**Luck, chance, and happenstance? Perceptions of success and failure amongst fixed-term academic staff in UK higher education**

**Abstract**

What does it mean to attribute success to ‘luck’, but failure to personal deficiency? In 2015/16, more than 34% of academic employees in UK higher education institutions were employed on temporary contracts, and the sector itself has undergone a substantial transformation in recent years in terms of expansion, measurement, and marketisation. Based on two waves of interviews conducted with fixed-term academic employees at different career stages, the article explores the narrativisation of success and failure amongst staff working at the ‘sharp end’ of the so-called neoliberal academy. Arguing that precarious employment situations precipitate the feeling of being ‘out of control’, the majority of the participants’ narratives were characterised by a distinct lack of agency. The paper explores the recourse to notions of chance and the consolidation of ‘luck’ as an explanatory factor in accounting for why good things happen; however, in tandem with this inclination is the tendency to individualise failure when expectations have been thwarted. While accounts of fixed-term work are suffused with notions of chance and fortune, ‘luck’ remains an under-researched concept within sociology. The article thus concludes by considering what the analysis of ‘luck’ might offer for a fuller, politicised understanding of processes at work in the contemporary academy.
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**Introduction**

*‘Mine is a dizzying country in which the Lottery is a major element of reality’ (Borges 1998:101).*

Processes of expansion, marketisation, and measurement have transformed the landscape of the UK’s higher education (HE) sector in recent years resulting in the emergence of what Gill (2013, 2014) has termed the ‘neoliberal university’. Since the Robbins Report in 1963, UK HE has evolved considerably (Halsey 1992): the number of students attending university has risen sharply (Bryson 2004b), culminating in the cap on admissions being lifted in 2015; the introduction of student fees in England - and the raising of the cap on fees in 2010 to £9000 - has led to the ‘marketisation’ of the sector (Brown with Carasso 2013; McGettigan 2013) and the positioning of students as ‘consumers’ (Molesworth et al. 2010); the activities of academic employees continue to be subject to scrutiny under the Research Excellence Framework (REF) (Back 2015; Burrows 2012; Holmwood 2014; Knowles and Burrows 2014) and the forthcoming Teaching Excellence Framework (BIS 2016). Yet Baron (2014:254) claims that the ‘impact’ of these processes is ‘poorly researched’.

In response to Gill’s (2014:12) recent observation that there is ‘a striking dearth of work on academic labour’, this article explores the experiences of one particular segment of the UK’s academic workforce: casualised employees. In 2015/16, more than 34% of academic staff working in UK HE institutions were employed on fixed-term contracts (see HESA); yet once atypical contracts are taken into consideration, the University and College Union estimates the figure to be closer to 54% (UCU, 2016), and ‘casualisation’ in the sector is a current UCU priority.

Existing research has shown that academics are experiencing substantial stress, anxiety and pressure to perform (Baron 2014; Gill 2014; Kinman 2014; Sullivan and Simon 2014), as well as being in increased competition with one another (Knowles and Burrows, 2014); working in this type of high-pressure environment could have profound effects on the well-being of staff (Kinman and Wray 2013). However, while the wider processes described above undoubtedly impact upon all employees in the sector, a distinction can be made between what Kimber (2003) terms as a ‘tenured core’ and a ‘tenuous periphery’ of academic workers. Temporary employment in the UK’s HE sector is arguably situated within a wider cultural context of ‘precariousness’ (Gill and Pratt 2008; Ross 2008; Standing 2011) where fixed-term employment is increasingly normalised under the guise of flexibility (Barcan 2013:114; see also Bryson 2004a; Sennett 1998). Gill and Pratt (2008:3) define ‘precariousness’ as ‘refer[ring] to all forms of insecure, contingent, flexible work’, including employment in skilled professions (see for example Chan and Tweedie, 2015). Previous research on HE suggests that differential perceptions and experiences of casualised work are likely to be contingent on the intersection of factors such as gender (Acker and Armenti 2004; Bryson 2004a; Lopes and Dewan 2014; Reay 2000; TUC 2014), ethnicity (TUC 2015), and age (Archer 2008); the variegated nature of the labour market in HE means that academic discipline may also influence ‘career progression’, as well as aspirations to remain working within the sector (see Vitae 2013, 2016).

The article begins by exploring the empirical context of the research. Based on two ‘waves’ of interviews conducted with casualised academic employees, the article then focuses on two interrelated facets of the lived experience of employment uncertainty: first, the narrativisation of chance and the consolidation of luck as an explanatory factor in making sense of success; and second, the corresponding tendency of the academic participants to individualise failure when expectations have been thwarted. While it is argued that accounts of fixed-term work are suffused with notions of chance and fortune, perceptions of ‘luck’ remain under-researched within sociology. The article thus concludes by considering what ‘luck’ might offer for a fuller, politicised understanding of processes of subjectification in the contemporary academy.

**Researching ‘casualisation’ in HE**

This paper emerges from a wider project exploring how processes in the UK’s rapidly evolving HE sector affect academic staff in uncertain employment situations. The project aimed to establish how ‘casualised’ academics make sense of insecure work, and the types of contingencies that affect their perceptions. Participants were recruited through personal and professional networks, and the use of snowball sampling. A total of 44 individuals were interviewed, all of whom were employed on fixed-term contracts in UK HE at the beginning of the research; 39 of these took part in a follow-up interview several months after the initial interview. Participants vary in age between their late twenties and mid-fifties; 18 are male and 26 female. The majority of participants in the study are white, reflecting a wider under-representation of BME staff in HE[[1]](#endnote-1) (ECU 2009); 27 are British, but participants from other EU countries, Australasia, Asia, the Middle East and North America were also interviewed.

The project aimed to capture and contrast the perceptions of casualised academics working in different types of role (researchers, teaching-only staff, and lecturers) and at different career stages: the most junior participant at the time of interview was only two days into their first appointment post-PhD, while the two most senior participants hold professorial positions. Participants work in different types of university around the UK, and while the majority work in social science disciplines, academics from the arts, humanities, natural sciences, law and architecture are also represented.

As academics themselves, those interviewed are well-versed in research ethics. The biggest concern has been to guarantee the anonymity of those taking part; as Magnus - a post-doctoral social scientist - notes in one of our interviews: “if there weren’t risks to making a big fuss about how shit it is at the beginning of your career, then you wouldn’t have to anonymise this”. Due to the participants’ considerable anxiety that their interviews might render them identifiable to colleagues and employers, it has not generally been possible to provide precise biographical details in this paper. Apart from the use of pseudonyms, care has also been taken to work with participants to sufficiently anonymise other details, such as employing institutions. All participants have been provided with copies of their interview transcripts to allay any fears over anonymity, but also to stimulate discussion and reflection during the follow-up interviews.

Since the research aimed to explore how the casualised academics make sense of insecure work, interviews were designed to probe participants’ subjective understandings of their employment positions (see also Gill and Pratt 2008; Tweedie 2013). To capture work histories, the first ‘wave’ of interviews began by asking participants to describe how they had come to be in their current role, before questions were posed to explore participants’ academic identities, future career plans, emotional responses to work, impressions of short-term employment, and the effects of work on other areas of life. Follow-up interviews were conducted with as many participants as possible to track changing circumstances and perceptions, but also to allow for the possibility of ‘the establishment of a genuine two-way dialogue’ (Sinha and Back 2014:474).

I was myself employed on a fixed-term lecturing contract for much of the duration of the empirical research, and the participants were made aware of my contractual situation. Müller and Kenney (2014:543, following Felt et al.) claim that the so-called ‘peer-to-peer’ interview – based on ‘shared membership in the academy’ - can facilitate ‘trust based on assumed similarity of experiences’. However, Mercer (2007:6) warns that ‘greater familiarity can make insiders more likely to take things for granted, develop myopia, and assume their own perspective is far more widespread than it actually is'. Thus, while I chose to discuss my own position and experiences openly with participants to foster confidence and as a means of establishing a shared stake in the issue of casualisation, I was careful in interviews not to ask questions that would merely chime with my own impression of fixed-term work in HE as a politicised issue (see UCU, 2016), rather than merely a ‘flexible’ working arrangement (see Barcan 2013; Bryson 2004a; Sennett 1998).

Informed by an abductive approach to data analysis, the research focuses on participants’ perceptions of academia and their working lives to address the construction of meaning (Tavory and Timmermans 2014: 21). Interviews were thematically coded and compared across cases, but also diachronically for those interviewed twice. One of the main themes to emerge from the first wave of interview data was the notion of ‘luck’; this finding was then explicitly discussed with participants during the second wave of interviews. Interviews are not understood here as having the potential to uncover an objective ‘reality’, and the participants’ opinions are not taken as ‘fact’; instead, the interview process is conceptualised as an act of construction between researcher and researched (Hammersley 2003:120), and discourse is understood as ‘occasioned’ (Gill 2000:175). Following Strübing (2007: 585), ‘Data, seen in this way, is not the unhewn material that a researcher starts out with, but rather the *relation* between the field, the research issues, and the researchers established in the course of the analytical process.’ In the subsequent section, I explore the connection between perceptions of success, the narrativisation of ‘luck’ in the interviews and the participants’ sense of agency.

**‘Counting my lucky stars’: Perceptions of success**

On beginning her first fixed-term humanities lectureship, Alice describes “counting my lucky stars”. Similarly, when describing getting a job as a teaching fellow in the humanities, Alan notes: “I was very lucky”, and then continues on to describe what he felt was the “fateful moment” (see also Giddens 1991) determining his appointment. These types of asides were common during the first wave of interviews conducted: participants tended to construe success in terms of luck – irrespective of variables such as gender or age, or length of contract - so that finding a job or being awarded a grant was often expressed as the result of some fortuitous encounter, series of events, or as pure happenstance. Even participants in more senior positions had a tendency to also describe success as a matter of chance, such as Sarah - a social science professor on a fixed-term fractional contract - who describes being head-hunted by a prestigious funder to head up an international project: “It’s sort of like a gift that’s fallen out of the sky: I’m just lucky”. In this section, I want to argue that this frequent recourse to notions of luck, chance and happenstance by the participants in this project is indicative of the diminished agency of casualised academic staff in the landscape of UK HE. My interest here is in exploring how academic employees *make sense* of their positions; it is clearly not possible to establish objectively whether the participants have really been ‘lucky’ and if success has been a matter of pure ‘chance’. However, I want to argue that the narrativisation of ‘luck’ is reflective of the tenuous position in which a sizeable proportion of the academic workforce now find themselves.

There remains a striking lack of sociological literature engaging with notions of luck outside of the sociology of gambling (eg. Reith 2002, 2003), which can perhaps be explained by Smith’s (1993:513) contention that ‘luck’ has remained at the level of a ‘residual category’ in much sociological research, and thus ‘chance’ has remained somewhat ‘taboo’ (Mattausch 2003:506). What, then, might be the dangers of conceptualising the concept of ‘chance’ as being beyond the purview of sociological analysis? Smith (1993:528) argues that:

…sociological models which include chance avoid the assumptions of either total chaos or total regularity. Instead, the three main causal elements of ‘agency’, ‘chance’ and ‘conditions’ are placed within a diachronic relationship where agencies, working within the constraints of logically defined conditions and chance impacts, in turn, modify these circumstances through a combination of intended outcomes and unforeseen chance consequences. Thus, the acceptance of chance as a sociological concept does not deny the significance of either structure or agency.

My interest here, then, is in using perceptions of luck as a starting point for thinking through the relationship between agency – understood here as an ‘individual’s capacity for action’ (McNay 2004:179) – and the wider structural conditions of employment in the HE sector. Reith (2003: para. 2) argues that ‘the way we deal with uncertainty is central for understanding how societies operate and organise themselves’. She notes how the application of reason during the Enlightenment sought to eliminate ‘irrational’ notions such as ‘luck’, and that the result of such a project was the creation of the new idea of ‘risk’, or ‘the science of uncertainty’, as a means of mastering the unknown (Reith 2003: paras. 13-4; see also Giddens 1991; Hacking 1990). Yet Giddens (1991:130) has argued that: ‘Notions of fate refuse to disappear altogether, and are found in uneasy combination with an outlook of the secular risk type and with attitudes of fatalism.’

Taking issue with the use of rational choice theory to analyse the relationship between luck and power, Lukes and Haglund (2005:54) assert that:

‘Luck’, according to the dictionary, means either ‘chance’ or ‘fortune, good or ill’. It is hard to see how it can play a useful explanatory role in accounting for differential outcome power (or social inequality) [...] Chance suggests mere accidents and fortune suggests destiny or fate or an act of God. But we are, supposedly, trying to explain […] the mechanisms that create and sustain inequality in positions or access to resources. Chance, Destiny, Fate and God constitute various different ways of declining to provide such an explanation.

Rachel - a social scientist who had been working as a post-doctoral researcher before being appointed as a lecturer on a permanent contract - also wonders if ‘luck’ is sometimes used as a convenient way of covering over privilege, as Lukes and Haglund (2005) argue. Yet the narrativisation of luck and chance in my research suggests that these concepts were not consciously invoked as a way of denying advantage. Instead, the participants appeared to take recourse to these notions when describing situations over which they felt no control. Byrne (2003:30) links the narrativisation of one’s life to ‘processes of subject construction’; she argues that an attention to narrative processes is ‘likely to offer a key entry point into the ‘techniques’ or ‘practices’ of the self’ (Byrne 2003:30). In particular, a focus on the context in which stories are produced may provide valuable insight into the production of subjectivities (Byrne 2003:32). It was a striking feature of the first ‘wave’ of interviews conducted that very few of the participants presented voluntaristic accounts of their career trajectories; instead, the vast majority tended to narrate their academic careers as happening *to* them, rather than presenting themselves as agents in control of their working lives.

Daniels (2003:619) asserts that ‘luck implies the existence of agency, good or bad, outside of the control of the human individual’, and recourse to the notion of ‘luck’ when describing fortuitous experiences was one of the unanticipated ways in which participants tended to express a lack of agency. Anne, a social science post-doctoral researcher, comments in our first interview together: “I guess maybe my interview is quite boring in a way because I was quite lucky to get the job in the first place”. The way in which Anne narrativises her career trajectory points to a fundamental lack of control: hers is merely a ‘boring’ story since her appointment is understood as a matter of chance. In a similar manner to Anne, when asked how he had come to be in his current role, Philip - who was also working as a post-doctoral researcher in the social sciences at the time of our first interview together - noted: “I think I was probably quite lucky in some respects”. He explains: “I know I should have more faith in my own skills and abilities, but it does feel a lot like luck”.

I want to turn now to the case of David to think through how having ‘faith in one’s own skills and abilities’ might be diminished by the wider conditions in which fixed-term employees find themselves in HE. During our first interview , David had been job-hunting for some time and had applied unsuccessfully for a number of post-doctoral fellowships; his mood was low and he confided that he was questioning his “commitment” to pursuing a career in academia. However, by the time of our second interview ten months later, David had secured a prestigious post-doctoral position in another EU country where he was shortly due to move.

David: I keep saying this to people and I believe it when people were congratulating me on getting the [funding] that I do think that it’s also a matter of luck in the sense of however you want to define luck: everything […] that’s not within your power to control […] I just cannot *believe* that my application for the [funding] was light-years ahead than the ones I had done before and that had been rejected.

Author: You said [in the last interview when describing failure], “I tend to personalise it, or individualise it, I tend to bring it down to my own understanding of reality, or my own capabilities and competencies” And I thought that was interesting talking about how when you hadn’t had these successes, you individualised that […] But now you’ve had a success, you’re saying: ‘oh, it’s luck’.

David: It’s definitely luck too. […] me saying it was luck – I’m definitely not saying it was only luck, but me saying that it was also luck, maybe that’s actually not necessarily not recognising my efforts or my capabilities, but rather because I had seen before how these efforts, these capabilities had not come to some kind of fruition; I now think that it’s not that I got so much better […] Let’s say I was good enough. I was good enough. So something else must have happened, been added to the equation.

[…]

But like I said before, attributing chance to one’s success maybe has to do with how you develop an understanding of how *hard* things are. Having said that, to be the devil’s advocate of what I just said, it’s funny because when somebody else has a success […]I don’t think ‘they were lucky’, I think they were fucking good […] The underlying, unspoken message there is that they are so much better than me, to come back to something we were talking about – competition – last time.

While grant applications to research councils in the UK are thought to have grown after the 2014 Research Excellence Framework exercise, success rates have conversely been reported as declining[[2]](#endnote-2) (Matthews 2015): ‘once success rates drop below 20 per cent, the process “becomes more of a lottery”’ (Martin cited by Matthews 2015, no pagination). It is hardly surprising, then, that in David’s case above, he sees being awarded a grant as a “matter of luck” due to the wider, competitive landscape of the UK’s HE sector. As Knowles and Burrows (2014:249) warn: ‘metricization’ runs the risk of ‘unleashing new forms of academic competition’. In this competitive environment, David sees the achievement of other academics as being an indication that they are “fucking good”, yet he understands his own successful funding application as being merely “*good enough”*. In her work on mothering, Lawler (2000:70) notes the way in which one of her participants ‘uses the concept of “luck” to mark out the limits of her own control’, and so the invocation of ‘luck’ by David points to what I want to argue is a sense of diminished agency for casualised academic employees, but also highlights the lack of entitlement he feels: the suspicion here is that while David has merely been ‘lucky’, the natural talent of other academics means that they are deserving of their rewards.

While recourse to luck was a common feature of the narrativisation of success, participants conversely tended to make sense of their frustrations or failures in individualising terms, as David notes in our first interview together when he describes trying to come to terms with a fruitless search for jobs and funding: “I tend to personalise it, or individualise it, I tend to bring it down to […] my own capabilities and competencies”. This seemingly ambivalent position – that is, invoking ‘chance’ in the case of success, but then taking personal responsibility for failure – is summed up neatly by Imogen, a lecturer in the social sciences, who explains: “You’ve also got that small voice in your mind that says: ‘no, you’re a bit shit’, or ‘you’re a bit lucky’, […] or ‘you’re probably both’”. Below I want to consider the individualisation of disappointment and thwarted ambition as symptomatic of the wider conditions of the contemporary academy.

**‘I am my own obstacle’: Individualising barriers to success**

I have been arguing that for the academic participants in this project, the narrativisation of luck is indicative of a feeling of being ‘out of control’, which is precipitated by the short-term nature of their employment contracts. However, in tandem with the propensity to take recourse to ‘chance’ in the case of success is the tendency of the participants to individualise failure. It has been argued that the experiences of academics have become increasingly individualised (Coate et al. 2015; Gill 2013, 2014; Gill and Pratt 2008; Leathwood and Read 2013; Sullivan and Simon 2014), as has ‘the management of risk’ (Reith 2004:397). While the casualised academics in this research often neglected to take credit for success in the telling of their academic stories (even if they did acknowledge hard work), failure to succeed – for example, in job-hunting, interviews, or publishing – was often attributed to a personal shortcoming, or miscalculation. As Reith (2003: para. 25) notes: ‘Ill fortune is no longer seen as a punishment from God, but as a personal failure…attributable to laziness, ignorance or irresponsibility’. In this section, I want to explore the ways in which perceived barriers to success are individualised, so that the most agentic aspect of the participants’ narrativisation is in the claiming of responsibility for failure or thwarted expectations. This is perhaps most succinctly summed up by Peter – a humanities post-doctoral researcher – who notes in our second interview together: “I tend to think – does this count as agency? – I tend to think, ‘I am my own obstacle’. So it’s not the most empowering version of agency!”

‘Imposter syndrome’ and feelings of fraudulence are already well-documented within research on HE (see for example Barcan 2013: 191-216; Gill 2013; Knights and Clarke 2014; Sullivan and Simon 2014), and Barcan (2013:192) argues that ‘recent decades have produced conditions that have greatly intensified’ the phenomenon of feeling like a fraud. She contends that while ‘experienced as a sense of personal inadequacy’, fraudulence can be ‘linked to the social positioning of the academic and/ or to a critique of institutional organization, pedagogical framework, or disciplinary orthodoxy’ (p.195). Karen - who was working on a number of teaching contracts in the humanities during the course of my research – explains:

“I’m losing touch with my own research, I really don’t have anything interesting to say, so part of that is the necessity of getting an income - and securing your living position takes you away from your own work - and then you start to feel separate from it and that engenders a feeling of disconnection and fraudulence […] meanwhile you’re applying for things and trying to sound smart and not feeling very smart.”

Miller and Morgan (1993) examine the production of academic CVs as a kind of ‘auto/biographical practice’, which must give ‘the impression of being a ‘proper academic’ or a ‘proper scholar’’ (p.140); they conclude that ‘there is an increasing element of alienation in the production of CVs’ (p.142). In their research on female mid-career academics, Coate et al (2015) note the gendering of self-promotion: ‘…feminine “norms” suggest a certain amount of modesty that conflicts with what might be seen as self-promotion’ (p.10). However, irrespective of gender, many of the casualised participants in my own research appeared to be uncomfortable with the self-promotional aspect of academia; as Howard - a social sciences researcher - comments: “my goodness, look at all of those self-promotional people still promoting themselves on Christmas Day, and it begins to wear you down”. In their study of business school academics, Knights and Clarke (2014: 340) note, ‘we were reflexively aware that as academics interviewing other academics, we comprised a specific audience for whom our participants authored particular narratives’. Thus, it was not surprising to me to find a gulf between legitimated forms of public presentation and self-promotion – such as in the CV, the interview, the conference paper, or on social media – and how the casualised academics described feeling about their self-presentation during interviews; in this sense, Maclean’s (2016) development of Laing’s notion of ‘double binds’ as ‘contradictory demands and expectations’ is helpful in thinking through such a disjuncture and the way in which particular kinds of discourses are occasioned (see Gill 2000:175).

In her research with younger academics, Archer (2008:282) notes that, ‘they were all able to see (at least in part) how their situations were not simply the product of their own responsibilities, successes and failings’. While in my own research the participants were well-aware of the wider processes occurring in HE and the implications of these processes for their own careers, there was also a tendency to individualise failure when describing set-backs, and this occurred across the sample irrespective of variables such as gender. This ambivalence can be illustrated by the case of Pedro, a social scientist who was working on a part-time teaching-only contract at the time of our first interview, but was job-hunting when we spoke next nine months later, a process he sums up by noting: “you are always a candidate”. He had recently been unsuccessful in an application for a temporary lectureship, an experience which he felt had been lacking in transparency:

“when you are in a situation like this where you […] keep getting ‘no’s, negatives and you keep rearranging your narrative about yourself and putting in question what you are and what you're worth and having to shape it to continuous judgements […] you obviously want to learn lessons from these failures, so you want to […] see […] what was it that I did wrong, what can I improve and therefore it's very easy to fall into that idea that I failed because I didn't do this right, so that's what I have to change. So you get into this cycle of trying to improve yourself as an individual and so trying to find […] what is wrong in yourself to be improved.”

In their critique of technologies of neoliberal governmentality (such as audit) in academia, Davies and Bansel (2010:9) describe how, ‘Like a well-trained pony, the free individual responds willingly to the smallest signs telling it where it should run and how it should leap’. While the casualised academics in my research are able to be reflexive about the potentially pernicious effects of neoliberal management techniques on both their own lives and the academy, it is nonetheless extremely difficult for the majority of those interviewed to resist such tactics: ‘Technologies of audit and surveillance, of self-audit and self-surveillance, are not simply discourses of responsibility and accountability but technologies for the reproduction of responsibilised and accountable subjects’ (Davies and Bansel 2010:9; see also Leathwood and Read 2013).

The penalty for resistance is made more acute by the precarious nature of the participants’ employment situations, in that failure to comply brings with it the risk of employment contracts not being renewed, appointments not being made, grants not being awarded. I want to argue here that it is hardly surprising, then, that given the wider structural constraints within which academics are currently working, the very little agency the participants do perceive themselves as having relates to the possibility of working *on the self*: of improving perceived deficiencies, of being wily enough to avoid potential mistakes, of playing the long-game even if the future is unthinkable (Gill 2014; Ylijoki 2010). As Katie, a postdoc in non-laboratory-based sciences, explains: “I treat everything as a potential opportunity where I’m going to screw it up and upset everyone”. She describes having “agency when it’s something that I’m maybe not doing well enough and I feel like I should be doing […] better”. Gill (2013:240) has argued that:

Being hard-working, self-motivating and enterprising subjects is what constitutes academics as so perfectly emblematic of this neoliberal moment, but is also part of a psychic landscape in which *not* being successful (or lucky!) […] is misrecognised - or to put that more neutrally, made knowable - in terms of individual (moral) failure.

When asked how she had come to be in her present position, Lesley – a research assistant in the humanities - began our first interview by stating: “well my understanding of my career is that it’s all been a bit accidental, I guess”. When I raised this statement with Lesley in our second interview together nine months later, she explained:

“I think a lot of it is maybe an attitude change in that when I was reading [the transcript] I was struck by the same thing, it’s like [I] sound like an idiot. […] I know that’s definitely not what you were saying, but saying that everything that’s happened is chance […] it just struck me as stupid. […] I think it’s when faced with these largely inscrutable structures, like universities and hiring systems […] it all seems quite chance-based, but talking to other people and seeing how they go about things, and realising that actually there’s probably been some plan, or I’ve put myself in a position to be able to react to these good opportunities […] and trying to be more responsible and mature about how I narrate my life: […] that would hopefully lead to feeling more empowered about it.”

Rose (1992:153) points to ‘the regulatory norm of the autonomous, responsible subject’; while Lesley gestures towards the “inscrutable” wider structures in HE, she then goes on to reproach herself for not being “more responsible and mature about how I narrate my life”. I have been arguing that lack of control is keenly felt by the majority of the participants across all career stages, and this is intertwined with the pervasive sense of risk associated with employment insecurity. In order to mitigate this sense of diminished agency, a number of strategies were described by those I interviewed (see also Archer 2008) in order to impose control on situations in which they felt relatively powerless. For Lesley above, taking individual responsibility is one such route to perceived empowerment. However, the most common way in which the casualised participants - across all disciplines and career stages - attempted to wrest back some modicum of control was through working excessively, and long working hours are also characteristic of the wider sector (Anderson 2006). For example, Gregory - a researcher in health and social sciences - explains: “you feel like you have to do absolutely as much as possible and do absolutely as much as is in your control, which is working as much as you possibly can”.

Yet some of these ‘coping mechanisms’ have the paradoxical effect of intensifying already disadvantageous situations, such as escalating already high stress-levels (Kinman 2014; Kinman and Wray 2013). When I ask Magnus – who, as noted, is a post-doctoral researcher – about how much control he feels he has over his working life, he explains:

“…all I can say is that the control that I have […] is to do the best that I can do […] and try to do my job as well as I can. But that has limits, and that has effects on the rest of your life […] But you can also do all that and be the model fucking junior academic […] and still not get a job […] the agency I feel like I’ve got is that I can do that as best as I can […] even though that can have detrimental effects on other areas of my life, and also just makes me stressed the whole time […] But then I feel completely agentless in terms of I’ve got no control over whether a job comes up […] I feel like I could jump the hurdles perfectly, and do everything exactly as they want, but still there’s nothing there”.

Adkins (2004:192) notes that: ‘One of the most influential ideas in contemporary social theory is that a range of aspects of social life are both characterized by and increasingly require reflexive forms of conduct’. Whilst reflexivity remains a ‘contested’ concept (Farrugia and Woodman, 2016:627), Akram and Hogan (2016:608) define it in terms of how ‘agents must engage with their own concerns and negotiate the best course of action for themselves’. They note that reflexivity ‘is heightened in periods of breach’ (Akram and Hogan 2016:608) - and the uncertainty precipitated by employment insecurity can arguably be construed in this manner - yet they caution against equating reflexivity with agency. In their critique of Margaret Archer’s work, Farrugia and Woodman (2016:640) demonstrate that there is reason to be suspicious of ‘the valorization of reflexivity within conditions that foreclose the successful establishment of a *modus vivendi*’. Thus, for Magnus above, there is both an awareness of the ‘hurdles’ that need to be jumped as a ‘model’ junior academic hoping for a career in academia, yet he perceives himself as having no control over the possibility of securing a permanent job at the end of his current position; while he can attempt to ‘negotiate the best course of action’ (Akram and Hogan 2016:608), the wider conditions in the HE sector under which he is working will determine whether this path is ultimately successful. In this sense,

Knowledge about risk for these competitive vulnerable subjects is no escape from danger: rather, it is itself dangerous knowledge. It produces an ever-present awareness of the danger of failure to recognise, anticipate, and manage risk. It provides academics with the means for deciding what action to take but also the means by which they might be found to have done something wrong. (Davies and Bansel 2010:15).

In their research on the role of chance in the narratives of young people, Thomson et al. (2002:338) warn that Giddens’ (1991) analysis of ‘fateful moments’ potentially ‘constructs young people as abstract individuals who make decisions and face risks’. The academics in my research are similarly compelled to ‘make decisions and face risks’ by virtue of their precarious employment situations, yet the conditions under which they are labouring radically constrain their outcomes. I want to conclude below by considering the political implications of these working conditions in UK HE, before proposing that the concept of ‘luck’ might provide a new locus for resisting the pernicious effects of neo-liberalisation in the sector.

**Conclusion**

I have been arguing in this article that the participants’ seemingly contradictory responses to success and failure – that is, the invocation of ‘luck’ in favourable circumstances, but the taking of personal responsibility when things go badly - are indicative of the academics’ diminished agency, but also of the wider conditions within the changing landscape of UK HE. In this sense, I have aimed to bring together an analysis of chance, agency, and structuring conditions (Smith 1993).

The demands of the so-called ‘neoliberal university’ have created ‘enterprising’ academic subjects who understand their own participation as being increasingly individualised. Academia valorises the individual successes of ‘superstar’ academics (Knights and Clarke 2014:338) through narrowly prescribed - and often unrealistic - measures of esteem; meanwhile certain forms of labour remain ‘hidden’ from authorised public performances of capability (Miller and Morgan 1993:135), and competent academic selves must relentlessly be promoted for purposes of public engagement, ‘impact’, student recruitment, and career progression. In tandem with the celebration of individualised success, comes a creeping responsibilisation in the event of failure: suspicions that if only one had worked harder, had the foresight to anticipate and negotiate set-backs, or produced better work then success might have been possible (see also Sullivan and Simon 2014). These tendencies are then undoubtedly amplified for those casualised academics who find themselves at the ‘sharp-end’ of the sector and whose ‘capacity for action’ (McNay 2004:179) has been diminished.

Whilst the HE sector benefits from the intensification of work and the endless striving towards so-called ‘excellence’, the individualisation of academic work has wider political implications beyond its immediate impact on academic employees. As previously noted, the little agency that the majority of my participants perceive themselves as having relates to work *on the self*; if processes of subjectification in the sector have the effect of focusing the gaze inwards, then the gaze outwards is in danger of becoming blinkered. However, while Davies and Bansel (2010:5) caution that ‘neoliberal government […] systematically dismantles the will to critique’, there has in fact been a burgeoning of critique aimed at the ‘neoliberal university’ in recent years, yet very little ‘active resistance’ (Leathwood and Read 2013: 1164); thus, the real threat here may lie in how individualisation forecloses the possibilities of solidarity to resist such processes. For example, while a few notable campaigns have made visible the issue of casualisation in UK HE,3 industrial solidarity is not without risk for insecure workers, and some employees will be more constrained in their ability to act than others; additionally, precarious employees require solidarity not merely from one another, but from those who are positioned in structurally advantageous situations, such as senior managers. So long as the wider culture of academic work upholds the values of ‘enterprise,’ then genuine possibilities for scholarly solidarity will be shut down.

In this article, I have been using the invocation of ‘luck’ in the case of success as a kind of heuristic springboard (see Da Col and Humphreys 2012c:3) to investigate the production of academic subjectivities in an environment of escalating competition and expectations, and I want to conclude by returning to the concept of ‘luck’ as a means of puncturing neoliberal discourses of ‘enterprise’. While I have argued that perceiving success as a matter of luck points to the gradual erosion of insecure employees’ confidence in their own skills and abilities, I believe ‘luck’ might also have an interesting potential to disrupt those narratives that celebrate the success of the ‘superstar’ individual, while simultaneously encouraging the taking of responsibility for failure. The notion that successful academic careers are forged through ‘enterprise’ alone – that is, work on the *self* to develop more ambitious plans, to become more industrious, to manage time better, and to take risks in the pursuit of ‘excellence’ - emphasises the agency of the individual whilst failing to take into consideration the structural constraints under which academics are labouring, but also the intervening role of chance in mediating success and failure. The open acknowledgement of ‘luck’ unmoors the neoliberal logic of ‘enterprise’: hard work does not always pay off, merit is not evenly rewarded, risk-taking can back-fire, and the individual academic may have very little control over this. The perception of success as a matter of luck amongst my participants exposes the wider processes at work in the sector; acknowledging the role that ‘luck’ might also play in failure challenges the very logic that underpins the contemporary sector.

**Notes**

1 Apart from academic employees of Chinese ethnicity (ECU 2009:1, following AUT).

2 In the case of five out of six of research councils (Matthews 2015).

3 Eg. The ‘Fighting Against Casualisation in Education’ network, or the ‘Fractionals for Fair Play’ campaign.

**Bibliography**

**Abbas, A. and McLean, M.** 2001 'Becoming sociologists: Professional identity for part-time teachers of university sociology', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 22(3): 339-52.

**Acker, S. and Armenti, C.** 2004 'Sleepless in academia', *Gender and Education* 16(1): 3-24.

**Adkins, L.** 2004 ‘Reflexivity: Freedom or habit of gender?’, in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism After Bourdieu*, Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 191-210.

**Akram, S. and Hogan, A.** 2016 ‘On reflexivity and the conduct of the self in everyday life: Reflections on Bourdieu and Archer’, *British Journal of Sociology* 66(4): 606-25.

**Allen Collinson, J.** 2000 'Social science contract researchers in higher education: Perceptions of craft knowledge', *Work, Employment & Society* 14(1):159-71.

**Allen-Collinson, J. and Hockey, J.** 1998 'Capturing contracts: Informal activity among contract researchers', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 19(4):497-515.

**Anderson, G.** 2006 ‘Carving out time and space in the managerial university’, *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 19(5): 578-92.

**Archer, L.** 2008 'The new neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics' constructions of professional identity', *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3):265-85.

**Back, L.** 2015 ‘On the side of the powerful: The ‘impact agenda’ & sociology in public’, <http://www.thesociologicalreview.com/blog/on-the-side-of-the-powerful-the-impact-agenda-sociology-in-public.html>

**Barcan, R.** 2013 *Academic Life and Labour in the New University*, Farnham: Ashgate.

**Baron, P.** 2014 'Working the clock: the academic body on neoliberal time', *Somatechnics* , 4(2): 253-71.

**BIS [Department for Business, Innovation and Skills]** 2016, ‘Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice’,

<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/523396/bis-16-265-success-as-a-knowledge-economy.pdf>

**Borges, J.L.** 1998 ‘The lottery in Babylon’, in *Collected Fictions,* New York: Penguin, pp. 101-6.

**Brown, R. with Carasso, H.** 2013 *Everything for Sale? The Marketisation of UK Higher Education,* London: Routledge.

**Bryson, C.** 2004a 'The consequences for women in the academic profession of the widespread use of fixed-term contracts', *Gender, Work and Organisation* 11(2)187-206.

**Bryson, C.** 2004b 'What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the

transformation of academic work', *Industrial Relations Journal* 35(1): 38-57.

**Burrows, R.** 2012 'Living with the h-index? Metric assemblages in the contemporary academy', *The Sociological Review* 60(2): 355-72.

**Byrne, B.** 2003 ‘Reciting the self: Narrative representations of the self in qualitative interviews’, *Feminist Theory* 4(1): 29-49.

**Coate, K., Kandiko Howson, C.B., and de St Croix, T.** 2015 ‘Mid-career academic women: Strategies, choices and motivation’, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

**da Col, G. and Humphreys, C.** 2012 ‘Introduction: Subjects of luck – Contingency, morality, and the anticipation of everyday life’, *Social Analysis* 56(2): 1-18.

**Daniels, I.M.** 2003 ‘Scooping, raking, beckoning luck: Luck, agency and the interdependence of people and things in Japan’, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9: 619-38.

**ECU [Equality Challenge Unit]** 2009 ‘The experience of black and minority ethnic staff working in higher education: A literature review’, <http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/experience-of-bme-staff-in-he-final-report/>

**Davies, B. and Bansel, P.** 2010 'Governmentality and academic work: Shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers', *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 26(3): 5-20.

**Farrugia, D. and Woodman, D.** 2015 'Ultimate concerns in late modernity: Archer, Bourdieu and reflexivity', *The British Journal of Sociology* 66(4): 626-44.

**Giddens, A.** 1991 *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Gill, R.** 2014 'Academics, cultural workers and critical labour studies', *Journal of Cultural Economy* 7(1): 12-30.

**Gill, R.** 2013 'Breaking the silence: the hidden injuries of the neoliberal university', R. Ryan-Flood and R. Gill (eds) *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process*. London: Routledge, pp. 228- 44.

**Gill, R.** 2000 ‘Discourse analysis’, M.W. Bauer and G. Gaskell (eds) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound.* London: SAGE, pp.172-190.

**Gill, R. and Pratt, A.** 2008 'In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural

work', *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7-8): 1-30.

**Hacking, I.** 1990 *The Taming of Chance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Halsey, A.H.** 1992 *Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Hammersley, M.** 2003 ‘Recent radical criticism of interview studies: Any implications for the sociology of education?’, *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 24(1): 119-26.

**HESA [Higher Education Statistics Agency]** ‘Statistical First Release 225 – Staff at HE

Providers in the UK’, https://www.hesa.ac.uk/pr/3770-statistical-first-release-225

**Holmwood, J.** 2014 ‘Turning the audit screw: The degradation of higher education’, *Global*

*Dialogue* 4(4),

<http://isa-global-dialogue.net/turning-the-audit-screw-the-degradation-of-highereducation/>

**Kimber, M.** 2003 'The tenured 'core' and the tenuous 'periphery': The casualisation of academic work in Australian universities', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 25(1): 41-50.

**Kinman, G.** 2014 'Doing more with less? Work and wellbeing in academics' *Somatechnics*, 4(2): 219-35.

**Kinman, G. and S. Wray** 2013 *Higher Stress: A Survey of Stress and Well-Being Among Staff in*

*Higher Education.* UCU,

http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/4/5/HE\_stress\_report\_July\_2013.pdf

**Knights, D. and Clarke, CA.** 2014 ‘It’s a bittersweet symphony, this life: Fragile academic selves and insecure identities at work’, *Organization Studies* 35(3):335-357.

**Knowles, C. and Burrows, R.** 2014 'The impact of impact', *Etnográfica* 18(2):237-54.

**Lawler, S.** 2000 *Mothering the Self: Mothers, Daughters, Subjects,* London: Routledge.

**Leathwood, C. and Read, B.** 2013 'Research policy and academic performativity: compliance, contestation and complicity', *Studies in Higher Education* 38(8): 1162-74.

**Lopes, A. and Dewan, I.A.** 2014 ‘Precarious pedagogies? The impact of casual and zero

hours contracts in higher education’, *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* 7(8): 28-42.

**Lukes, S. and Haglund, L.** 2005 ‘Power and luck’, *European Journal of Social Theory* 46(1): 45-66.

**Maclean, K.** 2016 ‘Sanity, ‘madness’, and the academy’, *The Canadian Geographer* 0:1-11.

**Mattausch, J.** 2003 ‘Chance and societal change’, *The Sociological Review* 51(4): 506-527.

**Matthews, D.** 2015 ‘Success rates: Surge in applications to ‘struggling’ research councils’, *Times Higher Education* October 29,

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/success-rates-surge-applications-struggling-research-councils>

**McGettigan, A.** 2013 *The Great University Gamble: Money, Markets and the Future of Higher Education*. London: Pluto Press.

**McNay, L.** 2004 ‘Agency and experience: Gender as a lived relation’, in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism After Bourdieu*, Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 173-90.

**Mercer, J.** 2007 ‘The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wilding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas’, *Oxford Review of Education* 33(1): 1-17.

**Miller, N and Morgan, D** 1993 ‘Called to account: The CV as an autobiographical practice’, *Sociology* 27(1):133-143.

**Molesworth, M., Scullion, R. and Nixon, E.** (eds.) 2010 *The Marketization of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*, London: Routledge.

**Müller, R. and Kenney, M.** 2014 ‘Agential conversations: Interviewing postdoctoral life scientists and the politics of mundane research practices’, *Science as Culture* 23(4): 537-59.

**Reay, D.** 2000 '"Dim dross": Marginalised women both inside and outside the academy', *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(1):13-21.

**Reith, G.** 2004 ‘Uncertain times: The notion of ‘risk’ and the development of modernity’, *Time & Society* 13 (2/3): 383-402.

**Reith, G.** 2003 ‘Living with uncertainty: The construction of ‘risk’ and the belief in luck’, *Organdi,* 6,

<http://www.organdi.net/article.php3?id_article=69>

**Reith, G.** 2002 *The Age of Chance: Gambling in Western Culture*, London: Routledge.

**Rose, N.** 1992 ‘Governing the enterprising self’ in P. Heelas and P. Morris (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: the Moral Debate,* London and New York: Routledge.

**Ross, A.** 2008 'The new geography of work: Power to the precarious?' *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7-8):31-49.

**Sennett, R.** 1998 *The Corrosion of Character,* New York: WW Norton.

**Sinha, S. and Back, L.** 2014 ‘Making methods sociable: Dialogue, ethics and authorship in qualitative research’, *Qualitative Research* 14(4): 473-87.

**Smith, M.** 1993 ‘Changing sociological perspectives on chance’, *Sociology* 27(3): 513-31.

**Standing, G.** 2011 *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

**Strübing** 2007 ‘Research as pragmatic problem-solving: The pragmatist roots of empirically-grounded theorising’, in A. Bryant and K. Charmaz (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*, pp. 580-99, Los Angeles and London: SAGE.

**Sullivan, N. and Simon, J.** 2014 'Academic work cultures: somatic crisis in the enterprise university', *Somatechnics* 4(2):205-218.

**Tavory, I. and Timmermans, S.** 2014 *Abductive Analysis: Theorizing Qualitative Research*, London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Thomson, R., Bell, R., Holland, J., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharp, S.** 2002 ‘Critical moments: Choice, chance and opportunity in young people’s narratives of transition’, *Sociology* 36(2): 335-54.

**Tweedie, D.** 2013 'Making sense of insecurity: a defence of Richard Sennett's sociology of work', *Work, Employment & Society* 27(1): 94-104.

**TUC [Trades Union Congress]** 2015 ‘Living on the margins: Black workers and casualisation’, <https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/LivingontheMargins.pdf>

**TUC [Trades Union Congress]** 2014 ‘Women and casualisation: Women’s experiences of job insecurity’,

<http://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/Women_and_casualisation.pdf>

**UCU [Universities and Colleges Union]** 2016 ‘Precarious work in higher education: a snapshot of insecure contracts and institutional attitudes’, <https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7995/Precarious-work-in-higher-education-a-snapshot-of-insecure-contracts-and-institutional-attitudes-Apr-16/pdf/ucu_precariouscontract_hereport_apr16.pdf>

**Vitae** 2013 ‘What do researchers do? Early career progression of doctoral graduates’, <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/reports/what-do-researchers-do-early-career-progression-2013.pdf/view>

**Vitae** 2016 ‘What do research staff do next?’, https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/reports/vitae-what-do-research-staff-do-next-2016.pdf

**Ylijoki, O. E.** 2010 ‘Future orientations in episodic labour: Short-term academics as a case in point’, *Time & Society* 19(3): 365-86.

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)