20%) with a mix of Creative Arts disciplines or Little Capital (2 or 8%) with only one Creative Arts discipline.
Faculties with many disciplines are seen to provide opportunities for learning and teaching that foster multi- and inter-disciplinary ways, as illustrated by the quote below,

...it’s become an opportunity out of the faculty structure with...College of Art...Film School and the School of Humanities (combined) re the convergent newsroom and looking at the impact of digital media and journalism and what the implications are [7]

The finding that the majority of Associate Deans are responsible for Faculties that comprised many disciplines is not surprising, and may be as a result of the massification of universities since the amalgamations in the early 90s. Amalgamations have led to increased institutional sizes. In turn, increased institutional sizes have created a rise in the corporatisation of universities, resulting in larger faculties with multiple disciplines. This has allowed the advantages of economies of scale and operating efficiencies, streamlined business models, more targeted resources, lower costs, diversity of program offerings and more scope for students (Ernst & Young, 2012; Pricewaterhouse Coopers Australia, 2016).

Summary for Hallmarks of Social Capital in Layer 2
1. Hallmark, member of Associate Dean Group: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
2. Hallmark, strategically connected relationship with Central L&T: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
3. Hallmark, line management: the majority of the Associate Deans are not equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
4. Hallmark, supportive Dean: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
5. Hallmark, positive relationship with Head of School in Creative Arts: the majority of the Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
6. Hallmark, implementing initiatives at School level: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
7. Hallmark, leading learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts: the majority of the Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
8. Hallmark, rigorous recruitment: the majority of the Associate Deans are not equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
9. Hallmark, full-time fraction: the majority of the Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
10. Hallmark, university that values learning and teaching: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
11. Hallmark, larger faculty: the majority of the Associate Deans are equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
12. Hallmark, many discipline areas: the outright majority of the Associate Deans are fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Economic Capital, 1 Hallmark

In Table 4.6, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmark of Economic Capital, having a budget is presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans provided in Appendix 4.2.

The 3 questions analysed were:

7. Can you describe your role and what you are responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?
21. What kinds of support structures, knowledge and skills do you think would be helpful in carrying out your role?
23. What barriers or frustrations do you face in your role?

Table 0.6 Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Economic Capital by Hallmark in Layer 2 (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A designates that the category was not used. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.

As shown in the table, for the Hallmark of having a budget, the outright majority of Associate Deans were not equipped to lead learning and teaching reporting the Least Capital (25 or 100%) with no discretionary budget attached to their role.

Having a budget was seen as desirable, as illustrated by the quotes below,

I don’t have my own budget…I don’t actually get my own budget, I would actually prefer to get a budget [24]

...there’s no power, there’s no budget and it would be good [to have a budget]…[25]

An Associate Dean who had been given a budget in the past but had had it removed commented on how much more authority she had with a particular Head of the Creative Arts School when she had a budget because the Head of School worked with her, as illustrated by the quote below,

Yeah, she d[id] [work with me]…especially when I ha[d] money to spend [12]

According to Marshall et al. (2011, p.92) the “...critical role of managers of learning and teaching [was] to assume control over budgets...If someone else is controlling [budgets], it just decreases your ability to react to situations and move things around”. In line with this, the finding in this study that the Associate Deans did not have a discretionary budget for learning and teaching decreases their ability to lead strategic projects or initiatives in the faculty and therefore it decreases their capacity for action.

Summary for the Hallmark of Economic Capital in Layer 2

1. Hallmark, budget for leading learning and teaching: the outright majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts

Overview of the 18 Hallmarks in Layer 2
Institutionalised Cultural Capital

Overall, for the Hallmark of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, being a Professor, there was no outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrating the Greatest Capital and, thereby, being fully equipped for their role to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

Embodied Cultural Capital

Overall, for the four Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital, there was only one Hallmark (possessing high institutional knowledge) for which the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Greatest Capital, being fully equipped for their role to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

In addition, there were two Hallmarks where the outright majority were not equipped. These include, having a formal induction, being engaged with technology and recognising themselves as a leader of learning and teaching.

Social Capital

Overall, for the twelve Hallmarks of Social Capital, there were three Hallmarks (member of an Associate Dean group in the university, having a supportive Dean and having many disciplines in the faculty) for which the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Greatest Capital, being fully equipped for their role to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

In addition, there were four Hallmarks where the outright majority were not equipped. These include, having a strategically connected relationship with the central learning and teaching unit, strategically implementing initiatives at a School level, being in a university that values learning and teaching, using quality assurance processes positively for quality enhancement and recognising themselves as a leader of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Economic Capital

Overall, for the Hallmark of Economic Capital, having a budget for learning and teaching leadership, the outright majority were not equipped for their role to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

In the next section, the Hallmarks for Layer 3, the higher education sector level are considered.

Layer 3: Higher education sector level

In the sections below an analysis of the data against the four Prototype Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Institutionalised and Embodied States), Social Capital and Economic Capital in Layer 3 is presented.

Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State, 1 Hallmark)

In Table 4.7, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, including OLT award, citation or fellowship, are presented. The analysis by individual
Table 0.7 *Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Institutionalised Cultural Capital in the Hallmark in Layer 3 (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Institutionalised Cultural Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT award, citation or fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A score of 3 was designated the most Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used. The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.

As shown in Table 4.7, *for the Hallmark of having an OLT award, citation or fellowship*, the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Least Institutionalised Cultural Capital (15 or 60%), not having received an OLT award, citation or fellowship, while a minority demonstrated the Greatest Institutionalised Cultural Capital (10 or 40%) having an OLT award, citation and/or fellowship.

Receiving a citation contributed to being appointed to the Associate Dean role, as illustrated by the quote below,

I did not see the offer on the Associate Dean thing coming. I thought I was tucked in the corner and completely ignored. Obviously popping up and doing things like setting up international student mentor programmes. I got the university teaching award...I got the ALTC citation...[16]

OLT awards, citations or fellowships, as an example of recognition and standing, have been implemented by the Australian Government and represent prestigious badges of recognition in learning and teaching across the sector (Galbally, 2002; Harrison & Jepson, 2015; Kalis & Kirschenbaum, 2008; Layton & Brown, 2011; Skelton, 2004; Chism, 2006). They can enhance credibility and can be used as a way of differentiating the recipient from others (Harrison & Jepson, 2015). However, in this study the majority of Associate Deans were not recipients of an OLT Award, citation or fellowship.

**Social Capital, 2 Hallmarks**

In Table 4.8, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Social Capital, using quality assurance processes positively for quality enhancement and being a member of external network are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.
The following 2 questions were analysed:

7. Can you describe your role and what you are responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?
22. Do you belong to any networks and how do they help you in your role?

Table 0.8  *Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Social Capital for the Hall-marks in Layer 3 (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Greatest (3)</th>
<th>Some (2)</th>
<th>Little (1)</th>
<th>Least (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance processes used positively for enhancement</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of external network</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A score of 3 was designated the most Social Capital. N/A designates that the category was not used. The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total group. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.*

As shown in Table 4.8, for the Hallmark of using quality assurance processes positively for enhancement of learning and teaching, the outright majority of Associate Deans demonstrated the Least Social Capital (21 or 84%) not using quality assurance management as a way to lead learning and teaching change but for compliance, while the minority had the Greatest Capital (4 or 16%) using quality assurance for quality enhancement.

Managing quality assurance as the main focus of the role is illustrated by the quote below,

...because we’ve got so many courses, we do probably about five course reviews a year and I at least co-chair most of them. Yes, so when I say co-chair that means I make sure the documentation looks good. Yeah, so that’s a fairly hefty part of my job, I would say at least half of it [24]

Using quality assurance processes positively for quality enhancement is essential and,

...the challenge for institutions is to implement a hybrid model of quality assurance; that focuses on compliance and improvements with increased emphasis on internal enhancements and active engagement with staff (Shah & Jarzaabkowski, 2013, p. 102)

However, Associate Deans in this study mentioned the “red tape” of quality administration which they found cumbersome, demanding much of their attention and detracting from their ability to implement quality enhancement and strategic leadership of learning and teaching.

For the Hallmark of being a member of an external network, the majority (18 or 72%) were equipped for their strategic leadership role, since they had either the Greatest Social Capital (7 or 28%) being a member on an Executive Board or had Some Capital (11 or 44%), being an active
member of an external networks. The remaining Associate Deans had the Least Capital (7 or 28%) and did not belong to an external network.

Being on the an external network was reported as very beneficial as illustrated in the quotes below,

...the DASSH ADLTN, that has been absolutely, it's been not quite life changing but certainly professionally life changing for me. I talk about it to people as being one of the best things that I have ever been involved in...I think how they helped me is how they helped most of us I believe, which it provides that sense of support which can be quite an intangible thing, we're geographically dispersed but I think that kind of psychological network is very important for all of us [14]

They [DASSH] kind of took me under their wing, and made sure I had someone to sit next to. And they talked about their own experiences of getting the job in the middle of a course review and things like that, which is what I've done too. So that was very supportive [10]

The finding that the majority of Associate Deans are members of an external network is positive as networks enable Associate Deans to meet with other learning and teaching leaders from different universities, and give them a greater sense of belonging (Baird, 2016; Brown & Duguid, 2002; Creech & Willard, 2001; Gulati, 2007; Zaheer, Gulati, & Nohria, 2000; Jarillo, 1988; Lavie, 2007; Wasko & Faraj, 2000; Senge, 1996; Wenger, 1998, Scott et al 2008; Southwell et al 2008a). However, on further analysis many of the networks they belong to are associated with their disciplinary background, rather than reflecting the eclectic mix of disciplines which they lead. Given that the external networks they mostly attend are mainly affiliated with their particular background discipline, this may not have encouraged the Associate Deans to look at the big picture of learning and teaching leadership across the university sector.

**Summary for Hallmarks of Social Capital in Layer 3**

1. Hallmark, using quality assurance processes for quality enhancement: *the outright majority of the Associate Deans were not fully equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
2. Hallmark, being on an external network: *the majority* of the Associate Deans were closer to being fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

**Economic Capital, 1 Hallmark**

In the Table 4.9, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmark of Economic Capital, having an OLT grant are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

**Table 0.9 Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Economic Capital in the Hallmark in Layer 3 (N=25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT grant</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.9, for the Hallmark of receiving an OLT grant, the majority of Associate Deans (13 or 52%) have either the Greatest Capital (5 or 20%) leading an OLT project or Some Capital (8 or 32%) being involved in an OLT project, and thus are equipped for their strategic leadership role. Those remaining Associate Deans demonstrate the Least Economic Capital (12 or 48%) with no involvement in an OLT project.

An OLT project contributing positively to the role, is illustrated by the quote below,

...and the ALTC learning and teaching money was fabulous and all those sorts of things, so we really got galvanised by being able to – not exactly reward people but to help them to become enthused by new projects or revitalising their course or programmes or those sorts of things. A group of us got an OLT grant at the end of last year. So I think there will be some publications coming out of that...we were very pleased about that [12]

In this study, the findings suggest that external funding for enhancing learning and teaching is seen by the Associate Deans as beneficial to their purpose in bringing about change in learning and teaching. However, the removal of the OLT and associated projects and the lack of a new body which will support learning and teaching leadership across the sector may suggest that the prestige associated with recognition from a national body for the Associate Dean may be further eroded. This is compounded by the lack of provision for opportunities to network with other Associate Deans and academic staff in other institutions (Murray, 2015).

Summary for the Hallmark of Economic Capital in Layer 3
1. Hallmark receiving an OLT grant: the majority of Associate Deans were equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Overview of the 4 Hallmarks in Layer 3

Institutionalised Cultural Capital

Overall, for the Hallmark of Institutionalised Cultural Capital, having an OLT award, citation or fellowship, the outright majority of Associate Deans did not demonstrate the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Social Capital

Overall, for the two Hallmarks of Social Capital, quality assurance processes used for enhancement and being a member of an external network, the majority of Associate Deans did not demonstrate the greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

In addition, there was one Hallmark where the outright majority were not equipped. This was using quality assurance processes positively for enhancement.

Economic Capital
Overall, for the **Hallmark of Economic Capital**, having an OLT grant, the outright majority did not demonstrate the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

**Layer 4: Global level**

In the sections below, an analysis of the data against the three Prototype Hallmarks of Cultural Capital (Embodied State), Social Capital and Economic Capital in Layer 4, is presented.

**Cultural Capital (Embodied State, 1 Hallmark)**

In Table 4.10, the outcomes of the analysis relating to Hallmarks of Embodied Cultural Capital, being engaged with technology are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The four questions analysed were:

18. What aspects of the role are you most confident about and why?
19. What particular qualities do you think a learning and teaching leader needs in your role?
20. What particular qualities do you think you bring to the leadership of learning and teaching in your role?
29. Can you identify any projects or initiatives in the Creative Arts over the past two years in which you have been involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Greatest (3)</th>
<th>Some (2)</th>
<th>Little (1)</th>
<th>Least (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with technology</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18 (72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N/A designates that the category was not used. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.*

As shown in Table 4.10, **for the Hallmark of engaging with technology**, the outright majority of Associate Deans have the Least Capital (18 or 72%) and were not using technologies in a proactive way. The remaining minority have the Greatest Capital (7 or 28%) actively working on learning and teaching projects involving new technologies.

Exploring new technologies is illustrated by the quote below,

I wanna get my head around these new challenges to teaching and learning that are being impelled by the whole discussion on MOOCs and use of their technologies and so on and what this means for traditional teaching [18]
In this study, the findings suggest that very few Associate Deans are engaging proactively with how technology can relate to learning and teaching in the Creative Arts for the future. Whilst some Associate Deans talk about the importance of online learning, or the emergence of MOOCs, it appears that it was from a distant “one size fits all” approach, instead of working with the disciplines to match relevant technologies to their particular needs or to develop, with academic staff new ways of using technology which would advance the needs of the discipline. This is of concern, since the literature suggests that it is imperative that Associate Deans have a conceptual grasp of technology, and keep abreast of the technological changes which support new approaches to learning and teaching, and specifically in relation to the disciplines they have responsibility for leading (Glenn, & D’Agostino, 2008).

Summary for the Hallmark of Embodied Cultural Capital in Layer 4

1. Hallmark, engaging in technology: the outright majority of the Associate Deans were not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Social Capital, 1 Hallmark

In Table 4.11, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Social Capital, being engaged in partnerships with industry and leading an international project are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The following question was analysed:

29. Can you identify any projects or initiatives in the Creative Arts over the past two years in which you have been involved?

Table 0.11  Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Social Capital in the Hallmark in Layer 4 (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in partnerships with industry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A designates that the category was not used. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.

As shown in Table 4.11, for the Hallmark of engaging in partnerships with industry, the outright majority of Associate Deans had the Least Capital (25 or 100%), with not one Associate Dean actively working in partnership with industry.

The finding suggests that the overwhelming majority of Associate Deans were not engaging with industry as partners. Developing partnerships with industry is reported as an ideal and effective way of creating and fostering opportunities for Associate Deans to innovate in learning and teaching within the disciplines. It is also associated with a deepening of knowledge of learning and teaching leadership (Gibb, Haskin & Robertson, 2009; Bramwell & Wolfe, 2008).
Summary for the Hallmark of Social Capital in Layer 4

1. Hallmark engaging in partnerships with industry: *the outright majority of the Associate Deans were not fully equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Economic Capital 1 Hallmark

In Table 4.12, the outcomes of the analysis relating to the Hallmarks of Economic Capital, leading an international project are presented. The analysis by individual Associate Deans is provided in Appendix 4.2.

The following question was analysed:

*29. Can you identify any projects or initiatives in the Creative Arts over the past two years in which you have been involved?*

Table 0.12 *Number and percentage of Associate Deans demonstrating the greatest, some, little or least Economic Capital in the Hallmark in Layer 4 (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International project grant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N/A designates that the category was not used. See Appendix 4.1 for how scores were determined and Appendix 4.2 for detail by individual Associate Dean.*

As shown in Table 4.12, for the Hallmark of receiving an international grant, the outright majority of Associate Deans have the Least Capital (25 or 100%) with not one Associate Dean reporting that they are actively working on a global project.

A grant from any funding body, including international organisations increases the standing of an Associate Dean in the Field (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974). However, the findings suggest that Associate Deans in this study are not active in this area.

Summary for the Hallmark of Economic Capital in Layer 4

1. Hallmark receiving an international project grant: *the outright majority of the Associate Deans are not fully equipped* to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Overview of the 3 Hallmarks in Layer 4

Overall, for the Hallmark of Embodied Cultural Capital, (engaging with technology), the outright majority of Associate Deans did not demonstrate the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

Overall, for the Hallmark of Social Capital, (engaging in partnerships with industry), the outright majority of Associate Deans did not demonstrate the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.
Overall, for the **Hallmark of Economic Capital**, (receiving an international project grant), the outright majority of Associate Deans did not demonstrate the Greatest Capital, fully equipping them for their role to lead learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

**Summary of Chapter 4**

Table 4.13 summarises the types of Capital, namely Cultural (Institutional and Embodied), Social or Economic, for which the Associate Deans were equipped or not for their strategic leadership role. Being equipped in Hallmarks is an indicator of the Capital possessed the Associate Deans and hence their ability to strategically lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. The different forms of Capital are colour-coded below, with Institutionalised Cultural Capital in yellow, Embodied Cultural Capital in green, Social Capital in blue and Economic Capital in pink.

### Table 0.13  Hallmark by Capital for which the Associate Deans were assessed as equipped, not equipped or closer to equipped or not equipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Capital</th>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Outright majority equipped</th>
<th>Outright majority not equipped</th>
<th>Majority equipped</th>
<th>Majority not equipped</th>
<th>Greatest plus Some Capital</th>
<th>Little plus Least Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionalised</strong></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>✓ 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td>Formal qualification in Creative Arts and Ed. or Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professorship</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLT award, citation or fellowship</td>
<td>✓ 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embodied Cultural</strong></td>
<td>Publications in higher education Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>✓ 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in influencing change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on leadership and management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophisticated conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership</td>
<td>✓ 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophisticated understanding of disciplinary differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being male</td>
<td>✓ 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the role</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophisticated level of emotional intelligence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior experience in related learning and teaching areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal induction</td>
<td>✓ 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More time in the Associate Dean role</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High institutional knowledge</td>
<td>✓ 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged with technology</td>
<td>✓ 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognised themselves as leader</td>
<td>✓ 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 4.13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Capital</th>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Outright majority equipped</th>
<th>Outright majority not equipped</th>
<th>Majority not equipped</th>
<th>Greatest plus Some Capital</th>
<th>Little plus Least Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Member of university Associate Dean group</td>
<td>✓ 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning &amp; Teaching Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Dean</td>
<td>✓ 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive relationship with Head(s) of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at a School level</td>
<td>✓ 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting or leading learning and teaching projects in Creative Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigorous recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time fraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University values learning and teaching</td>
<td>✓ 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger faculty</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many discipline areas in the faculty</td>
<td>✓ 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality assurance processes used positively for enhancement</td>
<td>✓ 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of external network, either on the executive or as active participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged in partnerships with industry</td>
<td>✓ 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Capital</td>
<td>Budget for leading learning and teaching</td>
<td>✓ 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader or participant in an OLT learning and teaching grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading an international project</td>
<td>✓ 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total hallmarks**: 6 13 9 8

*Note:* The outright majority is considered equipped or capable in relation to a Hallmark when greater than 50% have the Greatest Capital. The outright majority is not equipped when greater than 50% have the Least Capital. The majority closer to being equipped is where the sum of the Greatest and Some Capital categories forms the majority and close to majority not equipped is where the sum of Little and Least Capital categories forms the majority.

As shown in Table 4.13, an outright majority of Associate Deans were fully equipped in only 6 of the 36 Hallmarks, while for 13 of the 36 Hallmarks, the outright majority were not fully equipped. That is, there were double the number of Hallmarks for which the majority of Associate Deans were not fully equipped for their strategic leadership of learning and teaching role.

In addition, there were 21 Hallmarks where the majority of Associate Deans were closer to not being fully equipped and 15 Hallmarks where the majority of Associate Deans were closer to being fully equipped.
In the next chapter, a discussion of the Hallmarks by Capital for Layers 1, 2, 3 and 4 is presented. The prototype of the expert Associate Dean or exemplar is constructed and informs the development of a typology of the extent of leadership capability.
Discussion, Leverage points and Conclusion

There is action, and history, and conservation or transformation of structures only because there are agents [with] the propensity and ability to get into and play the game (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.19)

This Chapter begins by re-visiting and finalising the exemplar of the expert Associate Dean, using the leadership capabilities or hallmarks identified in Chapter 2 (See Figure 5.1). It then discusses the Symbolic Capital that individual Associate Deans can be said to possess in the Field using the analysis from Chapter 4. The differences in Symbolic Capital possessed by Associate Deans are reflected through a typology of the Associate Deans in their learning and teaching leadership role. The typology comprises Stars, Rising Stars, Copers and Strugglers. The Chapter addresses all three of the research questions:

1. What personal and contextual characteristics equip an Associate Dean to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts and what does expertise look like?

2. To what extent are Associate Deans in Australian universities equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

3. How can the strategic leadership of Associate Deans be strengthened to enhance their leadership role in learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

Bourdieu's Theory of Practice is used to establish leverage points that may bring about change for Associate Deans in their strategic leadership of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. The focus on the terminology “leverage points” rather than recommendations has the potential to direct attention to actions that ripple through the culture collectively and the leverage points chosen link directly with the findings of the study. Extrapolating from these leverage points which come directly from the findings, a number of further implications were identified and these are set out below.

The Chapter concludes with a summary of the study, barriers to change, its contribution to knowledge, suggestions for future research, discussion of the limitations of the study and some final comments.

Exemplar of the Expert Associate Dean (representative of High Symbolic Capital)

The Hallmarks of leadership capability identified in the literature review identified in Chapter 2 are synthesised below (See Figure 5.1).

From these Hallmarks, an exemplar, or prototype of the expert Associate Dean can now be confirmed. As outlined in Chapter 3, developing a prototype establishes a foundation for understanding the key capabilities or “central tendencies” or Hallmarks that contribute to expertise in any given Field, since as mentioned, “[e]xerts bear a family resemblance to one another and it is their resemblance to one another that structures the category ‘expert’” (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995, p. 9). In summary,

...a prototype embodies the typical exemplar category and, as such, serves as a basis for judgments about category membership...a prototype view can contribute in important ways to the dialogue on expert [learning and teaching leadership]. (Sternberg & Horvack, 1995, p. 9).
The prototype of the expert Associate Dean with its requisite hallmarks that ideally equip learning and teaching leaders in the Creative Arts provides an aspirational model for existing and future leaders in learning and teaching. Whilst it would be unlikely that Associate Deans would have all the hallmarks of the prototype, it would be expected that to be successful they should have the majority of them, including those enabled by the university.

**Figure 0.1 Hallmarks of Leadership Capability**

The Hallmarks generated from the literature review were used as criteria to assess leadership capability across the spectrum of Associate Deans in this study and the context in which they work.

The Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean comprises an amalgam of Hallmarks or assets that are most likely equip such a person for their leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts. A description of the Prototype of the Expert Associate Dean follows:

An expert Associate Dean would most likely have a PhD, a formal qualification in both Creative Arts and Education/Higher Education Learning and Teaching, and be a full Professor (either prior or once appointed to the role). They would have a high understanding of disciplinary differences. They would have received an OLT award, citation or fellowship, and have significant publications in the area of higher
education Learning and Teaching. They would experience great satisfaction with the role. As a fact of observation only, in this study they were also likely to be male.

They would have been recruited into a full-time role of a large Faculty with many discipline areas, including Creative Arts, through a competitive and rigorous process that ensured that they met the clearly articulated essential selection criteria aligned with the role on the ground. They would have line management of either school academic staff or learning and teaching academic staff, and be responsible for managing a discretionary learning and teaching budget.

Prior to taking on the role, they would have several years of experience in other learning and teaching roles and then time in the role as the Associate Dean. They would have had a formal induction to the role and be in a university that recognises not only the learning and teaching leadership role of the Associate Dean but also values learning and teaching equally to research.

An Expert Associate Dean would enjoy excellent relationships with others, be self-aware, motivated, empathetic and self-regulating, with the social skills to lead and persuade others to follow a vision. They would have significant knowledge of how the university works at both the formal and informal levels.

They would focus on leadership as well as management aspects of the role, and would recognise that the various disciplines needed different pedagogical approaches, and that they were one of many leaders, each working in a dispersed model of leadership to bring about strategic outcomes for the faculty. They would perceive themselves as strategic leaders and act accordingly. They would be able to perform the constituent activities of strategic learning and teaching leadership in a dynamic fashion because they would have a flexible conceptual knowledge of learning and teaching leadership, which blended an excellent grasp of policy, teaching and learning experience, with prior and contemporary knowledge of learning and teaching, and would be able to apply high-level reasoning and decision-making to any problem or issue. They would be deeply interested in supporting and bringing about change at the School level, working closely with discipline leaders, to integrate quality assurance processes with quality enhancement opportunities, focus on using technology and innovative pedagogies, and would lead learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts.

They would have a supportive Dean and enjoy a positive working relationship with the Head(s) of Creative Arts as well as with those in the Central Learning and Teaching Unit. In addition, they would be well networked, belonging to a group of Associate Deans within the institution. They would also extend their focus externally, taking an executive role on a Board of an external network or actively participating in such a network, as well as participating in OLT projects, developing partnerships with industry and engaging in international projects, including with a focus on new educational technologies.

Overall, an Expert Associate Dean would have a great deal of job satisfaction, especially since they themselves have the requisite personal assets and the local university and the wider sectoral and global context would contribute assets equipping them for and enabling them in their leadership role.
In answer to Research Question 1, the exemplar or Prototype of an Expert Associate Dean tells us what expertise looks like. It is consistent with the Hallmarks of Capital identified in the literature at the personal, university, the higher education sector and global levels. These Hallmarks combined are most likely to equip an Associate Dean for leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

Ownership of these Hallmarks combine to form the Symbolic Capital of Associate Deans and reflect their overall power in the field, as discussed in the next section.

**Symbolic Capital of Individual Associate Deans**

As outlined in Chapter 3, the Hallmarks of Cultural, Social and Economic Capital collectively demonstrate the Symbolic Capital that an Associate Deans possesses in the Field. The possession of more Hallmarks results in higher Symbolic Capital for that Associate Dean. The Symbolic Capital is the Capital that comes from the combination of the other forms of Capital, namely Cultural Capital, Social Capital and Economic Capital (See Figure 5.2). When these types of Capital combine and are perceived and recognized as legitimate and prestigious, the ‘owner’ is afforded or given ‘Symbolic Capital’ or power in the Field (Bourdieu, 1986a).

![Figure 0.2 Types of Capital](image)

In Table 5.1 below, the Symbolic Capital possessed by individual Associate Deans is presented. For detailed analysis of Hallmarks by individual Associate Dean and by Capital Layer, see Appendix 4.2.
Table 0.1  Number and percentage of Associate Deans with the Greatest, Some, Little or the Least Symbolic Capital (N=25) in Layers 1, 2, 3 and 4, as well as Overall Symbolic Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Associate Deans</th>
<th>Stars Greatest Symbolic Capital</th>
<th>Rising Stars Some Symbolic Capital</th>
<th>Copers Little Symbolic Capital</th>
<th>Strugglers Least Symbolic Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer 1: Associate Dean</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 2: University</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 3: Higher Ed Sector</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
<td>12 (44)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 4: Global</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>19 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: Aggregate of all Hallmarks</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figure in brackets denotes percentage of the total in the group.

Variation across levels

As shown in table 5.1, the number of Associate Deans at each Layer varies according to the sum of Symbolic Capital that they were afforded, either by their own personal characteristics or the context in which they worked. None of the Associate Deans in any category had all of the Hallmarks and the Hallmarks they did have varied across the Associate Deans; however, in the expert category they had sufficient Hallmarks to represent the prototype.

Overall, three (12%) Associate Deans had the Greatest Overall Symbolic Capital, scoring above 70 out of a possible 108 across the four Layers of the Field (see Appendix 5.1). These Associate Deans are sufficiently well equipped to be considered representative of the expert prototype for the strategic leadership of learning and teaching outlined below. Seven (28%) Associate Deans displayed a number of the Hallmarks indicative of Some Symbolic Capital, scoring between 50 – 69 out of a possible 108 (see Appendix 5.1), enabling them to be somewhat equipped in their strategic leadership role. Eleven (44%) Associate Deans displayed even fewer Hallmarks indicative of Little Overall Symbolic Capital, scoring between 35 – 49 out of a possible 108 (see Appendix 5.1). Four (16%) of the Associate Deans appeared to have very few Hallmarks indicative of the Least Overall Symbolic Capital and were grappling with enacting the role, scoring less than 34 out of a possible 108 (see Appendix 5.1). This analysis reveals that despite a lack of Capital by the majority of Associate Deans, there are individuals who have more “tokens” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) than others.

In analysing this finding we will begin by exploring the potential reasons why Associate Deans did or did not either possess or were afforded particular Hallmarks. For example, the finding that the outright majority of Associate Deans were fully equipped with regard to the criteria of having a PhD, being part of an Associate Dean group, having a supportive Dean and being responsible for many discipline areas, may be due to general changes and external influences on the university sector (Anderson et al., 2011; Chalmers, 2011; Marginson, 1997). In addition being male, while clearly not necessary for being fully equipped, is in keeping with the general male dominance in university leadership structures (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Currie, Thiele, & Harris, 2002; Fitzgerald & Wilkinson, 2010; Pyke, 2009). Further, having high institutional knowledge may be an indication of
the political nature of universities and its necessity for survival in organisational contexts. Specifically, having high institutional knowledge involves,

understanding the role of risk management and litigation, how universities operate, industrial relations issues and processes as they apply to higher education, being able to help staff learn how to deliver necessary changes effectively, chair meetings effectively and having sound administrative and resource management skills (Scott et al, 2008, p. 26).

However, there are other aspects of Capital which the Associate Deans generally did not possess, such as Hallmarks related to their learning and teaching knowledge and experience. The finding that the outright majority of Associate Deans did not have qualifications in L&T and/or Creative Arts, publications in L&T, did not have an interest in leading change as their primary motive for taking on the role, did not have a high conception of L&T leadership or disciplinary differences, were not engaging with technology, were not developing partnership with industry partnerships, did not recognise themselves as the leaders and did not have an OLT award/citation/fellowship, were all indicative of the lack of personal knowledge and skills in learning and teaching leadership (Southwell, et al., 2008a; Scott et al., 2008). Not having this base, may be preventing them from using quality assurance processes positively for enhancement, strategically implementing initiatives locally, engaging in partnerships with industry, leading an international project, and being strategically connected with a central L&T group. In addition, not having a formal induction, being in a university that does not greatly value learning and teaching, being dependent on the Dean for authority and not having a budget does not encourage or equip the Associate Dean for their leadership role in the context of building their capabilities as a leader of learning and teaching (Marshall et al., 2011).

In terms of the types of Capital in which they were equipped for their strategic leadership role, Associate Deans were less equipped overall in Embodied Cultural and Economic Capital. Both of these types of Capital are particularly relevant in leadership. The former provides the Associate Dean with the educational expertise and experience to lead the role strategically, the latter gives them positional power within the university to effect change. The literature argues leadership “...is associated with the exercise of possessed power” (Bullen et al., 2010). This power can come from five sources:

(a) position (legitimate power),
(b) ability to provide rewards (reward power),
(c) ability to threaten punishment (coercive power),
(d) knowledge and expertise (expert power); and
(e) personality (the extent to which others like or identify with them) (referent power) (Weber, 1945; Etzioni, 1961; French & Raven, 1968; House, 1984; Marshall, 2008; Bullen et al. 2010)

Moreover, that Associate Deans are less enabled in terms of budget or project grants could mean that the university and the wider higher education sector and beyond is not supporting the autonomy of the Associate Dean in learning and teaching leadership. A lack of budget denies them reward power and coercive power (Bullen et al., 2010). There are further implications to the economic disempowerment of the Associate Dean. By removing OLT grants in the sector, Associate Deans are not enabled to work collectively across the sector on learning and teaching projects and through doing so, develop a collective identity. Equally by selecting Associate Deans who do not have the required Embodied Cultural Capital related to learning and teaching knowledge, leadership and experience, the university has ensured that they do not have the necessary expert power for the role (Bullen et al., 2010) and will therefore not contest the Doxa of the university. Not giving the Associate Dean legitimate power through reporting relationships ensures that Associate Deans will
not have reward or coercive power either. This leaves the Associate Dean with referent power through their emotional intelligence and institutional knowledge to carry out their learning and teaching leadership role; such a weakened role is reinforced by the literature through its focus on using persuasion and having high emotional intelligence as the mode by which the Associate Dean shapes the university culture (Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008a). Such positioning by the literature of the Associate Dean role suggests that it too is influenced by the symbolic violence of a university culture which seeks to sustain itself.

Whilst Associate Deans have the formal position of leading learning and teaching, and thus possess a legitimate source of power, as the findings show, in practice their lack of Capital denies them the power to be effective. As Bourdieu points out, “[w]e can picture each player as having in front of her a pile of tokens of different colors, each color corresponding to a given species of Capital she holds” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 99). It is evident that some Associate Deans have more ‘counters’ in their game to lead learning and teaching strategically.

These differences in Symbolic Capital possessed by Associate Deans can be illustrated through a typology of capability – namely Stars, Rising Stars, Copers and Strugglers, to borrow two of the terms, “Copers” and “Strugglers” used by Floyd and Dymock (2011). Stars and Rising Stars are added to the typology to classify those Associate Deans denoted as outstanding or capable of being outstanding. For example, the Stars and Rising Stars possess the highest personal attributes, such as learning and teaching knowledge and leadership conceptualisation. While both the Copers and the Strugglers appeared to be lifted by their universities in terms of Capital afforded to them, the Copers tended to take a more managerial approach to their role rather than strategic leadership and that was expected by the university. The strugglers found it difficult to articulate their role and often the university had not enabled their leadership.

So what would a typical Associate Dean for each level of the typology be like? Below are detailed descriptions of the typology of the Associate Dean, together with some hypothetical illustrative narratives of what life may be like. While these latter simulations are, of course, fictional, they are inspired both by the commentaries provided by the participants in the study and by the literature.

Greatest Overall Symbolic Capital - or the ‘Stars’

Associate Deans in the ‘Star’ category are fully equipped to enact strategic leadership of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. Associate Deans in this category in the typology most closely resemble the exemplar or prototype of the Expert Associate Dean.

They are likely to have extensive personal prototype hallmarks in Layer 1 (92.4%), particularly in relation to knowledge and experience of teaching and learning, and it is also evident that in Layer 2 their strategic leadership is supported by the universities in which they work (77.8%). They lead beyond their Faculty walls, embracing the Higher education sector (75%) and pioneer innovations (50%). Their own experience and qualifications in learning and teaching enable them to grow the role and influence both their University and the higher education sector in which they work. The following narrative illustrates a typical day in the life of an Associate Dean who is a Star.

A day in the life of a ‘Star’ Associate Dean

One of the reasons why Professor Fellowes was attracted to the role of Associate Dean was because of the people with whom she knew she was going to be working. She had a really good feeling when she woke up in the morning because she knew her team was onside. In the last five to ten years there has been a welcome priority to learning and teaching agendas and research at her university and as
she goes about her work she is now able to see how the operational effort of the faculty is moving to the satellite vision of the faculty in the future, as it makes inroads with innovations. Her background has been in learning and teaching for 38 years, so when it comes to program conceptualisation, program development, assessment design, policy understanding and critique of policy around improved practice, she’s most confident, as well as assured about the kind of institutional memory that she’s built over the past 20 years. She’s off now to a meeting, where there will be discussion as to whether members of the academic staff who have applied for tenure or promotion are successful. She has supported a couple of the Deputy Heads to get a promotion through their work in leading learning and teaching at a school level. However she argues strongly against a promotion for an academic who was renowned for being a poor teacher and offers to discuss how they might better support that academic in their teaching. After the meeting, she chats with one of the Heads of a Creative Arts School who is having difficulty in his school with getting teachers and students to embrace new technology in the discipline. She suggests one of her new learning and teaching advisors might work with the school to ensure that new innovations in the school can bring academics and students together; she includes the Deputy Head of that school in the conversation and sets up a meeting so that they can work together. She thinks carefully before she gives a view, listening to the arguments of both the Head of School and the Deputy Head and weighing up what she can offer and what is needed for the situation. After coffee, another meeting, this time with the seven school Deputy Heads exploring directions for the faculty. Photography needs some help and the team work at seeing how they can document the situation so that they can find remedies. Changes in technology are also moving journalism from traditional outlets and the team work towards a synergy between technology and media. Professor Fellowes notes she will need to talk to the Heads of School at the next Faculty Executive to keep them up to date and ensure their support of the work. After lunch, it’s a meeting with the peer-assisted learning group and looking at course experience survey data across the faculty to see whether the faculty-wide project has had an impact on teaching. Stats from the surveys look promising and the group now are joined by the Deputy Heads of Schools who confirm the promising start and the group resolve to meet in a couple of weeks to consider where to next. This leads on to a meeting of the University Executive which is looking to directions for the following five years. She flies out at 7pm for Canberra where she will chair the evaluation group for a major Government Project in Education across the university sector for which there is a $7 million dollar grant.

Some Overall Symbolic Capital or the ‘Rising Stars’

Associate Deans who are ‘Rising Stars’ score just under 30% lower in each layer than those with the Greatest Overall Capital or the ‘Stars’.

Rising Stars often lack personal Hallmarks in Layer 1 which would give them a solid base in learning and teaching (69.1%) although they are still higher there than in other layers. They are less likely to be afforded Capital by their universities (55.3%). For example, only just over half of the Rising Stars have a formal structure of learning and teaching leaders through which they can work in the schools, and only a quarter of them lead learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts Schools. Few integrate what they are doing with quality assurance into professional learning and teaching of academics and changed curriculum. Just under half understand the complexity of disciplinarity and pedagogy. They are more likely to have a relational or multi-structural understanding of learning and teaching leadership. They are also more likely to have a small group of Faculty-based learning and teaching staff who report to them. They are not embedded in schools driving change at a local level and have no authority over academic staff, but some of them may have line management with learning and teaching staff. It is not likely that they are involved in regional or global innovations, although some may be involved in technology innovation. Rising Stars are more likely to be Associate Professors, even though some may not have PhDs, especially the case if they come from a Creative
Arts background. These are classified as “rising stars” because they do have the potential to rise. However, if they do not identify the Hallmarks which they need to attain or the university does not provide the context Hallmarks they require, they will fall short.

A day in the life of a ‘Rising Star’ Associate Dean

Operating quite well in one of the schools where he has an operational leadership position as a Deputy Head of School, Associate Professor Felstead finds it tough to tread the line between the Heads of School although he has the support of the Dean. He is someone who is a natural leader but does not adopt this position in the Faculty or even in his own school, as his own Head of School, to whom he reports as a School leader, sees himself as the strategic leader and sets up a situation where he rules by word of mouth rather than through meetings. This means that Associate Professor Felstead is out of the picture and catches up after the event. Meeting with that Head of School, at 9am, Associate Professor Felstead organises to do the management of the Head’s idea for a new program and agrees to follow up some recalcitrant academics. Fortunately, Associate Professor Felstead is only part-time in the Associate Dean role and leads his own program in the photography school where he has line authority so there is plenty of room for his directive skills in learning and teaching, for he is very talented. He works successfully with the Head of School within his own discipline area in translating the university strategic directions into ones that the School can tolerate whilst keeping the overall direction away from the students. Things do not run so smoothly in the other schools in the faculty where the Heads of Schools defend themselves against university sanctioned strategic change as much as possible. In a sense then, he is his own Head of School’s choice for the role and the choice of the other Heads of School because he does not rock the boat.

In relation to the other four schools in the faculty, he relates what is happening in the learning and teaching sphere and tries to encourage academics to try the strategic directions but often these directions are ignored and the Head of School only pays them lip service. Associate Professor Felstead recognises that there will be retribution to these schools eventually but he is not ready to take on the battle with the Heads of School at the moment as he has only been in the job a year. He does not see that Creative Arts disciplines require different pedagogies; he believes the same learning and teaching pedagogy can apply to all, and that the Creative Arts teachers needs to change their practice. For example, academics cannot spend six hours a day in student contact hours – even if it is Dance where the staff and students are putting together a public performance. It is a position with which the Drama, Music and Dance academics fiercely disagree. What drives him is the absence of “common sense” he sees around him. He is regarded in his role for being efficient and personable, but ultimately many of the academics feel that he does not understand their disciplines. He spends the day going from meeting to meeting where the direction of the university is replicated so he becomes an expert in quality assurance processes and knows how to bring about learning changes, at least on paper. The curriculum documentation says that the curriculum is embracing these initiatives, such as graduate attributes, so he feels that he has done his job, even though the academics only give them lip service.

At times, he feels restricted but the politics are too cemented to change. Associate Professor Felstead does not take up a leadership role outside of the university but in his program within the school he could be said to be pushing new global directions in his discipline; and incorporating his quite sophisticated understanding of learning and teaching. However, he does get really frustrated by the thought bubbles which come from the top which he knows will not work, and is told by other staff that they will not work, but still has to put them in place. He feels like he is the “meat in the sandwich”. Had he more autonomy, as well as continuing to develop his knowledge of learning and teaching through publishing and leading or participating in grants he could become a “star”.

121
Little Symbolic Capital or the ‘Copers’

These Associate Deans are most likely to be managing learning and teaching in their Faculty rather than leading learning and teaching strategically.

The ‘Copers’ focus their energy on effectively managing or administering quality assurance rather than on leading learning and teaching. These Associate Deans are just under 45% lower than the ‘Stars’ in their Capital at each layer, with the biggest difference between them and the ‘Stars’ in their personal Capital (56.3) in Layer 1. None of these Associate Deans are likely to have a background in both Creative Arts and Education, with many of them having a background in the Creative Arts only and only a third with a learning and teaching or Education qualification. A third are likely to publish in learning and teaching. None of them are integrating quality assurance practices into academic development opportunities or projects; or are involved in any innovative learning and teaching projects at a regional or global level or involved in technology innovation. Under half have a multi-structural level of understanding of learning and teaching leadership with the remainder of Associate Deans with a uni- or pre-structural level. They are also most likely to be working in a context where their universities value research more than learning and teaching and only a few of them would to any degree manage learning and teaching staff.

A day in the life of a ‘Coping’ Associate Dean

Associate Professor McCrippen is on her first meeting of the day. She worked out the other day that she goes to 27 different meetings. She literally travels from meeting to meeting which in many ways is repetitive. There are the course approvals meetings, and the quality assurance meetings and the teaching and learning meetings, and then there are the equal opportunity meetings, for example. At many of these meetings, she is ensuring that the quality assurance requirements of the university are met. She is also keen to keep up her own disciplinary research because she knows eventually she will go back into the School. She curses as yet another course outline arrives which she has to rewrite. She writes a letter to a staff member asking her to rewrite part of the course, realising that now she has moved into the Associate Dean role, the people she used to meet for lunch avoid her. She notes that she needs to speak to the Dean because one of the course guide offenders is a Professor and she is only an Associate Professor. It does not do to offend the status of those above her. She has a passion for teaching but in her new role she has not conflated the leadership of learning and teaching with the management of the quality assurance. She is a manager and on call over weekends for emergencies to do with course writing or audits. Any strategic direction she has to implement goes into the writing of courses and trying to confront the apathy of the academic staff who sometimes see her efforts as “ticking boxes”. She is respected by the faculty because she is efficient.

Least Symbolic Capital or the ‘Strugglers’

Strugglers are roughly 55% below the Capital totals of Star Associate Deans. They are likely to be in the role at less than a .4 fraction and are often new to academia or have been given the role as they are about to retire. They are differentiated by the absence of hallmarks, particularly in Layer 1 with their personal assets 70.6% less than the ‘Stars’. ‘Strugglers’ are not likely to have a learning and teaching qualification nor integrate quality assurance into the professional learning of teachers or other strategic projects. None of them is likely to publish in learning and teaching or have had any experience in learning and teaching other than teaching in their own discipline prior to the role. They mostly focus on management and administration. There is often uncertainty in their minds about what their role is. None of them are likely to lead or support projects in the Creative Arts or be
involved in technology, regional or international projects and they are unlikely to have line management of any staff. In short, they are in roles in which they do not seem to achieve much and often they do not even have the support of the Dean. They appear to be there because it is the norm to have an Associate Dean position in universities but it is a low level administrative role.

**A day in the life of a struggling Associate Dean**

An interesting question came up in Dr McClaren’s performance review about why he was not leading learning and teaching well. He came away reflecting, “You would have thought it would be obvious to the Dean that the Heads of School lead it. I’m only there to OK the courses they write or to sound the alarm if one of the courses is not compliant”. Dr McClaren works extensively on equal opportunity for women, the disabled, the ethnic groups, all those areas the Heads of School won’t touch; and this is because they won’t let him near teaching and learning in their Schools. He has become somewhat cynical about the whole process as he sees the courses that the schools put forward bearing little relationship to what is taught. He is on his own too. His Dean has only met with him three times this year and it is now October. He is also not on the Faculty Executive committee and feels that his role description is too vague to be of any use to him. He wonders if the role description were more detailed and if the Heads of School’s role descriptions were more detailed, it might be better. He’s got lots of ways he thinks it could improve but it is too deeply entrenched and he has no one on his side. He is glad he is still teaching as well. Whilst he is still operating fairly efficiently in the role, there is a sense that the role is frustrating to him. He is looking for a way to get out.

There were commonalities across all of the typology categories that are not mentioned in each case. These commonalities included a lack of developing partnerships with industry, the absence of budget in the role or an international grant. On the positive side, the majority of Associate Deans had institutional knowledge and were supported by the Dean. Whilst there were approximately equal numbers of male and female Associate Deans, there were more males in the ‘Star’ category (2 to 1), more males in the ‘Rising star’ category (4 to 3), more females in the ‘Coper’ category (7 to 4) and more males in the ‘Struggler’ category (3 to 1).

**Overview**

As presented above, Associate Deans in this study fall within a strategic leadership typology of ‘Stars’, ‘Rising Stars, ‘Copers’ and ‘Strugglers’, based on their Symbolic Capital across all four layers in their Field. Overall, in this study, there were three ‘Stars’, seven ‘Rising Stars’, eleven ‘Copers’ and four ‘Strugglers’.

In answer to Research Question 2, to what extent are Associate Deans in Australian universities equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?, this finding suggests that the majority of Associate Deans did not have sufficient Capital to compete as equals in the “…battlefield” (Bourdieu & Waquant, 1992, p. 17) of the university, and thus were not fully equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. However, the picture is not entirely bleak; the ‘Stars’ and ‘Rising Stars’, comprising 40 percent of the group, are either equipped or nearly equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. This suggests potential that it is possible for the Associate Dean, supported by their university to become a “Star”.

For the Associate Deans who fall into the Star category, the kinds of strategic leadership capabilities they embody give insight to the complex decision-making they exercise:

> You can do it if you have particular qualities, so a sense of humour when things go wrong is important, you’re not going to go overboard. It’s the sort of role that if you were too serious
about it you would disintegrate. The workload is enormously high, it’s enormously complex, things come out of left Field so fast and you have got to deal with it immediately. And so it’s got to be someone who is organised and terribly managerial while on the same side it’s got to be someone who’s got really serious creative practice, otherwise you have no legitimacy [2]

I’m not a one night flash in the pan type person – I’ve got sustained credible profile, I’ve got a passion and commitment to leading learning and teaching. I’m able to develop a shared vision and ensure that it doesn’t just remain a vision, but actually action it, and alongside of that continue to monitor the evidence, what’s the data telling us and where do we go next. So that good feedback of where are we at, where are we now and where are we going, that’s important. Just to work hard [7]

Unfortunately, for the Copers and the Strugglers, fully enacting the leadership role of the Associate Dean is very difficult. They do not have the degree of personal or contextual Symbolic Capital required to lead strategically. Without a substantial degree of personal or contextual Symbolic Capital in the role, the ‘Copers’ and ‘Strugglers’ often become casualties of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacqant, 1992), reflecting Bourdieu’s position that, [c]umulative exposure to certain social conditions instils in individuals an ensemble of durable and transposable dispositions that internalize the necessities of the extant social environment, inscribing inside the organism the patterned inertia and constraints of external reality (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.12).

Leverage points to strengthen the strategic leadership of the Associate Dean

How can the strategic leadership of Associate Deans be strengthened to enhance their leadership role in learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

Given the large proportion of Associate Deans with less than optimal leadership capability, what can be done about it? The following leverage points are drawn together from the findings of this study and outline how the strategic leadership of the Associate Dean can be strengthened to enhance the leadership of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. As mentioned, the term leverage point is used in line with Bourdieu’s Theory with the expectation that action on these leverage points would be able to persuade people to see the traditional university culture differently. Leverage points are used instead of recommendations as they are meant to be levers for change. Each leverage point is discussed in turn below.

Associate Dean

Leverage Point 1:

The Associate Deans could:

Recognise and take advantage of the opportunities provided by the higher education sector in universities so that they can proactively and consciously build their qualifications and experience for the role, and reflect on and develop their role to enable their leadership of learning and teaching to flourish.

Associate Deans who have the prerequisite qualifications for the role, the opportunities to climb a career ladder which “grows” their knowledge, an induction and ongoing professional learning, and an effective external network will be in a position to understand the dynamics of the Creative Arts and
use their expert knowledge to grow their Capital in the role. However, to succeed, they need to be conscious of how the university operates, both in its history in the present and contemporary politics, and they should work the system intelligently.

The Associate Dean needs to have learning and teaching knowledge, qualifications and experience; a knowledge of disciplinary differences as a pre-requisite to the role; a desire to initiate, lead and influence change; a desire to carry out research projects in learning and teaching and publish in higher education learning and teaching to further their knowledge; and a knowledge of the ways in which the faculty works. It is also important to lead or co-lead meaningful learning and teaching projects and global initiatives in the Creative Arts (and other disciplines) as part of change implementation strategies. At the moment, the system is stacked against Associate Deans as their capacity to operate in this manner is hampered by the lack of structures within universities to achieve these aims, but as Scott et al. (2008) comments, Associate Deans need to be proactive as,

[e]ffective higher education leaders not only take an active role in making specific changes happen by engaging people in the process of personal and institutional change and improvement; they also help reshape the operating context of their institutions to make them less change averse, more efficient and agile, and more change capable. (p. xiv)

This leverage point would strengthen the following Hallmarks of the Associate Dean:

- A qualification in both Creative Arts and Education (Institutionalised Cultural Capital)
- Publications in learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Interest in bringing about change in learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Understanding disciplinary differences (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Experience in learning and teaching prior to the role (Embodied Cultural Capital).

**University**

**Leverage Point 2:**

The University could:

Revise recruitment and professional expectations of the Associate Dean to ensure Associate Deans have the necessary knowledge, experience, and motivation for change to be leaders of learning and teaching. The Associate Dean needs as part of their appointment:

- learning and teaching knowledge and experience, as well as knowledge of disciplinary differences as a pre-requisite
- to have the desire to initiate, lead and influence change
- to have the desire to further their knowledge and to publish in higher education learning and teaching, leading to furthering knowledge in the faculty as well as the discipline of learning and teaching
- the ability to lead or co-lead meaningful learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts (and other disciplines) as part of change implementation strategies
- an ambition to engage in global changes to learning and teaching, particularly in developments in technology, through networks, ongoing professional learning and scholarship.

The University, as a major player in the leadership of the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching for the Creative Arts, and following a rigorous appointment process, should provide the conditions that
improve their authority as leaders in the Field in which they work in a purposeful and ongoing manner.

2.1 A competitive recruitment process is essential to find the best people to take on the Associate Dean role. Both Scott et al. (2008) and Southwell et al. (2008a) in their studies questioned the recruitment of learning and teaching leaders. The study by Southwell et al. (2008a) included a review of guidelines for appointing Associate Deans and their position descriptions. They pointed out that “...expertise in teaching and learning, curriculum development and review, and evidence of prior leadership in teaching and learning [were] not prerequisites... [in current recruitment practices and that Associate Deans did not have]...any direct authority over those with operational responsibility for teaching and learning” (p. 151). It is essential that recruitment processes examine the qualifications and experience of applicants to ensure their expertise to the role. As shown in Chapter 4, however, the majority of Associate Deans were tapped on the shoulder for the role, and though they may appear to be great teachers in their own disciplines, they may also not have the requisite skills and knowledge for such a key leadership position, and there may not be a clear pathway within the university to gain that knowledge (Norton, 2013).

Those in the study who did have learning and teaching knowledge had much greater Capital than those who did not as the Capital from learning and teaching knowledge built Capital in other areas for the “Star” and “Rising Star” Associate Deans. The “Star” Associate Deans in this study had PhDs in learning and teaching and years of experience outside of their primary discipline, but they were the exceptions. The others without that learning and teaching knowledge were unable to draw on a diverse range of theoretical positions in relation to learning and teaching when faced by pedagogical and curriculum issues. Having knowledge and extensive experience in learning and teaching also affected the Associate Deans conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership and their self-belief in capacity to enact leadership. In this study, the higher the Associate Dean’s conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership was, using the SOLO taxonomy to gauge the level, the more likely it was that the Associate Dean would have had a learning and teaching qualification and publications in scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). The difficulty for the Associate Dean is how they acquire this knowledge and build this knowledge over time, when having a qualification in learning and teaching is not a pre-requisite for the role.

Norton et al. (2013) commented that it was surprising that in an institution that provided academic credentials for a variety of professions, the university had not demanded of its academics that they have a teaching qualification. However, it should be expected that the leaders of learning and teaching be required to have a qualification in education. The lack of such qualifications is a finding that echoes Blackmore & Blackwell (2006), who seven years earlier found that Heads of Central Learning and teaching units did not have educational qualifications. James et al. (2015) also suggest that “…the creation of an Australian recognition system for higher education teaching qualifications, skills and experience” (p. iii) is critical in order to bring about progress in the professionalisation of learning and teaching. And as James et al. (2015, p. 23) point out,

[t]he move to professionalise teaching across the higher education sector requires institutional and cross-institutional recognition of formal qualifications and experience in teaching. A structure through which national recognition of teaching qualifications and experience can be facilitated could accomplish this and would work to elevate the status of teaching.

Equally, only eleven of the Associate Deans had a background in the Creative Arts and, therefore, an enculturation in the studio model of education and its unique pedagogy would have been missing for the others. Nine of the Associate Deans with a Creative Arts background did not have an educational
credential. This means that the majority of the Associate Deans did not have either the necessary “disciplinary content knowledge” or the “pedagogical content knowledge” (Cochran, 1991; Kleickmann et al., 2013; Scott et al., 2008; Shulman, 1986, 1987) to lead learning and teaching in a multi-disciplinary faculty.

There was also a lack of substantial prior experience for the majority of these Associate Deans and this would weaken their adaptive expertise as “…learning is a continuous process grounded in experience” (Kolb, 1984). This lack of learning and teaching experience identifies a broader problem across learning and teaching leadership positions in universities - that there is no career structure to build towards the position of Associate Dean or beyond.

Unless there are a number of highly qualified learning and teaching experts in the system, then a competitive recruitment process is futile, which is probably why, to date, so many have been tapped on the shoulder.

2.2 A further area which is under-explored in the literature is the need for Associate Deans to understand disciplinary differences. Heads of Schools are reported to resist strategic leadership from the Associate Dean thinking that that Associate Deans will destroy the integrity of their disciplines (Bullen et al. 2010, Blackmore, 2007). And quite possibly, Associate Deans may not recognise the “signature pedagogies” (Shulman, 2005) of each discipline, because many of them have internalised the pedagogy of another discipline in their own socialisation process as academics. However, what this study has found is that rather than internalising all the discipline Discourses of the schools the Associate Dean leads, which is an impossibility (Gee, 2004; Emibayer & Johnson, 2008) Associate Deans need to understand that there are disciplinary differences and work with and through discipline leaders in the schools with learning and teaching backgrounds and qualifications. It was evident that this only happened formally in three cases in the study, although there were a number of informal arrangements where the Associate Dean talked to program leaders but the university had not arranged formal reporting relationships of these people to these Associate Deans or structures which enabled a team from the disciplines and learning and teaching leaders to collaborate together. This undermined their leadership, reducing their authority and standing. An Associate Dean who is the leader in a multi-discipline faculty requires an organisational framework with discipline leaders to effectively and strategically lead schools in the faculty. The study also found that the majority of the Associate Deans who had a background in Creative Arts had the least Capital for the Associate Dean role, unless their qualification was coupled with a post-graduate qualification in Education.

2.3 Learning and teaching leadership is about managing change and the Associate Dean should have the right disposition and desire to initiate, lead and influence change. According to Scott et al., (2008, p. 16),

> effective higher education leaders not only take an active role in making specific changes but it happens by engaging people in the process of personal and institutional change and improvement; they also help reshape the operating context of their institutions to make them less change averse, more efficient and agile, and more change capable.

Whilst many Associate Deans were passionate about learning and teaching, and this may have contributed to them agreeing to take on the role, only three Associate Deans were interested in taking on the role in order to bring about change. Change management is considered as the core function of leaders of learning and teaching in universities, given that much of the work of those in learning and teaching leadership positions is around managing or bringing about change, which has at its heart the need to “…challenge and transform followers’ expectations” (Marshall, 2006, p.7). A
passion for learning and teaching is not seen as necessarily leading to a capacity for re-conceptualising learning and teaching in the disciplinary area. The various motivations of these Associate Deans for the role, included wanting to help first generation university students, or developing skills in first year students, or just having a passion for their particular discipline and so on suggests that there was no unanimous agreement around the Associate Deans’ role as change agent, by either the university or the Associate Dean.

The Associate Dean role has been reported as leader of strategic change and the role developed to lead and manage improvements in learning and teaching at a faculty level. This was because it is recognised that managing change from the centre was too distant from the local need of schools in a faculty. Radloff and de la Harpe’s (2007, p. 50) desire for the leadership role at faculty level to provide “…hands-on and operational support” to those locally has only happened with a few of these Associate Deans in this study. The majority of the Associate Deans approve programs or courses and do not focus on the professional development requirements of academic staff in disciplinary settings whose practices then remain the same and whose “complex unlearning” (Scott et al., 2008, p. xiv) remains unconsidered. Given the needs of the nation and the economy to be “agile” in thinking “(Turnbull, 2015), the academic teachers in these unreconstructed discipline pedagogies are not preparing students, themselves, their universities or their country for the future.

Good change management capability is pivotal in the leadership process and can only occur when the Associate Dean has a deep knowledge of learning and teaching and change theory, so that they can blend their knowledge with strategies which will work with the discipline in the school. This knowledge should be a pre-requisite for taking on the role. Without this foundational knowledge, Associate Deans cannot imagine the future or make conceptual decisions. Managing change depends on the authority to do so, and the majority of these Associate Deans did not have this authority. In addition, the number of Creative Arts academics who were appointed to the roles, and their lack of educational qualifications and experience suggests that the university faculty may have worked to employ their own staff who would not challenge them. Indeed, one of the Associate Deans said that he was chosen because he was a Creative Arts person and not an educator.

Whilst Associate Deans should already possess the capabilities outlined by Scott et al. (2008) through their prior learning to the role, these capabilities need ongoing strengthening through the publishing in learning and teaching or Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). SoTL not only provides learning and teaching leaders development of their own knowledge, and academic staff with opportunities for potential changes in their pedagogy, but develops and refines a conceptual documented language for talking about learning and teaching which is critical to the Creative Arts (de la Harpe & Peterson, 2009a). The privileging of discipline research over teaching and learning research (SOTL) has affected Associate Deans where “…the predominance of discipline based research as the traditional vehicle for promotion seemed to overshadow any consideration of SOTL affiliated activities” (Hutchings, Anders, & Ciccone, 2011, p.10). Associate Deans in this study reported that the promotions board appeared to look down on SoTL and chose those for promotion who were undertaking discipline research rather than educational research. This was reinforced by this study where more than half of the Associate Deans in the study continued to publish in their own disciplines yet only a third published in higher education learning and teaching.

2.4 Associate Deans should be required to lead or co-lead meaningful learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts as part of a change implementation strategy opening up the faculty to global changes in learning and teaching.

Very few of the Associate Deans in this study led learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts. In short only the Stars and some of the Rising Stars were attempting projects that specifically related
to the Creative Arts. Through these projects, those Associate Deans engaged in global changes to learning and teaching, particularly using technology, establishing networks, and completed ongoing professional learning and scholarship as part of their appointment. The changing landscape of university learning and teaching with a focus on student-centred learning, increasing globalisation and a more widespread use of technology also created an impetus for these Associate Deans to improve and enhance the quality of the student experience in universities and made critical the importance of the strategic leadership of the Associate Dean responsible for learning and teaching. This study has shown the majority of the Associate Deans have not been involved in this. The technology knowledge of this group of Associate Deans also requires considerable development and should be part of ongoing professional learning of the Associate Dean.

This leverage point would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Having a PhD (Institutionalised cultural Capital)
- Background discipline in both Creative Arts and Education (Institutional Cultural Capital)
- Qualification in Education/Learning and Teaching (Institutionalised Cultural Capital)
- Publishing in higher education learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- A high conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- A high degree of disciplinary integration with learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Prior learning and teaching experience before taking on the Associate Dean role (Embodied cultural Capital)
- Being recruited through a competitive rigorous process that scrutinises the qualifications, experience and skills required for the role and recognises the Discourse of learning and teaching required for the role (Symbolic Capital)
- A formal induction to the role (Institutional Cultural Capital)
- Interest in influencing change (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Enabled to implement change at a school level through a formal structure (Social Capital)
- A positive working relationship with the Head of School (Social Capital)
- Leading and /or supporting learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts (Social Capital)

**Leverage Point 3:**

The university could:

*Establish a hierarchical career pathway for the Associate Dean and other leaders of learning and teaching to ensure commonality of purpose and the building of professional identity.*

*A career pathway for the Associate Dean and other leaders of learning and teaching needs to be established in universities across the sector.* The Associate Dean role in faculties is usually a temporary secondment from a school role which typically results in the academic returning to their substantive position after a three to five year term. In the majority of cases, when in the role they may have some faculty learning and teaching staff working with them but they do not, in the majority of cases, have staff in schools who report to them. The majority of Associate Deans continue with their own discipline research and seem to eventually settle on a focus on the management aspects of the role. These Associate Deans focus heavily on a consensus pathway which approves new courses/programs. If they do attempt leadership of learning and teaching it is often seen as not a serious venture and appears to just touch the edges of professional learning of academics, usually working with those who volunteer. There is no formal career pathway or a career ladder where a teaching and learning leader can move through various learning and teaching positions, or into other universities, such as in the case of disciplinary academics who may move through Course Co-Coordinator, Program Leader, Deputy Head, Head of School, Dean or Executive Dean of Faculty, to
PVC or DVC or to other universities. What is needed is a career pathway defined for those interested in learning and teaching to build their skills and their seniority, and to give weight and definition to the important role of learning and teaching experts in the university context now and into the future.

This leverage point would influence the following hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Line management of academic and/or learning and teaching support staff (Economic Capital)
- Being a full Professor or promotion to a full professor through the role (Symbolic Capital)
- Leading a large faculty with many disciplines (Symbolic Capital)
- Enabled to implement changes at a school level through a formal structure (Social Capital)
- Leading and/or supporting learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts (Social Capital)
- Working in a university in which learning and teaching is valued as much as research (Symbolic Capital)
- Level of Satisfaction with the role (Symbolic Capital)

**Leverage Point 4:**

The university could:

*Define the Associate Dean role to ensure similarity of role across the sector including responsibilities, size of faculty, time fraction, bestow a Professorship to the role, a discretionary budget and multi-disciplinary leadership.*

It was evident in the study that there was no uniformity of role across the sector, or in some cases, even within the same university. Sizes and composition of faculties were uneven. If uniformity were to happen, this might mean that some Associate Deans need to have more than one faculty to lead. The role name still varied, despite the literature constantly calling for a unique identifying name. The support systems for the role were also diverse. The nature of the role – management versus leadership – differed greatly as did the degree to which Associate Deans were given authority, although the majority had little authority. This has made change in the role much more difficult because there is no defined role which can be pointed to across the sector. It also makes external networking for the Associate Dean less than helpful. They are often reduced to exploring what the identity of their role is in their external meetings, as has similarly been reported for the central learning and teaching units (Boud, 2008). The uncertainty about the role can be seen in Bourdieusian terms as a conscious/unconscious attempt to undermine the role and deny it power. In view of that, the status of the Associate Dean role should carry with it a professorship and manage its own discretionary budget in order to give power to the role and attract high calibre candidates.

This leverage point would influence the following hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Being recruited through a competitive rigorous process that scrutinises the qualifications, experience and skills required for the role and recognises the Discourse of learning and teaching required for the role (Symbolic Capital – Contextual)
- Being a full professor or promotion to a full professor through the role (Symbolic Capital – Contextual)
- Leading a large faculty with many discipline areas (Symbolic Capital – Contextual)
- Having a discretionary budget for leading teaching and learning (Economic Capital – Contextual)
- Line management of academic staff and/or learning and teaching support staff
- A full-time role (Economic Capital – Contextual)

**Leverage Point 5:**

The university could:
Provide the Associate Deans with the power and authority to lead learning and teaching in the university to enable them to bring about change which is authentic for the disciplines and aligns with the strategic direction of the university.

Associate Deans must be given the power and authority to lead learning and teaching. Central to the issues faced by the Associate Deans in this study is the need for legitimacy to lead learning and teaching. Associate Deans talked about the need for authority and power which would give them agency to enact the leadership of learning and teaching. The literature argues leadership “…is associated with the exercise of possessed power” (Bullen et al., 2010). This includes legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power and referent power (Weber, 1945; Etzioni, 1961; French & Raven, 1968; House, 1984; Marshall, 2008; Bullen et al. 2010).

Southwell et al. (2008a) and Scott et al.’s (2008) argue that the Associate Dean leads through influence and expertise and believe that the Associate Dean has enough authority through influence and expertise. They therefore need emotional intelligence and knowledge of learning and teaching leadership. Yet this study has shown that the majority do have that expertise and it does not work on its own. Associate Deans require other kinds of legitimate power to enact the role.

Goleman’s (2004) theory of emotional intelligence had been published and was very influential in the thinking of many researchers at the time that Scott et al. (2008) and Southwell et al, (2008a) completed their studies on leadership of learning and teaching. Both studies saw emotional intelligence as key to leadership of learning and teaching in the university, particularly to the Associate Dean whom, they decided, led through influence. The idea of emotional intelligence was carried further by Southwell et al. (2008a) in their influential study by developing a model of “servant leadership” for the Associate Dean which drew on,

- a very different set of characteristics, including social skills, empathy, awareness, stewardship, foresight, persuasion and a commitment to community building (p.27)

Southwell et al. (2008a) saw this as important for the Associate Dean because of its “connections between servant leadership and the notions of leading with influence, the concept of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 2004), moral purpose” and community building. So between Scott et al (2008) and Southwell et al. (2008a), this became the mantra for the role of the Associate Dean and it satisfied the adherence to collegiality which is central to academia for it did not threaten the authority of the schools.

There was also great value for it as it revolved around teamwork,

...we have shown that the more collaborative approaches to the leadership of teaching at the individual subject level are associated with more conceptual, change-oriented and student-focused approaches to teaching. Given that other research has shown that these more conceptual change and student-focused approaches to teaching are associated with deeper approaches to learning (Trigwell et al, 1999) this study would suggest that the way in which teachers experience the leadership of their departments is an important precursor to the quality of student learning processes and outcomes in their departments. (Scott et al., 2008, p. 13).

In an equal world, the notion of communities of practice might have worked. However, for Associate Deans, burdened to be the influencer in an hierarchical system where all the power of budget and hiring and firing lay in the hands of the Heads of School, this was very difficult.
Many Associate Deans in this study argued that influence was not enough to lead faculties in change. There are different reasons why Associate Deans struggle with leading academics and show that, as for some Associate Deans in Southwell et al.’s study (2008a), Associate Deans feel often they are the ‘Passed Over and Pissed Off’ (POPOs)” (p.62).

Those in this study who managed the leadership very well had other sources of power. One had “reward” power. Another had the “coercive” capacity to punish but she was also a Head of School”. The stars all had expert power. Just under eleven of the Associate Deans in the study talked about their need for line management of academics in the role, recognising too its limitations.

In summary, whilst the foremost leaders had excellent emotional intelligence – four of the top five scored at the highest in emotional intelligence - it did not give them sufficient authority to lead learning and teaching on its own without other forms of authority. It is interesting that both Scott et al. (2008) and Southwell et al. (2008a) mount this emotional intelligence argument even when the literature before had shown its shortcomings:

> [w]e kind of write it [learning and teaching policy] and it hits a vacuum at the Faculties. There isn’t a coordinated way of making it happen (Lines, 2000, p.12).

Scott et al. (2008) and Southwell et al. (2008a) even found disagreement about leading through influence from respondents within their own projects: “[T]here was emerging evidence that the people in these roles [Associate Deans] lacked the power to make or manage change effectively” (Southwell, et al., 2008a, p.21) and that “…initiating change…[was] seen as too difficult without authority” (Southwell, et al., 2008a, p. 100). Scott et al. (2008) too acknowledge the difficulty of enacting leadership through influence. In the midst of this contestation, confusion also emerged about the definition of strategic leadership of learning and teaching which requires further research including defining the leadership boundaries of the different learning and teaching leaders within the faculty.

Whilst Scott et al. (2008) sustained his belief that the Associate Dean role is an “horizontal” (p. 68) influence across all the schools in the faculty, carrying out the role with only referential authority, and without line-management. He did understand that they needed an explicit role description to do so. As his recommendation for explicit role descriptions were not taken up, the legitimacy of the role is diminished in practice. The ambiguity of purpose of senior leadership put Deans, in particular, in conflict when deliberating on the competing demands of Heads of Schools and Associate Deans.

It is essential that the university work to give Associate Deans different kinds of authority so that they are able to enact strategic changes to learning and teaching.

This leverage point would influence the following hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Having a discretionary budget for leading learning and teaching (Economic Capital – Contextual)
- Line Management of academic and/or learning and teaching support staff (Economic Capital – Contextual
- Demonstrating a sophisticated level of emotional intelligence (Social Capital)
- A high conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Leader or participant in an OLT learning and teaching grant (Symbolic Capital)
- Knowledge about how the institution operates (Embodied Cultural Capital – Contextual)

**Further implications**
Extrapolating from these leverage points which come directly from the findings, a number of implications are evident. Therefore additional leverage points could be undertaken within the university context and are set out below.

The university could:

*Develop a framework of complementary role descriptions for leaders of learning and teaching to ensure effective collaboration in leading change in the faculties and defining what leadership of learning and teaching is for each role.* One Associate Dean in Scott et al.’s (2008) study expressed this succinctly,

> What is needed is to develop a hierarchy of clear, consistent and complementary role descriptors focused on the activities, capabilities and competencies identified as so important in this study—rather than continue on using generic [position descriptions] associated with a title...It is role complementarity, relevance and focus that are now the key issues (p. 108)

Having developed an exemplar or prototype of the expert Associate Dean, this framework could now begin.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- A useful relationship with the central Learning and Teaching Unit (Social Capital)
- A positive working relationship with Head of School and Deputy Head (Social Capital)
- A supportive Dean (Social Capital)
- Knowledge about how the institution operates (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Qualification in learning and teaching (Institutionalised Cultural Capital)
- A high conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- A high degree of disciplinary integration with learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- A focus on leadership as opposed to management (Embodied Cultural Capital)
- Enabled to implement change at a school level through a formal structure (Social Capital)
- Line management of academic and/or learning and teaching support staff (Economic Capital).

The university could:

*Streamline and greatly reduce bureaucratic university structures and processes in order to expedite change and give more time to Associate Deans and other leaders of learning to work at an operational level*

Clarifying the leadership roles for learning and teaching may make the need for constant meetings redundant. In this study it was evident that the plethora of meetings that Associate Deans attended took up much of their time. This coupled with the onerous reporting arrangements, and the regular reviews of schools as well as the email traffic each day prevented them from exercising leadership over learning and teaching. It is a way of blocking change and is exacerbated by the time it takes for any changes to work through the onerous committee structures.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Belonging to an Associate Dean group across the university (Social Capital – Contextual)
● A positive working relationship with the Head of School and Deputy Head (Social Capital – Contextual)
● A supportive Dean (Social Capital – Contextual)
● Knowledge about how the institution operates (Embodied Cultural Capital – Contextual)
● Enabled to implement change at school level through a formal structure (Social Capital – Contextual)

The higher education sector could:

Value learning and teaching equally with research demonstrated by government funding under the one external body to ensure recognition of learning and teaching on a par with research.

The higher education area through its statutory bodies and policies, for example, Universities Australia (https://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/), should more actively leverage across the sector to promote leadership of learning and teaching at a meta-level to ensure change occurs across universities.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

● Working in a university in which learning and teaching is valued as much as research
● Being recruited through a competitive rigorous process that scrutinises the qualifications, experience and skills required for the role and recognises the Discourse of learning and teaching required for the role
● Being a full professor or promotion to a full professor through the role

The higher education sector could:

Ensure that a teaching and learning institute remains separate from university leadership

Significantly the Government has disbanded the Office for Learning and Teaching, completely withdrawn funding for learning and teaching grants, and merely maintained learning and teaching awards, which some argue marginalises learning and teaching in universities (McFarlane, 2011).

Reading the invited submissions to the Government from academics perplexed by the actions of Government to close the Office for Learning and Teaching, there is a sense of bewilderment about this move in the higher education sector. It is evident that this change will have an impact on opportunities for those undertaking projects. This closure has also received international criticism, Across the next decade, the higher education sector will face continuing demand, equity, diversity and competition challenges. Disinvestment at this moment in learning and teaching is exactly the wrong policy position to take (Murray, 2015).

It is timely that the higher education sector and government realise that if their teaching and learning university sector is to thrive, money has to be invested into it in terms of research, and teacher change, and that as most of the money which is fed into ordinary research comes from student fees, it has a moral and an economic obligation to look more deeply at the consequences of their decisions. Barber et al. (2013) points out the repercussions of ignoring this coming “avalanche”.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

● Working in a university is which learning and teaching is valued as much as research
● Publishing in higher education Learning and Teaching
● Level of satisfaction with the role
The higher education sector could:

*Re-assess quality assurance measurement tools for learning and teaching*

Despite the quality assurance interventions since the 90s, more intensive auditing seems to have just added to workload rather than quality of learning and teaching in any appreciable way. The sector should re-develop its quality assurance procedures for learning and teaching to support effective learning and teaching strategies which could incorporate professional development goals for academics.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Responsibility for integrating quality assurance with leading the professional learning of academics and learning and teaching initiatives in the faculty. Enabled to implement change at a school level through a formal structure.
- Engaging in regional approaches to learning and teaching in the faculty. Engaging in global approaches to learning and teaching in the faculty.
- Engaging in technology to enhance learning and teaching in the faculty.
- Level of satisfaction with the role.

The higher education sector could:

*Professionalise the Leadership of Learning and Teaching by requiring programs/courses in learning and teaching leadership in universities*

It is paradoxical that universities set up to teach students are not demanding professional accreditation from their own academic teaching and learning leadership staff. There are few masters programs which deal with the accreditation of learning and teaching leaders. Knowledge of the theories of learning and teaching, curriculum planning, assessment, and change management, as well as leadership of staff and mastery of technology are all seminal to the success of the leadership of the Associate Dean as well as other professional learning and teaching leaders in the university. Norton et al. (2013, p. 17, 20) ponder why universities have not professionalised learning and teaching,

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Having a PhD (Institutionalised cultural capital).
- Background discipline in both Creative Arts and Education (Institutional cultural capital).
- Qualification in Education/Learning and Teaching (Institutionalised Cultural Capital).
- Publishing in higher education learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital).
- A high conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership (Embodied Cultural Capital).
- A high degree of disciplinary integration with learning and teaching (Embodied Cultural Capital).
- Prior learning and teaching experience before taking on the Associate Dean role (Embodied cultural Capital).
- Being recruited through a competitive rigorous process that scrutinises the qualifications, experience and skills required for the role and recognises the Discourse of learning and teaching required for the role (Symbolic Capital).
The higher education sector could:

Provide external networks for Associate Deans more appropriate to their leadership position of multi-disciplinary faculties and global strategy.

Associate Deans require networks more appropriate to their leadership position. As the global knowledge economy continues to grow, networks have the potential to link people from across the world, and concurrently, the importance and study of networking has grown in both business and academic contexts. However, the networks that the majority of Associate Deans have access to are not suitable for their needs. As learning and teaching experts who have a need to understand disciplinarity itself, change management, teaching and learning innovations and global trends, the networks which mainly focus around a particular group of disciplines are too narrow. More needs to be done in this area once the learning and teaching sector has “woken up” to its leadership role at a global level.

Such a direction would influence the following Hallmarks of Associate Deans:

- Belonging to an external network either on the executive or as active participant
- Engaging in regional approaches to learning and teaching in the faculty
- Engaging in global approaches to learning and teaching in the faculty
- Engaging in technology to enhance learning and teaching in the faculty

Most of the leverage points above are the responsibility of universities and government and it is up to those institutions to address so that change may occur on a systemic level.

To summarise, in response to How can the strategic leadership of Associate Deans be strengthened to enhance their leadership role in learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?, a number of leverage points were identified and extrapolated upon in this study which would strengthen the role of the Associate Dean in their leadership of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts. These are listed below.

The university could:

- define the Associate Dean role to ensure similarity of role across the sector including responsibilities, size of faculty, time fraction, and multi-disciplinary leadership. This may mean the Associate Dean is responsible for additional faculties to ensure similarity of role
- develop a suite of complementary role descriptions for leaders of learning and teaching to ensure effective collaboration in leading change in the faculties
- provide the Associate Deans with the power and authority to lead learning and teaching in the university to enable them to bring about change which is authentic for the disciplines and aligns with the strategic direction of the university.

The higher education sector could:

- value learning and teaching equally with research. One way of doing this would be in providing government funding for learning and teaching research as well as other types of research under the one external body to ensure recognition of learning and teaching
- re-develop its quality assurance measurement tool for learning and teaching to focus more on the autonomous student rather than dependency on the teacher to better reflect the active learning in universities
- measure the professional learning of academics in their learning and teaching practice, ensuring that it is linked to changes in pedagogy to ensure professional learning is actively pursued through annual reviews
- provide external networks more appropriate to their Associate Dean leadership position of multi-disciplinary faculties and global strategy.

Summary of the study

The purpose of this study was to deepen understanding of the factors affecting the performance of the Associate Dean in the role of leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts disciplines and to suggest ways of strengthening the role. The research questions the study aimed to address were:

1. What personal and contextual characteristics equip an Associate Dean to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts and what does expertise look like
2. To what extent are Associate Deans in Australian universities equipped to lead learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

Based on the findings to these questions a further issue to be addressed is that of how can the strategic leadership of Associate Deans be strengthened to enhance their leadership role in learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?

What are often seen as discrete power struggles (discussed in Chapter 1) operate together in the university sector to create the cultural context which affects all staff, including Associate Deans. The particularised struggles of the Associate Dean are a constant refrain in the literature, emerging in early studies (Kift, 2004; Lines, 2000), then in the two major studies, by Scott et al. (2008) and Southwell et al. (2008a) and have persisted over time (Bullen et al., 2010; Marshall et al., 2011; de la Harpe & Mason, 2012). Such struggles, however, are merely a subset of those struggles within and beyond the university, and it is these broader struggles which have dominated the culture and positioned the Associate Dean role through habituated structures, processes, and power relationships.

The six contextual power struggles discussed in Chapter 1 frame the development of the Associate Dean role. The first struggle highlighted how successive government interventions called for improvements to learning and teaching increasingly through the mechanisms of quality assurance of learning and teaching, greater accountability and scrutiny, and amalgamations, within a diminishing funding environment.

The second struggle focused on the move from the dominant collegial academic university culture to a corporate one, due in part to the massification of education, the growth of student and staff numbers, globalisation, the requirement to be more entrepreneurial and accountable, and the introduction of measurement of learning and teaching outcomes. This saw the traditional academic culture of universities being challenged and inherent existing power and authority structures inevitably defended at the same time as a move towards corporatisation was unfolding. The unrelenting push for quality assurance saw the introduction of the Associate Dean role into universities from the 1990s they were increasingly positioned by academics as outsiders.
The third struggle outlined the amalgamation of the Creative Arts into the traditional university and its subsequent marginalisation, given its lack of a research identity and a distinctive studio pedagogy which siloed it from the traditional university. The studio teaching model more and more came under attack as university funding diminished and class sizes in the university grew. The Associate Dean in the multi-discipline faculty found it difficult to lead Creative Arts given their lack of enculturation into the distinctive Creative Arts disciplines and absence of the necessary disciplinary staffing reporting structures to enable them to overcome this.

The fourth struggle focused on the move to a more central and generic leadership of learning and teaching of university faculties versus learning and teaching approaches that are embedded in a distinctive disciplinary difference.

The fifth struggle explored the paradigm shift that saw the privileging of student-centred learning, the increase in internationalisation and the introduction of new educational technology

The sixth struggle outlined several barriers to the leadership by the Associate Deans of learning and teaching which emerged in the literature, including the clarity of the role; their role in change management; the need for induction and ongoing professional development; and the valuing of research equally to teaching. There was ongoing resistance reported between academic staff in schools and learning and teaching change and quality assurance.

Whilst Associate Deans had a very different role from those in central learning and teaching units, the rejection of their strategic leadership by academics in schools of Creative Arts mirrored that faced by those former pioneering central units by academic staff for teaching and learning, suggesting a deep-seated, cultural antipathy to any change that was not generated from within the disciplinary area and a mismatch between the learning and teaching generic model and disciplinary content pedagogies.

These struggles combined meant that reform of learning and teaching through the Associate Dean role was a tall order,

[t]hose who have to lead through influence – like...Associate Deans [used] analogies [to describe their role as] like ‘being a matchmaker’; ‘herding cats’; ‘juggling egos’; ‘trying to drive a nail into a wall of blancmange’ or ‘voting Labor in a safe Liberal seat’ (Scott et al., 2008, p. 51)

A contested space such as this, with a range of potential and active forces, or struggles for power, is described by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) as,

...a Field of struggles aimed at preserving or transforming the configuration of these forces. Furthermore, the Field as a structure of objective relations of force undergirds and guides the strategies whereby the occupants of these positions seek, individually or collectively, to safeguard or improve their position in the Field. (p.101)

The context and rationale in Chapter 1 pointed the way to the major tensions that exist within the university which prevent change. Recommendations about learning and teaching, and government demands for quality assurance appear to have been rejected by traditional academic culture as new managerialism (Biggs, 2002; DEST, 2003; Preston and Price, 2012). Whilst there may be valid reasons to reject managerialism, a strengthening of the strategic leadership paradigm for the Associate Dean is critical to moving from the traditional research university of the past. Universities have cultures which “...take root, grow, evolve, and silently control the attitudes and the behaviours of members even if no one is paying attention” (Schwahn and Spady, 1998 p. 62). Whilst the research paradigm direction of most universities drives the culture, the leaders of learning and teaching within that
setting can strengthen their own positions by becoming consciously aware of how they are being positioned by the culture and actively work to increase both the leadership of learning and teaching and the importance of learning and teaching,

[s]ocial agents themselves are the product of history, of the history of the whole social Field and of the accumulated experience of a path within the specific sub-Field. Thus in order to understand what such and such a professor will do in a given conjecture, we must know...how he got there and from what original point in social space...To put it differently, social agents will actively determine, on the basis of the socially and historically constituted categories of perception...the situation which determines them (Wacquant, 1989, p. 10)

**Barriers to Change**

Despite previous studies recommending changes in learning and teaching leadership of universities (Scott et al., 2008; Southwell et al., 2008; Marshall et al., 2011, de la Harpe & Mason, 2012), why has change proved so elusive for the role of Associate Dean? Returning to the context of learning and teaching leadership in Chapter 1, the study has shown that the accumulated history of learning and teaching interventions within the university, and the massive changes which have happened in the global world laid both the foundations for and built the structures or “generative matrix” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 19) through which the Associate Dean role was conceived and has operated since. That history reveals a complex, contested and constantly changing cultural terrain with many factors, both historical and contemporary, undermining the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean and constantly privileging the traditional research university.

Using Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, this study suggests that the failure to adopt previous recommendations is because university systems do not have the fundamental building blocks in place which allow them to be implemented. Such building blocks include: providing opportunities for Associate Deans to gain the qualifications required to lead learning and teaching and recognising that learning and teaching expertise is critical for the role; enabling a career structure, or uniformity of roles, or induction to learning and teaching leadership taught by people who know the area; developing a career structure for learning and teaching academics across the tertiary sector in its own right; setting up staffing structures within multidisciplinary faculties which enable Associate Deans to lead strategic learning and teaching in individual disciplines, taking account of their disciplinarity; and setting up expectations that Associate Deans lead the scholarship of teaching and learning - all the Hallmarks which create the ‘Star’ Associate Dean in the typology. Further, according to Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice, these recommendations will never be adopted if there are other factors that are more powerful in the Field that prevent them from occurring, namely maintaining the hegemony of the traditional university culture. The processes, structures and “agents” in the Field enact the “reality” as the players see it, in that “people are not fools; they act...in accordance with their objective chances because they have often internalised them, through a long and complex process of conditioning” (Wacquant, 1989, p. 14). So at the individual level, unless players become reflective and stop operating without questioning within their traditional environment, the status quo or Doxa will prevail.

This study has dug deeply through all the four layers of the Field of Associate Deans responsible for learning and teaching in the Creative Arts to reveal the dilemmas which they face in terms of a lack of Symbolic Capital for the role. It shows how leadership is not fully supported by the Capital possessed or afforded to the Associate Dean within the Field. Underlying and unrecognised issues, work towards maintaining traditional university systems. Only a consciousness of the problem can root it out.
It is hoped that this study has assisted in uncovering the systemic and structural conditions which prevent the Associate Dean from leading learning and teaching strategically.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

There are four ways in which this study has contributed new knowledge in the area of learning and teaching leadership. Firstly, the study has identified fully the multidimensional Field of the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching in the Creative Arts and the relationships between “players”. Secondly, the study has developed and tested a prototype in the form of an exemplar of the Expert Associate Dean. The prototype exemplar not only comprises the personal characteristics of the expert Associate Dean but also the capabilities given to the Associate Dean in the context in which each works.

Thirdly, through this exemplar, this study has developed a typology of “Star”, “Rising Star”, “Coper”, “Strugger”, reflecting the current capability of Associate Deans in 20 Australian universities. Such a model has the potential to be used by other studies of leadership positions within the university and in other contexts.

Fourthly, key leverage points have been identified which have the potential to strengthen the strategic leadership role of the Associate Dean in the Creative Arts.

Finally, using Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice has enabled the study to uncover and explain the complexity of relationships, structures and processes (both historical and contemporary) that prevent the Associate Dean from enacting strategic leadership, in doing so providing insight into why previous recommendations in the field have not been implemented:

> Getting hold of the difficult deep down is what is hard. Because if it is grasped near the surface, it simply remains the difficulty it was. It has to be pulled out by the roots; and that involves beginning to think in a new way (Wittgenstein, 1992, p. 1)

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The application of this research into the university setting is the next logical step for future research. That is, how to work with these models and within the university framework to bring about change. For example, working with Human Resources to develop a position description for the Associate Dean, specifying the leadership capabilities derived from the Prototype or in developing future university policy in relation to leadership of learning and teaching. Or at the local level, working with a team of learning and teaching leaders to achieve collaboration. As well, further research needs to focus on a measurement tool for staff efficacy and student achievement so academics maintain their currency through professional development in learning and teaching and that it reflects more closely the working towards developing autonomous students in the disciplines working within a globalised context.

**Limitations of the Study**

It is regrettable that in a study such as this the recommendations, or leverage points in this case, may go unheeded. Unfortunately, while there is potential for these leverage points to bring about change, the intractability of the culture in universities and beyond works against any revolutionary change. Nonetheless, by addressing the research questions, publishing articles from this study about the insights into the role of the Associate Dean and the Field will build the accretion of consciousness in the profession and increase the leverage for future change initiatives. The leverage points outlined
both encompass those extrapolated from the findings and include some which are more speculative than others but are still pointed to by the research. They provide future researchers with useful starting points for improvement in the area of learning and teaching.

Concluding Comments

Unless Associate Deans, universities and the higher education sector accept a need for change, such as by making use of these leverage points, an opportunity for real change and strategic leadership of learning and teaching will be difficult, particularly given the demise of the OLT.

In particular, leadership of learning and teaching in universities requires strategically aligned practices across all universities and all faculties, including faculties with Creative Arts disciplines, where different pedagogies exist. This direction will ensure support for the provision of high quality experiences for students, enabling them to become critical, conceptual and creative thinkers, who can build knowledge and skills in inter-, trans-, and multi-disciplinary ways in any new contexts in which they find themselves. Bourdieu documented such a change in French universities in the 1960s when they eventually accepted a broader offering of subject disciplines.

Functioning like a sort of collective ritual of divorce from ordinary routines and attachments, its aim is...spiritual conversion. The crisis leads to several simultaneous conversions which mutually reinforce and support each other; it transforms the view which the agents normally have of the symbolism of social relations, and especially the hierarchies, highlighting the otherwise strongly repressed political dimension of the most ordinary symbolic practice to show how collective crisis and personal crisis provide each other with a mutual opportunity, how political revision is accompanied by personal regeneration, attest by the changes...in symbolism which consecrate a total commitment to an ethico-political vision of the social world, erected into the principle of a whole lifestyle, private as much as public (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 193).

Bourdieu (1998) recognised that sometimes radical social change brings about change inside institutions which they cannot withstand and this is what is required for learning and teaching in Australian Universities.

Figure 0.3  John L. Hart cartoon

While not suggesting that missing the opportunity for change would lead to the extermination of the universities, although Barber et al. (2013) do suggest the size of the threat that universities face, the
Hart cartoon (Figure 5.3) above might reflect the desirability of seizing and accepting suggestions for change in learning and teaching in order to succeed. Such a change of direction is long overdue.
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Appendix 1 Springboard: creatED
A strategic network for Associate Deans in the Creative Arts

Introduction

This chapter describes the createED project, which became the springboard to this study on the role and the leadership of Associate Deans in the Creative Arts. The createED project provided a case study that identified significant issues in the role of the Associate Dean leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts and became part of the rationale for the PhD research. The createED project was funded by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council; its aims were to enhance leadership capability, to address issues of learning and teaching importance and to publish about learning and teaching leadership and to contribute to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Disciplines included Architecture, Art, Creative Writing, Design and Performing Arts (Music, Theatre and Dance). The creation of the createED network was built on Southwell et al.’s (2008a) recommendation that Associate Deans, learning and teaching “…develop mutual support networks...[including] external networks” (p.122).

The project was initially led by a national team, four with specialisations in higher education Learning and Teaching (including online) and others with Disciplinary Expertise in the Creative Arts: Barbara de la Harpe (RMIT), Fiona Peterson (RMIT), Richard Blythe (RMIT), Sue Trinidad (Curtin), Noel Frankham (UTAS and ACUADS), Richard Vella (Newcastle University and NACTMUS), Sue Street (QUT and AusDance), Donna Lee Brien (CQU and AAWP) and Anthony Cahalan (CSU) (2009), and later, Graham Forsythe (UNSW).

I was appointed as the Project & Network Manager for the duration of the project at a full-time fraction., being responsible for bringing people together, facilitating ongoing communication and collaboration; overseeing and developing strategic activities; ensuring milestones and budget were being met; preparing interim and final project reports; and supporting the Project Leadership Team in realising the potential of the network. I also liaised with the Disciplinary Leadership and Local State-based Leadership Teams, assisting them with the development and administration of the disciplinary and cross-disciplinary collaborative projects; planning for online and local activities; undertaking literature searches; ensuring appropriate ethics approvals were sought; and preparation of reports. However, as the project progressed I also became a co-leader of createED and had responsibility for designing and implementing the online component of the network.

This chapter covers the rationale for the createED network; the design and implementation of the network; and how the network unfolded. Informal conversations with Associate Deans were conducted to find out how the network might be more useful to them and how their role operated in relation to leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts. The assumptions and outcomes of the project and from the conversations are presented below. They reveal that the leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts was confused and needed further exploration and this project became a springboard for this thesis.

Rationale for the createED project

The national network (createED) was conceived in response to the lack of targeted forums for learning and teaching leaders to engage with key issues in learning and teaching including those facing the creative arts disciplines. The network sought to bring together those in learning and teaching leadership roles in a strategic alliance to develop ‘collective clout’ and build leadership capability.
The idea of creating the network received enthusiastic support at the project proposal stage from 19 Senior Executive University leaders (Deputy Vice Chancellors, Pro Vice Chancellors and Deans). In addition, there was significant backing from learning and teaching leaders in universities where Creative Arts programs were offered. An email survey resulted in the majority, (approximately 80%) of those contacted, in learning and teaching leadership roles in the Creative Arts at 30 universities indicating their support.

A strategic knowledge network (Peterson, 2004) was specifically chosen for the national network as it embraced both the sharing of knowledge and the enhancement of individual practice. Networks are perceived as places where members can begin to forge an identity across the sector from their pockets of isolation and establish social, cultural and symbolic Capital (Bourdieu, 1986).

Moreover, using technology to support a network online is a viable way to easily enable networking for globally dispersed individuals or groups (Ardichvili, Page and Wentling, 2003; Barab, Makinster & Scheckler, 2003; Dube, Bourhis & Jacob, 2006; Wasko & Faraj, 2000; Moore, 2008; Wenger, McDermott & Snyder, 2002) “…to engage in mutual learning [and knowledge sharing] not constrained by time and place” (Moore, 2008, p. 37).

The createED network was developed for learning and teaching leaders to discuss key issues in learning and teaching leadership, specifically those facing the Creative Arts disciplines. The network set out to enable those in formal learning and teaching leadership roles in faculties in universities to engage with broader strategic, operational and leadership and management issues affecting the Creative Arts disciplines and the wider higher education sector. The development of Associate Dean leadership capability was seen as a focus, as there had been little interaction between Associate Deans in the Creative Arts up until this time, and also as an outcome as the collaboration of Associate Deans would develop a common language and a common interest. It would provide opportunities for them to join forces to (re)position, promote, enhance and influence institutional and discipline-specific learning and teaching practices, as a strategic network. It would also be ideally placed to assist bridge-building between the Creative Arts disciplines and formal learning and teaching leaders in the faculty, and benefit learning and teaching within the Creative Arts. Creative Arts was a specific focus given the large size and scale of the Creative Arts in universities, and a lack of an existing formal learning and teaching leadership forum for this group.

Design of the network

The createED network was developed building on current research about strategic knowledge networks. The createED network had four components – an online network site; face-to-face meetings within States; collaborative learning and teaching projects across States; and national meetings for Associate Deans. Collaboration, both online and in local contexts, was seen as the key to the development, adoption or adaptation of actions of critical significance and importance to learning and teaching leadership in the creative arts disciplines. Thus, mechanisms for both online and face-to-face communication were included in its design.

As collaboration, online, in local contexts, by discipline, and by project, were seen as key to the development, the final design (See Figure A1.1) included:

- a national online network, where participants would be at the cutting edge of learning and teaching innovation, solve problems, grow leadership, find inspiration, spread great ideas, advance careers, be heard and mix with like-minded people
- face-to-face, cross-disciplinary, state-based networks to engage in leadership professional development activities/events contextualised for learning and teaching leaders in the Creative Arts disciplines in order to build social cohesion and Capital
disciplin-based networks to co-ordinate specialist disciplinary activities (online) with members across the network and help in the disciplinary contextualisation of professional development activities; and

• project-based interstate networks which provided an opportunity for learning and teaching leaders to collaborate on authentic institutional learning and teaching imperatives. Two projects addressed key issues and challenges in learning and teaching pedagogy while another addressed viability imperatives and the resourcing of contemporary learning and teaching models.

Figure A1.1 Design of the createED network and components

Implementing the network

Fifty-seven Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching/Education/Academic) were identified through university websites across the 38 Australian institutions which offer Creative Arts disciplines. Identifying those in formal learning and teaching leadership positions was challenging due to the variation in titles and structures across universities. These leaders were invited by email to join the network and contribute to its face-to-face and online design and implementation. The network focused on the middle tier of leaders, the Associate Deans and Deputy Deans, given that at the heart of these strategic learning and teaching leadership roles there is a strong mandate to lead the enhancement of learning and teaching practice in disciplinary homes (de la Harpe & Radloff, 2006).

Online component

The createED network online site allowed learning and teaching leaders to engage online in collaborative professional development activities, share knowledge and resources and to collaborate
on projects. It was designed as a resource for learning and teaching leaders to check for upcoming conferences, and to access learning and teaching information which was relevant to their needs. It provided opportunities for members to upload biographical details and a picture of themselves, contact one another via multiple communication modes e.g. social networking, alerts, group discussion and messaging. It was also designed to be aesthetically pleasing so as to appeal to learning and teaching leaders responsible for the Creative Arts disciplines.

Groupsite proprietary software was agreed upon following significant exploration of multiple technology platforms and selected for its ability to store information, collaborate through discussion forums and blogging, share files and media, share a calendar for events, its ability to send out mass emails and its search facility. The createED Groupsite was initially trialled with the Western Australian State-based team and then broadened to a wider group of learning and teaching leaders in Australia (See Figure A1.2).

![CreateED Groupsite](image)

**Figure A1.2** The CreateED Western Australia trial

A participatory design approach underpinned the online network site design where members were invited to comment on its design, usability and functionality. The use of participatory design was seen as a way for all members of the network to contribute to the design process, resulting in authentic and strong collective thinking and informed directions through ownership. This approach allowed identification of what participant needs were and the development of designs that responded to and satisfied those needs.

In using participatory design, it was recognised and acknowledged that leaders in learning and teaching had lots to offer in terms of both change management and cultural change; moreover if the network site was to succeed its membership had to “...interact, learn together, build relationships, and in the process build a sense of belonging and mutual commitment” (Wenger et al., p.2). The
online approach was therefore “…flexible, responsive, active, problem-based, [and used] ‘just-in-time, just-for-me’ learning methods” (Scott et al., 2008, p.xvii).

Over the two years that the project ran, a number of initiatives or ‘hooks’ were introduced to the online environment to engage network members to collaborate or share. These included:

- Burning issues section to post to;
- General discussion area to post to;
- Featured ALTC project discussions, facilitated by the leader(s) of the project;
- Strategic project group pages with wikis (one on viability and two on pedagogy);
- Opportunity to undertake the ACER 360 degree leadership feedback tool;
- Online Surveys (such as the Academic Standards survey);
- Opportunity to be mentored by an expert in the area;
- Opportunities to collaborate with Creative Industries Innovation Centre (CIIC); and
- Group areas for State-based and Discipline-based teams, with their own discussion forum/blogs/management areas.

To engage members further in the network they received the following:

- a number of “playful triggers” (Akama & Ivanka, 2010) by mail to remind them to visit the network website, such as a Christmas card, a bookmark, a calendar and a bottle of champagne for the 100th member on the network site;
- regular news updates as the network unfolded to encourage participation and information on how and where to join the network; and,
- invitations to engage in a suite of leadership professional development resources contextualised for learning and teaching leaders in the creative arts disciplines.

![Figure A1.3](image-url)  
**Figure A1.3** The createED home page

*Face-to- face, local, cross-disciplinary, state-based component*
The local face-to-face, cross-disciplinary component provided opportunities for state-based learning and teaching leaders to meet face-to-face (approximately 8 times per year) to engage in leadership professional development activities/events contextualised for the Creative Arts disciplines in order to build social cohesion and Capital. A local state-based leader was sought to act as a relationship manager to build and foster relationships and social Capital locally. This was seen as an exciting opportunity to demonstrate leadership capability that would contribute to career progression. Face-to-face meetings were envisaged as supporting the online network interaction in that many participants would have met one another in person.

**Disciplinary, national online component**

The disciplinary component provided opportunities for members to engage in specialist disciplinary activities (online) with members of their discipline across the network and to have an opportunity to engage in cross-disciplinary projects using a trans-disciplinary and action learning approach. The disciplinary leaders were to have pivotal roles in fostering the growth of social Capital between and among members. Discipline leaders were sought for each of the Creative Arts disciplines, namely: Art, Architecture, Creative Writing, Design and Performing Arts (Music, Drama and Dance). It was also seen as an exciting opportunity for members to demonstrate leadership capability, contributing to career progression.

**Project component**

Three national cross-disciplinary collaborative projects were seen as an opportunity for learning and teaching leaders to collaborate on authentic institutional learning and teaching imperatives. Two of the three projects addressed key issues and challenges in L&T pedagogy and strategies for leading contemporary L&T practices; while the third addressed viability imperatives and the resourcing of contemporary L&T models.

**How the network unfolded - challenges**

**Online component**

The site was initially intended only for those identified as being in a formal learning and teaching position responsible for the Creative Arts. However, at the first meeting of the project leadership team the six discipline leaders questioned the list of learning and teaching leaders that contained only the Associate Deans or equivalent. They were united in their view that whilst those on the list may represent the institution’s formal learning and teaching leader, they were not the ‘real’ leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts disciplines. They successfully argued for the network to include members nominated by the disciplines as ‘leading learning and teaching’ and provided additional names of those to invite. In response, the online network was opened to additional members. As explored below, this raised significant issues in terms of who was leading learning and teaching and the purpose of the network.

In terms of the Associate Deans, 16 (28%) of the 57 who were invited immediately joined the createED network through the online site. Forty-one did not join. A number (19) of those who did not join forwarded the invitation to others in discipline leadership roles (evidenced by requests to join the createED network). Comments from 12 of the Associate Deans who forwarded on their email indicated that they had done so because Creative Arts was not their discipline area and/or they did not have expertise in the area.

Subsequently, the number of those on the initial list in ‘formal’ learning and teaching positions who joined the online network increased from 16 to 28 (49% of formal learning and teaching leaders, an
increase of 21%) in response to further email communication. A designated and private area for only those in formal learning and teaching leadership positions was retained but was never used.

The decision to widen the membership and the learning and teaching leaders themselves in forwarding their invitation to join the network to others meant that the invitation was distributed widely and the membership of the network became diverse. It grew to include central teaching and learning academic developers, an Executive Dean, Heads of Schools or program coordinators, managers of projects, academics in the Creative Arts disciplines and even a PhD student. In this way the number of those accessing the online resources grew organically to over 220 within six months and the membership became too diverse.

As already mentioned, over the two years of the project, many attempts were made to engage members on the site through a range of professional development activities. These initiatives aligned with the literature on professional learning of academics which shows that informal, peer-based, ad hoc and authentic opportunities were more effective than formal activities (Knight, Tait & Yorke, 2006).

Throughout the implementation of the network regular feedback was sought through email surveys, online statistics, and feedback from participants in the network meetings. Feedback revealed that the aspects most wanted according to Wenger, White and Smith’s (2010) 9 Community Orientations were content followed by individual participation. Opportunities for collaboration, communication, connecting or building relationships were not rated highly by those members who responded; with community cultivation the least wanted aspect (de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson, 2011).

Over time, the number of ‘hits’ or visits to the site grew from 1390 hits per month on average in 2010 to 1601 on average in 2011. However, there was little contribution or posting of views by the majority of members on the site. What attracted the most hits were the ‘bio’ pages of members (1695 views in 2010; 1339 views in 2011).

The createED online network site continued to evolve in response to what the members said they wanted – a content driven site with a ‘just-in-time’ and ‘just-for-me’ focused orientation. This was in contrast to the original ideal of a participatory, collaborative learning and strategic network one, and despite a significant level of energy expended by the project manager to keep the network growing and maintaining momentum.

State-based and disciplinary network components

The project struggled to get Associate Deans to take on a state-based or disciplinary leadership role. The overall, feedback from those who took on state-based and disciplinary leadership roles indicated that it required extensive effort and energy to get people together and/or to maintain momentum.

With regard to state-based activity, one state-based leader was very active and held three meetings, one was successful in holding one meeting, one tried to call a meeting but was unsuccessful in drawing members, three were non-active, initiating no State-based meetings, and two leaders withdrew. With regard to Disciplinary-based activity, three Discipline-based leaders withdrew, three were non-active, and one Discipline-based leader tried to initiate online discussion and invited discipline members to join the discipline-based team with little success in maintaining activity. Thus, both State-based and Disciplinary network components were never fully realised as envisaged.

Project component
Overall, the project-based component involving thirteen (13) network members working collaboratively was a successful component of the network. The cross-disciplinary projects were not only ends in themselves but led to further collaborations and publications by individuals within the teams. The collaborative projects across Australia were challenging but three projects were completed.

**Assumptions underpinning the createED network**

As discussed above, the createED network was intended to provide national leaders of learning and teaching with an opportunity/mechanism to come together and develop a shared strategic intention to enhance leadership practice, both individually and collectively. It was believed that membership of the network would enhance identity and strengthen the position of the Associate Deans within their individual institutions.

It was thought that the createED network would be an active site for the creation of new knowledge for innovative applications such as undertaking learning and teaching projects in the Creative Arts which focused on improving viability, for example, and would shape, influence and/or create new professional practice (Peterson, 2004). Underpinning these aims were four key assumptions which were only revealed as they became problematic as the project progressed:

**Assumption 1** - Formal learning and teaching leaders, such as Associate Deans, were the leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

**Assumption 2.** Opportunities for professional development and working in multi-, cross- and trans-disciplinary ways would be embraced by network members. Active engagement and collaboration would occur spontaneously, naturally and enthusiastically on the site, given the geographical dispersion and possible isolation of network members.

**Assumption 3.** The purpose of and direction for the online network would be collectively determined and would emerge through the use of a participatory design methodology.

**Assumption 4.** Both online and face-to-face and disciplinary and local level member engagement would be required for the success of the network.

In the next section, the assumptions are discussed and challenged.

**Assumptions challenged**

Each of the core assumptions in the original proposal was challenged: these are discussed in full in the journal article entitled “Reflections on establishing a network to strengthen leadership of learning and teaching in the creative arts” by de la Harpe, Mason & Peterson (2011). Below is an outline of how each of the original assumptions was challenged in the design and realisation of the network.

**Assumption 1 - Formal learning and teaching leaders are the leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts**

There were issues in identifying the learning and teaching leaders in the Creative Arts from the beginning of the project. Identifying those in formal learning and teaching leadership roles with Creative Arts in their remit was difficult. There were differences of opinion as to who was leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts in the leadership team. Only half the Associate Deans joined the createED network. Finally, many Associate Deans, did not see themselves as the leader of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts and forwarded their invitation to join the network on to
Creative Arts discipline academics. Due to conflicting ideas of who the ‘real’ leaders of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts were, its size was both small and large, with both closed and open voluntary membership. It also had a heterogeneous membership rather than a homogenous one and stability fluctuated. There appeared to be a lack of clarity as to who was formally leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts disciplines. There was also a lack of clarity about what learning and teaching leadership was and it needed a much clearer definition. Did strategic leadership imply cross-faculty initiatives inaugurated through the Associate Dean and were these initiatives then translated and led by the School? Or did the Associate Dean need to be involved more deeply in order to enable academics to deliver the strategic initiative?

Assumption 2. Opportunities for professional development and working in multi-, cross- and trans-disciplinary ways would be embraced by network members. Active engagement and collaboration would occur spontaneously, naturally and enthusiastically on the site, given the geographical dispersion and possible isolation of network members.

The reality was that members were very slow to engage, communicate, collaborate and/or share online. Active engagement, collaboration and sharing did not occur as naturally, spontaneously or ‘viral’ as it was thought or hoped it would with this group of people. Rather, there was much ‘lurking’ taking place (that is, reading without contributing), which suggested that members were at least embracing the opportunity to access information. In contrast to an active, collaborative network, what emerged then was an individually-centred network with a ‘just-in-time’ and ‘just-for-me’ focus. However, because of the diverse membership in the online network it was difficult to know whether the professional development articles/videos/discussions were relevant to the members.

Assumption 3. The purpose of and direction for the online network would be collectively determined and would emerge through the use of a participatory design methodology.

In reality, gaining ‘buy in’ to the online network was challenging. The purpose and direction that emerged for the network from the few who responded to the feedback surveys was a content focused orientation, underpinned by a philosophy that was mostly ‘just-in-time’ and ‘just-for-me’. Feedback and the statistics from the site revealed that few in formal learning and teaching leadership roles, or indeed members overall, embraced the participatory design approach in the online network.

Assumption 4. Both online and face-to-face and disciplinary and local level member engagement would be required for the success of the network.

The discipline and local state-based leaders did not take a pivotal role in fostering the growth of social Capital between and among members locally and online. The discipline leaders did not coordinate online specialist disciplinary activities and state-based leaders found it difficult to hold face-to-face meetings with members to help with local contextualisation of professional development activities. On the other hand two of the three interdisciplinary projects undertaken by small sub-group of 13 were successful despite being challenging to complete. A key strength of the collaboration through the projects was the modelling of multi- and interdisciplinary ways of working.

In summary, as highlighted in the assumptions above it was very clear that it was more difficult than anticipated to realise a professional network for formal learning and teaching leaders responsible for leading learning and teaching in the Creative Arts.

It therefore became apparent throughout the createED project that the participation by formal learning and teaching leaders was limited in the network, except for those who had become engaged
with cross-disciplinary projects. It was also apparent that the discipline leaders in the createED leadership team and many academics in the Creative Arts also saw themselves as leaders of learning in teaching in the Creative Arts rather than the Associate Deans. And some Associate Deans agreed.

The challenging of the assumptions led to the Project leader and the Project manager to have informal conversations with 11 Associate Deans. These Associate Deans or equivalent were from ten institutions located in four states and one territory across Australia. Of the 11, six were female and five were male. They came from a range of disciplinary backgrounds. Three were from the Humanities, three from Art/Art History, two from Education, and one each from Law, Engineering and Performing Arts. Four (4) Associate Deans had joined the createED network while seven had not. After the conversations, eight (8) Associate Deans had joined the network.

The outcomes of these conversations are discussed in full in the journal article entitled “The dilemma of formal learning and teaching leadership in the creative arts” by de la Harpe & Mason (2012).

**Trying to make it work**

The informal conversations with the 11 Associate Deans did not have a pre-determined set of questions but began with a conversation about how the createED network would be or was being useful to them.

The benefits mentioned in the conversations mirrored a preference for a content orientation focus. Many commented on the network’s usefulness for content or information. In addition, many Associate Deans commented on the value of building relationships with others, as illustrated in the comments below:

I think it would be very worthwhile for people of like-mind getting together informally initially seeing where it can head

There is nothing worse than just talking to one person all the time because...eventually there is no more to know. So you actually need to broaden the network, broaden the intellectual gene pool a bit. Get out there, talk to people and learn. See what exciting things other people are doing. So I can see the value immediately.

A clear preference for face–to–face networking to online networking was articulated in the informal conversations.

...there is something about getting people together to just bash heads and that the online fora doesn’t quite enable as well

A lack of trust in participating in an online network where discussion posts might be taken out of context was mentioned.

Scared of putting stuff out in the public, people are very shy of that.

Based on the feedback in these informal conversations a new face-to-face national network component was implemented in the createED project.

**New National Associate Deans, face-to-face component**

In order to develop cohesion and to foster relationships between only the Associate Deans, a new national Associate Deans, face-to-face component was added. Two face to face national network
meetings for Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching/Education/Academic) across the Creative Arts were held by the createED project. At the first createED national Associate Deans’ meeting in 2011, of the 57 Associate Deans invited, 11 attended from 10 universities across Australia and another 12 participants from another 12 universities were delegated the invitation by an Associate Dean, mirroring the forwarding of material relating to their role to the Creative Arts academics. Participants had various roles including Head of School, Program/Course coordinator and so on. At the second meeting in 2012 there were 19 attendees representing 16 universities across Australia, with only three of these attendees acting as delegates for the Associate Dean. Meetings focused on developing a strategic alliance, addressing issues of leadership in learning and teaching across the Creative Arts, and provided opportunities to network. Feedback was very positive, however overall participation was still low. Relevance and alignment to learning and teaching disciplinary networks was mentioned in the informal conversations with attendance being more likely where there was a direct link to the Associate Dean’s own disciplinary background.

It seemed that there was more to the Associate Deans’ participation in the network than simply a preference for face-to-face networking, as still Associate Deans were delegating their invitations to participate in the network.

Digging deeper

In the informal conversations with Associate Deans a number of issues about the role and its leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts started to surface. These included differing titles, varying time fractions, lack of time, lack of role definition, lack of authority, tension between the value of research and teaching, dispersal of the Creative Arts in the university, restructuring or disappearance of Creative Arts disciplines, and complex relationships with academics in the Creative Arts disciplines. It was time to explore these issues more deeply to find out why this was so.
### Appendix 2 Interview questions for Associate Deans

#### Interview Sheet Associate Deans (Learning & Teaching/Education/Academic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Title/Role:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your name</td>
<td>University:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Place of interview:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the interview will be conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is Thembi Mason and I would like to discuss the leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts. This research is part of my PhD and has arisen from working on the createED project which aimed at strengthening learning and teaching leadership in the Creative Arts. Creative Arts was defined for the project as including Art, Architecture, Creative Writing, Design and Performing Arts (Music, Dance and Theatre).

In this interview I would like to explore your thoughts on the strengths and weaknesses of learning and teaching leadership for the Creative Arts within the university system, both as it stands now and how you think it could be improved for the future.

The interview should take less than 1 hour. With your consent I will be taping the session in order to accurately represent your comments.

All responses will be kept confidential. No interview responses will be shared. If you do not feel comfortable answering a question please let me know and we can either address your concerns or move to the next question. You are of course free to end the interview at any time.

Do you have any questions about the background and format of the interview?
I’d like to start by asking a few questions about yourself

**Questions or prompts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your discipline area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was your undergraduate degree in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a PhD. If yes, what did it focus on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a learning and teaching qualification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What area do you research and publish in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your understanding of leadership of learning and teaching?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’d like to move to your leadership of L&T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe your role and what you are responsible for in terms of leading learning and teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you the formal learning and teaching leader in your College/Faculty/School?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What made you interested in the area of L&amp;T?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many disciplines are you responsible for leading learning and teaching and how much time do you spend with each?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been in your learning and teaching leadership role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your role full-time or part-time? If it is part-time, what time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraction do you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What time fraction do you think this role requires?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any line management responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would it impact/influence your leadership of learning and teaching in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Creative Arts if you had line management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of induction/professional development did you have before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you came into your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of induction/professional development do you think the role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the role are you most confident about and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What particular qualities do you think a learning and teaching leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs in your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What particular qualities do you think you bring to the leadership of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning and teaching in your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of support structures, knowledge and skills do you think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be helpful in carrying out your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to any networks and how do they help you in your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What barriers/frustrations do you face in your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways would you like to change your role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to L&amp;T leadership in your university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you please draw the learning and teaching structure at your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How valued is learning and teaching in your University?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do learning and teaching initiatives/issues filter down to School level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are initiatives/issues involving learning and teaching escalated up through the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you identify any projects or initiatives in the Creative Arts over the past two years in which you have been involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role did you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to do more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the L&amp;T committee operate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you chair your College/Faculty/School L&amp;T committee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you on the College/Division/University L&amp;T committee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the central learning and teaching unit interact with you and your School?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could alignment around learning and teaching initiatives work better in your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to L&amp;T leadership of the Creative Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the Creative Arts disciplines dispersed or co-located at your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the structure or disciplines in the Creative Arts changed in the past 5 years in your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What issues do you think are facing the Creative Arts, in particular, in your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you see leadership of learning and teaching currently operating in the Creative Arts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is responsible for leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role do you play in leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What power or influence do you think you have in your role in relation to the Creative Arts disciplines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe a way to strengthen the leadership of learning and teaching in the Creative Arts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the barriers preventing improvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your relationship with the Heads of Schools and Faculty/College Associate Dean in relation to learning and teaching leadership and how receptive are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they support or collaborate with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your relationship with the informal learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaders and academics in relation to learning and teaching leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how receptive are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they support or collaborate with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about your position, would you recommend this role to a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleague?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you reapply for this position when your term comes to an end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional questions for CALTN members.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How and why were you chosen to represent your university on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts Learning and Teaching network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think this network will help you in your role? If so/how/if not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you/will you report what occurs at the network meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back to your university?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you/will you gather issues facing leadership of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and teaching in the Creative Arts and communicate these issues to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there anything more you would like to add?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ll be analysing the information you and others provide for my thesis. Would you like a copy of aggregated results to review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-interview comments**

- Special conditions or circumstances that may affect the interview.
- Feelings, interpretations, other comments

19 May 2010

Assoc Prof Barbara de la Harpe et al
College of Design and Social Context
RMIT University

Dear Barbara,

Re: Human Research Ethics Application – Register Number CHEAN A-2009/03-02/10

Professor Joseph Siracusa, the Deputy Chair of the Design and Social Context College Ethics Advisory Network (CHEAN) assessed your amended ethics application entitled “Created: Strengthening Learning and Teaching in the Creative Arm”. This approval will be ratified at the Committee’s meeting on 21st May 2010.

I am pleased to advise that your application has been approved as Low Risk (Risk Level 2) classification by the committee. This approval will now be reported to the University Human Research Ethics Committee for noting.

This now completes the Ethics procedures. Your ethics approval expires on 30 January 2013.

Please note that all research data should be stored on University Network systems. These systems provide high levels of manageable security and data integrity, can provide secure remote access, are backed on a regular basis and can provide Disaster Recover processes should a large scale incident occur. The use of portable devices such as CD’s and memory sticks is valid for archiving, data transport where necessary and some works in progress. The authoritative copy of all current data should reside on appropriate network systems, and the Principal Investigator is responsible for the retention and storage of the original data pertaining to the project for a minimum period of five years.

You are reminded that an Annual Final report is mandatory and should be forwarded to the College Ethics Subcommittee Secretary by mid-December 2010. This report is available at http://www.rmit.edu.au/browse.ID=6aqq/xd0wkp or can be located by following the link under Policy at http://www.rmit.edu.au/dsc/chean

Should you have any queries regarding your application please seek advice from the Deputy Chair of the College Human Ethics Advisory Network (CHEAN) Prof Joseph Siracusa on (03) 9925 1744, joseph.siracusa@rmit.edu.au or contact Lisa Mann on (03) 9925 2974 or email lisa.mann@rmit.edu.au

On behalf of the DSC College Human Ethics Advisory Network I wish you well in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa Mann
Ethics Coordinator
DSC College Human Ethics Advisory Network

cc: Dr Fiona Peterson, School of Media & Comm
Prof Richard Blythe, School of Architecture & Design
Prof Susan Street, QUT
Prof Sue Trinidad, Curtin University
Prof Noel Frankham, University of Tasmania
Assoc Prof Donna Brien, CQU
Prof Anthony Cahalan, CSU
Ms Thembi Mason, College of Design & Social Context
Dear Barbara and Themb,

Your recent request to make minor amendments to the above-named research project has been approved by the DSC CHEAN. The approved amendments are as follows:

- Extend ethics approval until 31 January 2014
- Expand the original interview group to include Associate Dears (L&T) or those in equivalent role, Heads of School of Deans, those whom Heads of School identify as informal learning and teaching leaders in Creative Arts, and members of the mandel createED/Creative Arts Learning and Teaching Network in Australia.

A copy of this approval will be added to your file (ref. number CHEAN B-20003093-02/10)

Regards,

Lisa Mann
Project Officer & Ethics Coordinator
College of Design & Social Context
RMIT University
Bld 101, Level 10, Room 05A
Ph: (03) 9925 2574
http://www.rmit.edu.au/dsc/checn
Appendix 4 Data analysis

A4.1 Determining Associate Dean participant scores for Prototype Hallmarks

For each Layer and for each relevant type of Capital, scores were allocated according to the following schema. The collated results are shown in A4.2, Table A4.1.

Layer 1 Cultural Capital (Institutionalised)

1.1.1 Hallmark: A PhD gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role.

A PhD was awarded a score of 3, representing the greatest Capital.

1.1.2 Hallmark: A formal qualification in Creative Arts and Education or Higher Education Learning and Teaching gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role.

A qualification in both Creative Arts and Higher Education/Education was awarded a 3, designating the greatest Capital for the role of leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

A qualification in Education or Higher Education L&T was awarded a 2, representing some Capital for the role of leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

A qualification in Creative Arts only was awarded a 1, representing little Capital for the role of leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

A qualification in other disciplines, for example, Humanities, Sciences, Business and Engineering and without any educational qualifications was not awarded a score, representing the least Capital for the role of leading learning and teaching for the Creative Arts.

Layer 1 Cultural Capital (Embodied)

1.1.3 Hallmark: Publications in higher education Learning and Teaching give the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Publishing in higher education Learning and Teaching was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied).

Area of research publication was determined not only through the Associate Deans’ responses but also a web search of their recent (last five years of) publications including Google scholar, university profile pages and other links through the Google search engine. The focus was on the topic area of the publication and not on where it was published. Thus, an article which discussed a disciplinary learning and teaching approach was counted as learning and teaching regardless of where published.

1.1.4 Hallmark: Interest in influencing change gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

An interest in influencing learning and teaching as the core reason for taking on the role was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.
A passion or interest in learning and teaching was awarded a 1, representing little Capital.

Those with other reasons for taking on the role, such as responding to an approach, being organised or so that others did not take on the role were not awarded a score, representing the least Capital.

1.1.5 Hallmark: A focus on leadership as well as management gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Equal emphasis on of Marshall’s leadership and management dimensions was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.

Emphasising more of Marshall’s leadership than management dimensions was awarded a 2, representing some Capital.

Mentioning only Marshall’s leadership Dimensions was awarded a 1, representing little Capital.

Emphasising only Marshall’s Management dimensions or more management than leadership dimensions was awarded the least Capital.

(See A4.4, below, for more detailed analyses of both the leadership and the management dimensions)

1.1.6 Hallmark: A highly sophisticated conception of learning and teaching leadership gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A highly sophisticated conceptualisation (extended abstract) of learning and teaching leadership was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.

A less sophisticated conceptualisation (relational) was awarded a 2, representing some Capital.

An even less sophisticated conceptualisation (multi-structural) was awarded a 1, representing little Capital.

Having the least sophisticated conceptualisation (pre-structural or uni-structural) was awarded the least Capital.

(A full analysis of the Associate Deans conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership is included in A4.5, below)

1.1.7 Hallmark: A highly sophisticated degree of understanding of how disciplines integrate gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A highly sophisticated or ‘Merging’ degree of disciplinary integration was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.

A less sophisticated or ‘Perspective-taking’ degree of integration was awarded a 2, representing some Capital.

An even less sophisticated or ‘Stereotyping’ degree of integration was awarded a 1, representing little Capital.
The least sophisticated or ‘Mutual ignorance’ degree of integration was awarded the least Capital.

1.1.8 Hallmark: Being male gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Being male was awarded a score of 3, representing the greatest Capital.

1.1.9 Hallmark: High satisfaction with the role gives the Associate Dean the greatest Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

Highly satisfied with the role was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.
Mostly satisfied with the role was awarded a 2, representing some Capital.
Not satisfied with the role was not awarded a score, representing the least Capital.

1.1.10 Hallmark: A high degree of Emotional Intelligence gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

Four or more components of emotional intelligence demonstrated was awarded a 3, representing the greatest Capital.
Three components of emotional intelligence demonstrated was awarded a 2, representing some Capital.
Two components of emotional intelligence demonstrated was awarded a 1, representing little Capital.
One or no components of emotional intelligence demonstrated was awarded the least Capital.

Layer 2 Cultural Institutionalised

2.1.1 Hallmark: Being a full Professor gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Institutionalised) for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans who were Professors.
A score of 2 designates Associate Deans who were Associate Professors.
Those who were Senior Lecturers or below were not awarded a score.

Layer 2 Cultural Embodied

2.1.2 Hallmark: Prior experience in learning and teaching roles, other than in teaching in own discipline, gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A score of 3 represents having more than 10 years of experience in the area of learning and teaching.
A score of 2 represents having between 6 and 10 years.
A score of 1 represents less than five years of experience.
2.1.3 Hallmark: A formal induction to the role gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A score of 3 represents having an induction.

2.1.4 Hallmark: More time in the Associate Dean role gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A score of 3 represents having more than 10 years of experience in the role of Associate Dean.

A score of 2 represents having between 6 and 10 years.

A score of 1 represents less than 5 years in the role.

2.1.5 Hallmark: Possessing institutional knowledge gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied) for the role.

A score of 3 represents having institutional knowledge.

Social Capital, University Level

2.2.1 Hallmark: Belonging to an Associate Dean group across the university gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 represents belonging to an Associate Dean group across the university.

2.2.2 Hallmark: A strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning and Teaching Unit gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 represents having a strategically connected relationship with the Central Learning and Teaching Unit.

2.2.3 Hallmark: Having line management of academic and/or staff in learning and teaching support roles gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 represents having line management of academics in the faculty and/or more than 8 learning and teaching support staff.

A score of 2 designates Associate Deans who had line management of 4-7 learning and teaching support staff.

A score of 1 designates Associate Deans who had line management of 1-3 learning and teaching support staff.

2.2.4 Hallmark: A supportive Dean gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who felt the Dean supported them.

2.2.5 Hallmark: A positive relationship with the Head of School gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who had good relationships with the Head of School.
A score of 2 designates Associate Deans who were enabled to manage only quality assurance aspects by the Head.

A score of 1 designates the reporting of a strained relationship between the Associate Dean and Head.

Associate Deans who reported no relationship with the Head were not awarded a score.

2.2.6 **Hallmark: recognising themselves as a leader of learning and teaching for the Creative Arts**

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who recognised themselves as leaders of learning and teaching.

2.2.6 **Hallmark: Successfully implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.**

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who were implementing learning and teaching initiatives in schools.

2.2.7 **Hallmark: Leading university learning and teaching strategic projects for the Creative Arts gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.**

A score of 3 designates leading projects in the Creative Arts at an operational level.

A score of 2 designates leading or supporting generic university learning and teaching initiatives in the Creative Arts.

A score of 1 designates being primarily involved in developing new or redeveloped programs/courses in the Creative Arts.

No mention of any engagement with any projects in the Creative Arts is represented by a blank in the table.

2.2.8 **Hallmark: Appointment through a rigorous recruitment and selection process gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.**

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans who were appointed through a rigorous recruitment process.

A score of 1 designates Associate Deans who were ‘tapped on the shoulder’ and agreed to take on the role.

2.2.9 **Hallmark: A full-time fraction gives the Associate Dean greater Social Capital for the role.**

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans with a full-time role.

A score of 2 designates Associate Deans who had 0.5 – 0.9 time fraction.

A score of 1 designates Associate Deans with less than 0.4 time fraction.

2.2.10 **Hallmark: Universities in which learning and teaching is valued gives the Associate Dean more Social Capital for the role.**

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans who believed learning and teaching was valued at their institution.
2.2.11 Hallmark: Larger faculties gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans with over 300 academic staff in the faculty.
A score of 2 designates Associate Deans with 100-299 academic staff.
A score of 1 designates Associate Deans with fewer than 100 academic staff.

2.2.12 Hallmark: Faculties with more discipline areas gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans with a mix of different Creative Arts and other disciplines.
A score of 2 designates Associate Deans with a mix of different Creative Arts disciplines only.
A score of 1 designates Associate Deans with one Creative Arts discipline only.

Economic Capital, Layer 2

2.3.1 Hallmark: Having a budget for leading teaching and learning gives the Associate Dean Economic Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans with a budget.

Cultural Capital, Institutionalised Layer 3

3.1.1 Hallmark: Having an OLT teaching award, citation or fellowship gives Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Institutionalised State) for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans with an OLT award, citation or fellowship.

Social Capital, Layer 3

3.2.1 Hallmark: Using quality assurance processes positively gives Associate Deans Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates Associate Deans who used quality assurance processes positively for quality enhancement.

3.2.2 Hallmark: Being on an external board or an active member of an external network gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who had a board position on an external learning and teaching network.
A score of 2 designates Associate Deans who are active participants in an external network.

Economic Capital, Layer 3

3.3.1 Hallmark: Leading or participating in an OLT project gives Associate Deans Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 designates those Associate Deans who had led an OLT project.
A score of 2 designates those Associate Deans who had participated in an OLT project.

Embodied Cultural Capital, Layer 4

4.1.1 Hallmark: Developing technology skills and capacities gives the Associate Dean Cultural Capital (Embodied State) for the role.

A score of 3 represents Associate Deans embracing and developing learning and teaching projects using technology in the Creative Arts.

Social Capital, Layer 4

4.2.1 Hallmark: Engaging in partnership with industry gives the Associate Dean Social Capital for the role.

A score of 3 represents Associate Deans engaging in partnerships with industry.

Economic Capital, Layer 4

4.3.1 Hallmark: receiving an international grant

A score of 3 represents Associate Deans who received an international grant for a L&T project.
## A4.2 Associate Dean participants by Capital and by Hallmark

Analysis of the data according to the schema set out above in A4.1 led to the categorisation assessment for participating Associate Deans given in Table A4.1.

### Table A4.1
**Detailed scoring of Associate Dean participants by Capital and by Hallmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Institutionalised Cultural Capital</th>
<th>Embodied Cultural Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts AND L&amp;T (Q1, 2, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorship (university websites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT award, citation or fellowship (university websites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in L&amp;T (Q5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in learning and teaching role (Q9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Leadership and management (Q.6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation of L&amp;T leadership (Q.6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding disciplinary differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with role (Q23, 44 and 45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in L&amp;T prior to role (Q11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction (Q16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Associate Dean role (Q.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional knowledge (whole interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with technolgy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field layer</th>
<th>Field layer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Stars**
- **Rising stars**
- **Copers**
- **Strugglers**
### Type of capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Capital</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hallmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hallmark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional insight (Whole interview)</td>
<td>Emotional insight (Whole interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal networks with other Associate Deans (Q22)</td>
<td>Internal networks with other Associate Deans (Q22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful relationship with central L&amp;T unit (Q33)</td>
<td>Useful relationship with central L&amp;T unit (Q33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management (Q14)</td>
<td>Line management (Q14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Dean (Q40)</td>
<td>Supportive Dean (Q40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working relationship with Head of School or Deputy Dean (Q42)</td>
<td>Working relationship with Head of School or Deputy Dean (Q42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived themselves as a leader of L&amp;T for Creative Arts</td>
<td>Perceived themselves as a leader of L&amp;T for Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at school level</td>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading or supporting projects in the Creative Arts</td>
<td>Leading or supporting projects in the Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (Q9)</td>
<td>Recruitment (Q9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role fraction (Q12)</td>
<td>Role fraction (Q12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT grants</td>
<td>OLT grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International grants</td>
<td>International grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Partnerships</td>
<td>Industry Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of scores</strong> (max 108)</td>
<td><strong>Sum of scores</strong> (max 108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field layer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of scores (max 108)</td>
<td>Sum of scores (max 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hallmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hallmark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional insight (Whole interview)</td>
<td>Emotional insight (Whole interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal networks with other Associate Deans (Q22)</td>
<td>Internal networks with other Associate Deans (Q22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful relationship with central L&amp;T unit (Q33)</td>
<td>Useful relationship with central L&amp;T unit (Q33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management (Q14)</td>
<td>Line management (Q14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Dean (Q40)</td>
<td>Supportive Dean (Q40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working relationship with Head of School or Deputy Dean (Q42)</td>
<td>Working relationship with Head of School or Deputy Dean (Q42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived themselves as a leader of L&amp;T for Creative Arts</td>
<td>Perceived themselves as a leader of L&amp;T for Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at school level</td>
<td>Strategically implementing initiatives at school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading or supporting projects in the Creative Arts</td>
<td>Leading or supporting projects in the Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (Q9)</td>
<td>Recruitment (Q9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role fraction (Q12)</td>
<td>Role fraction (Q12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT grants</td>
<td>OLT grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International grants</td>
<td>International grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Partnerships</td>
<td>Industry Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of scores</strong> (max 108)</td>
<td><strong>Sum of scores</strong> (max 108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field layer</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A4.3 Associate Deans participants’ backgrounds, qualifications and experience

Table A4.2 shows the qualifications, area of research (if any), and length of experience in a learning and teaching leadership role of the participating Associate Deans arranged by background discipline.

Table A4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background discipline by HERD Grouping</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Learning and Teaching qualification</th>
<th>Experience in L&amp;T leadership role (years)</th>
<th>Area of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;1 (6 months)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;1 (4 months)</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/HE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grad Cert L&amp;T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/HE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Masters Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Discipline/HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PhD Education</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dip Ed</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Grad Cert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discipline/HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;1 (6 months)</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Certificates L&amp;T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM/HE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Masters, Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM/HE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PhD Education</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Discipline/HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/HE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Grad Cert</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/HE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Masters, Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4.4 Leadership and management dimensions mentioned by Associate Deans

The numbers of Associate Dean participants who mentioned various numbers of leadership and management dimensions are given in Tables A4.3 to A4.6.

**Table A4.3**
Management and leadership dimensions mentioned by participants (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership and management dimensions mentioned</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More leadership than management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal leadership and management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More management than leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A4.4**
Number of leadership dimensions mentioned by participants with their disciplinary backgrounds (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership dimensions mentioned</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Disciplinary background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creative Arts (3), Creative Arts/Humanities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mentioned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creative Arts (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two mentioned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Creative Arts (3), Humanities (3), Humanities/Higher Education (2), Business (1), Engineering (1), Education (1), Creative Arts/Humanities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three mentioned</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Humanities (3), Creative Arts/Higher Education (2), Science/Higher Education (2), Education (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A4.5
*Number of management dimensions mentioned by participants with their disciplinary backgrounds (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management dimensions mentioned</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Disciplinary background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creative Arts(1), Humanities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mentioned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Creative Arts(5) Humanities (1) Humanities/Higher Education (1), Science/Higher Education (1), Creative Arts/Humanities (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two mentioned</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Creative Arts(3), Humanities (3), Humanities/Higher Education (1), Business (1), Engineering (1), Education (2), Science/Higher Education (1) Creative Arts/Humanities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three mentioned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Humanities (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table A4.6
*Number of times each leadership and management dimension was mentioned*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership dimension</th>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Establishing vision/direction</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Communicating vision, aligning resources and encouraging others to align</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Motivating and inspiring stakeholders</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management dimension</th>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning and budgeting for learning and teaching change</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Organising staff to support effective learning and teaching change</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Monitoring and problem solving to ensure changes and improvement of learning and teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A4.5 Conceptualisation of learning and teaching leadership

Table A4.7 shows background discipline, qualifications and area of publication of Associate Dean participants against SOLO level of understanding of the learning and teaching leadership role.

**Table A4.7**

*Level of understanding (SOLO), background discipline, L&T qualification, and area of publication of Associate Dean participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLO Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Background discipline</th>
<th>L&amp;T qualification</th>
<th>Area of publication</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestructural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creative Arts (3), Creative Arts/Humanities (1)</td>
<td>None (4)</td>
<td>None (3) Discipline (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unistructural</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Creative Arts (4), Humanities (3), Creative Arts/Humanities (1), Humanities/Higher Education (1)</td>
<td>None (7), Grad Cert (1), Dip Ed (1)</td>
<td>Discipline (7), Discipline and HE L&amp;T (1), None (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multistructural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Humanities (2), Business (1), Education (1), Science/Higher Education (1), Humanities/Higher Education (1)</td>
<td>None (3), B.Ed (1), M.Ed (1), Grad Cert (1)</td>
<td>Discipline (4), Discipline and HE L&amp;T (1), HE L&amp;T (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Humanities (1), Engineering (1), Creative Arts/Higher Education (1), Science/Higher Education (1)</td>
<td>PG Teaching Certs (2), Grad Cert (1), Dip. Ed (1)</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T (3), Discipline (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Abstract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creative Arts/Higher Education (1), Education (1)</td>
<td>Ph.D (2), M.Ed, B.Ed</td>
<td>HE L&amp;T (1), Discipline and HE L&amp;T (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4.6 Roles and responsibilities as described by Associate Deans

In response to the interview questions and prompts (Appendix 2), Associate Dean participants variously made mention of their different areas of work and responsibility. These mentions are collated in Table 4.8.

Table A4.8
Work areas mentioned by participating Associate Deans by number of mentions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work area</th>
<th>Number of mentions by work area</th>
<th>Number of Associate Deans (N=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving and implementing professional development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Strategy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implementation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4.7 Emotional intelligence demonstrated by Associate Deans

Table A4.9 presents emotional intelligence assessments derived from the Hallmark scores of participating Associate Deans and Table 3.1.

Table A4.9
Assessment of emotional intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence component</th>
<th>Number of Associate Deans demonstrating component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skill</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Based on Goleman 2004, using Hallmark scores and Table 3.1.
A4.8 Associate Deans and discipline responsibility

The discipline responsibilities of Associated Dean participants are given in Table A4.10.

Table A4.10
Number of Associate Dean participants by discipline responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative Arts and other disciplines</th>
<th>Creative Arts disciplines only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one Creative Arts discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Associate Deans</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A4.9 Time fractions and responsibilities of Associate Deans

Time fractions in Learning and Teaching leadership role and other responsibilities of participating Associate Deans are given in Table A4.11 by faculty size. In large faculties (>500 staff) all Associate Dean participants spend 100% of their time in their Learning and Teaching leadership role; in smaller faculties, slightly more than half of the Associate Deans spend a significant time fraction on other responsibilities.

Table A4.11
*Time fraction; teaching, supervision, and other responsibilities of participating Associate Deans by faculty size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty size</th>
<th>Small (&lt;100 staff)</th>
<th>Medium (100-500)</th>
<th>Large (&gt;500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Associate Deans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time fraction</td>
<td>0.25; 0.4 (2); 1.0 (4)</td>
<td>0.4; 0.5 (6); 0.6; 1.0 (4)</td>
<td>1.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching responsibilities, not including supervision of research students</td>
<td>0.4 teaching (2)</td>
<td>0.1 teaching (5); 0.4 teaching</td>
<td>0.1 teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Associate Deans who supervise research students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other leadership positions</td>
<td>3 Deputy Head of School; Program Coordinator; Acting Head of School</td>
<td>6 Sub-dean; Head of School; Deputy Head of School (2); Program Director; Deputy Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>