ARE YOU ONE OF US?

AN EXPLORATION OF DISCURSIVE IDENTITY FORMATION IN THE SALVATION ARMY

A thesis submitted to

The University of Technology, Sydney,

as partial fulfilment of

the degree Doctor of Education

Terrence Grey

May 2011

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signed

Acknowledgements

The production of a doctoral thesis represents the culmination of a long and challenging journey. Countless hours spent reading, researching, thinking, writing all come at a cost to life and relationships particularly for a part time student.

This journey has not been taken alone but with the support of family and friends. I want to thank most sincerely my wife Lyn who while undertaking her own Doctoral studies supported me through her encouragement and insights. In her I also found a fellow student/learner willing to discuss ideas, challenge hypothesise, point out blind spots and suggest ways forward. In a similar vein I also acknowledge my good friend Dr. Dean Smith who endured with grace so many conversations concerning Foucault and offered helpful suggestions concerning my 'reading' of the Salvation Army officer discourse.

To Professor David Boud my primary supervisor, I express my sincere thanks for his direction, sage like advice and professional insights. Thank you for guiding me on the journey. Under your direction I have learnt much.

Finally to the officers, cadets (who are now officers), and ex-officers who were so willing to assist me in this research through accepting my invitation to be participants, I express my sincere thanks for your honesty and trust.

Contents

Glossary - Organisationally Specific Terms

Applicant	An individual (lay Salvationist) who commences the application process to become an officer.
Articles of War	Soldier's covenant document signed upon being accepted as soldier of The Salvation Army.
Australia Eastern Territory	The international Salvation Army is divided into geographical Territories and Commands. In Australia there are two such Territories.
Cadet / Novice	These two terms appear interchangeably and represent someone who is accepted by the organisation for training to become a Salvation Army officer (normally residential two years full time).
Candidate	An individual (lay Salvationist) who has been accepted by the organisation in the period prior to actually commencing training to become a Salvation Army officer
Corps	Equivalent to a local parish (church)
Corps Officer (CO)	Equivalent of a local parish minister
Divisional Commander (DC)	An officer responsible for organisational operations within an assigned geographical area (a Division). A middle management position.
Division	A Territory is further divided into geographical divisions for which the Divisional Commander is responsible
Field (the)	Work place context, normally in a corps (parish)
Field Officer (interchangeable with Corps Officer)	Officer appointed to be responsible for a local corps (parish)
O&R	'Orders and Regulations' – official instructions regarding policy and practice (internationally)
Official minutes	Territorial official instructions regarding policy and practice (locally)
Soldier / Salvationist	Lay member of The Salvation Army normally associated with a local Corps (ie parish)
Territory	A geographical region, in this research it encompasses NSW, ACT and QLD.
Territorial Commander (TC)	Territorial Commander (CEO of the Territorial organisation – responsible to the General in London)
Training Officer	An officer appointed to the College generally responsible for the practical aspects of cadet training. They also function as formation officers and assessors.

Abstract

Within any organisation individuals are presented with particular identity positions which they take up in the process of becoming organisational members. Often such identities are taken for granted, assumed to be naturally occurring and therefore not open to contestation or negotiation. This thesis focuses upon the formation of professional identity within a particular organisation – The Salvation Army. Through applying Foucauldian discourse analysis and narrative identity formation, I seek to deconstruct the object: a Salvation Army officer professional identity, and to illuminate the ways it is co-created through discourse. To achieve this I map the discursive terrain that produces 'officer' through disrupting the normalised, the natural, the invisible, the unspeakable, and the silent assumptions that govern officer identity thus giving insight into current practice.

The data generated in this study was produced through undertaking in-depth interviews with three cohorts: six cadets (novice officers of varying prior organisational experience) in their second (and final) year of training, four experienced officers (of greater than ten years organisational experience) and two past officers who had resigned from officership. Organisational documents (both contemporary and historical) were also exegeted in an effort to show how the organisational historical archive has its material effects upon the contemporary experience of participants and thus how discourse produces and works to maintain a particular kind of object named Salvation Army officer.

Analysis of the data revealed that the Salvation Army officer is an object produced by socio/historical forces sustained by the circulation of power/knowledge in contemporary organisational discourses. The discourse seeks its own stability through the very objects it creates – Salvation Army officers. Subjectivity is the result of technologies of power which circulate via discourse and through discursive practices. Through technologies of discipline, self and performance, officer subjectivities are co-created primarily by means of surveillance, assessment and confession.

This study has revealed that through the twin conceptions of divine call and the divinely authorised organisation, the officer life is marked by a narrative of costliness, sacrifice, loss, and radical availability, and an identity that embraces the discursively produced attributes of loyalty, obedience, commitment and conformity. Individual identity within the prescribed limits is formed in the crucible of resistance to the circulation of

power/knowledge.

Through applying a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis I deconstruct and disrupt the ‘invisible and pervasive necessity’ that discursively defines the object Salvation Army officer. I show that there is no overarching ‘realist’ necessity for the object ‘officer’ to be any particular way, save for the historical particularity that acts to produce it in the contemporary world.

Chapter 1
Introduction and Organisational Context – The Salvation Army

Introduction

Generated in the context of Victorian England, The Salvation Army emerged in the latter half of 19th century to become part of the evangelical Christian Church. While many of its methods were novel and for many a traditional churchman disturbing, it was clearly a product of its time and place. The central place of its founder 'General' William Booth and his wife Catherine (whose influence should not be underestimated in the shadow of her husband), the centralised structure, the system of organisational controls, the practices and emergent traditions that became solidified over time, all represent its particularity in time and space. Its emergence while not inevitable was nevertheless determined by the range of possibilities that were located within the intersection of historical discourses that operated at the time.

My interest in this is the emergence of The Salvation Army officer as an object. Even allowing for the way that the Salvation Army officer object was modelled upon the British military of Victorian England, it remains a particular production and construction. It is not a naturally occurring object in the world of objects, but rather one that continues to be produced within particular discourses to serve specific organisational objectives.

Since its inception, the training of Salvation Army officers has been predominantly concerned with forming novice members ('cadets') into a particular and distinct kind of person – a Salvation Army officer. The initial training discourses constructed the Salvation Army officer as a new object not to be confused with ministers, priests or pastors. In seeking to establish an identity for itself, the organisational discourse focussed upon a binary understanding of itself within which 'the Church' and 'the Army' (Salvation Army) were quite disparate entities.

For instance, in the early Salvation Army there was a default suspicion of the educated. Booth feared that they could not (would not) be able to submit to his organisational disciplines. They also constructed the 'educated parson' as the anthesis of The Salvation Army officer, the parson – remote from and disinterested in the needs of the under classes, concerned only for his flock, lacking in genuine love for the lost (read impoverished classes). On the other hand stood the (idealised) Salvation Army officer – generally uneducated, but passionate about the mission to the under classes, willing to

give all to save some and do it as one defined by, and loyal to, the structures of The Salvation Army.

While there has been a shift in organisational perspective concerning the education and training of Salvation Army officers over time (degree level training is now offered at the Training College located at Bexley North – Sydney), the predominate emphasis remains upon producing a particular kind of person – a Salvation Army officer whose identity resonates within the organisational space they will inhabit. The training of Salvation Army officers has been more focussed on producing a particular kind of person who willingly embodies what the organisation aptly calls the 'blood and fire spirit'[1] which should permeate their being. This 'blood and fire spirit' is of course short hand for a particular way of being in the world – an organisationally created and constructed reality or set of discursively determined dispositions, in short an officer identity.

The Objective of this Study

As an organisational member of The Salvation Army I have been an officer for over 22 years, during which time I have worked in parish (Corps) appointments for 10 years and in training and education appointments for 12 years. I come to this research as an organisational insider, produced by the very same processes, forces and discourses that will be the focus of this study.

This study arises from reflection upon my own engagement with organisational life. I, like most novice organisational members was ready and quite willingly to embrace the expectations and disciplines implied in taking up a novice officer identity. What was perhaps initially strange was very quickly embraced or at least accepted as the 'giveness' of organisational membership and practices. Following those early neophyte days, I came to detect an increasing dissonance between how the organisation required me to act, think, perceive and how I was experiencing the world, principally through ongoing study (this was particularly apparent in the conflicted domain of what constituted authorised knowledge and practice). For a time I 'wall papered' over the cracks that were developing for me personally, in a desire to take on the idealised officer identity that the organisation projected as normal and therefore desirable. When I was appointed to a training and education function I became conscious of an

[1] 'Blood and fire' is the motto of The Salvation Army and features in many of its symbols. To produce the 'blood and fire' spirit is stated as the 'supreme aim of training' (The Salvation Army 2005)

intersection of ‘forces.’ On the one hand there was a developing resistance to expected officer cultural norms, and yet on the other hand due to my place in the organisation I found myself acting as an agent for these very same cultural norms and expectations. For me, officership was a conflicted location in which I sought to carve out an ‘identity space’ which allowed me to take up an identity different from the naturalised models that organisation culture promoted, and which I was required to ensure novices adopted.

Over the period I served in the training and education field I became increasingly interested in what a Salvation Army officer identity was and how it was produced in the training setting. I observed first hand how those entrusted with training responsibilities for cadets spoke about the process of the novice member’s professional and personal socialisation into an officer identity. These evaluations ranged from a ‘gut feeling’ (‘I know it when I see it’) to attempts based upon competency based training descriptions utilising the rubrics knowledge, skills and attitudes which tend to be atomistic, overly prescriptive and fail to adequately capture the nuances of the espoused ‘blood and fire spirit’ ideal.

What eluded us in the past, and continues to do so in the present, is an adequate conceptualisation and language with which to understand what this officer professional identity is and how novice members dialogically integrate this identity into their repertoire of ways of being in the world. As I have already intimated, on a personal level I have felt organisation power/knowledge operate upon me and through me, seeking to produce in me a particular kind of professional identity. In many instances this has elicited a response of some level of resistance to what are considered by many of my colleagues as the natural, the expected, even the incontestable truths of organisational life. Sometimes when my resistances found articulation through various questions and contestations the response would be some variation of ‘that’s the way we do it, because that’s who we are.’ To belong to this organisation requires a particular set of values, characteristics and practices that conform to the power/knowledge that circulates to create a particular organisational identity, a subset of which is individual identity. Such resistances which I speculate may be the product of my location in multiple discourses particularly due to many years of study at various denominational Church institutions and so called ‘secular’ universities have destabilised the normality of organisational life and practice. In a sense this has led to my own personal journey of ‘rendering strange’ what was once normalised and taken for granted. While this study is not intended or designed to be a therapeutic exercise

through which I attempt to excise personal organisational demons, it is clear that I have a vested interest in finding a way of coherently understanding how officers are produced, why certain selections are made in terms of what is valued in individual officer identities, and why some appear to find themselves located on the margins of organisational life and thus the implied relative valuing of the individual.

I wish to render visible the transparent and normalised ways that define being officer and that are manifest through discourse. I will attempt to achieve this by disrupting and deconstructing the 'invisible and pervasive necessity' that discursively defines the object - Salvation Army officer. As we shall see in the following chapters, Foucault maintained that power/knowledge circulates through the discourse producing particular objects (in this instance Salvation Army officers) and associated subjectivities. Power operates upon all and is most effective when it is hidden from view – normalising subjects so that they operate as if the discursive world were not a product, but *the* reality and can therefore be no other way. Through this research I hope to disrupt what is normal and natural in the officer discourse to show that there is no overarching realist necessity for the object 'officer' to be any particular way, save for the historical particularity that acts to produce it in the contemporary world.

It is my hope that if I can adequately show that 'officer' is not a naturally occurring object nor a necessity of history, that this might impact how the organisation treats (through technologies of discipline) those whose officer professional identity has been deemed to be an aberration to be marginalised or rejected. Recognising that 'officer' is a social construct rather than produced through divine fiat, may generate a conversation concerning how 'officer' can be deconstructed and reconfigured in other ways that recognise the significant changes in socio-cultural location that the modern Salvation Army operates in, and draws its officers from. If this research has enough explanatory power then this might allow the organisation to reconfigure the way it automatically responds to individual resistances as something to be overcome, broken down or pushed through so that those who dare hold them are reintegrated (or redeemed) into the normalised organisational way of being. Rather, resistances and the individual subjectivities that generate them may be embraced as opportunities for opening up new possibilities, for new ways of being. In such an unstable discursive space resistance, difference, diversity may become generative, and 'natural necessities' challenged as potential bind spots.

Through surfacing the circulation of power/knowledge and the way that this shapes

individual identity through various technologies, this research offers a way of understanding the purposes and intent of training (and producing) Salvation Army officers. Relatively recently there has been a move to allow some cadets to undertake a significant portion of their training in distance mode (the majority continue to be trained residentially). Through appreciating the significance of discourse for identity formation through technologies of self, technologies of discipline, and technologies of government, the organisation might also be better placed to make intentional choices concerning the objectives of training, its mechanisms, the modes through which it is delivered, and the ways that novices learn to be officer.

Hence my research question:
How does organisational discourse co-create a particular Salvation Army officer professional identity in novice members?

The Contemporary Organisational Context

Organisational life is a rich and complex landscape within which members are expected to operate effectively to achieve organisational objectives. To accomplish this, novice members need to acquire the necessary abilities, dispositions and ways of being to negotiate the socio-cultural topography which creates organisational reality with its many demands and pitfalls. All organisations have a unique but nonetheless powerful culture which makes sense of organisational reality as it is experienced by members. This shared way of 'being in the world' is mediated via the multiple discourses which have currency within the organisation. Discourse determines the range and type of actions, language, and symbols which are meaningful and appropriate within the organisational context (Rosen 1985, p33). In effect organisational discourse acts upon the novice to normalise behaviours, beliefs and practices such that the individual learns what it is to be, and operate as a member of a particular organisation with all its local taken-for-granted understandings. In this particular study I focus upon determining how organisational discourses create particular kinds of subjectivities for new members as they strive to become a Salvation Army 'officer.' However while I acknowledge that 'narrative learning' an approach which seeks to address the processes through which learners at a cognitive level, intersect new concepts with past experience expressed through story (which I dip into in chapter three), and 'learning in organisations' could have provided an equally fruitful theoretical basis for this research, I chose to construct learning in discursive terms, as a technology for constructing particular kinds of subjects (Foucault 1984, p123). In concert with this I also recognise that cadet training may also be understood from other

perspectives such as political, psychological and spiritual, but these cannot be pursued within the terms of this present study.

The organisational context of this study is The Salvation Army - Australia Eastern Territory (ACT, NSW, QLD)[2] which is primarily a denomination within the evangelical Christian Church. Appreciating the religious dimension is profoundly important for developing an understanding of organisational membership. Like other Christian denominations The Salvation Army has clergy which in accord with the organisation's military metaphor are called 'officers.' Officers are normally drawn from among the laity (called soldiers) who may offer themselves for full time (culturally understood – 'life time') ministry.

In terms of process a solider makes application to divisional leadership (similar to a diocese in Anglican terms). Once the application is received the individual is known as an 'applicant' (which represents a new discursively constructed identity). The applicant then undergoes various vetting procedures (background checks, assessment by local corps officer (minister), feedback assessment by members of the local congregation, articulation of a clear rationale that explicates their desire to be an officer, psychological testing etc.). The application is then processed to the Territorial Candidates Board. The chair of this board is the Territorial Commander who is responsible for all the work of The Salvation Army for an assigned geographical area[3] (in this case the Australia Eastern Territory which as noted above encompasses NSW, ACT, and QLD). Should the application be accepted, the applicant becomes known as a 'candidate' which means they are normally accepted for training to commence in the following year.

Candidates are expected to complete some preparatory training (mainly of a practical nature) prior to the normal two year residential training period. At the commencement of this two year period of training the candidate transitions to being known as a 'cadet.' This naming is a way of creating particular discursive subjectivities which indexes their identity and thus their relative distribution of power and how they are treated (arranged)

[2] I recognise that organisational discourses are bounded and not universal although one may identify a hierarchy of discourses (within the international Salvation Army) which impact local discourses (intertextuality). Where appropriate I will try to identify how the hierarchy has mediated local manifestations of 'officer' discourses. In this thesis we are concerned only with the Australia Eastern Territory and thus all references to The Salvation Army assume this context unless otherwise stated.

[3] It should be noted in accord with the military metaphor, the Territorial Commander takes the final decision in all aspects of the Army's work (other members of boards are advisory only).

within the organisational officer training discourse. It should be noted that unlike some other denominations, by the time the candidate transitions to cadet through entering training there is a general assumption that the individual will proceed to becoming an officer. There are of course exceptions to this practice such as cadets withdrawing of their own volition or being terminated, and some who get to the end of training and are either delayed from progressing or are refused. Thus while there is an aspect of the 'try and see' to establish if this is the right course of action, overwhelmingly the general expectation (and pressure) is that cadets proceed through training to become officers of The Salvation Army.

While there are regular formal reviews of cadet progression and performance (as defined by the officer discourse), near the end of this two year period the cadet undergoes a final review process from which recommendations are made to the Territorial Commander concerning the cadet's suitability to be accepted as an officer. Part of this review is the satisfactory completion of training (which interestingly does not necessarily mean that the cadet meets all the requirements of the training course which is built around a Diploma of Theology qualification). Rather it would appear that the degree to which the individual has accepted the personal values, attributes and character which are created and assigned by the 'officer' discourse form the basis of any recommendations. If accepted by the Territorial Commander (irrespective of the recommendations from the Training College), the cadet signs an officer's undertakings document and officer's covenant and is commissioned and ordained as an officer of The Salvation Army with the rank of Lieutenant which they hold for the first five years service (following satisfactory completion of this period they will normally attain the rank of Captain).

Organisational Culture

In considering how to approach and frame the questions that form the basis of this research I initially sought to situate my thinking and reflection in the 'organisational culture' literature. It seemed to me that what I experienced and was observing were indeed aspects of culture which produces the taken for granted assumptions that we hold and the shared practices that define a social (organisational) group.

Within the discipline of anthropology for example, the study of culture has included aspects such as narratives, rites, and rituals of indigenous peoples. In essence the methods employed among anthropologists were directed toward the collection of narratives as much as observing rituals and customs which only make sense within a

narrative framework. Culture as a social phenomenon includes social artefacts such as documents, institutions, architecture, art, icons, rituals and beliefs all of which can be read as texts. As Geertz argues, to get at the meaning which lies behind and within socially established patterns, an anthropologist can interpret them as 'texts' of a sort, models of and for reality and social interaction (Geertz 1973, p6). If we accept social reality or culture as text or as multiple narratives, organisation culture can similarly be viewed as text or narrative. These narratives are created via language, and have their own grammars which account for the ways of acting.

Since the 1980's the notion of organisational culture and its utility for the achievement of organisational outcomes has increasingly become part of both the popular and scholarly literary landscape. It is employed in various ways to speak about the complex nature of organisational social life. On the level of practices and behaviour culture has been simply viewed by some in terms of the pragmatic 'how we do things around here' (Deal & Kennedy 1983). Others understand organisational culture in terms of concepts, underlying practices such as the beliefs, values and attitudes that shape how members perceive and interpret events providing meaning and cues for the formation of rules which govern patterns of behaviour (Trefry 2006, p564). As new organisational members are 'enculturated' they begin to inhabit the organisationally normalised ways of perceiving, thinking, and acting (Schein 1992, p99).

In this way culture can itself be conceptualised as learning in terms of how individuals become organisational members through a process of adaptation and socialisation. Thus culture operates as a way of creating organisational reality and ways of being in the world (as socially constructed within the organisation). Potential members are expected to learn what it means to be and act within this constructed reality through adoption and participation in its narratives. All organisational members inhabit a culturally created and defined space within which they understand themselves and perceive others.

In seeking to apply a cultural approach to my research question, it soon became apparent that a limitation of the purely cultural perspective was that it tended to ignore the broader social historical influences which act upon founders as well as organisational members. The founder and those who later join the organisation are not free agents unconstrained in identity and practice, but are subjectivities constructed by socio-historical forces. The cultural account of organisational existence also tends toward being reductionist in the way it simplifies organisation experience to one of 'fit'

with pre-existent and predetermined organisational culture. If culture is understood as a dynamic social phenomenon produced and reproduced through social interaction, then it may be said to exist discursively via the agency of symbol, language, and practices. Thus cultural narratives are produced and modified over time as organisational members interact both within organisational space but also across other discursive locations. I detected a significant overlap in the conceptualisation of culture and discourse particularly since both terms can be employed in such broad ways by theorists and researchers alike. Alvesson represents an attempt to pry these two ideas apart somewhat. For him 'culture refers to a socially shared orientation to social reality created through the negotiation of meaning and the use of symbolism in social interactions … Culture is then understood to be a system of common symbols and meanings, not the totality of a group's way of life' (Alvesson 2004, p318). Discourse on the other hand, he maintains, is focused on language and language use, how it constructs phenomena and surfaces meaning as it is constituted in discursive acts (Alvesson 2004, p328-329). These insights led me away from a purely cultural perspective to consider a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis as providing a more generative theorisation for appreciating the socio-historical dimension and the way that power/knowledge circulates via language producing statements that create a particular organisational reality, and individual identity.

Thesis Outline

In the chapters that follow, I will attempt to outline the theoretical perspectives that undergird and frame this study. The social world of meaning is constructed through discourse, including our very identities which emerge from it, for without discourse there is no social reality (Herackous 2004, p177). I have chosen Foucauldian Discourse Analysis as my theoretical lens because I am interested in the macro level of how ways of talking about a particular topic (in this instance the object Salvation Army officer) create the object in the specificity of its particular historical, social and institutional context. I intend to examine how the object officer comes to be 'through talk' within the localised institution of The Salvation Army in the Australian Eastern Territory. A Foucauldian approach within the diverse approaches to discourse analysis offers productive techniques to analyse the ways in which individual members of the organisation are discursively constituted and thus how discourse produces effects in the real world of human action and being. Through this approach I intend to produce a satisfying and generative account of the processes through which objects (officers) are 'talked into being' and the identity positions they take up through the discursive resources available to them.

In chapters two and three I attempt to introduce the critical ideas associated with two foundational theorisations – a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis, and narrative identity formation. In these chapters I endeavour to critically examine selected key ideas that will form the basis of this study and frame my data analysis. For those familiar with a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis I will explore the epistemological commitments which ground such analysis. In terms of my approach I will attend to technologies of the self (organisational subjectivities or identities), technologies of discipline (organisational surveillance and controls), and to a lesser extent technologies of government (organisational modification). In tandem with this I will attempt to develop a conceptualisation of identity and how it is formed. In this I take up a constructivist stance that understands identity as fragmented, unstable and constructed across the discourses that individuals inhabit. This identity is the product of discursive interventions within particular institutions at particular historical moments. Through the stories (narratives) we tell about ourselves to ourselves and to others, we construct local and temporal versions of identity to serve political and social ends. Thus subjectivity (identity) is discursively produced. In effect discourses speak through us, and in us. Yet this is not to reduce existence to a kind of discursive determinism produced through the circulation of power/knowledge. I maintain that while Foucault's account of discourse has been criticised by some as 'agentless' (Reed 1998, p197), and thus closing off the possibilities for individual agency, Foucault also attends to the notion of resistances. In fact the very resistances power/knowledge seeks to eradicate are points at which an idiosyncratic individuality might emerge.

Chapter four represents my account of methodology. In this chapter I make explicit my assumptions around choices of analytic, design, and analysis. I seek to justify my choice of Foucauldian discourse analysis for this project, and yet also indicate some of its theoretical limitations. I make explicit my epistemological assumptions in taking up a social constructivist position, and further demonstrate my reflexive consciousness as insider researcher. I explain my research design and give an account of the participant selection processes. In terms of research tools, I provide a rationale for in-depth interviewing for producing co-constructed narratives, together with the prudent use of historical and contemporary organisational texts and documents which contain programmatic statements that seek to create, define and maintain the object officer. Finally I provide a detailed description of how the data analysis was undertaken, and the limitations of this project.

Chapters five, six and seven embody my detailed analysis of the research data sourced through interviews and organisational documents. Drawing upon the theorisations discussed in chapters two and three I attempt to explore the ways in which individuals speak their officer identity into being. I highlight points of resistance within the organisational officer discourse, and the spaces in which participants experience what I name as 'discoursal incoherence.' I identify the regimes of truth that create and regulate officer objects and the complex ways that participants experienced these truths. Analysis of the narratives together with organisational materials revealed several fundamental truths that construct officer: Officers are produced as subjectivities that are defined by loyalty, obedience, hard work, commitment and conformity (in their particular organisational nuances) which are scaffolded by the circulation of power/knowledge that creates and supports these values and how they are strategically operationalised through 'technologies of discipline' in the formation of 'officer' (object and subject) organisationally.

As my conclusion, chapter eight is an attempt to bring the main points of this research together. In this chapter I discuss what the research has revealed about the dimensions of the normalised officer identity and the strategies that individuals employ in their attempts to resist the circulation of power/knowledge as it acts upon them to produce this identity. I also attempt to highlight both the surprises that emerged from my analysis of the data, and offer a concise summary of 'the silences' that I detected in the officer discourse (what cannot be said, or perhaps even thought). As part of bringing the research together I also offer some suggestions for further research opportunities that may be productive in the future, and the possible ways in which the knowledge produced in thesis may be used.

Chapter 2

Theorisation I - Discourse

The theoretical perspective of discourse which forms the basis of this research is drawn from the work of Michel Foucault. Before exploring some of Foucault's ideas that are pertinent to this research I must first offer a brief statement concerning the ways, and extent to which I draw upon Foucault's work. As will become all too apparent to readers who are familiar with Foucault, I have not attempted to use all of Foucault's ideas and those I have employed may not be used in exactly the same way that he utilised them. I draw particularly upon Foucault's insights concerning power/knowledge, technologies of the self, and technologies of discipline in relation to discourse, and intersect these with a conceptualisation of self narrated performative identity. I believe that this approach is consistent with Foucault's intention that '[w]hat I say ought to be taken as 'propositions', 'game openings' where those who may be interested are invited to join in – they are not meant as dogmatic assertions to be taken or left en bloc' (Foucault 2000, p224).

Discourse

Discourse theory is employed in a diverse range of approaches from linguistic studies to literature and philosophy. Discourse represents a way of understanding how particular ways of being, thinking and acting become normalised in a community. For instance in linguistics, discourse often refers to the speech patterns and use of language, dialects, and acceptable statements, within a community. Others take up the position that discourse describes texts (oral, written and embodied) and the meaning behind them utilised by a group of people who hold certain ideas and values in common (reminiscent of our description of culture above). Discourse theory seeks to analyse the way these systems of shared meaning shape the way people understand their place and role in social locations and how this impacts (if not determines) socio-political activity. In the main it is this second perspective which might be broadly describe as critical post-structural, which will inform my research into the formation of Salvation Army officer identity.

Foucault took up a critical stance in his historical accounts of scientific discourses. He sought to describe the underlying discursive regularities and how they effect and transform the broader social and political processes of which they are a part (Foucault 1972). In this framework discourses are utterances, representations and practices that are available within any historically determined position. They are formed around a

common set of taken-for-granted assumptions which privilege certain modes of self expression, ways of being in the world, even the constitution of what counts as knowledge and thus what questions can be legitimately posed, in fact can even enter into subjective consciousness. Discourses are reconstructions of the *material conditions* of thought or 'knowledges' (Kendall & Wickham 1999, p35). Thus Foucault argues that discourse does not describe social reality; it creates and constitutes social reality for those who are member participants of the discourse (Danaher 2000, p16).

Some realist critics have argued that the category of discourse reduces everything to thought or language and thus denies the existence of realty beyond that which is produced within our thoughts or consciousness. Discourse theory does not preclude one from acknowledging that there are objects in the world which are not 'created' by discursive practices (such as the computer I am sitting before as I type this *thought*). However, what this object 'computer' *means* within any particular discourse may vary substantially because it may well be assigned different meanings and values within different discourses. For instance within the community of which I am a participant, the computer is a useful, if not *now* indispensable tool for the accomplishment of various tasks assigned to me and thus framed as necessary to organisational participation. In other discursive formations 'computer' could be constructed as a time wasting device which diminishes productivity through constant emails (read 'interruptions') or as distractions from real work (ie. social networking phenomenon like 'face book'). The object computer comes to have quite different meanings and thus utility in the different social worlds constructed within and by different discourses (Laclau & Mouffe 2001). Thus epistemologically the object talked about within a discourse does not exist outside of discourse positions, or as Howarth expresses it,

> '…there is no 'extra-discursive' realm of *meaningful* objects … from a discourse perspective, for objects to be meaningful they must be part of a wider discursive framework. Thus, meanings cannot be reduced either to the world of (extra-discursive) objects, or to the realm of ideas or concepts' (2002, p127-128).

Since the Enlightenment, many intuitively hold that the subject is an intentional and free actor, the primary agent of social action and the creator of meaning. Foucault on the other hand maintained that the subject is historically contingent; so that discourses are not the result of the free actions and choices of individual subjects. All subjectivity is the result of technologies of power which circulates via discourse and discursive practices. Discourse defines and produces the objects of our knowledge and thus does not

describe social reality as a pre-existent object, but rather creates it within the 'boundedness' of our shared taken for granted assumptions which are themselves of discursive origin. Thus subjectivity is the point where interaction between the techniques of domination and the techniques of the self occurs. The contact point where individuals are driven (and known) by others and is tied to the way they conduct themselves, and know themselves (Foucault 1997).

In Foucauldian terms 'knowledge' is a set of conditional and contingent statements which are either explicitly or implicitly, represented as absolute, universal and necessary in order to achieve the objectives of a particular discourse. Claims for 'truth' are little more than an attempt to privilege particular knowledge claims, in contestation to those truth claims made from within other discourses. Thus in discursive terms universal truth cannot exist as such claims are always historically conditioned and contingent.

For Foucault there is an inextricable link between knowledge embedded in discourse and the power that enables some discourses to be more dominant than others (Mackey 2007, p97). Power via the constitution of knowledge is also distributed across various subjectivities within the discourse thus positioning what can be articulated or questioned and that which cannot and by whom. Thus discourse produces subjectivities which may participate within the discourse (sharing taken-for-granted assumptions) constraining the possibilities of language and action, which I maintain are not fully determined, while also creating subjectivities which are 'other' and thus constructed as outsiders who are not authorised to participate discursively from their speech position. For instance up to this point in the Salvation Army cultural context, laity [non-officers] are not invited (note the power relations this implies) to engage to any significant degree in the training discourses that form the professional identity of officers, simply because they are 'not officer.' In effect they do not have an effective 'speech position' within the discourse.

Language both reflects and constructs the situation or context in which it is deployed. We not only communicate socially via the agency of language, but we think ourselves (discursively) into being through language. As Bernstein maintains, language is not a tool but the medium in which we live and create meaning (Bernstein 1983, p145). Human existence is not merely a series of open and disconnected events, but rather experience is events in search of narrative, because events or actions imply intentions. Foucault focused upon groups who were named in social discourses as 'sick', 'mentally

ill', 'prisoner' (which created a particular subjectivity which may then be controlled and treated by society in particular ways). Thus within discourses there are no objective positions, but rather the discourse itself regulates our approach to ourselves and each other through the establishment of 'regimes of truth' and the closely associated exercise of power. However, we should also recognise that while discourses seek to dominate texts in order to make them understandable within a particular institutional habitus, other discourses are also present and thus interact in ways that might potentially produce reconstructions for change (Boyes 2004, p113).

Similarly I would argue that such discursive practices (activities produced by discourses) co-create the subjectivities 'candidate', 'cadet' and 'officer.' These are discursive positions produced in and by discourse which establish regimes of truth and knowledge that regulate our approach to ourselves (our identity) and each other (Anderson 2003, p3; Foucault 1980a, p93; Jacobs 2006, p.40). These discursive positions reflect discursively 'prepared' social roles which define identity and the range of possible ways of being (social role) within the discourse. For instance the very naming of particular subjectivities as 'candidate', 'cadet' and 'officer' which are often used as forms of address helps create or change social relationships and also index a set of conventional expectations. Someone assigned an identity in one group, for example 'cadet,' is expected to construct their identity and role performance according to those created by the discursive formation (and as we will see in chapter three under *Narrative Identity Formation*, from the range of ontological narratives available to them to frame their own narrative of self). This could be something as profoundly simple as the selection of an appropriate form of address which indexes a particular social identity and discourse role. For example the idea that within the hierarchal culture of The Salvation Army a territorial leader can invite others to use a first name form of address (rather than their rank - 'Commissioner') simply attempts to mask the relative social identities which will continue to operate (Johnstone 2008). Clearly discourse has real effects in the world of everyday practice and lived experience. Understanding that our social discourse creates reality has significant implications for how we understand the past (history) which is always encroaching on our present and casting its shadow over our future. For instance if a particular problem arises which requires a decision concerning what course of action to take, the range of available actions/responses which present themselves are the products of the discourse(s) within which the problem itself emerges, and as such are historically (discursively) determined.

A Foucauldian Perspective

Michel Foucault is recognised as among the most influential so-called post-modern theorists. Instead of taking up the essentialist or absolutist versions of human activities and meanings which were part of the prevailing Marxist and phenomenological philosophies and exerted considerable influence upon intellectual life in post war France, Foucault attempted to contextualise and historicise the different kinds of truth, knowledge and rationality which had been produced by cultures. While Foucault denied that his texts were structuralist works, he appears to draw upon insights offered by structuralism. For instance following the work of Saussure, structuralism understood meaning as relational (rather than in any sense absolute). Words, events, ideas and activities were not meaningful in themselves, but only as they related to other words, events, ideas and activities. Secondly, structuralism extended Heidegger's insight that people are not really free agents in the world. Individuals think and act in particular ways because they (and their ideas and activities) are produced by the structures (social, political, cultural) in which they exist. According to this perspective, people are not free agents who think or enact ideas, rather structures 'think and act' through people. The notion of a 'free subject' is actually the product of a culture which *creates* our thinking and behaviours (about free subjects). However, for Foucault the structuralist approach also had its shortcomings. For instance while such an approach may be able to account for everything in, for example an 'object' in a particular period of history, what it failed to describe was that which is not present - the repressed silences which powerfully shape the object, the things which cannot be said or thought. Like Saussure's theory of language, structuralism could account for the rules that make a particular system coherent, it could not in the end, account for people's activities (Danaher 2000, p9).

Foucault describes his archaeological approach to history as one in which he seeks to focus on the particular, rather than as do traditional versions of history, on the totality of what is said on a topic or at a time.

> The analysis of the discursive field is orientated in a quite different way; we must grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show what other forms of statements it excludes (Foucault 1972, p28).

Thus *archaeological* analysis is not concerned with what ought to be, as if seeking to find resolution to contradictions, but is concerned with discursive practices as they are

at a particular point in time. At that point in time the present practice is influenced by past practice. This is not to suggest some linear unified evolution of thought, but rather discursive practices may compete with one another seeking dominance as they are embodied in the wills of speakers (Budd 2006, p73). As we shall observe, Foucault was also influenced by the insights offered by Friedrich Nietzsche, particularly concerning the relationships among truth, knowledge and power. Knowledge or truth that emerges in a culture is the product of 'the powerful' exercising power to impose their will over others. There is thus no one inevitable version of truth, but rather many possible versions many of which are silenced or written out (sometimes violently).

In *The Order of Things* (1974), Foucault challenges notions that seek to maintain that over time there is more or less continuity in how humans experience and make sense of the world. Rather he maintained that there is no continuity or progress, but rather periods of history which were organised around their own specific world views (epistemes). These epistemes are not the product of the historical evolution of ideas into 'higher' forms, but rather mark the sudden appearance of a different way of viewing the world. An episteme is something like a way of understanding the world which is specific to a time and place; a set of understandings which enable us to construct sense of the world. The episteme is the product of certain organising principles which relate things to one another (by classifying things and assigning them meanings and values) and which as a result, determine how we make sense of things, what we can know, and what we can say (Danaher 2000, p15-17). The episteme is not part of our consciousness (always before us informing questions and practices), they are the taken-for-granted ground from which we operate and know in the world. Epistemes operate through the production of discursive formations which are its organising principle. They make meaningful speech possible through their organisation of ideas or concepts to produce objects of knowledge. Thus knowledge produced in our episteme is our 'truth', but because our episteme forms the ground of that truth, it becomes (or should become) everybody's truth as well, which automatically implies an exercise of power.

Thus discourses are something approaching frames which bound a particular body of statements. They are specific events of language use, for instance minutes, texts, legal documents, orders and regulations, speeches, conversations etc. The basic unit of discourse is the statement (*énouncé*) which is the building block of discourse. Foucault appears to take a functionalist position that statements are not propositions or sentences, rather they are units of language use, 'the statement is not therefore a

structure … it is a function' (Foucault 1972, p86; Sawyer 2002, p438). The statement is the smallest unit which brings forth phenomenon through enunciation (in effect statements approximate speech acts). Thus a statement is only a statement if it creates objects which are discursive objects constructed, classified and identified by the statement itself, so a statement is a function of existence that enables groups of signs to exist. Of course the rules for the existence of statements have to do with historically variable bodies of knowledge; they are the rules for what it is possible to know at a particular point in history.

The statement creates the object to which it refers through enunciation. The enunciation of the object implies that it is brought into existence as a social and discursive fact and can therefore be articulated (Anderson 2003, p11). Thus the statement is a special mode of existence which serves to enable groups of signs to exist, and enables rules or forms to become manifest (Foucault 1972, p99). Foucault focused his analysis on practice which is verbal performance, and thus defined discourses in functional terms, as combinations of speech acts (Sawyer 2002, p440). These discursive objects are not things which exist independent of discourse, as though the discourse simply refers to or describes the object. Rather objects for Foucault are 'objects of knowledge' which are recognised within their particular fields of interest. Moreover these objects do not remain stable but are subject to transformation both between discursive formations and within given discursive formations. This means that a discursive formation needs to be defined in such a way so as to allow for the transformation of its objects. A discursive formation is a grouping of statements that can be delimited and individualised. In effect all statements re-actualise other statements in some way, thus paving the way for potential future statements (Anderson 2003, p12), a conceptualisation which is similar to the notion of 'intertextuality' as employed by Kristeva

My interest is less about the ways that discourse is structured by internal rules which are constitutive of the discourse itself, that is the linguistic perspective, than discourse as it consists of groups of related statements (*enounces*) which interrelate to produce meanings and effects in the world we inhabit and is thus productive of subjectivities within the discourse. A statement can only be regarded as a statement if it creates subject positions that can be signed over to individuals, that is, if the statement creates discursive spaces from which something can be stated. Subjects do not stand outside of the statement; conversely the statement articulates the space and possibility of subjects (Anderson 2003, p11). In effect statements within what I shall assign as the

'officer' discourse, enable the object 'officer' to appear as an object, in fact such statements *constitute* the discursive object itself. The range of possible statements is limited by the discourse within which they emerge, generally based upon a set of common assumptions which, as stated above may be taken for granted and thus rendered invisible. These statements which are re-actualisations of previous statements within the discourse emerge as one choice among the many possible actualisations.

As an organising principle, discursive formations make particular speech choices possible through organising ideas or concepts by which objects of knowledge are produced. The object of knowledge is actually a discursively produced object which comes to be accepted as truth. In this regard, Foucault identified three factors: disciplines, commentary and the author. We noted above how Foucault focused upon groups who were named in social discourses as 'sick', 'mentally ill', 'prisoner' and how such groups are assigned a particular objectivity. The discourse of mental illness for instance is very tightly controlled by those who are the keepers of the disciplines and institutions who are authorised to name, describe (and prescribe) what constitutes mental illness. These discipline experts through their participation in 'professional training' are inculcated into the received knowledge mediated via the discourse (including texts such as books, articles, conference papers, policy documents etc.) which provide commentary on, and therefore actually produce the object 'mental illness.' This object is quite different from the 'madness' which was produced by discursive formations four hundred years ago (perhaps the object would be demon possession). During the Renaissance, madness was not considered to be a disease or illness and the mad were not excluded from the rest of society. Rather they were considered to be under the influence of 'folly' a benign or even a wise and revelatory mode of thought. The great confinement of the mad was, therefore, neither a necessary nor inevitable development (McHoul & Grace 1993, p15). Thus it is discourse which in any given historical period constrains and enables what can be written, said or thought about a given social object or practice, as in our case Salvation Army officer.

Often, accepted disciplinary knowledge is organised around revered names within the discourse ie. particular authors, theoreticians, philosophers who hold a privileged place in the discipline's canon. Those who practice in the discipline continually reinterpret the artefacts produced by such significant 'names' resulting in commentary after commentary each offering some different perspective or insight into the work of these

authors (in one sense this thesis offers commentary on the work of the so 'canonised' Michel Foucault - which is itself rather ironic!). The combinations of disciplines, commentary, and authors coheres together to produce 'the' (rather than 'a') truth of for example 'Salvation Army Officers' and works to silence any position which fails to conform within the discursive formation (Danaher 2000, p31).

Discourse is constitutive in that it contributes to the production, transformation, and reproduction of the objects and subjects of social life (Fairclough 1995, p41). Foucault refers to the unity of discourse as the space in which objects emerge and are continuously transformed (Foucault 1972, p32). This space is defined as the relationship between specific institutions, economic and social processes, behavioural patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterisation, a relationship which constitutes the rules of formation for objects (Fairclough 1995, p42). Thus a discourse may be seen to have a number of identifiable components: *objects* (the things they study or produce), *operations* (the methods and techniques or 'ways of treating' these objects), *concepts* (terms and ideas which are routinely found in the discipline and which may constitute its unique language), and *theoretical options* (those different assumptions, theories and perhaps even hypotheses available within the discipline, and which might oblige a physicist for example, to 'decide' between relativity theory and quantum mechanics) (McHoul & Grace 1993, p44).

Since discourses are the languages, representations and practices that are available in a historically specific context, it is clear that the status and dominance of a discourse is a product of power relations. Following Nietzsche we might suggest that where there is meaning, there may be found the indicators of the struggles, contestations and at times violence which produced it. As discussed above, Foucault saw that there is an inextricable link between knowledge which itself is the product of discourse and the power that enables some discourses to be more dominant than others (Mackey 2007, p97). Knowledge created within and by discourse reinforces and sustains existing 'regimes of truth' (Foucault 1980a, p131) which operate to determine what is legitimate and closes off other possibilities of conception. This power/knowledge acts in covert ways upon subjectivities within the discourse such that they are generally unaware of its operation (hegemony). Foucault understood that power which is acting upon subjects forming them in particular ways is most effective when it is hidden from view. Yet this is not to say that power is solely a device to be wielded by particular subjectivities – 'the powerful.' Power does not belong to any one or any particular

group but rather is distributed across discursive networks. Yet power can be, and often is, exercised oppressively. Foucault stressed that the play of power does produce systematic power relations and that there are rulers and the ruled, dominators and the dominated (Foucault 1980a, p97). While it is clear that power acts upon people in non-egalitarian ways, it is also the case that power acts upon all – the dominated and dominant. All are written upon by social institutions such as family, schools, universities, bureaucracies, medical and hospitals, religions, either directly, or indirectly through the circulation of discourses throughout the culture (Danaher 2000, p74).

> Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything because it comes from everywhere …. power comes from below; that is there is no binary and all encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix - no such duality extending from the top down and re-acting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. One must suppose rather that the manifold relations of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups and institutions, are the basis of a wide ranging effects of cleavage that ran through the social body as a whole (Foucault 1979, p93-94).

While discourses represent political interests, in Foucault's analysis power is not simply always repressive, but a productive concept which via the operation of webs of power enable certain knowledge to be produced and 'known' (Cheek 2004, p1143). Therefore, there is a recursive relationship between language and power, language practices produce and are in turn shaped by power relations. Power/knowledge is a fluid concept, sometimes resistive, other times meeting resistance, it moves throughout organisations and social structures in ways more like a capillary action than a direct flow mechanism (Butler 1999).

In the context of The Salvation Army, power leaves its mark through for instance the production of 'orders and regulations', official minutes, rules, the repetition of practices and the creation of norms. Most pointedly, as alluded to above, power is exercised by the universalising of particular knowledges. To distinguish these types of power from the power exercised by the State or by a sovereign, Foucault coined the phrase the 'micro-physics' of power, or 'micro-power'. He insisted that micro-power, in particular power located in sites away from the central locations of macro-power, had become a defining characteristic of power (Foucault 1981; Foucault 1990).

Bio-power

According to Foucault people act and think as a product of the power/knowledge that is produced within and by discourses (Foucault 1977, p194). Prior to the Renaissance, power was held by particular groups or individuals (ie. the church or monarchy) who exercised such power in coercive ways to achieve their goals. Foucault observed that following the Renaissance there developed a very different approach to the exercise of power arising out of the knowledge produced by the human sciences which provided the basis for technologies that sought to control, regulate and define the human body and its associated behaviours. Foucault called this *bio-power*. Bio-power 'brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life' (Foucault 1981, p143). The knowledge produced by the human sciences (via disciplines) provided the state with a mechanism to regulate and control their populations to serve the ends and interests of the state. Tied to this was the development of an administrative apparatus which once again drew its knowledge from the human sciences in producing 'policing' institutions which were not only concerned with criminal activity, but also included areas such as health and welfare that constructed individuals and groups in particular ways (Danaher 2000, p65).

Education is one such procedure through which discursive practices are socially controlled and constrained. In this regard Foucault maintained that any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledges and powers which they carry (Foucault 1984, p123). Knowledge is something which creates us as subjects of its power because we make sense of ourselves and our place in the complex social webs of interaction by referring back to various bodies of knowledge. However, while individual identity is produced discursively, at the same time individuals also become the medium of power. 'The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent that it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle' (Foucault 1980a, p98).

Knowledge is the result of the power struggles across different fields, institutions and disciplines and is employed to authorise and legitimate the exercise of power. For instance as candidates enter into The Salvation Army College setting they are embarking upon a process which will see them transition from various identities (perhaps defined in terms of employment positions 'worker', 'manager,' 'professional') toward embodying a student/emergent officer identity. While engagement with

particular academic disciplines to achieve the appropriate credentialing (as part of their authorisation to practice) is accepted, the individual must also negotiate the College system which will act upon them to create a particular kind of identity. The system is set up to mould these people into the kinds of officers the organisation requires for the future – 'officers with the blood and fire spirit' (The Salvation Army 1991, p7) (we will examine this as part of the broader organisational discourse in the research phase). For now we will simply note that the cadet will be required to make themselves known to the system so that it can monitor progress, make judgements, and via the exercise of bio-power 'create' particular kinds of people who will serve the needs of the organisation.

Foucault's genealogical approach (following Nietzsche's investigation of the historical origins of powerful institutions and discourses which drew their power from claims to universality) focused on the ways that discursive power works on bodies. Basically power works to write its effects onto our embodied selves, that is discursive power shapes how we act and the ways we think in the world (Danaher 2000, p75). Genealogy seeks to describe the procedures, practices and institutions involved in the production of discourses, knowledge and their power effects. For Foucault the mechanisms of power subtly reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday life (Foucault 1980a, p39).

Foucault's genealogical approach is an attempt to map the strategies, relations and practices of power which create knowledge and in which knowledges are embedded (Carabine 2001, p273). The effect of this is to produce subjectivities who in conforming to or embracing the power/knowledge produced by and within discursive practices, are themselves incorporated into the ideological aspirations of the social entity through hegemony (in the context of this study this will be the organisational entity – The Salvation Army). I employ the concept of ideology here not simply as a way of articulating a false consciousness based upon true/false distinctions, but rather as a category which seeks total closure in which there is no recognition of 'an other' or outside which constitutes that discourse (Howarth 2002, p131).

While I maintain that for this kind of study the explanatory power of a discursive approach is evident from what I have argued above, I nonetheless want to introduce a note of caution. In my view discourse does not account for subjectivity in its entirety. While generative in terms of how language powerfully creates realities through

statements that are accepted as normative, the discursive approach does not take adequate account of the non-linguistic elements that also constitute subjectivity such as emotion and cognition.

Discipline

As we have already observed, discourse employs technologies of power to write upon individual subjectivities. Foucault through his genealogical analysis identified how these technologies act upon bodies to produce normalised forms of control upon bodily dispositions, in terms of behaviours and ways of thinking about the 'social self.' For instance in military induction training, soldiers are acted upon to produce particular types of subjectivities which will operate in normalised ways (as determined by the prevailing discursive practices). Similarly Foucault discerned analogous technologies of discipline operating in industry, education, medicine, government, etc. directed toward producing 'docile bodies' which are adapted for the demands of participation in modern economic life regulated in terms of time and space (Fairclough 1995, p52). Power is most effective when it operates hidden from view and thus individuals submit themselves to it. This metaphor of 'seeing' and 'hidden' or 'not seen' is a helpful way of appreciating the technology of disciplinary power that is based upon the idea of *surveillance*.

Surveillance as a disciplinary technology is related to the common expression 'big brother is watching,' and thus the way this impacts upon how people discipline their own ways of being in the world. However this should not to be understood in some value neutral way whereby all possibilities are simply present to the individual from which they may choose. The options themselves are discursive products which act upon the individual to produce particular behaviours. Foucault drew upon the idea of the 'panopticon' which was designed by Jeremy Bentham in the late eighteenth century. According to Bentham's design a tower was placed in a central position within a prison which afforded the prison officer perched in it a view of all prisoners, while at the same time not allowing the prisoners the knowledge of whether they were being watched or not. As Foucault explains, the objective of this innovation was 'to induce in the inmate a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power' (Foucault 1977, p201) that is, such constant observation was designed to control and normalise prisoner behaviours. Foucault saw a similar logic at work in the surveillance (or the 'authoritative gaze') that operates within various institutional spaces in society.

The judges of normality are present everywhere. We are in a society of the

> teacher-judge, the doctor-judge, the educator-judge, the 'social worker'-judge; it is on them that the universal reign of the normative is based; and each individual, wherever he may find himself, subjects to it his body, his gestures, his behaviour, his aptitudes, his achievements. The carceral networks, in its compact or disseminated forms, with its systems of insertion, distribution, surveillance, observation, has been the greatest support, in modern society, of the normalising power (Foucault 1977, p201).

Under the guise of 'personal security' surveillance cameras now proliferate the shopping and commercial precincts of many western societies. Constant visibility on the one hand keeps the individual subjected, and on the other allows individuals to be treated and 'arranged' like objects (Fairclough 1995, p53). This surveillance is not solely generated by those who inhabit a discursively assigned position of organisational power, peers also come to embody the disciplinary gaze and take on the role of agents of organisational control. For instance the rise of work teams in organisational structures and the use of information technology as a new generation of panopticism (Rhodes, Iedema & Scheeres 2007, p89). In a similar way the disciplinary technology of surveillance operates in institutions like education in which it serves to construct a particular kind of student 'learner' who acts in particular normalised ways. In this, surveillance is designed to be reflexive in that it becomes a way of looking upon our own behaviours, and thus serves to influence our socialisation into the discursive space making ourselves the object of our own gaze (Danaher 2000, p54). Such surveillance and the discipline that it threatens not only acts upon those who would break the 'discursively produced rules' but also produces a normalisation of 'correct' behaviour among the rest of the group population. Thus such discipline has both negative (repressive) effects and positive (productive) effects (Scheurich & McKenzie 2008, p331). In terms of the construction of an officer professional identity the discipline of surveillance is repeatedly employed through small group work, individual interviews, mentoring and formal review processes via which comments (judgements) are offered to cadets concerning their observed behaviours in various classroom, workplace, and social settings, and upon which students are 'invited' to reflect and thereafter self moderate themselves (compliance in this context is constructed as developing maturity). These all require some degree of trust between the subject (cadet) and the institution which is based upon the recognition that the power that is exercised through surveillance is legitimate. Trust is manifest where there is least resistance to the way things are ordered. Foucault referred to this type of control as 'the gentle efficiency of

total surveillance' (Foucault 1977, p249).

In his *Discipline and Punish (1977)*, Foucault argued that in the new penal system the focus is not only upon what criminals do, but also upon what they *are* or will be. He employs the word 'soul' as a way of describing this new focus which shifts from the behaviours of criminals to their being or their 'selves.' The new penal perspective has taken to judging something other than crimes, namely, the 'soul' of the criminal. Foucault understood this as a political technology of the body (Foucault 1977, p201). Officer discourses while presented in terms of 'revealed religious universal truth' seek not only to shape and control behaviours, but attempt to do so via techniques of power directed at controlling the 'soul' of individuals – officers, and for which they are themselves the bearers of this power.

Discourse establishes what is normal and thus by implication what counts as *not* normal through the messages that circulate within it. Normalisation operates as a method by which judgements are made concerning conformity against particular measures and definitions. Normalisation seeks to produce homogeneity through a system of comparison and differentiation but not in some simple binary way. Usually what is normal is an assumed or naturally occurring object and correspondingly abnormal is likewise considered an unnatural thing which results in exclusion and marginalisation of speech position. The establishment of a norm also sets up a standard to which individuals should seek to align (construct) themselves (Carabine 2001, p278). Of course the effect of normalisation upon individual subjectivities is not totalising, but is rather the subject of resistance, negotiation and contestation, such that the idea of normal is a dispersed rather that absolute idea. Within organisational discourses what is considered normal is recognised and rewarded, while what is assigned as *not* normal is marginalised, punished, perhaps even demonised and ultimately excluded. The 'normal' may also be said to be manifest in those who are named as effective models for novices to emulate. As I shall discuss in my analysis in chapter six, the officer models who are identified as the material templates upon which novices should be 'cloned.'

In contemporary workplace contexts surveillance supported by technologies of performance (such as the audit, reporting, 'checks and balances', performance appraisals and the like) act upon individuals to focus their gaze upon themselves and thus produce individuals who self regulate their bodies, thoughts and actions. These are constructed as those who most effectively 'make a contribution' to organisational

goals which in context of The Salvation Army are discursively aligned with ‘divine’ imperatives.

Examination is also an important form of discipline particularly within education related discourses. Examination disciplines subjects through measurement against norms and standards. For example the examination as used as an assessment instrument in a course unit may be employed as a device to inculcate a particular body of knowledge which is created and circulated within the organisational or institutional discourse. Thus examination implements power relations whereby knowledge is created, authorised and inculcated into individual subjectivities (for instance intellectual ascent to a set of fixed prescriptive beliefs (doctrines)). Examination of individuals and the field of documentation that this generates constitute the individual as a describable object who becomes objectified as part of statistical analysis of populations (again a form of normalising though the production of averages). This objectification through documentary techniques, constitutes the individual as an object for a branch of knowledge (the human sciences) and the power which is related to this created knowledge (Fairclough 1995, p52).

Foucault also draws our attention to ‘confession’ as a technology of discipline. He defines confession in discursive terms as a ‘ritual of discourse’ (Fairclough 1995, p53). Confession is undertaken in the presence (be that physical or implied) of another who is the authority and who requires the confession and offers a way to mediate ‘forgiveness,’ ‘reconciliation,’ and new ways of being in the world through making judgements. Foucault understood confession as ‘all those procedures by which the subject is incited to produce a discourse of truth about his sexuality which is capable of having effects on the subject himself’ (Foucault 1980a, pp215-216). While ‘the truth’ of confession maybe co-produced by the confessor and the listening/questioning authority, the agency of domination resides in the one who questions and listens (Besley 2005, p83). Confession is not solely the domain of the religious context. It is employed in therapeutic discourses, and various shades of counselling (the psy sciences).

Summary

Within the organisational context of The Salvation Army, I would suggest that ‘officer’ as subjectivity is the product of carefully deployed disciplinary technologies in the form of surveillance, examination and confession. The cadet is required to surrender themselves to the diagnostic processes that these technologies employ in order that an

officer identity and its attendant authorised practices may emerge. The cadet is framed ideally as a willing, cooperative and active participant with those who are agents of these technologies, as particularly indicated through the activity of ‘confession.’ Individual resistances are often framed as immaturity, or some lack in the character of the individual, because power/knowledge produced by the discourse produces and assigns the subjectivity not only of the cadet but of those who make such judgements – ‘the judges of normality’ upon whom ‘the reign of the normative is based’. Questions around the values and practices that the cadet is expected to allow be written upon them, are seldom fore grounded as they remain invisible to those who are themselves produced by the officer discourse.

In the next chapter I shall attempt to address what constitutes identity and how it is an unfixed construct of narrative together with how resistances to the operation and flow of power/knowledge constitutes individuality.

Chapter 3

Theorisation II – Identity, the Narration of Self

The notion of identity – the 'I' of an individual is neither a naturally fixed or adequately defined point from which to commence to discuss the concept of professional identity. From a modern point of view, the European quest for rationality which was significantly driven by the Renaissance and Reformation, supplanted the notion of God with the human person as capable of discerning the meaning and utility of the world. Scientific rationality became privileged as the primary way of knowing in the world which of course produced a particular kind of subject 'knower' – one who could apply logical, rational, thought in their search for universal rules by which the world is governed, and through which they might control the world. This knowing subject is thus ascribed agency and individual autonomy.

However, privileging scientific rationality as the primal way of knowing in the world in effect writes out of consciousness other ways of knowing (for instance the imaginative, sensual), thus constraining the freedom to act, upon which agency and autonomy are predicated due to particular 'rational scientific' ways of conceiving the world. Scientific 'objectivity' implied that the individual somehow stands outside the material world and also the human world of social relatedness in their quest for knowledge (Chappell 2003, p35-36). This modern configuration of the 'I' has been, and continues to be, a powerful construction of identity as a conscious knowing rational self, capable of agency in the world through exercising autonomy within it. One of the basic implicit assumptions of this view is that human experience provides transparent and unmediated access to the reality of the world which exists external to, and independent of, the human subject - 'the truth of the world is out there.'

Within this foundationalist framing there are those who would argue that identity is a relatively stable and fixed idea (like the kernel in the nut). 'Identity is that collective or true self hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves' which a people with shared history and ancestry hold in common' (Hall 1990, cited in Hall 2000, p17). This idea of identity as fixed over time is derived at least in part from conceptualising the individual in terms of a suite of characteristics which remain consistent and to some extent unique over time. After all, the argument goes, to come to know someone is another way of expressing the idea that one can be recognised through 'public' facets of character that are repeatedly expressed over time and with little variation (Hibbert, MacIntosh & McInnes 2007, p237).

As referenced above, such a view is particularly pervasive in western culture with its intuitive beliefs arising out of the centrality of individualism founded upon scientific rationality. There is a 'self evident' assumption that there is a sharp dividing line between what is 'inside' the person and the 'external world'. As Norbert Elias (2000) observes,

> 'nothing is more characteristic of the unquestioning way in which even today, in thinking about human beings, the separate individual is taken as the starting point … always the image of the single human being … From this conceptual starting point, society presents itself finally as a collection of individuals completely independent of each other, whose true essence is locked within them and who therefore communicate only externally and from the surface' (p288)

Alternatively we might argue that identity is not simply an interior concept, but rather one that is relational and thus social, to do with sameness and difference between ourselves and others, in effect an intersubjective field. Identity arises out of a chain of relationships with others (Watson 2006, p510), in terms of the 'person' we operationalise in particular contexts and social spaces. Identity is constructed through difference with the other – its *constitutive outside*. This implies that identity is derived from a capacity (power) to exclude or render outside what is other and thus not part of the process of *identification*. However, this is not to suggest that our individuality is a possession of each person locked away from what is external to the self. Rather it is a modality which is derived from a network of interdependencies among human beings through which they are bound together. People are to varying degrees dependent on each other, initially by nature, and then through socialisation, education, mutual social needs. Framed this way humans exist only as pluralities, only in figurations (societies, groups, organisations) (Elias 2000, p295). Thus each portrayal of the self operates within the conventions of a particular relationship and the multiple connections upon which life is constituted (Gergen & Kaye 1992, p255). These social pluralities rely upon the powerful constructive effects of language which lies at the heart of social existence. In this, language in terms of words and ideas is not simply neutrally descriptive of a pre-existent reality, but is creative in that it constructs experienced reality. Bakhtin (1981) maintained that our sense of ourselves is fashioned in relation to the identities of others. He viewed identity formation as a linguistic, ideological struggle to make others' words one's own. However through 'revoicing' or 'reaccenting' the words others have spoken, one can manifest agency to direct one's actions (Hull & Zacher 2007,

p76). If I were to articulate this from a discursive perspective, as Chappell et. al. express it so succinctly, ‘our conception of who we are, our identity, is constituted by the power of all the discursive practices in which we speak and which in turn ‘speak’ in us’ (2003, p41).

The Latin term *persona* means ‘mask’, as if we perform a role when we ‘face’ the world and others in particular ways. As a metaphor this is not to suggest that there remains an ‘essentialist self’ who always remains hidden behind the mask which is manifest in the discursively constructed world. Rather there are multiple identities which are never unified and, it is increasing argued, remain fragmented and fractured, never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions (Hall 2000, p17). These embodied ‘roles’ represent who and how we wish to be perceived relationally by others. In taking up a discursive approach to identity formation I recognise that identities consist of multiple processes of identification that are constructed by different, intersecting and often conflicting discursive practices. As such, identity is the product of discursive interventions within particular institutions at particular historical moments (Chappell 2003, p29).

We are all defined by various identities which shape how and who we are in the world according to context. The identity we are particularly concerned with in this research is the professional identity of the Salvation Army officer, or as Burwood would suggest, a particular Salvation Army officer way of being in the world (Burwood 2007, p125). In framing this identity as ‘professional’ I am attempting to capture the complex nature of work practices which require an understanding and application of abstract knowledge in a systematic way to solve complex problems. Closely aligned with this are high performance expectations of the general public and the requirement of a strong personal commitment guided by a norm of service to society, and recognised by that society (Fogarty & Dirsmith 2001, p250).

Narrative Identity Formation

There is a link between professional practice and professional identity. Professional identity is generated in sites of professional practice, who we think we are, influences what we do. However this is a dialogical phenomenon as we also become who we are *because* of what we do (Beijaard 2004; Cameron 2001). According to Beijaard et.al (2004, p123), the self is inseparable from a person’s narrative or life story; through stories a person generates a sense of self. Indeed McAdams would suggest that narrative may be *the* way through which human beings make sense of their own lives

and the lives of others (McAdams 1995, p208).

This notion of story telling is a reflexive engagement whereby the self comes to be through reflecting upon sedimented experience (Antonek 1997, p23). The self is discovered in its own narrational acts. Selfhood is the kind of entity that is characterised by its ability to reflect upon itself, thus identity is a narrative construction – a narrated self in the world (Ezzy 1998, p244). The narrated self is constructed by and within intersecting discourses which shape if not determine how the story is embodied and thus 'told.' Ricoeur maintained that human experiences are held in the mind as pre-narratives (narratives in the making) which he calls mimesis1, or prefiguration. The articulation of an experience or the narration of that experience (which we might call its emplotment) Ricoeur calls mimesis2, or configuration. Once experience is narrated there remains the possibility of refiguring or re-authoring that experience, to make yet greater sense of the experience, perhaps in a different narrative context which Ricoeur calls mimesis3, or refiguration (Car, Taylor & Ricoeur 1991). Further, Ricoeur argues that,

> 'like a text, human action is an open work, the meaning of which is 'in suspense'. It is because it 'opens up' new references and receives fresh relevance from them, that human deeds are also waiting for fresh interpretations which decide their meaning. All significant events and deeds are, in this way, opened to this kind of practical interpretation through present praxis. Human action, too, is opened to anybody who can read' (Ricoeur 1981, p208).

Chappell et. al. draw a theoretical distinction between reflexive identification (the identities that people reflexively construct for themselves through self narration), and relational identification (constructing a self-narrative based upon narrative sources available to them outside themselves).

> 'Thus although a self narrative can be developed to appear that it is the unique property of the person …. , in practice that identity draws on social and cultural definitions of possible identities (ie. the identity position/associate with *my*self pre-exists *me*)' (2003, p47f).

Narrative provides persons with a linguistic apparatus to create identities through the selective weaving together of thematic events in which characters act and speak in particular ways. Thus the narrator constructs identity(ies) through a process of 'sameness' and 'otherness' (as highlighted above) as a way of identifying with

particular characters as *strategically* constructed within the narrative. Identity construction is thus a social or discursive process which draws upon the range of socially and culturally available narrative identities and their attendant practices (Chappell 2003, p49). These narrative resources from which relational identity is constructed, draw upon what we might call a range of socially available 'ontological narratives' (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004, p163; Somers & Gibson 1994). These ontological narratives are the stories that a person uses to make sense of who they are in terms of their ways of being in the social world (determined by discourse). This self narrative is also informed by preconscious sources such as the individual's *habitus* which furnishes the storied self with particular dispositions. Thus we might speak of the narrativity of *habitus* which informs the development of the socially constructed identity. For example the dispositions which Bourdieu argues are acquired within family life are mediated via the lived narrative of experience which are reinforced via circulating narratives over time (for instance dispositional narratives that reinforce relative class positions) (Bourdieu 1994, p96-97).

In autobiographical narrative (one in which the narrator is a key actor) the narrator tells the story as one who is positioned temporally and reflexively outside themselves. From this position the narrator, drawing upon a range of socially available narratives, 're-presents' themselves in particular ways as a particular kind of person. This is not necessarily the representation of social reality, but rather a construction at particular points in time. The same (or at least similar) narrative could well be retold in a different setting with the effect of constructing a different notion of enduring identity (Squire 2008, p44). There is always a degree to which the narrator does not just 'make things up' as much as he or she inventively, judiciously, purposefully fashions a story that is 'true to life' for particular purposes (Andrews, Squire & Tamboukou 2008, p104; Holstein & Gubrium 2000).

Ricouer argued that historical action (in real time and space) and interpretative imagination shape narratives. The very act of narrating past events into a present, is a hermeneutical act of imagination (Ricouer 1988). Narratives are integrally temporal because they configure the events of the past, present, and future into a narrative whole (Ezzy 1998, p245). Our identity is constructed from the stories we tell ourselves and others through drawing upon the culturally and discursively available stock of narratives (Tamboukou 2008, p102). It is through this narrativity that we come to know and make sense of the social world, and it is through narratives and narrativity that we constitute our identities (Somers & Gibson 1994, p59). 'Narrative identity is coherent

but fluid and changeable, historically grounded but 'fictively' reinterpreted, constructed by an individual but constructed in interaction and dialogue with other people' (Ezzy 1998, p246). This 'storied self' is not a stable unitary self, but rather is multiple and continuously emergent and dynamic each situated in different and particular contexts, and working strategically to resist those contexts (Andrews et al. 2007, p104).

From a Foucauldian perspective, subjectivity is produced through the discourses that an individual inhabits (or the discourses that inhabit the individual) over the period of a life time. Within these discourses, individuals are at one and the same time positioned by, and yet also choose to position themselves in terms of their 'interim form of subjectivity.' Thus persons take on particular subject positions through the discourses within which they participate. This implies that notions of identity are constantly in flux through each emergent situation.

> … while not negating the power of the conscious and unconscious minds to store and use the multiple layers of knowing that accumulate in anyone's life, each person is, nevertheless, also in an important sense, constituted a fresh in each new context, each new set or relations and positioning within the discourses and storylines (Davies 1994, p4).

This identity work is always in process and emergent as is the evolving storied self. In terms of this current project I am seeking to identify and understand the processes through which the emergent Salvation Army officer identity is adopted, adapted and hermeneutically projected by novice members. Such an identity is available via the range of ontological narratives which circulate within organisational discourses. So novice members who are seeking to form a particular 'officer' identity, recast their narrated selves in terms of the range of 'officer' ontologies available to them. Through these narratives novice members position themselves as particular kinds of officer identities. These ontological narratives provide models of being officer via the agency of discursively produced behaviours and practices. Through the adaptation of such narratives a novice learns through a narrativity of 'sameness' and 'otherness' to construct their own 'officer' identity which continues to evolve over time (Chappell 2003, p53).

This is not to suggest however, that all ontological narratives of for instance 'officer' are equally available to all cadets (and for that matter other officers) to draw upon. Theorising identity via a narrative perspective means that only those ontological narratives (and the identities that may be constructed from them) which circulate within

organisational discourses are privileged. Widely circulating narratives tend to exclude the experiences and views of some sectors of society while including and privileging others (Mishler 1995). Only particular identities may exist within officer discourses which are the sources of what Foucault names as 'regimes of truth' (Foucault 1980a, p131). 'Stories that seem too different from the discursively sanctioned narratives might be evaluated as untrue or incredible … the implication is that people *must* use socially circulating stories as a member's resource in crafting their own narratives of personal identity' (Loseke 2007, p763). The discursively constructed truth of 'officer' will only permit a particular range of manifestations of an officer identity. All others are excluded as deviant from the accepted normalised version(s). Thus the range of ontological narratives available on which to model the continually emergent storied self is discursively controlled and normalised. However, there are always 'genetic aberrations' that inhabit the margins of discursive organisational life (where the intersection of different discourses is most generative), and it may well be in this space in particular that the potential for organisationally contested identity emerges. It occurs to me that attempting to live in a type of 'discursive isolation' may go some way to accounting for fundamentalism and radicalism in religious contexts.

If, as I have attempted to argue, professional identity is a fluid concept in that it is performed relationally and dialogically relative to the social context and space in which professional practice emerges, then we might speak of professional identity as discursively produced. To thus acquire an identity is to be objectively located in the discursive world (Scanlon 2007, p227) and within social space. All of us have many potential identities which are manifested in response to particular contexts. However, professional identity is not simply the manifestation of a subjectivity assigned to one by discursive formations and practices. We are all formed by multiple discourses together with individual temperaments and personality dispositions (*habitus*). An officer professional identity is neither a naturally occurring object nor unchanging in character over time; rather it is constructed by multiple intersections of individual and collective officer experiences, practices, histories, symbols and languages, expressed in countless habits, rituals, activities and myths (Mackey 2007, p97).

To attempt to speak of an officer discourse may be misleading if one takes this to mean one all encompassing discourse which shapes all officer professional identities. As discussed previously, all discursively produced positions are sites of struggle and contestation for dominance, each producing different versions of events. There are multiple ways of knowing or constructing the officer world, however what emerges

within organisational discourse(s) is a single set of knowledges and related practices which are *privileged* as the natural and therefore the normal way of being officer at a particular time and place. In a sense the discourse provides the teleological objective of officer professional identity as a technology of control in the interests of the organisation (a political dimension). In taking up a Foucauldian perspective, I seek to understand individual cadet/novice officer's self construction of their own professional identity in relation to the officer identity which is discursively produced for them as subjectivities within the discourse. In this I note that identity, subjectivity, power and knowledge are a complex interrelated network. As Chan observes, 'power, in Foucault's analysis, is a spiderless web that 'produces' and 'procreates' new personhood' (Chan 2000, p1064).

Resistance of Subjects

Foucault offers his readers profound insights into the truth regimes of social life however, his descriptions of these regimes make them appear relentlessly oppressive perhaps even totalising in their effects (Scheurich & McKenzie 2008, p338). One is left with the impression that Foucault offers a masterly description of the relentless oppression of social life as it constructs and writes its powerful effects upon the life of individuals, yet in this he has been accused of rarely offering any alternative space or possibilities from the totalising effects of discourse.

While Foucault's insight into the constitutive power of discursive practices is fundamentally important to my theorisation, I also wish to avoid the reduction of this notion to no more than a 'discourse determinism' through recognising that such practices seek to constrain discursively *preconstituted* social subjects (similar to Bourdieu's use of *habitus* - a way of being, a predisposition, tendency, propensity of inclination). We must therefore take into account how the constitutive processes of discourse dialogically interact with preconsitituted subjects who already have some sense of identity (generated within other discursive spaces) (Fairclough 1995, p60). All subjectivities are themselves sites of intersection of multiple discourses which are themselves constantly changing. Thus the process of being formed as subjects by the circulation of power/knowledge means that subjectivity is itself an unstable idea. Discourse(s) in effect seek to produce a 'resubjectification' of individuals (Butler 1997, p11). The subjectivity of candidates – cadets – officers is discursively reconstituted according to the number, nature and distribution of discourses that the individual inhabits. Indeed, Foucault maintained that power which is always bound to knowledge, tends to meet resistance, and therefore resistance is a indispensable element of power

itself. Power requires resistance to sustain it, otherwise power simply ebbs away (Foucault 1980a, p142). Foucault recognised that right from the earliest days of life, all are subject to overt and covert types of social control, which act upon individuals so that they identify with particular subject positions within discourses and thus construct identity. Also of significance here is the notion that in an ongoing way, subjects are member participants of multiple social and cultural institutions (and discourses) many of which may exert a more powerful influence on values, beliefs and behaviours over time, than those espoused within and by organisational (Salvation Army) discourses (Linstead & Grafton Small 1992, p225).

Discursively Produced Individuality

Yet Foucault argued that while disciplinary power acts to produce normalisation it does not necessarily produce conformity or a regularised discursive identity. On the contrary, one of the prime effects of disciplinary power was to produce precisely, individuality. This is one of the significant features of Foucault's thesis on power. We must not make the mistake of thinking that techniques of power have crushed those natural forces which mark us as distinct types of human beings with various 'personality' traits. Rather, differences, peculiarities, deviance and eccentricities are ever more highlighted in a system of controls that is concerned with seeking them out. The very notion of a personality derives from this process: 'as power becomes more anonymous and more functional', Foucault writes, 'those upon whom it is exercised tend to be more strongly individualised. In a system of discipline the child is more individualised than the adult, the patient more than a healthy man, the madman and the delinquent more than the normal and non-delinquent' (Foucault 1977, p193). The intention may have been to produce a regularity, but the *effect* was quite the opposite: a multiplicity of disparate and variegated identities (McHoul & Grace 1993, p72). Thus the identification of locations for resistance are points of light that indicate the operation of power/knowledge.

While power/knowledge is generated within discourse and acts (often covertly) to produce particular kinds of subjectivities, it is clear that individuals do not simply acquiesce to the power/knowledge which acts upon them (the rendering of the proverbial 'docile bodies'). Individuals seek to resist the technologies of discipline which act to shape and mould them. Thus individuals become the sites for power struggles over the determination of discursive practices which operate to write their effects upon the embodied self. Barretti noted in her work on the socialisation of students in social work education, that variables such as age impacted the 'effectiveness' of values

socialisation. Younger students were less resistant than older students to such socialisation (Barretti 2004, p273). I would postulate than younger students were less likely to have been exposed to, and be inhabitants of, multiple discourses to the same extent as older students. Thus perhaps age, experience and past identity formations (*habitus*) all contribute to the degree and points of resistance offered by cadets to discursive subjectivities (Sommerlad 2007, p204).

Subjects may respond with various resistance strategies such as 'foot dragging, false compliance, feigned ignorance … that are conducted below the veneer of legitimacy; covert and seditious acts carried out in the silent spaces of everyday life' (Flemming & Sewell 2002, p859). In effect we are referencing a constant renegotiation of identity within discourse rather than the taking up of pre-structured positions, an account of the practices of subjective self-constitution. Surveillance, dialogically conceived between the other and self, leads to an ontological multiplicity in the performance of self in the midst of difference.

> Observance further highlights the contemporary possibility that people 'succeed' in reflexively reconfiguring their identity, practice, norms and future as their participation vacillates between being central and peripheral, centrifugal and centripetal, visible and invisible. Their openness to, and *observance of*, the dynamics of what is 'in' and what is 'out' enables employees to assume and enact a productive subjectivity that is not determinable by a singular or even consistent stance (Rhodes, Iedema & Scheeres 2007, p95).

A significant emphasis in Foucault's work is upon the power struggle over the determination of discursive practices: 'Discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the power which is to be seized' (Foucault 1984, p110). Subjects are not the blank slates upon which discourse writes itself, but rather through resistance and struggle social subjects may impact and reshape discursive practices and co-create an individual emergent professional identity (Volkmann & Anderson 1998, p296). However, in this research context I also recognise that cadets are generally more likely (like most new organisational members) to be open to, and embracing of, the subjectivities that are generated for them (at least initially) for such a positioning engenders social acceptance and authorised participation within the social group (itself the object of taking up the discursively produced 'cadet' subjectivity). The measure of the effectiveness of discourse is of course the degree to which cadets recognise and acknowledge themselves in the

terms made available to them by the discourse, in effect that they come to know themselves as Salvation Army officers. However cadets are themselves 'the social artefacts' of the various discourses that they have inhabited. So I would expect that the degree to which they have inhabited the social space of The Salvation Army will be reflected not only in their acceptance or resistance of the officer discourse, but also how power/knowledge flows through them, thus influencing their interim form of subjectivity.

Mackey (2007, p98) maintained that the normalising effects of discourse can be resisted through the practice of a reflexive ethical self which enables the individual to examine contradictory possibilities and power relations within professional discourses. From a Foucauldian perspective a history of professional identity excavates the historical conditions that motivate the present circumstances that generate the conception of Salvation Army officer. This approach allows one to pose the question 'how is this professional identity created?' which permits the questioner to reflect upon their practice and the conditions under which that practice occurs. 'Foucault's intention was to learn to what extent the effort to think one's own history can free thought from what it silently thinks, and so enable it to think differently' (Mackey 2007, p99). In this regard Jørgensen and Phillips offer two helpful metaphors for understanding how we might contest the 'taken for grantedness' and therefore normalised terrain constructed by discourse. 'Either the taken-for-granted can be understood as emanating from a centre and spanning a certain radius out to the periphery on which it is not so taken for granted. Or one can understand the taken-for-granted as an all-imposing structure containing gaps that provide potential footholds for dissension' (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, p190).

Summary

The aim of this study is to understand how organisational officer discourses operate to co-create a particular kind of Salvation Army officer professional identity in novice members. Foucault offers a generative set of concepts such as regimes of truth, power/knowledge, bio power, resistance, technologies of self etc. which I will attempt to intersect with a conceptualisation of performative identity which is narratively produced. As such, the concept of identity is multiple, fragmented and constructed according to the social spaces into which we seek to speak ourselves into existence. The narrative itself is the product of the range of ontological narratives that are available within (in this case) the officer discourse. Through this process cadets are constantly engaged in the co-creation of an interim form of subjectivity (or resubjectification) locating them in

the discursive world of organisational social space. I am not interested in reducing officer identity to no more than the product of discursive determinism. Subjects can and do resist power/knowledge, in fact as Foucault pointed out power only exists where there is resistance, and such resistance produces individuality.

In the next chapter I shall attempt to outline the methodological approach I have taken in constructing and implementing this research. I shall also seek to give an account of my own reflexivity, thus making explicit my positioning as insider/outsider researcher and my assumptions about the social world that shapes how I construct and interpret this study.

Chapter 4

Methodology

Introduction

In previous chapters I have sought to provide a description of the organisational context of this study - The Salvation Army, followed by an account of the theoretical perspectives adopted in this research – a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis which I intersect with a conceptualisation of identity as plural, fragmented and produced through narrative. In this chapter I outline what I intend this study to achieve, beyond providing a discursive account of the co-creation of Salvation Army officer professional identity in novice members. I will provide a justification for my selection of Foucauldian discourse analysis as my analytical lens, yet while also recognising its limitations. I offer the reader an account of how I reflexively position myself as insider/outsider researcher in the midst of the very discourses that frame me and my participants, and how this has impacted the study. Further I discuss how this research project was designed, undertaken and the results analysed, and offer an account of the limitations of the research, both theoretically and methodologically.

The talk that circulates in The Salvation Army in general and in training discourses in particular is generally predicated upon a realist view of the social world. Within this world there are objects named: soldiers, candidates, cadets and officers. This study proposes that these objects and their attending subjectivities are not naturally occurring but are in fact produced by organisational discourses which then arranges them in particular ways to serve organisational purposes. The object of this study is to map the discursive terrain that produces ‘officer’ and so understand the processes that lead to the production of a Salvation Army officer professional identity. I intend to make visible what is not thought nor spoken, due to organisational discourse constituting objects and arranging them in particular ways that creates reality and shapes our individual and corporate interpretation of experience. Through this disruption of the ‘invisible and pervasive necessity’ produced via discourse and silently operating through power/knowledge, it is my intent to show that contemporary officer identity is one version of many possible alternatives. In other words I hope to open up other possibilities for being ‘officer’, a broadening of the authorised utterances that call officer into being, while all the while realising that this research project itself is the product of intersecting discourses. I also intend that the insights generated by this research will disrupt the ways that organisational leaders have generally understood resistances as ‘anti-organisational’ attempts to undermine or even destroy the one unified

organisational reality that it is their responsibility to preserve at all costs (a discursively produced fiction). Perhaps these research findings might even provide the catalyst for an ongoing conversation that at least commences from a position of critical awareness of our social construction, and thus engender a willingness to critique the way that officers are produced and arranged. In effect I intend this study to have the effect of deconstructing and thus expanding organisational discourse boundaries and through this also to show how while we in The Salvation Army are produced according to the internal rules of our discourses, there are other discourses which could equally intersect with our own to produce different versions of organisational life and in particular the object 'officer'.

Discourse analysis based upon a Foucauldian perspective does not offer a particular research methodology which can be pre-packaged and readily applied. Discourse analysis is an approach based upon particular theorisations of discourse as constitutive of experience in the world, rather than a fixed method. Drawing upon the theorisations and concepts outlined in chapters two and three, discourse analysis maintains that subjects and experience are produced by language and are therefore discursively constituted. Discourse analysis is thus concerned with how an individual's experience is socially and historically constructed by language. The context within which discourse and discursive practices occur are central to the research process (Crowe 2005, p56).

A Foucauldian approach to discourse offers us a set of concepts which while integrative are also generative in that they can be conceptualised as a toolbox from which we can judiciously draw to generate data and illuminate analysis. The objective of this research is to consider how the object 'officer' as a formation of discourse 'comes to be' and to examine its effects 'in the real' (Foucault 1980b, p131), particularly how specific subjectivities (cadets/novice officers) are constrained and enabled in their efforts to take up their professional officer identity. Within discourse the concept 'officer' is constructed as a particular object which is normalised as a truth object, formed by discourse enunciations.

It is *not* my intention to undertake an historical archaeological examination of the discourses that created the space within which the object officer emerged in the late 19th century, but rather to examine how the object officer is constituted as 'real' in contemporary officer discourses, in other words to explore 'the conditions of its continuing possibility.' In this way I will attempt to employ history as a device to disturb the stability of the taken for granted in the present. Thus where it is prudent and sheds

light on the object of this study I will refer to organisational documents (both contemporary and historical) in an effort to show how the organisational historical archive has its material effects upon the contemporary experience of participants and thus how discourse produces and works to maintain a particular kind of object named Salvation Army officer.

Equally it is not my intention to make judgements concerning what is true or false, right or wrong, but rather establish what the discursively produced object 'officer' looks like through disrupting the historical conditions that led to its emergence and examining the truth statements and power/knowledge that sustain its derivative subjectivities in the present.

In the process of fashioning and sharpening my research question, it appeared to me that a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis offered a way into conceptualising how the social world is the product of particular discourses which inhabit us, framing our understandings of the world, what is possible and what is not. Such an approach allows us to see that what is natural in one context (discourse), is not necessarily the case in another and thus how power/knowledge produces certain discursive truths about The Salvation Army and 'officer' that dominate and attempt to subsume all others. Through exposing the discursive nature of organisational reality, Foucauldian discourse analysis offers the possibility of seeing other ways, other possibilities for being officer that are produced through resisting the unchallenged assumptions and 'statements' about Salvation Army officer and associated practices, through the examination of how such statements come to be in their historical specificity. Foucauldian discourse analysis is also generative in appreciating the disciplinary techniques that are at work often, and most powerfully, below the radar of conscious detection deconstructing, reconstructing and normalising individual identities (body and soul) through the self disciplinary gaze, to serve as instruments of the organisation. Foucault's approach foregrounds the capillary action of power relations, and the identification of power/knowledge and its effects upon all in the discourse. Yet it also recognises the possibility of resistance and the resultant individualisation of officer identity. Thus applying Foucault's 'instruments of analysis' (Foucault 1980a, p62) will enable me to interrogate, problematise and perhaps even hold out possibilities for transforming how 'The Salvation Army officer' is conceived and operates in the contemporary social world of practice (Cheek & Porter 1997, p110-111). Of course I do not claim that this or any theorisation can account for all social reality and so refer the reader to the section titled 'limitations of research' nearer the end of this chapter, in

which I outline some of the deficiencies of Foucauldian discourse analysis.

Positioning of the Self as Researcher

As both an organisational member and seeking to take up the position of researcher, clearly I am attempting to engage in this research space as an 'insider.' The designation 'insider' arises in response to the perspective of earlier social scientists who were expected to be objectively removed from their own gaze on the research project (Kanuha 2000, p440). Social investigators were to engage in research from an outsider position (read 'assumed objectivity') from which they minimised their contamination of the 'pure' research space. It is very difficult to maintain that such a position ever really insulates the objects of research from the researchers as even simple observation - the presence of the researcher impacts the context to some degree. It is also problematic in that observation alone cannot provide the rich data that actual participation within social contexts can provide. Indeed the very notion of 'observation' should be disrupted, as events are only ever available to the researcher via representations which the researcher themselves co-authors.

Thus the very conception of insider and outsider research is not a clear cut distinction. As Mercer points out, an insider may be defined in terms of particular characteristics which they share with the subjects of their study, for instance gender, ethnicity, culture or organisation. Those who do not share such characteristics may be considered 'outsiders' (Mercer 2007, p4). However individuals are not characterised so simply in terms of one single status set (Merton 1972, p22) but are constituted by various sets which are situational and contingent. The division between such theoretical locations (insider / outsider) are thus permeable and unstable with the result that we are in fact 'multiple insiders and outsiders' (Deutsch 1996, p184). In fact subject and object emerge as partners in the generation of meaning (Crotty 1998, p9). There must be an interaction which shapes (if not creates) reality and therefore leads to the interpretation of this construction. Thus there is a double hermeneutic operating whereby both the researcher and subject are both engaged in making sense or meaning. However I echo Mertens' observation that 'the assumption is made that data, interpretations, and outcomes are rooted in contexts and persons apart from the researcher and are not figments of the imagination. Data can be tracked to its sources, and the logic used to assemble interpretations can be made explicit in the narrative' (1998, p13). Hence in the writing of the data analysis chapters that follow, I have sought to anchor my interpretations, observations and intuitions in the data collected and assembled from interviews and organisational materials. I have attempted to demonstrate this through

frequently quoting directly from the data so that readers may draw their own conclusions concerning the legitimacy and explanatory power or otherwise of my interpretations and conclusions.

The insider perspective may provide access to rich data through deeper appreciation of organisational culture, the routines, scripts, symbols and controlling metaphors which shape organisational practices. The insider is familiar with the subtle nuances of organisational life, the power structures and sub texts, what is taboo, and what kinds of language opens doors into otherwise inaccessible research spaces. Yet it is also apparent that the insider position has its challenges as well. Organisational familiarity can bring with it a taking 'the natural' for granted, perhaps developing myopia, the obvious question – unasked, the shared intuition leading to assumptions that are not tested, the politically sensitive issue not raised, seemly shared norms not articulated (Mercer 2007, p6). Organisational members may be unwilling to make themselves vulnerable to someone bound to the organisation and its power structures by sharing information that they perceive may be detrimental to their career. Alternatively subjects may use the organisational researcher as an information conduit back to the organisation through disclosing information which is designed to have political implications.

As insider researcher it may appear that I am at one time claiming some insider knowledge of organisational life and thus a position of privileging such knowledge and intuitions, while at the very same time also claiming to be subversive in being able to deconstruct 'what is,' challenge the assumed and expose the silences. It appears to me that any claim to position ones' self in such an idealised location is naïve, as the location itself is a fiction created to serve the self legitimising purposes of the researcher. Nonetheless with this critical consciousness of my own researcher position and the organisational research space, I will attempt to carve out a generative research location.

In this research enterprise what I found most challenging was the constant struggle to think outside the very discourse which constitutes me as an organisational member. To think, or imagine how things could be different, how other possibilities could have emerged and so identify the historical forces that conspired to produce the truth of 'officer.' I am produced by the very same power/knowledge that circulates within the discourse, and subject to the same 'truths' which are but representations of 'officer'. However, for some time now I have personally experienced a disruption in my

experience of the organisation and its discursively created reality. For me dissonance has become a regular and somewhat normal experience wherein organisational practices, values, controls and truths have become increasingly destabilised. In seeking to account for this experience I believe that through broader experiences particularly, although not exclusively, via the intersection with multiple educational and organisational discourses, have produced me as a subjectivity that is not the standard, normal Salvation Army officer (of course such an object is a fiction). Rather than finding life comfortable in the central locations of organisational life, I have found myself inhabiting positions on the boundaries where the organisational discourse is somewhat dissonant and disrupted. This is not to suggest that this positions me as something other that a product of the Salvation Army officer discourse, but it does account for the various intuitive footholds that have emerged from which to be more 'critically conscious' of the ways in which the organisational officer discourse operates. In addition I also found that the former officers (those who had resigned from officership and the organisation) were particularly helpful in disrupting the normalised, and breaking the silences. They not only provided much rich data, but unique perspectives of the officer discourse now that they were removed by temporal and experiential distance. Indeed their observations and experiences where particularly useful in disrupting the normal and highlighting the flow and effects of power/knowledge in producing their (past) officer identities. For them the officer self was in the process of being reconstructed into a new form of interim identity which positioned them within other discourses. It was the intersection of these discourses in the experience of these individuals which was fruitful in deconstructing 'what is.'

It proved difficult to locate a space from which to hear the voices and experiences that sometimes aligned with my own and yet on other occasions contradicted my experience of the organisation. Detecting the silences, the unsaid, and what could *not* be said, was extremely challenging. I sometimes felt like a fish attempting to swim against a powerful stream of discursively produced consciousness, sometimes bumping into the narratives of my interviewees, other times rubbing against the boundaries of the organisation. As organisational insider I had a reasonable understanding of the discursive truths of officer, and yet even here I was surprised by some of the narrative elements that emerged across the data set. For instance the significance that 'confession' as a technology of self was represented as pervasive, powerful and intentional. Through the techniques of confession the officer discourse deconstructs the individual and seeks to produce in them the desire to become the idealised officer construct. Through confession of shortfalls or inadequacies (which are

themselves creations of discourse) individuals reconfigure their identity toward that which aligns with the discursive norm, yet every attempt to embrace this truth also implies the destruction or loss of another self. This self is framed within the discourse in various ways (for instance immaturity moving toward maturity), but always as something to be willingly and uncritically embraced. This makes confession a particularly powerful technology as through it, power/knowledge does not impose itself from outside upon the individual forcing them to comply, but conceals itself, making itself appear as if it originates from within, from the desires (soul) of the individual.

I was also conscious of the way in which I was complicit with the interviewees in the creation of interim narrative identities. In response to my questions and follow up questions we worked together to co-produce a particular representation of themselves. In a way the interviews were themselves productive as part of the process of continuing identity work. The interview questions appeared to sometimes raise issues that some participants had not formally considered previously, and for others became a process through which they engaged in identity making – differentiating and other occasion aligning themselves with particular organisational models that they had perceived.

I cannot claim any objective place in either the process or the analysis of data. But on the other hand I believe that the insider position has provided a shared context from which to commence, a place of intuitions, some of which have proven reasonably accurate while many others failed to resonate with the data and were thus discarded. The insider position has offered a place from which to work to produce thick and descriptive data analysis some of which as indicated above was unexpected.

I am also conscious that the purpose of this research is to produce an artefact called a thesis which is part of the authorisation (via examiner gatekeepers) to scholarly participation through the conferral of a degree. Thus just as I theorised my participants as creating particular identities through the ways they narrated their experiences, so I am aware that this thesis is on one level my attempt to produce a particular identity for myself through narration (scholarly, competent, insightful, producer of new knowledge, articulate, skilful – 'the doctoral graduate profile'). These aspects of the identity I desire to create for myself are signalled through not only the content and its treatment, but the very forms of writing I choose to deploy. I shall of course leave it to others to evaluate how successful I have been in narrating this scholarly identity.

In terms of staking out my theoretical positioning I approach this research from a social

constructionist perspective drawing upon poststructuralism and postmodernism, rather than foundationalism or realism. Within this perspective, knowledge is constructed discursively and thus remains contingent and unfixed. All knowledge is historically and culturally embedded, meaning that there cannot be a context free neutral basis for truth claims (particularly claims for absolute truth or universal knowledge). Truth claims are discursive effects rather than transparent accounts of reality (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, p175). Thus as researcher I offer a representation of organisational reality and therefore cannot claim to produce 'objective' knowledge (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). Acknowledging the discursive nature of our constructed social reality does not mean that it is therefore not 'real.' It is this shared social construction which determines the range of possible actions available to us as we operate in the physical world. Thus our representations have powerful effects in the real world of practice. For instance, within the discourse of 'officer' in The Salvation Army, what possible range of behaviours are available within this socially determined reality? What counts as knowledge, and what are the taken-for-granted understandings in the 'officer' discourse which cannot be contested because they are naturalised and normalised? What are the regimes of truth that produce officer and are so powerful that if contested are constructed as either heretical or just plain nonsense?

What I am trying to foreground for myself and the reader is the issue of reflexivity which has become increasingly important across research traditions and theoretical stances, but particularly for research arising from within a poststructuralist perspective. However, if knowledge is indeed socially, politically, institutionally and even discursively constructed then the notion of reflexivity itself is not a stable object but is equally informed and constructed within, and by, communities of researchers. Reflexivity cannot itself be self referential, but is a construction that must therefore be open to critique (Alvesson, Hardy & Harley 2004). Reflexivity as a necessary element in the production of a thesis represents not only the 'worthiness' of such an element, but the scholarly construction of what constitutes an acceptable thesis (ie. there was a time in terms of thesis production when reflexivity was not as an important element as it is now, or perhaps maybe in the future). This suggests a political dimension as much as the desire for securing a generative and reliable epistemology (Deetz 1996).

Nonetheless as a discursively produced object myself, how can I claim to produce any knowledge other than that reflecting my own assumptions, intuitions, and knowledges which are no more than idiosyncratic, is itself a worthy question? There must be at least a tentative location from which to write, otherwise we will be subsumed in the

endless vortex of relativism based upon the never ending interrogation of knowledge. While there maybe no 'extra discursive locations', we might also argue that one can inhabit multiple discourses. As I pointed to above, as researcher I would argue that through study, experience and social location I have occupied multiple organisational, theoretical, academic, social and political discourses that offer me various locations and perspectives from which to reflect and problematise the particular discourse which is the object of this study.

While I am clearly responsible for my selections and analytical choices, nonetheless the interview data from which this work is generated is **co**-produced in relationship with other individuals – their organisational experience and knowledge, which was at times out of sync with my own and on other occasions quite surprising. It is these eruptions of the unexpected that were most generative and to which I attend in particular.

Research Design

It was clear from the commencement of this research undertaking, that the kinds of data that would be rich and generative would be produced by directly engaging with the experiences of organisational members, those who were in the process of becoming 'officer' and those who actually were officers. Initially I considered doing a series of case studies but felt that this might be too narrow, restrictive and fail to produce the quality of data that was required. It soon became apparent that individual interviews would allow me to explore at depth the rich individual experiences of my subjects who were formed by the organisational officer discourse, and offer an approach for disrupting the way in which power/knowledge tends to normalise the discursively produced experiences of officer.

I view this interview data as generating narratives through which particular kinds of subjectivities are discursively produced. Interviews do not simply facilitate a value neutral process which will result in the 'real' data of the interviewee's experience external to the interview. Such narratives are not accounts of a 'true reality' but rather are a way for interviewers and interviewees to co-produce situated and locally produced accounts of the world (Holstein & Gubrium 2000). Narratives are a means of human sense making and as such are 'relational spaces' (Phoenix 2008, p64). As Mishler maintains, 'telling stories is one of the significant ways individuals construct and express meaning. This assumption informs the work of many investigators from a variety of disciplines having different theoretical perspectives' (Mishler 1986, p67).

Therefore I conceptualise the interview in terms of a social encounter and thus the data produced as the result of a socially situated activity (the interview process itself). The interview produces *accounts or versions* of the interviewee's past (or future) experiences, thoughts, feelings, actions. In effect the interview is an artefact, a joint accomplishment of the interviewer and the respondent (Chase 2008, p64; Dingwall 1997, p56; Rapley 2007, p16; Squire 2008, p43). In this social space, the interviewer and interviewee approach the interview with different desires and agendas and from different social locations. For instance respondents may see the interview as a context within which they are required to demonstrate competence as an expert, or knowledgeable member of a particular community. Potter (1996) speaks of this as claiming 'category entitlement' through which the speaker position is self authorised. In the dialogue the interviewee takes interactional cues from the interviewer regarding the acceptability or otherwise of the accounts being constructed (Dingwall 1997, p59). During the interviews I became increasingly conscious of the ways in which some interviewees (particularly among the cadets cohort) sought 'legitimising cues' from me. It was something more than signalling understanding or at other times sympathy, rather it appeared to be a form of authorisation or validation of their experience as it was constructed in the interview itself. This was an example of the interview itself providing a location within which to conduct identity work. This was most apparent when cadets expressed concern, reluctance, resistance, or disapproval of organisational practices. My validation (or at least non-condemnation or non-criticism) constructed the interview as a place from which cadets were staking out the boundaries of their officer identity in the moment, in that location.

As such a co-production, narrative necessarily involves at least some reconstruction of stories across time and place. The very telling of stories is situated and so serves particular purposes in particular historical contexts. In other words, stories are *performed* differently in different social contexts and therefore cannot mean the exact some thing twice (Squire 2008, p44), thus there is always a certain uniqueness to the interview as a purposeful 'storied event.' So Rapley who maintains that in terms of analysis the focus should be upon what actually happened in the interview itself, how interactions produced a particular trajectory of talk and how specific versions of reality are co-constructed (Rapley 2007, p20). The interviewer is not neutral, but engaged with the interviewee in the dialogical construction, a strategy of 'cooperative work.'

In exploring the concept of identity in my theorisation chapter three, I pointed to the idea that 'the self is discovered in its own narrational acts. Selfhood is the kind of entity

that is characterised by its ability to reflect upon itself, thus identity is a narrative construction – a narrated self in the world' (Ezzy 1998, p244). In a sense we speak ourselves into being through the strategic telling of narratives (a technology of the self). The notion of story telling is a reflexive engagement whereby the self comes to be through reflecting upon experience. In terms of my Foucauldian approach to discourse I am interested in the way that power acts to create the conditions of possibility for specific narratives to emerge as dominant and for others to be marginalised or repressed (Tamboukou 2008, p104).

As a framing for the interviews I employed a semi structured approach in which I used a set of predetermined questions across each cohort (novice, experienced officers and past officers – see appendix) yet with the flexibility to follow 'trajectories of talk' that appeared to be productive through follow up questions. According to interviewee responses I selectively followed up on specific themes or topics (perhaps seeking clarification or expansion) in an effort to co-produce detailed and comprehensive talk (Rapley 2007, p16). As far as possible I employed a technique of inviting participants to frame and construct their own story through allowing silences and spaces rather than a constant flow of question or conversation.

Such a framework provides insight into the constructed nature of the identities involved in organisational stories – the identity of the storyteller and their perspective of the identities of others and their place within the social structure as they perceive it. Thus discourse analysis is an appropriate approach for analysing interview transcripts which can be legitimately treated as narrative accounts or stories through which they narrate themselves into being.

When I initially proposed this research project I had intended to also undertake a Foucauldian 'archaeological' analysis of the historical textual archive within which the object 'officer' comes to exist in particular socio-historically situated contexts. Very early it became clear that such an enterprise was well outside the physical dimensions of what was achievable. However, I still intuited that the ways in which 'officer' is constructed and normalised in the historical materials of The Salvation Army would contribute to my analysis of the contemporary interview materials. I have thus drawn upon a data set of rich textual resources going back to the emergence of The Salvation Army in 1878. This has allowed me to hone in on how 'officer' has been historically constructed and normalised as an object, particularly as an artefact of the historical conditions that produced it in its 'particularity.'

These institutional texts may be understood as crystallisations of particular moments in time and space and assume that they describe stable, objective realities. Discourses themselves may encourage if not demand that such texts are authoritative and decontextualised institutional realities to which institutional members are held to account. 'Such crystallisation is the result of glossing over the various contingencies and other contextual factors associated with the text's production and use in concrete institutional settings' (Miller 1997, p78). The selection of texts was based upon the degree to which they contained 'programmatic' statements in that they sought to impose a vision, or define most clearly the emergence of the object officer, and what this institutionally normalised object looks and acts like in the world (Kendall & Wickham 2007, p132). I have sought to use the material judiciously where it enlightens the historical dimension of 'officer' within and relative to, the narrated experiences of contemporary members of The Salvation Army.

Interviewing

I recognise that even before the data collection processes are begun, that I am already engaged in making analytical choices about the types or kinds of people whose voices might form part of this research and of course by implication deselecting those who will remain silenced. Since the object 'officer' stands at the centre of this research I decided to interview three organisational cohorts: experienced officers of 10 years or more service, past officers (those who had resigned from their officership) and cadets (pre-officer). In the analysis that follows in chapters five, six and seven, where a participant is cited I have referenced the ID code indicated in the tables below and italicised the quotation. In these chapters the reader will become aware of the way I have regularly referenced my analysis to interview fragments. Upon reflection I believe this has arisen out of an anxiety to show that the analysis is securely sourced and located in the thick description of the data rather than no more than the projection of my assumptions and intuitions (Fontana & Frey 2008, p140-1).

Officer Cohort

I selected four experienced officers based upon such factors as breadth of organisational experience, place in organisational hierarchy, ability to be reflexive, and gender. I wanted to sample a spread across organisation locations. To this end I secured interviews with a recent ex Senior Executive level officer, a Divisional Commander (middle management), a Senior Training officer responsible for training cadets, and an officer who had spent most of their officership as a Corps officer (parish

work). The gender balance of this cohort was three male and one female, mainly due to reflecting the gender spread of incumbent senior and middle management.

ID Code	Recent/Past Organisational position	Years of service as Officer	Gender
O1	Senior Executive	43	Male
O2	Senior Training Officer	17	Male
O3	Divisional Commander	36	Male
O4	Corps Officer	10	Female

Past Officers (resignations)

I selected two officers who had resigned from Salvation Army officership during the years 2008/2009. I made my selections based upon the contextual and personal attributes of the individual (ie. their ability to be reflexive), I also took into account their geographical proximity to arrange a face to face interview. I decided to pursue individuals who had resigned within a one and a half to three year window in the hope that their organisational experiences would still be relatively current and fresh. This space would also allow a period within which the participant could have commenced processing their experience of the organisation as an officer. On the other hand I did not want them to be too far removed from those experiences chronologically so that they lost their immediacy and potency. Ideally I was also seeking an individual who was no longer part of The Salvation Army (as a non-officer), which would present them with opportunities to experience other ways of being in the world and social discourses other than The Salvation Army. From my assessment of the list of possible candidates (based upon my insider organisational knowledge) I identified two participants, one who was now located in Queensland and another from Sydney as potentially the most productive participants.

ID Code	Past Organisational Position	Years of service as Officer	Gender	Age
E1	Corps Officer	14	Female	early 40s
E2	Corps Officer / Divisional Officer	12	Female	early 40s

Cadet Cohort

Among the cadet cohort I decided to interview six individuals who had varying exposure to The Salvation Army prior to entering training in which (at the time of the interviews) they were in their second and final year. The novice cohort was relatively small (17 cadets – 14 residential, 3 non residential). I decided to focus on the residential cadets as not only were they the easiest to physically access, but as full time residential they were also more likely to experience the officer discourse constantly acting upon them in a very intentional training space. For the purposes of this research, the cohort was divided into a matrix of gender (male/female) and degree of prior experience of The Salvation Army (high/low). I assessed this prior experience based mainly upon the period they had been part of a Salvation Army Corps (church) prior to entering training as a Salvation Army officer. At the time of design I intuited that the richer source of data would likely be produced by those who had 'lower' prior experience of the organisation. Thus I intended to interview 1 male, 1 female with a 'higher' level of previous experience of the Salvation Army, and 2 males and 2 females who had 'lower' prior experience of The Salvation Army. Ideally I would have preferred participants with shorter periods of prior experience for the 'low' category, but these were the closest available within the cohort.

ID Code	Prior experience of organisational (High/Low)	Period of prior experience as organisational member (years)	Gender	Age
P1	Low	1.5	Female	late 50s
P2	Low	5	Female	20s
P3	High	20+	Female	late 20s
P4	Low	8	Male	30s
P5	High	20+	Male	20s
P6	Low	9	Male	late 30s

Prior Formation of Cadets

As organisational novices, cadets potentially provide the clearest insight into the transitional experience of discourse acting upon them as non-officers to produce the officer subjectivity. However, cadets are not all simply blank slates upon which discourse writes its effects. Each individual is 'preformed,' produced by the complex intersection of discourse positions that they inhabited prior to their experience in The Salvation Army as cadet. While it is clearly outside the bounds of this study to offer a detailed account of either the discourses or the 'preformed' subjectivities that were

produced prior to Salvation Army experience, it remains incumbent upon me to at least signal the kinds of prior formation that defined cadets.

Prior to her first coming to The Salvation Army only 1.5 years before entering training as a cadet, P1 had an extensive background in the Presbyterian, Uniting and Pentecostal Churches. In these churches, she had been involved in various ministry positions. In her professional life P1 was a school teacher. While P1 had a low prior experience of The Salvation Army, she was clearly familiar with the Christian religious tradition and had exposure to various organisational and institutional contexts which had pre-formed her.

P2 had some contact with various Salvation Army corps (churches) for 5 years prior to entering into training. Her main experience was at a corps that was fairly unusual in the way it operated and thus did not offer a representative experience of most Salvation Army corps (and what it means to be a Salvationist). Prior to entering training P2 was involved in social work. Her narrow prior experience of The Salvation Army did produce some dissonances in the training setting. For P2 the Training College was a quite foreign space when compared with her limited prior experience of The Salvation Army in her corps.

P3 is an example of a 'life long' exposure to life in The Salvation Army. She had grown up in The Salvation Army and as a child of a parent who is a Salvation Army officer had grown up with first hand insight into the institution and the ways of being officer. In fact for several generations there have been Salvation Army officers in her family. P3 expressed a sense of call to officership at the young age of 11. Prior to entering training she was a family support worker for children and family services. P3 is an example of someone whose prior experience of The Salvation Army has been both broad and deeply penetrating.

Prior to entering training as a cadet, P4 was a primary school teacher and was also an acting principal. P4 had only 8 years prior experience of The Salvation Army, yet before this was a congregant of the Baptist church. In fact it was in the Baptist setting that P4 speaks of being called to full time ministry, he initially only came to The Salvation Army because his then girlfriend attended.

P5 represents another example of 'life long' exposure to The Salvation Army (although he had been a soldier for only 5 years prior to entering training). His parents were themselves officers, which indicates that P5 had some degree of first hand experience of organisational life from an officer's perspective. Prior to training P5 was a childcare worker, but had always been involved in the ministries of the corps (sometimes to the perceived detriment of his work place) [P5:7].

P6 was a secondary school teacher prior to entering training. In his early teens he left The Salvation Army not aligning himself with any organisational church, but in later life with a family, returned to The Salvation Army corps 9 years before entering training as a cadet.

Ethical Considerations

All the formal university processes concerning ethics approval were completed prior to any contact with participants. This of course included seeking permission from senior Salvation Army leadership to undertake this research project. While the research proposal was approved, it was with conditions that suggested some reticence or perhaps even suspicion of what the study might conclude. Approval was communicated via an email but with some conditions which included, that I seek permission to be on the College campus when speaking with cadets and that a 'summary of findings' to be submitted *prior* to the final submission of the thesis. I sought clarification of these two conditions. Regarding the first condition I expressed concern that this might lead to the identification of the individuals that I was intending to interview. I was informed that this was simply so that College staff were aware when non-College personnel were visiting the campus (an OH&S issue). Whom I was visiting or speaking with was irrelevant.

The second condition was of somewhat greater concern. I inquired as to why this requirement was felt necessary, as the fact that it was requested prior to submission raised in my mind the question of whether this might lead to an attempt to censor or influence in some way my research findings. The response I received was rather cryptic. Apparently senior leadership wanted to see the findings as they felt it was possible that 'they might not agree with them.' I again sought further clarification as to whether this suggested that pressure might be brought to bear to modify the findings should leadership disagree or disapprove. Again, I was assured that this was not the case. When completed, the entire thesis will be made available to leadership should they desire it.

This process left me with a sense of the organisational distrust of 'the academic' as an appropriate or even valuable way of generating organisational knowledge (referred to in the introduction). It also represented the way in which organisational discourses seek to authorise and thus regulate the circulation of power/knowledge and its potential impacts upon organisational life.

Organisationally I had no power or influence over any participant save that of perhaps years of service in the organisation. In terms of the novices in particular I did not have any input into, or influence over, their appointments (career assignments), their evaluation as individuals or of their performance in their studies.

Once potential participants were identified, my initial approach was made via email. In the email I broadly outlined the purpose of the study, the time commitment involved (approximately 1-1.5 hours), that they were under no obligation to accept, and if they did, they could withdraw at any time without question. Following positive responses I then arranged a meeting to discuss the project further and then conduct the interview.

The physical location in which the interviews were held varied according to the needs of the participants. I met with the majority of novices at the Training College either in the participant's home or in a quiet recreational room, for the others the location was either my office or the office of the participant. No one other than the participant was informed of the interview or its purpose. For all except two novices I did not wear uniform as this could potentially be constructed as an 'officer' (with all the organisational values and coding that that may imply including relative power positions). On the two occasions that I did wear uniform it was because the interviews were conducted in an organisational office space which included the normal organisational expectations around wearing uniform. In these interviews I intended to take up the position as researcher investigating a particular aspect of organisational life which to some extent we shared together.

The interviews with experienced officers took place in either their office space or mine. Due to these locations there were organisational requirements regarding the wearing of uniform (thus both myself and the participants were in uniform). This is itself a normalised expectation and experience for the participants, so I would be very surprised if the fact that we wore uniform even entered their consciousness. However, in meeting with the ex-officers I decided to meet in locations and at times that would enable me to avoid wearing uniform. Since both participants had been out of a normalising Salvation Army setting for an extended period I did not want to be seen to be taking up an organisational location, perhaps even representing the organisation in some way. This had the potential to impact significantly upon the ex-officer particularly if they were still dealing with personal issues around resigning from officership and leaving the organisation.

At the commencement of each interview I again outlined the purpose of the study and in a general way, the type of information I hoped to gather. I also clearly discussed with each participant the possible risks/costs for them both in terms of the organisation and personally in the process of the telling of their experiences. I described how the interview would be digitally recorded and how their personal information would be handled and protected via encoded passwords held on a private computer. I also assured them that in the thesis or any published work their identity would be protected through appropriate coding or pseudonyms. I reminded them again that they could withdraw at any time they wished without any pressure from me. I asked all participants to read and sign the standard research consent form approved by the university ethics committee.

To varying degrees I was known to all participants and this assisted me in quickly establishing an atmosphere of trust that facilitated frankness and openness in the interviews, however I also recognise that as researcher I was operating in the personal space of others through their lived experiences (both positive and negative). This needed to be negotiated with care and sensitivity as particularly for the novice participants they were still very much in the midst of negotiating their own interim form of personal officer identity, and the interview process itself at times raised some difficult questions for some participants.

At the conclusion of interviews I asked participants if they felt at ease with what had been said and recorded, and if they were comfortable with me proceeding to use this material. There were two occasions in particular during the interviews that I became aware of a ‘surfacing reluctance’ – a reservation concerning what was spoken and how that might possibly be read by the organisation. I acknowledged this to both participants during the interview, asking again if they were comfortable with the de-identification protocols that were in place. On both occasions I noted the material, and that I needed to handle this material (if used) in a very cautious way.

Generally, and among the cadet cohort in particular, at the conclusion of the interview participants expressed a sense of gratitude for being given the space and opportunity to process and express how they felt and what it means for them to become an officer. One of the officers who had resigned articulated how the process had been for them ‘therapeutic’ in opening up a space for reflection, processing and self expression that had not been afforded them before.

Conducting Interviews

Once the ethical procedures (outlined above) were completed I briefly introduced again in broad terms, the research question. I then proceeded to basically use the key questions I had prepared as a framework for ensuring a relative consistency across interviews (see appendix). I did not slavishly follow the questions in some programmatic way but rather where it appeared productive, followed the narrative along various and sometimes fruitful pathways, depending on the quality and breadth of answers that were generated (Rapley 2007, p18).

I tried to make it as clear as possible that there were no right or wrong answers, but only the participant's perspective, experiences, hunches and intuitions, which I assured them would be most helpful. As interviewer I tried to listen carefully to responses noting down any areas that required further clarification, but generally waiting until the participant had completed their answer before seeking clarifications through follow up questions. The intent was to allow as far as possible the narrative to emerge from the participant's experience and according to their framings. I had determined before hand to allow silences and spaces to hang, rather than seeking to jump into the space to fill them with more words. This of course produced some long pauses, but also allowed the participants the necessary processing space to consider their responses and to produce 'extended talk.'

During the interviews and the post interview transcription process, I found myself conscious of the many turns in the conversations that could be construed as the insertion of my intuitions and feelings into the 'collaborative work.' As interviewer I found myself sometimes feeling caught between the desire to 'birth' the participant's narrated experience, and on the other hand expressing empathy and understanding which validated their perspectives/concerns. Sometimes this empathy may have revealed my feelings/opinions and may have shaped the discussion in a particular way. While I maintain that the interview itself is a cooperative work that produces versions and perspectives of social events (Rapley 2007, p21-22), nonetheless I found the 'inner dialogue' of reflexivity important in evaluating the limits of my own engagement and talk. After all what is the essential difference between the confirmation of an intuition and the validation of a preconceived (discursively produced) truth or value? I was constantly foregrounding this question in my mind as I listened and responded to interviewees.

Over the interviews I realised that I had to develop the skill of directing the

conversations in particular productive ways, rather than allowing it to ramble down paths that were clearly non-productive (at least from the point of view of my research questions). The first couple of interviews were about 1.5 hours long which was then reflected in the time commitment to transcription. I soon developed the skills to hone in on what was productive without overly controlling the conversation, or reducing it to no more than answers to a series of survey questions. This made the average interview just over an hour in duration. I tried to transcribe each interview prior to conducting the next, noting emerging themes that would inform the next interview through either asking a direct question, or sometimes making some observation and inviting a comment, thus testing my interpretation of themes and trajectories of talk that were emerging in my analysis (Gubrium & Holstein 2002, p15). I sought to be particularly aware of, and attentive to, the surprising or the response that appeared to dance around 'domains of silence' the things that appear to be on the horizon of articulation but fall short of speech perhaps because in the officer discourse it cannot be said. I was intent on carefully and sensitively drawing out this speech horizon if it existed.

Research Analysis

All interviews were transcribed into a tabularised 'Word' document. I decided not to identify line by line, but rather small manageable 'chunks of talk.' The table enabled me to keep text and the identifying unit number together regardless of formatting. I also regularly noted the time stamp of the digital recorder in the table so I could return to the digital recording later to verify what was said if necessary (this proved very useful later). In terms of transcription protocols I sought to note voice inflections, intonations, emphasises, laughter, overlapping speech, silences etc. Once transcribed, I undertook a second reading against the digital recording correcting errors along the way, and noting significant themes, patterns and ideas to revisit later in the analysis phase. Through this method I found myself already becoming familiar with the data.

Once completed the transcriptions were imported into NVivo8 as sources for analysis. Prior to locating themes across interviews, I attended to the voices within each narrative. This allowed me to focus upon how the narrator positioned themselves in relation to the organisation, and in relation to themselves. I tried to identify the 'narrative linkages' that the participant self narrated emerging from between the biographical particulars of their life, and the resources and constraints in their environment for self and reality construction (Chase 2008, p67). My emphasis was upon a hermeneutical approach rather than structural analysis although I recognise that the later overlaps with the former.

Based upon the Foucauldian discourse theorisations and understanding of identity as a unstable product of narrative, as discussed in chapters two and three, I undertook a careful and fine reading of transcripts (sources) twice, through which I noted emergent themes and to which I assigned a code in NVivo taking into account not only what was produced, but how it was produced (ie. discursive turns etc.). In my analysis I also attended to the sequencing and progression of themes within interviews, their transformation and resolution (Squire 2008, p50). As participants responded to questions and ideas they constructed themselves as having particular philosophies and habitual ways of dealing with the world that constitute a projection of identity (Phoenix 2008, p67), and the ways that they managed their different senses of self. Following this I re-read the interview material comparing themes so that I could refine the coding, and importantly noted any deviant examples within the data. This deviant material is important as Foucault suggests, 'discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy …' (1981, p101-102). Thus I was particularly attentive to any indication of sites of 'discoursal incoherence.' This is a space created by multiple discourses which struggle for dominance within organisational life. This contested space opens up possibilities for subjectivities to reconstruct their professional identity(ies). The fact that organisationally there are multiple versions of what constitutes effective professional practice and identity, clearly points to 'discoursal incoherence' as the creative space within organisational existence. My objective was not to bring closure or control but to identify the ways in which officers are formed and produced in the dialogical space between discourses. I also focussed upon rendering strange what was apparently familiar. Foucault would take a familiar idea and 'render it strange'; he would seek to unsettle notions typically taken for granted in an effort to appreciate the strangeness that lies behind the mask of familiarity (Hoskin 1990, p29). To uncover this strangeness I sought to deconstruct the interview materials using the tools of discourse analysis described in the theorisation chapters. Through this analysis 'the central focus of interest becomes the way in which texts construct meanings and subject positions for the reader, the contradictions inherent in this process and its political implications, both in its historical context and in the present' (Weedon 1987, p167). In this study I sought to examine how meanings and subject positions were constructed, in effect how officers speak themselves into existence.

I then re-read all transcribed materials according to code noting discursive regularities, patterns of meaning across the data set, assumed ways of being, disruptions,

statements of truth, the experience of power/knowledge, ‘regimes of truth,’ significant silences around what cannot be said (Ball 1990, p3), making extensive comments and notes in the annotations facility of NVivo8. I then refined the coding structure through the consolidation of appropriate codes into categorisations, and then rearranged the relative structure of the codes so that it reflected a logical flow of material to assist in the drawing of the analysis together in the writing up phase. For each category I brought together all the annotations pertaining to that coding and reread these against the interview data fragments associated with that code. From this material I generated my data analysis and findings chapters.

From my analysis of the transcripts certain themes emerged that appeared to dominate across the experiences of the participants. A powerful and central knowledge produced by the officer discourse was that of ‘divine call’ which featured in almost all accounts. Since the earliest days of The Salvation Army this idea has evolved over time to become something that is fundamentally central to the identity of the Salvation Army officer, so much so that for a majority, one cannot be ‘officer’ without it. In effect it is maintained that the object ‘officer’ is produced by an act of divine will – an organisational ‘regime truth.’ If officer is a divine ‘achievement’ then this ‘naturally’ implies the divine authorisation of organisational structures, processes, beliefs, practices and identity. This was one of the most confronting and to some extent surprising findings - the way that the officer discourse draws its power from the divine through in effect collapsing the divine and organisational wills into one. The data revealed that this collapse does not produce one univocal position that is uncontested, but the officer discourse operating upon all organisational members constructs an environment that attempts to disperse such resistance through fundamental organisational values that define officers. The data identified these values as obedience, hard work, loyalty, commitment and conformity. Resistance is framed as the disregarding or deconstructing of one or more of these operationalised values and is normally experienced as detrimental to, or the undermining of, the stability and effectiveness of the organisation. In their narratives, participants regularly referenced the ways in which they experienced the organisation as acting upon them to produce a particular kind of subject – a Salvation Army officer. Although participants did not employ a common language to speak of their experiences, there emerged a common notional framework from across the narratives. The participants referred to a comprehensive network of surveillance both within the organisation from managers above, from peers, but also the general public, which to varying degrees produced the inward gaze of self regulation. Another surprise the data revealed was the way in which

'confession' featured so pervasively in many narratives. Organisational practices and systems worked to produce novices as 'truth tellers' about themselves to themselves, to mentors and assessors, and ultimately to God. With this truth telling (confession) came various expressions of change (repentance) and the re-forming of identity according to the organisational prescriptions. The identity that participants sought to manifest in organisational locations appeared to the participants as 'self directed' and 'self actualised' through their own agency, yet was actually produced through the strategically directed and transparent technologies of discourse.

Limitations of Research

Methodologically in seeking to apply Foucauldian discourse analysis a significant limitation is that there are no clear or mandated sets of procedures to follow that make a particular study an example of Foucauldian discourse analysis. The relatively unstructured nature of the analytic makes its mastery difficult for the novice researcher. As stated above, Foucauldian discourse analysis offers a set of concepts with which the scaffold the research, to generate data and illuminate analysis. Such an approach produces an account rather than the 'repeatable truth' that realist approaches seek. Thus in such reader's minds Foucauldian discourse analysis may be criticised as being relativistic and producing no more than endless versions of reality. I cannot claim to produce *the* truth of officer (as this would simply be an attempt to replace one truth claim with another), but a social account of human practices at a particular time and organisational location of course influenced by my own social location within the organisation. This location also references the selectivity which I as researcher introduce into the research process itself. Which texts are selected and on what basis (and equally those that are silently excluded)? Which participant voices in their infinite nuances are heard and how they are deployed may lead to the legitimate charge made of Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1995) that only particular interpretations are disclosed, while a multitude of others remain obscured.

Foucault's approach is also criticised as annihilating the stability of the 'knowing' subject, as it is reduced to no more than the product of power/knowledge relations. Thus since all knowledge is socially produced it can never be regarded as certain. So while a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis may disrupt 'taken for granted assumptions it can provide no grounding for alternative modes of knowledge, for they will be equally bereft of a firm epistemological territory upon which to stand' (Cheek & Porter 1997p, 112). Thus any epistemologically based conclusions produced in this research may just as legitimately be criticised as being no more than discursive effects

of knowledge/power.

As an approach, Foucauldian discourse analysis may ultimately surface the mechanisms through which discourse operates to produce subjectivity (officers), yet it fails to offer any way of evaluating knowledge based claims ie. other ways of being officer, of progressing, of seeking what is 'better.' Indeed Foucauldian discourse analysis may legitimately be criticised for in the end leading to a paralysis concerning future action and failing to proffer a way forward into the future. In this sense I use Foucault diagnostically – a making sense of 'what is', rather than any future project that attempts to make choices about the future possibilities of officers and their practices (which of course will be produced again by power based discourse). Power will always circulate, the question to focus upon is identifying its *effects*. However, it may be legitimate to maintain that epistemological judgements are possible for statements asserted *within* discourses (as against across different discourses) (Howarth 2002, p128).

At a process level another limitation is the temptation to simply use transcripts as a source of quotations to support the preconceived ideas of the researcher (Potter 1998, p127). I found myself continually assessing myself as an insider researcher with intuitions that at times appeared to be born out by the transcribed data of the interviews. In these instances in particular I regularly sought confirmation across multiple participants. What was more of a concern to me was that of attempting to listen for silences and gaps within the narratives. To claim insight into what is not present, could be challenged as being no more than producing the proverbial arguments from silence.' But these were not merely any silences such that anything could be said, but rather identifying the silences that were sustained behind particular discursive forms, knowledges and practices.

Quantitative research is usually based upon large sample sizes which claim to be representative of a population and therefore offering the realist prize of generalisability. Like most qualitative studies this study is based upon a relatively small sample of the overall officer population (although of the novice population, the 6 participants represented a healthy 35% sample). Employing semi structured interviews rather than for example a survey instrument like a standard questionnaire allowed me to co-produce a complex and rich data set. However while richness and density allows one to produce comprehensive and subtle insights, it also limits the project in terms of sample size. Since individuals are produced by the multiple discourses that they

inhabit, it is ultimately impossible to claim that all individuals will experience the officer discourse in the same way. However, this is not the point of this current study. The question at stake here is in effect mapping, delimiting and describing the organisational discourse itself and how it acts upon individuals to produce the object officer.

Within the limitations of this research it was difficult to produce an adequate account of the predispositions with which novices entered into training and may have thus contributed to their resistances to knowledge/power. In this, I acknowledge that such predispositions may also be examined from a psychological perspective around identity, unconscious feelings and non-rational behavioural routines. It was also not possible to explore the ways in which individuals who were at once produced through discourse, and yet were also carriers and modifiers of that very same officer discourse.

Summary

Foucauldian discourse analysis offers a generative set of theorisations through which to understand the ways that organisational discourse produces 'officer' and so recognise the processes that lead to the production of a Salvation Army officer professional identity. This approach like all approaches has its limitations both theoretically and methodologically but on balance Foucauldian discourse analysis is particularly suited to this study.

In this chapter which draws upon the theorisations developed in previous chapters, I have sought to make as explicit as possible both to myself and the reader how I, as insider/outsider researcher, am located in the midst of this organisational research. I have endeavoured to offer a detailed account of my own reflexivity and the ways in which I as researcher impacted the research enterprise - its design, implementation and analysis.

Having clearly articulated both the limitations and potency of Foucauldian discourse analysis and my methodological approach, in the following chapters I turn my attention to data analysis through thick description. In these chapters we shall see how the object officer is created and sustained by organisational discourses that seek to preserve organisational equilibrium. Challenges, resistances, identities that contradict the organisationally constructed reality within which officers exist as instruments of the organisation, are met with various strategies and technologies that seek to 'reform', 'grow' even 'redeem' (in a religious sense) the individual. Yet if these discursive technologies fail to restore conformity (and thus organisational equilibrium), then

discourse can resort to ‘demonising’ the non-compliant through the flow of power/knowledge which has been constructed as self evident truth. We shall attempt to deconstruct (render strange) these self evident or ‘natural’ truths in an effort to map the discursive terrain of the Salvation Army officer identity.

Chapter 5

Officer – The Divine Appointment

In *Discipline and Punish* (1977) Foucault noted the rise of the modern prison and the novel form of criminal punishment that accompanied it. The primary difference between the modern system and its antecedents in terms of the regimes of punishment is that retribution for one's crimes was no longer enacted upon the criminal's body. Criminality turned instead to adopt modern techniques of power that acted upon 'the soul' of the criminal. One of Foucault's main arguments was that only a particular *mode of society* could have invented this form of punishment at a particular historical moment (McHoul & Grace 1993, p66). We turn now to consider the particular modes, representations and material conditions of thought or 'knowledges' that make the object Salvation Army officer possible.

The Salvation Army officer is not a naturally occurring nor inevitable object in the world. Rather it was produced through complex discourses located in 19th century England. In 1857 William Booth (who was later to become the founder of The Salvation Army), was appointed to the Halifax circuit of the Methodist New Connection. In the following year he was ordained into the ministry and appointed to Gateshead. The relationship between William and the Methodist New Connection was not to last long. In 1861 William tendered his resignation due to personal differences and what he experienced as constricting organisational structures (an irony that I hope will not escape the reader as we examine the possibilities that gave rise to the officer object).

In 1865 William together with his wife Catherine moved to London and undertook tent missions among the poorest of the East End. As Booth received increasing attention and support the organisation grew and in 1869 became known as The Christian Mission with Booth as its leader with the title General Superintendent. In 1878 the organisation was renamed The Salvation Army resulting in a powerful and generative military metaphor being employed that profoundly shaped organisational identity. Booth took the title 'General' while Mission station preachers were invested with the 'designation' of Captain. By the mid 1880s the military metaphor provided the structural and intellectual framing for organisational identity, generating other ranks, uniforms and an intricate system of discipline based upon military forms that were written upon the lives of the Mission's leaders, leading to the creation of the objects – Salvation Army officers.

At this point it would be wise to seek to avoid reading back contemporary understandings of rank and structure into a quickly evolving if not somewhat chaotic space of the early Salvation Army. While Booth as leader was addressed as General (a shortened form of General Superintendent) and for all intents and purposes appeared the wield authority and direction as a military commander, the concept of rank took some time to evolve. Initially 'Captain' was more a signifier of a particular leadership position, title or job function, than a way of indexing a relative organisational hierarchical position. Thus anyone considered suitable by Booth could be 'seconded' to take on a particular leadership role signified as 'Captain.' Nevertheless one could argue that already in Booth's way of operating, organising and directing the Army, the military metaphor was already present in a nascent way within The Salvation Army's predecessor – The Christian Mission. While other organisational metaphors dot the landscape such as captain of a fishing boat, railway metaphors, etc. the predominate metaphor that eventually shaped organisational structures and practices was the military Army. This was a metaphor that was midwifed by the discourses of Victorian England and the imperialist expansion of the British empire made possible by the military organisation. The rise of the military as an acceptable way of conceptualising Christianity can be traced in significant part to the response to the Crimean War of the mid 1850's. In Victorian Britain preachers delighted to identify Christian virtues with military ones. Professional soldiering long regarded as incompatible with Christianity, was lauded by the church going public as 'soldier saints'.

> '…late nineteenth-century British militarism was not only an affair of unprecedentedly adulatory attitudes towards Britain's professional soldiers, but also of civilian imitation of military organization, discipline and paraphernalia, and the diffusion of military sentiments and rhetoric in general' (Anderson 1971, p46)

By the mid 1860's many sections of the religious public had accepted the army as part of the church militant on earth and were so constructed as Christian heroes. The birth of the 'militarised' Salvation Army in the 1880's may be seen as part of this broader social acceptance. In some sections of religious work in particular, there was the developing imitation of military discipline, titles, uniforms as a kind of para-militarism within the Church (Anderson 1971, p66). Certainly by the early 1900's the military metaphor also had the benefit of shaping an organisational identity that differentiated it from the established Church which became a particular concern. From the beginning the organisation wanted to establish an identity which was distinct from the rest of the Church, as this quote from the Founder attests,

> ‘An essential of Salvationism is separation. Remember that The Army is different from the churches, and therefore separate from them. We are a people, who once were not a people’ (Booth 1924, p84).

In the material that follows in this and succeeding chapters, I will seek to illuminate via my data analysis the dimensions of the discursively produced object: The Salvation Army officer, through applying Foucauldian discourse analysis to the data collected by means of interviews and selected organisational documents. The reader should note that when referencing quotes from interview transcripts, I have utilised the following convention [participant ID: line number in transcript] ie. [P1:26] and the quotation italicised. Descriptions of participants and their categorisation are located in chapter four.

As clearly stated in chapter four, it is not my intention to undertake an historical archaeological examination of the discourses that created the space within which the object officer emerged in the late 19th century, but rather to examine how the object officer is constituted as ‘real’ in contemporary officer discourses, in other words to explore ‘the conditions of its continuing possibility.’ Nonetheless historical organisational documents are important for appreciating the historical conditions that led to the continuing possibilities of the object ‘Salvation Army officer.’ Thus I will draw upon organisational documents as a way of indicating how the organisational historical archive has its real material effects upon the contemporary experience of participants as articulated through the interviews. These organisational documents assume that they reflect a reality called ‘Salvation Army officer’ and thus work to maintain this object in its historical specificity. The selection of texts will be based upon the degree to which they contain such ‘programmatic’ statements that seek to impose a vision, or define most clearly the emergence of the object officer, and what this institutionally normalised object looks and acts like in the world (Kendall & Wickham 2007, p132).
As Poynton and Lee advocate,

> ‘We should not ‘burrow’ into discourse looking for meanings. We should instead look for the external conditions of its existence, its appearance and its regularity. We should explore the conditions of its possibility. Just how is it possible to know that, to think that, to say that - these are the questions we should be asking.’ (Poynton & Lee 2000, p49).

Not only am I intent on mapping the discursive terrain that produces the object Salvation Army officer and its many subjectivities, but also through destabilising this

normalised object, exposing the flow of power/knowledge and the application of discursive technologies, I wish to open up other possibilities for constructing officer that might be as generative and effective in the contemporary historical particularity as it appears 'officer' was, when it emerged from the historical vicissitudes of the late nineteenth century. I seek to disrupt the unseen necessity that the authentic Salvation Army officer object must, through some predetermined historical necessity, appear in the particular way which the contemporary discourse determines as natural. Perhaps such a disruption might open spaces within which it might be possible 'to think into existence' a greater plurality which can be not only accepted, but embraced as authentic expressions of officer.

Organisationally the object officer is defined as one who is a carrier or agent of the 'Blood and Fire' spirit and 'who is enabled to sustain and advance the purposes of The Salvation Army' (The Salvation Army 1925, p19). While the concept of 'blood and fire spirit' remains somewhat ill-defined, it is an attempt to preserve the pioneering attitudes and values (now part of an organisational mythology) of the Founder and those who saw the spread of The Salvation Army in its initial phase of growth in the late 1800's / early 1900's. In terms of instilling this as an aspect of the emergent officer identity of cadets, *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers* states this objective includes: 'fostering growth and maturity, self discipline and acceptance of authority, the spiritual development of cadets, evaluation and development of … self motivation, positive self esteem and *a clear sense of identity* as Salvation Army officers' (The Salvation Army 1991, p7). Through applying Foucauldian discourse analysis I shall attempt to deconstruct this notion of '*identity* as Salvation Army officers' to which the archive refers.

Call

One of if not the, primary discursively produced conditions that makes the object officer possible is that of the 'divine call.' As one senior officer commented quite enthusiastically *'… I guess I've probably talked that [divine calling] up over the years, and when I was Candidates Secretary [responsible for processing those who apply to become officers] I talked it up, that if you're not convinced you're called, don't come, because it'll get too hard'* [O1:90]. This position was supported in the perspective offered by one novice who wanted to become an officer, but felt that the desire itself was not enough, there must be a divine call: *'it was exciting because I wanted to be an officer so it was very cool to get that [the call from God]… like a green light from God I*

guess, I could do what I wanted to' [P3:16]. These accounts reflect a deeply entrenched tradition and understanding that a particular and individual divine calling is absolutely essential to officership as is indicated in the following excerpt concerning the training of officers in 1925,

> 'The cadet himself must be convinced of his call from God to offer himself and his service to The Salvation Army. I do not consider it too much to say that, if any cadet thinks he can do God's will as fully outside the ranks of The Salvation Army as within it, he should be encouraged to go outside …I think we ought not to be afraid of making it absolutely clear to the cadets that we do not want them unless they are called' (The Salvation Army 1925, p99, 100).

However this has not always been the case. In the early period of the Christian Mission and indeed the fledgling Salvation Army, the notion of a divine call was secondary. It took a period of approximately 20 years before the idea of a divine call for officership became a regular feature of the officer discourse. Prior to this individuals would offer themselves based upon the need that they observed, or perhaps inspired by the charismatic leadership of Booth himself. Others were, in the modern idiom, 'headhunted' that is, they were identified by Booth or some other significant leader and simply asked to contribute to the Army's mission. As an example, in his book *General Booth and the Salvation Army (1911)*, Alec Nicols relates how following the imprisonment of some members of the Salvation Army in Forfar, he received a telegram from Bramwell Booth asking him (as a lay Salvationist at the time) to become an officer and replace those imprisoned (Nicols 1911, pp9-10). We should also be mindful that initially it was clear that Booth had no intention of creating another 'church denomination' and thus ideas most often associated with being 'clergy' were generally irrelevant to what was conceived of as an adjunct missional organisation.

Over time, the concept of 'calling' gradually became increasingly prevalent and significant as a way of authorising the relative positions (status) of officers as leaders, and soldiers as followers or those who execute the orders of officers. In the contemporary context an officer is now constructed as an individual who experiences a divine call 'upon their life' to serve God 'as a spiritual leader' via the organisational agency of The Salvation Army.

In their attempt to define what an officer is, all interviewees spoke of the importance of the divine call in their personal narrative *'…well first off we could say, [an officer is] a*

person called by God, to do a ministry [in the Salvation Army]' [O1:6]. The 'calling' narratives offered by the participants were generally presented in terms that were designed to create the impression that 'calling' is a deeply personal and unique experience. Yet of course to recognise such narratives as 'call stories' is to acknowledge those aspects that such narratives share in common (I would argue are in fact produced by the range of acceptable call narratives available within the discourse) and which are produced by the circulation of power/knowledge.

Call is constructed always as individual, even where couples are involved (according to Salvation Army convention both partners must be individually called to become an officer) – 'a truth' produced by the discourse to which we will return later. Call is 'called out' from among 'the ranks' of lay Salvationists to full time ministry in The Salvation Army, ie. it is not a general call to any possible ministry of which The Salvation Army officer is but one, it is specific and particular to this organisation. A regular feature of the call narrative is the offering of some level of resistance by the one called, before final acceptance. *'I felt God is saying to become an officer, but I struggled with the word 'calling' in that sense. Umm… I didn't really want to… I always fought with the Salvation Army'* [P5:12]. *'I told everyone that I would never be an officer because everyone expected me to be'* [E2:8]. Normally within a theological framework resistance to the divine will and purpose would be read as 'sinful', 'disobedient', something to be avoided. In fact as we shall point out below, resistance to the divine will is reframed as resistance to the 'will' of the organisation. Yet within the particular framework of calling, resistance to the divine call to become a Salvation Army officer is not constructed in negative terms such as disobedience, but most often serves as a mechanism for personally validating the legitimacy of the call itself, and thus functions as a means of verifying that the idea, or source of the call is from God, rather than located in the individual. It is constructed as 'testing' the veracity of the call. In this study only one individual (P3) did not offer a 'resistance to call' aspect in their contemporary narrative, but even she referred to resistance in her story of her experiences as a teenager when she felt officership was a possibility [P3:22].

The construct of 'resistance to divine call' in effect serves to legitimise the call for the individual and also conforms to the 'call narrative proforma' that circulates within the discourse (Loseke 2007, p.763).

- God speaks (through various ways).
- The recipient may ignore, reject or resist this growing sense of call.

- Through some set of circumstances the call is interpreted as verified, and at some stage in the process particularised as called to be a Salvation Army officer.
- The called 'gives in' or submits and commences the process of application for officership.

These are the general moves that constitute the call narrative form. This form of call narrative is commonly distributed across the officer discourse, in effect becoming the template upon which individuals who feel any sense of officership as a vocation, view and begin to speak about their experience. Thus the discourse through this 'regime of truth' (Foucault 1980a) and its range of call narratives, generates how individuals come to name, understand and speak of their 'calling' experience. Indeed it appears that it is the discourse which makes available to novices a bounded set of linguistic expressions with which to construct and communicate their desire to become officer: "God spoke to me", "he wanted me to become a Salvation Army officer", "the divine purpose for my life," "I resisted," "when I chose to be obedient there was a sense of peace and contentment." The officer discourse thus constructs the experience through laying down the forms and epistemological limits that determine the 'legitimate' call narrative which when personalised by the individual becomes part of their narrated identity. In effect the range of possible experiences which could be named 'call' are not merely limited by the discourse (as though a way of filtering out what is 'not call'), but actually construct (determine) the experience of 'call' itself. E1 (an ex-officer) recognised something of this discursive framing of her 'call' experience as she reflected,

> *'I still do not have a language with which to describe my sense of call. And that is still what I'm trying to work out as I go through life. I don't know if I ever will or if it just looks different as I express it in different places. I think then [in the past] it was narrow because it was all I knew, officership was all I knew'* [E1:11].

There was however one novice whose call narrative deemphasised the uniqueness of the call to Salvation Army officership, through representing call as one to ministry in general. P1 whose association with The Salvation Army was only eighteen months long prior to entering training for officership (but had an extensive background in other Christian denominations), employed 'call' as a way of speaking about her response in faith to *'whatever was in front'* of her at the time. Call for her represents an attempt to make sense of life's diverse experiences (rather than a relative valuing of particular forms, functions or expressions) – *'I'm just responding to ... this particular aspect of the*

call' [P1:49]. I speculate that her conception of call as open and non specific which is different from the norm in Salvation Army contexts was due to her pre-formation in other Christian Church organisational discourses.

The concept of divine call is part of the bounded set of discursive truths that create the object officer. It also functions as a lens through which quite disparate human experiences are normalised and regularised to produce the truth of divine call as it pertains to Salvation Army officership. Candidates who fail to produce the required [interpretation of] experience are likely to be excluded or at least treated with suspicion by those who themselves are defined by this truth (Foucault 1980a) as is suggested by the following text taken from The Salvation Army Melbourne official webpage 'Explore the Calling' which is targeted at attracting new candidates for officership:

> 'The idea of a special call from God is at the heart of being an officer'….
>
> 'We want as many people as possible to be officers in The Salvation Army, but only as many as God calls to this life—no more, no less. If you're not called to be an officer, then you shouldn't be one, but if you **are** called, then anything else becomes second best.' (The Salvation Army 2010c)

This 'truth of officer' is supported by two main official documents a cadet signs prior to actually becoming an officer – 'Undertakings Entered into by an Officer of The Salvation Army' and the 'Officer's Covenant.'

> The relationship between The Salvation Army and its officers is sacred. This needs to be cherished and preserved as a means of achieving God-given common spiritual purposes. Therefore, in addition to the promises made on becoming a soldier and those in the officer's covenant, a Salvationist is commissioned and ordained as an officer on condition that the following promises and declarations are made:
> *In response to the call of God*, I give myself of my own free will to be an officer of The Salvation Army … (The Salvation Army 2008, 'Undertakings')
>
> MY COVENANT
> CALLED BY GOD
> to proclaim the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ
> as an officer of The Salvation Army
> I BIND MYSELF TO HIM IN THIS SOLEMN COVENANT… (capitals as per original document) (The Salvation Army 2010e, 'Officer Covenant')

In this document the reader will note that only certain words are capitalised giving a particular emphasis through foregrounding them. In this instance we note that the intended emphasis falls upon the covenant relationship between the one called and the God who calls. The organisation through which this covenant is to be 'lived out' and whose disciplines, systems of control and accountabilities will determine the lived meaning and experience of this covenant, is interestingly backgrounded.

Of course the notion of divine call does not originate with The Salvation Army but has a long established history in the Church and even beyond. But the emphasis upon the exteriority of call, that is call must be located in the divine intent (expressed in some form), rather than say intuition or an individual desire to contribute to something worthwhile, plays itself out in how the organisation takes up divine prerogatives in the way it constructs officer. In effect organisational power/knowledge is exercised through representing itself as the divine will (I will attempt to develop this particularly important concept in greater detail in chapter seven).

Function or Status

As one called by the divine will, an officer would appear to be of similar 'kind' when compared with clergy located in other denominations. Yet within organisational discourse there are competing perspectives that prove difficult to reconcile concerning the nature and function of the object officer. In the early days of the Christian Mission the station preachers (individual geographical locations were called 'stations'), were constructed as individuals who served a particular function within the overall organisational structure of The Mission. Their task was to be short term evangelists who shared such responsibilities with others in the station. The introduction of the quasi-military metaphor and rank in the context of, and drawn from, nineteenth century class structured English society soon led to the emergence of officers who were constituted and constructed by a hierarchical system of rank and position (such as 'staff officers'). Officer represented a set of functions (some defined by particular appointments), but also representing a particular status within the organisation that constituted it as a different order from that which is 'not officer.'

These conflicting truths about officer continue to circulate in the contemporary officer discourse. Interestingly, most novices when asked about the differences that make someone officer as against non-officer, spoke about this difference in purely functional

terms (job role) and availability to the organisation. An officer is *'just somebody who has been given a [particular] role to play'* [P1:381].

In official organisational discourse it is commonly held that there is no officer function that cannot be undertaken by a non-officer (soldiers).
As The Salvation Army International Doctrine Council asserts,

> 'In keeping with our tradition of not drawing rigid lines between officers and soldiers, it has been one of the distinctives of The Salvation Army to believe that there is no essential ministry exercised by a Salvation Army officer that could not also be carried out by a soldier' (The Salvation Army International Doctrine Council 2002, p78).

One notes in this that the Council employs the language of 'no essential ministry ….that *could not* be carried out by a soldier' which references a potentiality, a possibility, that a soldier could exercise all the functions performed by an officer. What happens in the actual practices of The Salvation Army is quite another question to which I shall return later.

As this knowledge circulates throughout the organisation, one of its effects is to discursively produce officers who are on the one hand apparently selected by divine will and thus in some sense 'the privileged', while on the other are constructed as one among many, along with all soldiers. The historical possibilities which enabled this complex truth to emerge perhaps lie in Booth's reaction against simply replicating in any way the Churches of the late nineteen century. He was intent upon not founding 'another' church but rather a mission society that would undertake evangelical mission to the poor and dispossessed. He welcomed whomever saw the need (as he saw it) and was willing to join him (on his terms). Thus at least initially there was no system of an officer leadership class. This was to emerge later.

The object officer is also constructed as radically available to the organisation in terms of time and geography (appointment and location). According to Orders and Regulations for Territorial Commanders and Chief Secretaries of The Salvation Army 1938, officers should be in a constant state of readiness to receive a transfer to a new work and new location solely at the discretion of the Territorial Commander (The Salvation Army 1938, p39). Officers are required to undertake to make themselves available to the organisation in terms of a 'life long' willingness to embrace whatever appointment the organisation directs, as stated in "The Undertakings":

> ‘I declare it to be my intention, as God shall help me, to give *lifelong service* as a good and faithful officer of The Salvation Army.’ (my italics) (The Salvation Army 2008)

and The International Commission on Officership,

> ‘Lifelong service as an officer has long been the established expectation within The Salvation Army. In seeking to strengthen this ideal of lifelong service we would re-emphasise the value of the Officer’s covenant as a constant reminder of an individual’s call and *availability to God*.’ (my italics) (The Salvation Army 2000).

Again we should be aware that the notion of officership as ‘life long’ is a second generation phenomenon which evolved over the period 1890-1905. Prior to this normalisation of ‘officer’, individuals moved in and out of officer positions with relative ease and without the framing as ‘deserters’ or ‘deserting the ranks’ that later became part of the organisational narrative and was designed to make those who remained feel better about themselves as loyal and thus acted as a device to give officers pause to consider the implications of resignation.

Among those I interviewed there were four (one officer, one cadet, and the two ex-officers) who held to a view that if one can be called into officership by God, then it must at least be possible in theory for God to call one out of officership [O3:29, P1:181]. Although for the officer O3 such a call would have to be an extraordinary circumstance.

In the contemporary discourse officers generally do not choose appointment or location for themselves, they are instruments available to the organisation in response to the divine will expressed through the call. These discursively constructed obligations are ratified and enacted through a liturgical ceremony which culminates in the signing of the two documents mentioned above: ‘Undertakings Entered into by an Officer of The Salvation Army’ and the ‘Officer’s Covenant.’ Through the signing of these documents the individual in effect binds themselves to the organisation. Yet these same documents appear to be framed as protecting the organisation from material obligations to the individual officer.

> ‘I understand and agree that there is no contract of service or of employment nor any other legal relationship between the Army and me.

> Accordingly the Army shall have no legal claims upon me nor I upon the Army.'
>
> 'I understand and agree that although I may expect to receive, and every attempt will be made to provide, allowances according to an official scale no allowance is guaranteed to me.'
>
> 'Unless clearly authorised by my leaders in accordance with orders and regulations, I will not engage in secular employment, paid or unpaid, knowing that I have committed all my days and hours to Salvation Army officer mission and ministry.' (The Salvation Army 2008, points 1,3, 9)

The discourse produces an object that is an 'instrument' to be wholly controlled, directed, and deployed as the organisation sees fit to achieve organisational objectives. The effective speech position of officer is radicalised as one whose role is to allow themselves to be used by God (ie. The Salvation Army) in whatever way deemed appropriate. This *instrumental* view of officers constructs them as ones called by God to serve him in The Salvation Army. The official website of the Australian Southern Territory of The Salvation Army offers a concise statement concerning the officer as leader:

> 'Leadership is given to people who have no contractual tie to The Salvation Army, who have no legally binding relationship to The Salvation Army at all, and whose first allegiance is given to God.'
>
> 'Your covenant is with God, not with The Salvation Army.' (The Salvation Army 2010h, 'Your Commission')

The novice is inducted via the technologies deployed in training to embrace an organisational reality that seeks to write upon them the truths of officership (Foucault 1980a, p39). Radical availability and utility to the organisation are woven into the fabric of the officer discourse, and as such are a 'truth' that defines officer identity. *'I can be moved anywhere at anytime. Umm… not all other vocations have that. I've given myself to … I guess the vulnerability of leadership to say that I can be at a corps, or I could be at a social... I could be in DHQ, THQ [various types of appointments].'* [P5:57].

Under the rubric of radical availability to the organisation there is a correlation between the actual appointment itself and the period of time spent in that particular appointment.

During the early days of The Salvation Army it was common practice for ‘officers’ to be moved quite regularly (perhaps every three months). Most appointments in a Territory are made by the Territorial Commander who determines the nature and period of the appointment. Thus there are no hard and fast rules about the length of appointments as this varies according to predisposition of the incumbent and how they frame organisational needs. Currently there is a general expectation that appointments will be three to four years in duration for most officers. If I might inject a personal narrative, I was told that I was to have a change of appointment (after an unusually extended period in one location within which I had been appointed to various job functions), a change which I neither ask for nor welcomed. In a conversation I had with the Territorial Commander of the day I asked why I was to be moved (was it a reflection upon the quality of my work or person, expertise or professionalism?). The response was simply that I was not a good model for cadets, because I had simply been in the one appointment too long. Officers by definition ‘move every three or four years.’ As far as the Territorial Commander was concerned this was an incontestable (and for them transparent) discursive truth that defines officer. Such a discursive truth works to effectively silence contrary positions that may destabilise the organisational reality.

As one ex-officer reflected upon this common experience, *'… and all I'm doing is this lived experience of every two years over and over again. I want to… to have a greater impact and I can't do that if I've only got two years or three years at a time'* [E1:261]. It may be true that many officers may welcome appointment change and perhaps even experience it as ‘rescuing’ from appointments that might be proving difficult (an argument used to support current practices). Nonetheless through this practice, the discourse assigns ‘officer’ an identity as a transient and obedient object that can be utilised in however the organisation sees fit. This has produced a conditioning of the lay people of The Salvation Army (soldiers) to regard these practices as normal and expected, such that on the rare occasion that a Salvation Army corps (local church) community raises objections to the movement of their officers, it is constructed as aberrant behaviour which is a disruption to the norms of Salvation Army culture and is thus largely ignored.

In a way this construction has been employed as a means of clarifying the difference between officer and non-officer within official organisational discourses. When the concept of functionality is removed from the ‘differential equation’ (as stated by the International Doctrine Council – ‘all functions can be exercised by non-officers’), officer (assuming equal competence) is defined solely by the concept of radical availability to

the organisation, a view supported by all officers interviewed. For example, *'I see as a Salvation Army officer you're called to lifelong service within The Salvation Army to be used and available as God and The Salvation Army see fit'* [O2:21; O4:21].

Radical availability stands as a defining attribute of officership. Officers, while not guaranteed payment for service (as they are not employees) are neither permitted to have other employment, paid or otherwise as indicated in the Officer Undertakings, 'I will not engage in secular employment, paid or unpaid, knowing that I have committed all my days and hours to Salvation Army officer mission and ministry' (The Salvation Army 2008). Nothing is permitted that might distract or take energy away from organisational objectives and controls. Thus the notion of full-time officership only comes into being through the truth that an 'officer' is always fully available to the organisation. Officers only exist 'at the pleasure' of the organisation. This truth of officer can also be seen in the way the organisation has constructed officership for couples. The 'ideal' is that both persons in a couple must apply to become Salvation Army officers and undertake the same training (The Salvation Army 2010f).

However, while this may be a discursive 'truth' of officership, many novices appeared to struggle with this construction. For some novices radical availability together with their own subordinate location (speech position) within the hierarchy, resulted in a sense of their own expendability in terms of meeting the needs of the organisation (the instrumental view). Like pawns sacrificed to achieve some greater strategic purpose in a game of chess: *'But when you're in that chess game [referring to the appointments system], you're one of the pieces it's a different story. And so as the last two years [during training] have gone on my mindset has changed, I think that our whole appointments system is very weird.'* [P6:132]. *'Because…. the grunts.. I suppose you'd call them, the field officers could be seen as the pawns. Umm… especially within the rank [system]… '* [P6:136]. This problematising of non-consultative processes was also represented among the officers interviewed. Concerning the lack of conversation around an appointment that she received, E1 expressed similar frustrations, *'...the system where you're just told that you're moving and where you're going. So there's no conversation about how to process and transition change at all.'* [E1:94] … *'oh bugger ...I'm just a pawn in the system'* [E1:254].

No doubt as the discerning reader will have already noted, as an active participant in the officer discourse, I share the concern that this study represents to varying degrees my own personal resistances to, and dissonances within, the organisationally

prescribed reality. This is clearly represented by the insertion of my own personal narrative into the discussion above. While I cannot in the end escape the orbit of the subjective, I am conscious of not allowing it to become the centre around which materials gravitate through selection and interpretation. However I recognise that the deconstruction of the discursively produced 'truths of officer' that is in part the object of this study, are the product of the ongoing internal dialogue between the research data and my own organisational positionings and experiences.

Higher Calling

The invention of 'officer' as a class (rather than a positional job title) creates a dissonance within the organisational space. As stated above, the emergence of the officer class required the innovation of a set of practices and procedures that would allow the organisation to perpetuate if not expand this leadership class in response to escalating opportunities and the need to maintain centralised controls. The conception of officer (as a leadership class) in The Salvation Army has become associated with the language of 'higher calling' as a device to raise the appeal of the notion of officer in the minds of those who might consider it as an option. Within the organisational discourse there is a strand of talk that constructs 'divine call' to all kinds of vocations, that is not exclusively officership, *'I've heard people say they had been called to do a particular job, or a particular kind of work in their life. So I haven't just heard that [the notion of calling] by officers at all'* [O4:38].This is understood by some as the democratisation of officership where it is placed on the same theological footing as other vocations. However, as a method of theologically and organisationally privileging officership, the language of officership as a 'higher' calling emerges as a distinct strand. In effect this has served to reinforce the fundamental difference between officer and non-officer. Over time officers have been constructed as the leaders and directors of Salvation Army activity, while soldiers have been constructed as executing their directions (normatively without question). The language of higher calling also appears to imply a closer or more intimate link with the divine will and thus a valuing or privileging of officership over all other vocations (serving organisational interests).

Cadet novices noted the strategic operationalisation and deployment of 'higher calling' language during public events in which the vocation of officership was a central concern. In such contexts designed to encourage Salvationist laity to consider applying to become 'officer', or in other contexts to reinforce this idea to cadets themselves, senior leadership regularly referred to officership as 'a sacred and holy calling.' It is not that such language necessarily states that officership is different in kind or order from

other vocations, but that such language is generally *reserved* for speaking about officership. Rarely if at all is the language of 'call' applied to becoming a soldier (Salvationist). Thus through a general silence around how the call of God relates to other (non-officer) vocations, there emerges an implied privileging of the object officer as of a different order (divinely ordained) within the discourses in The Salvation Army.

> *'you hear language like a 'sacred holy calling' which to me elevates it [officership]. So in one sense people talk about this 'priesthood of all believers' where we are all brothers and sisters and we are all equal and we're all called to the same task. But then you hear officership being described as 'sacred and holy' which makes it this other thing which to me is not compatible, well not necessarily compatible, but is not the same thing'* [P2:26].

Even among those who maintain that all are called to various aspects of life, still officership is privileged as something of a different order. As one officer who appeared to want to maintain that officership is one among many possible callings that particular individuals might receive, he still privileged officership, *'…in the sense of privilege, yes, but certainly not on a scale of importance. No, only in terms of privilege'* [O3:26].

Through this selection of organisational language the natural (and incontestable) assumption becomes that to take up leadership in The Salvation Army *is* to become an officer. As E1 observed when speaking about the desire to explore leadership in The Salvation Army prior to applying to become an officer,

> *'… [officership was] a natural progression growing up in the Army moving into leadership. It seemed to be a place to fulfil that call'* [E1:6].

Other participants went further to suggest that officers were sometimes constructed in terms of a caste who had the authority (presumably divinely authorised) to direct 'those below' them through the exercise of priestly type power. P3 suggested, *'…that officers can sometimes become that more or less priestly status of being better than everybody else and being this authority figure that stands above the soldiers and church'* [P3:53]. Within such a framework the 'truths' of rank and hierarchy emerge as the necessary and natural ways through which power flows and operates across the very objects it creates – 'officers' (Cheek 2004). Similarly E1 in looking back upon her officership reconstructed ordination as the authorisation of a status that legitimised the use of power. *'I think ordination is about power…'* [E1:339], *'I don't think it's about umm… affirming people's call to ministry'* [E1:341] (although it should be noted that none of the other currently serving officers spoke of ordination in these terms). In effect ordination

produces objects (officers) who become particular nodes for the circulation of power.

Traditionally during the Commissioning events (where cadets are 'made' officers through a liturgically framed 'speech act' of the Territorial Commander) there is always an appeal made for lay Salvationists to consider offering themselves to become officers. Often the language used in these moments clearly reflects the notion that without adequate 'officer strength' the future of The Salvation Army is in jeopardy (a common narrative fragment). Equally, on the other side of this discursive equation, the production of officers (witnessed at the Commissioning event itself) is constructed as signs of hope and of divine blessing for the future, indeed a continuing divine authorisation of the organisation and its existence. The officer discourse projects the object officer as integral to not only the operations of The Salvation Army, but stands at the very centre of its continued existence. At this point it is impossible to conceptualise a Salvation Army without officers who play a central leadership role. The question 'what would an officer-less Salvation Army look like?' awaits a paradigm shift in power/knowledge before it can emerge as a 'real' question. As the following quote from the Salvation Army officer recruitment website appears to assume:

> While the need for Salvation Army services continues to grow, the number of officers has been shrinking. In 1994 there were 1,307 active Salvation Army officers and cadets in Australia. Today there are only 1,161. (The Salvation Army 2010h, 'Your Commission')

This fragment implies that service provision and continued organisational existence are directly related to officer strength.

It was clear that most participants were very genuine in their espoused beliefs around the issues of the exercise of power through rank and position. There appeared to be a sincere desire to live out and practice the egalitarian values associated with the theological metaphor 'priesthood of all believers' (as it is commonly employed). Yet most novices referenced a dissonance between the organisationally espoused values, and the actual practices that resulted from the material effects of power/knowledge.

P6 spoke of experiencing the message emanating from senior leadership as conflicting with his own values of 'equality' derived from the metaphor of the 'priesthood of all believers' (and perhaps the intersection with contemporary liberal humanist discourses). '*I am saying to myself; I want to empower [the people in his first appointment], I want to have a priesthood of all believers but the hierarchy is saying to me, well no, you have to step above that'* [P6:105]. P6 articulates the conflicted

discursive space he feels he currently inhabits. He holds values that he believes do not necessarily align with the way that he experiences 'officer' as represented within the discourse. At this point it remains to be seen in what ways P6 moves beyond his current interim form of subjectivity and the practices that will emerge from such a positioning.

Officers are themselves constituted as part of an organisational hierarchy of officers that is defined in terms of rank, a hierarchy of appointments and a relative indexing of positions. *'I guess it feels like this rank is used to put people in a place in a particular position'* [P2:302]. Rank provides a way of organising and arranging objects in relation to each other and the organisation, providing a form of relative indexing of identity and therefore shaping the nature of organisational relationships that operate. Since in the main, rank is based upon time served, it generates a sense that novices are not granted the same speech position as someone of more senior rank (and therefore implied experience). Individual officer identity is informed by the space that individuals are assigned and occupy within the organisational matrix. A majority of novices reflected upon how respect for rank and position were inculcated as natural, necessary and normative particularly within the training context. As Foucault observed, 'any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledges and powers which they carry' (Foucault 1984, p.123). Failure to conform to these normalised discursively produced practices that authorise and structurally inculcate position and status is *'…. where you can get into trouble around here'* [P3:61]. It is not permissible to contest this reality as this is a self evident truth of officership. In fact the training discourse works through technologies of performance and surveillance to ensure the inculcation of such values and resultant behaviours (Foucault 1977). For instance when senior leadership visit the College, cadets were required to wear formal 'dress uniform' rather than the general informal uniform they would normally wear during the day. A novice asked the question why this was necessary

> *'…. she [the Territorial Commander] would say when she comes here she expects cadets to be in formal uniform when she comes..... But it was that very firm thing of when she comes she expects cadets to be in that uniform'* [P3:61].
>
> *'That we were told it was about this mark of respect is also …we are just being told we are not allowed to question that. We're not allowed to challenge that.'* [P2:90]

This is a revealing example of Foucault's observation that power/knowledge is not the possession of any one person (in this case the Territorial Commander (TC)), but operates upon and between all (Foucault 1980a, p97). In her response, the Territorial Commander *'said it's about respect for the position,…its about respect for the position of Territorial Commander.'* [P3:61] It appears that the TC may reflect the values and beliefs about rank and hierarchy which are produced by the officer discourse acting equally upon her (as upon novices). In effect she may represent a view whereby as custodian of the office she needs to perpetuate those practices that have in the past supported 'the ways things are.' In effect she represents the discourse speaking itself into 'discursive life' through her.

Interestingly and unexpectedly, P2 constructed the dissonance she experienced between the egalitarian values enunciated through 'the priesthood of all believers' metaphor, and the fields of 'higher calling' and 'status' of officers, through employing the theological concept of sin. *'I guess I see it as human brokenness. I see it as we have this ideal of the 'priesthood of all believers' that we do very much believe in, but in the day to day, in the living that out, our brokenness, our desire to make ourselves important [is played out]'* [P2:30]. The implication is that this brokenness should be 'redeemed' into some other way of being - presumably something that would represent egalitarian values, structures and practices. P2's analysis was surprising in that the choice of theological language 'sin' (brokenness) employed to describe these organisational practices is particularly evocative, powerful and perhaps even somewhat dangerous. For a novice to name these practices and positionings in such a way is an articulation of 'what is silently thought.' The fact that it is dangerous also points to the relative discursive speech positions that such naming exposes, and hints at the way that the officer discourse seeks to maintain organisational equilibrium.

Summary

The Salvation Army did not emerge in the late nineteenth century as a fully formed entity. While one might argue that the antecedents of power/knowledge that has come to define the contemporary Salvation Army and in particular the object 'officer' were latent in the historical discourses of the time and in the person of Booth himself. Nonetheless certain contemporary truths of officer are founded upon a later trajectory of discursive talk. These include the notion that to become an officer one *must* have a divine call. For those who maintain that God calls people to all kinds of vocations, officership is then privileged through applying the modifier - 'higher' calling. Such a calling is by definition 'life long.' Once accepted there is no going back, God's life long

call is stamped upon the individual. This regime of truth is a subset of the fundamentally important and powerful notion of radical availability to God (through the divinely authorised organisation), which makes the officer an instrument of the organisational will. While the organisation continues to espouse the core value that availability is the only difference between ‘officer’ and ‘not officer’, organisational practices arising from the circulation of power/knowledge construct officer as a privileged object, in that it is impossible to conceive of an officer- less Salvation Army.

In the next chapter I shall attempt to describe the construction of the Salvation Army officer in its contemporary historical specificity. I will discuss this in terms of the how the officer discourse produces the truth of officer inscribed upon the very soul of the individual, thus creating a particular form of officer identity.

Chapter 6

Officer – The Regimes of Truth

In this chapter I attempt to shift our thinking and analysis from the historically produced knowledges that scaffold and define the possibility of Salvation Army officer, to focus more upon the sets of values it assumes, and the authorised models it constructs and offers as normative.

First I will attempt to excavate the relationship between 'officer' and 'not officer' (lay Salvationist or soldier) in an attempt to further destabilise this organisational regime of truth that maintains that the difference is simply in terms of 'availability' to the organisation. Then I will examine the 'values of officer' that emerge from the discursively produced 'truths' that clearly have their material effects upon member participants. These 'values of officer' are the operationalisation of power/knowledge as it circulates within the discourse acting upon all, to produce a normalised object – a Salvation Army officer. For example one such strategy that the officer discourse utilises to reproduce itself in individuals is via the range of officer ontological narratives that are authorised and made available to others (particularly novices) as templates upon which officer identity may be formed (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004, p163).

Relative Discursive Positioning of Non-Officer

As discussed in the previous chapter, a core organisational espoused value is that of the egalitarian 'priesthood of all believers' (not as it might have been theologically employed by Luther, but rather as it has come to be commonly deployed in organisational discourses). One novice I interviewed approached the issue of the positioning of non-officers (soldiers) within organisational discourses from the perspective of equitable access to ministry practices. If (as the espoused value declares) officership is simply about calling and availability, then why could not a lay Salvationist (with suitable qualifications) be offered the position of Divisional Commander (middle management position), perhaps even Territorial Commander (most senior leadership position in the territory) for an agreed period, perhaps while maintaining their non-officer status? Such a proposal certainly disrupts the regime of truth that operates to ensure that positions of influence and decision making lie solely within the purview of officers, who are themselves appointed by those above in the hierarchy. Such thinking would lead to a radicalisation of the notion of officership in the contemporary. P5 acknowledged that he, *'couldn't see [this] happening.'* When pressed as to why he thought such a practice could not emerge he responded; *'… we seem to*

have certain rules in place or even umm… sometimes there are unwritten rules that it just can't happen. That they are positions for officers' [P5:71].

P5 has learnt that discourses in The Salvation Army produce 'unwritten rules' in the sense of undocumented yet commonly accepted reasons why things are the way they are and cannot be another. However, the fact that P5 is aware that such 'rules' exist, suggests that they are indeed visible, circulating within the discourse, defining what is possible and what is not. P5 is expected to accept and embrace these normative ways of being that will shape his professional officer identity. Indeed when asked about why he wanted to become an officer, P5 himself acknowledged that although he had a ministry (job function) in his local corps context he recognised that *'to do things within the Salvation Army I had to have that title [officer]'* [P5:91]. The conferring and embracing of the organisationally assigned officer identity opened up possibilities for practice and influence that are not available to the non-officer.

> *'I think within the organisation they [officers] had a level of influence that could …. they [officers] were bringing about change within their corps, which was spreading out a little wider. Umm… so I saw to make a difference within the organisation, officership was the way. People seem to listen to officers.'* [P5:103]

In this study I detected a surprising silence generally around the degree of influence and power that non-officers can (and expect to) exercise within the organisation. Laity do not have an effective speech position from which to significantly influence (in transparent ways) how the organisation operates. At best they may be consulted (according to the wishes of senior leadership at the time) on particular issues.

> *'…in that soldiers are just.. that they're just the soldiers and they do what they're told and they don't actually have... I don't think they're seen as having any place in casting vision or what they want.'* [P1:374]

'Functionally' Salvationist soldiers as representatives of the non-officer laity are not given a significant voice in organisational strategic and operational matters.[4] These are the purview of officers alone. As an example I pointed out that at senior management

[4] However it would be wise to avoid a naivety around this issue. While it is true that the power of the laity is not represented positively within officer discourses, it is nonetheless present and operative producing real effects. There have been occasions where groups of soldiers may have been less than impressed with the performance of an officer (or whatever reason), and sought through informal channels to have them 'moved on.' This is not to suggest that such practices are welcomed by officers (including hierarchy), but simply that despite the silence around such events they do occur and have real effects.

level (Cabinet) from where policy and strategy emerge, there are no non-officer Salvationists represented. However, I note that there are certain employee positions that now contribute to strategic deliberations, for example the Chief Financial Officer (a non-Salvationist employee). However, they do not represent the cohort of non-officer Salvationists, but rather their particular professional domain of expertise. This has become a normalised way for officer and non-officer to operate. It is discursively transparent and generally accepted as an organisational norm, but it clearly suggests that the egalitarian value believed to be commonly espoused through the metaphor 'priesthood of all believers' is not what is shaping practice and we need to understand this phrase in a different way from notions of egalitarian participatory practices. It appears that as 'officer' as a higher calling, and a leadership class develops, increasingly soldiers began to construct officer as the professional (in varying degrees) who undertakes the religious functions as well as organisational, and thus accept that officers (supported by the military metaphor) make all decisions concerning the organisation. When I attempted to disrupt this view in informal conversations I undertook with various soldiers, the possibility that it could be any other way was a quite foreign concept. In fact to even raise such a question was interpreted by many as quite subversive to what is the (natural) ordering of organisational reality. Such conversations left me quite astonished that people who in their professional lives outside The Salvation Army clearly valued and indeed expected participatory practices, yet within The Salvation Army had become so normalised that to question this ('natural') ordering, generated either strong reaction, or an apathy that accepted the inevitable 'givenness' of the present discursively produced organisational reality.

Costliness

The truth of divine 'calling' generates a set of values that produce the officer's material mode of being. Drawing upon the notion of calling, the officer subjectivity is defined by the ideals of 'costliness,' 'sacrifice,' and 'loss' which are divinely authorised if not required. In responding to the call of God, the officer sets aside any other possibilities for the future that may have been on their personal horizon, to embrace 'the sacrificial lifestyle' of officership. For instance all officers are given the same allowance according to years of completed service (rather than based upon reward or recognition of competence or job position/responsibilities). The scale is based upon Average Weekly Ordinary Time Earnings (AWOTE) figures as at 1 July 2008. A married officer in their first year of service receives a rate of 28% of AWOTE ranging to 35.5% of AWOTE after the completion of 45 years service (The Salvation Army 2010a).

In this sense the ideals of officer are defined by the sacrifice of all other possible futures that the individual may have entertained or perhaps imagined for themselves. This is a particularly powerful and pervasive narrative fragment within the officer discourse. The individual's willingness to sacrifice their future imagined form of life is discursively constructed as a validation of the authenticity of the divine call and thus serves to reinforce the individual officer's subjectivity and identity within the organisation.

> *'… I think, the willingness to give up, I guess to make some sacrifices in terms of earning an income, owning your own assets…. I guess the dream of having your own home was not one that I necessarily had, but coming into officership I feel like I give that up. I relinquish some of those things that people in the world make choices in their life to own a home, to climb a ladder in terms of employment, to choose where they live, to choose where their children are going to go to school. All those kinds of things I've realised I've kind of relinquished.'* [P2:46]

Yet for some who become officers the overall lifestyle (allowance package, home, car, personal status) afforded by officership may very well exceed what they may have been able to attain outside of officership (which is rarely spoken about). Nonetheless, the narrative fragments of costliness and sacrifice function as powerful filters through which officership is constructed and viewed from the outside (ie. by those not officer).

The very notion of sacrifice acts as a discursive device that validates the desire to become an officer, cementing the bond to the organisation. Officers as a class 'give up...' to fulfil God's call and purpose in The Salvation Army as officers. The 'costliness factor' is constructed as a confirmation that this is a divinely ordained way of being in the world (a discursive truth), and thus serves to reinforce the effectiveness of organisational disciplines and controls. Costliness may well include the surrendering of aspects of self identity to the productive effects of power/knowledge as it acts upon the individual to produce the kind of officer that the organisation desires (Foucault 1977, p194).

Hard Work

Another defining value within the officer discourse is that of working hard, long hours, to be available, in an attempt to meet expanding demands. Even prior to actually

becoming an officer, novice P1 had become well aware of the significance placed upon the value of working hard within the officer discourse: *'officership is defined by how much work you do and how tired you are and how much you give of yourself … and you give and you give and you give'* [P1:213], which was a narrative similarly supported by experienced officers. In naming the attributes of the model officer O4 responded, *'They are probably seen as people that are hard workers'* [O4:86] *…. 'Like they [officers] don't want their name to be sort of brandished around that they're not a hard worker'* [O4:98]. Hard work is written into the narrative construction of the model Salvation Army officer.

In the College training system, cadets are required to undertake an academic and practical work load which will require of most a commitment to work well beyond a 50 hour week. It appears that the College system through course design, technologies of performance, and surveillance attempts to write this key organisational value upon the emergent officer identity of cadets (Foucault 1984, p.123). P1 related how she had contested the excessive demands made by the College system upon her:

> *'when you make a comment about how hard life is at college, how much work you've got to do, the officer goes ' O well, just wait until next year' [in the first appointment as an officer] it's like .... [raspberry sound]. Because to me that devalues the amount of work you're currently doing and says, you just wait, if you think this is bad just wait till next year so that in a sense is saying… officership is defined by how much work you do and how tired you are'* [P1:213]

In a sense 'busyness' is a form of organisational 'currency' (ie. relating to the value and worth of individual officers – a way of self validating). Officers learn to create a narrative identity which embraces or at least projects 'hard work' as a personal value. To be labelled lazy is an anathema and in some forums worse than being deemed incompetent. Cadets are inducted into the discursive 'truth' that officership is defined by long hours and competing demands which cannot be adequately met.

> *'… there's an expectation, and it's definitely been something that we [among cadets] have discussed at college, this expectation to be 'super officer', to have every second of the day doing something, and always busy. This whole idea that it is something that officers tend to take pride in being run off their feet…'* [P2:459]

This is not to suggest that all cadets simply embrace this value and thus write it upon

their own emergent officer identity (resubjectification). P2 observed that many of these narrative fragments focus upon projecting a particular image of officer as always working, always busy. Clearly for those who articulate them, such fragments are a source of satisfaction and even pride that busyness equates to the value not only of their personal contribution to organisational goals, but is determinative of their own officer identity *'… as cadets we have discussed that's what officers say and they take pride in saying they are so busy 'I haven't had a day off in six months' like…. that's ridiculous not having a day off in six months.'* [P2:469]

It may be that this is because 'success' as an officer in many areas of work is difficult to quantify in such disparate contexts, whereas the core organisational value markers of officership – working hard, obedience and loyalty, are arguably more easily measured and recognised. Yet it is interesting to note that despite the significance of the 'working hard' narrative and the part it plays in constructing officer identity, the training system offers a dissonant counter note to this narrative. P2 described elements in the training program that offered a modified view of the hard work narratives. According to these voices it is appropriate and necessary to take time for refreshment and recreation to avoid 'burn out'. Yet she also noted that this runs contrary to the prevailing narratives that circulate and what she had observed modelled, *'…I get a sense that a good officer was someone who was always busy and worked seven, eight days a week and never stopped. And definitely that was modelled to us by [two officers - names withheld] they just live chaotic lives.'* [P2:459]

During the interviews novices gave the impression that this counter note of seeking balance was not generated by an altruistic concern for individual well being, but as a way of limiting the financial and operational 'cost' to the organisation through human attrition – reinforcing an instrumental view of officer. It was pointed out that although a balanced life was articulated and offered as desirable, that this did not align well with the excessive organisational work requirements during training [P1:213]. The ideal of hard work indicates organisational utility, although in the interview data references to the actual achievements made through hard work were surprising lacking. It appears that ceaseless 'activity' is valued in an organisation that defines its very identity as 'pragmatic.'

Loyalty, obedience, commitment, conformity

A pamphlet from the 1960s designed to explain what a Salvation Army officer is, expresses quite succinctly one of the purposes of training as 'developing … a sense of

complete commitment to the organisation as a proven medium for vital and constructive Christian work' (The Salvation Army 1960, p23) (my italics). Likewise in the current version of Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army, under section 3 'Breaches of Discipline', it defines disloyalty as, 'persistent refusal to carry out lawful orders or instructions, open contempt for superiors… serious or persistent breaches of orders and regulations … resistance or rebellion against The Salvation Army, its principles and discipline and/or its duly appointed leaders' (The Salvation Army 2004).

All those interviewed referred in some way to loyalty, obedience, commitment and conformity as key attributes that constitute the Salvation Army officer identity. Officers referred to their 'officer covenant' as a committing of their lives (and conforming of their identity) to the organisation in response to the call of God. Signing the 'covenant' and 'undertakings' documents represented a willingness to recognise organisational authority and follow its direction even if the individual disagreed with the direction itself and how it was enforced by those who were vested with organisational power. *'I have had to come to this place, umm leading up to commissioning and being prepared to sign my covenant, and I guess agree to this …. I guess agreed to following those rules'* [P3:97, 99].

P3 appeared willing to accept, despite some personal reservations, that signing the covenant and undertakings documents requires obedience and loyalty to those who occupy positions of organisational authority. The officer discourse represents this as a normalised way of being officer, or as a regime of truth. *'…well they [loyalty and obedience] are a big part of being an officer'* [O2:108]. When asked about the kinds of behaviours that the organisation values in novices P1 observed, *'I think I'm expected to be loyal to the Army…'* [P1:202]. Loyalty and commitment to the organisation were expressed in terms of an appropriate response to the divine calling. For many, calling functioned as a kind of binding to the organisation irrespective of how difficult or what that might cost the individual over time. *'I suppose in a sense there's this overriding call that people hang onto. That they feel that God has called them to this and even if it is hard and it just doesn't fit them they're going to do it anyway'* [P1:251]. This is an accurate reflection of the narrative fragment that is regularly heard among officers when reflecting upon difficult circumstances. The divine call functions as a narrative device that works to maintain long term obligation to the organisation. In effect the narrative seeks to produce a psychological dependence upon the organisation as the

sole location for personal fulfilment and actualisation, through obedience to the divine voice that has called them into the 'officer space.'

In this regard P1's exegesis of the discourse is instructive. In the 1922 edition of *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of The Salvation Army*, the qualities of obedience and loyalty feature as essential attributes of officers, 'unvarying compliance with all instructions is the very essence of [that] obedience which lies at the root of good government' (The Salvation Army 1922, p33). While in a series addresses delivered at officer conferences, Mrs Bramwell Booth (wife of the then General, and herself the then British Commissioner) reminded officers that they 'are the servants of The Army. There are those over us whose duty it is to take account of our work as masters of a servant' (Booth 1924, p155).

Among the experienced officers similar observations were drawn, the clearest was made by E1 who, when asked about her experiences of the organisation seeking to instil particular traits and values responded,

> *'there's the 'faithfulness', there's the 'discipline', and there is the 'duty' …. It always seemed that those kinds of traits were way more important than any spirituality,… the traits of commitment and submission, and submission to authority and obedience and 'the pathway of duty'.* [E1:82]

While another officer reflected upon the organisational expectations he experienced upon commencing a new senior role,

> *'…in coming to this role it's… there is an expectation I guess that you've got to dot the 'I's and cross the 'T's and salute and move on, so as to be the right sort of example for those that are in training'* [O2:161].

P2 observed *'I think that they want us, as in those who are entering into officership, to be loyal and to be compliant, … and to fit a certain shape'* [P2:65]. Indeed, at the 1925 International Training Staff Council, 'submission' was declared to be a critical aim of training,

> '…exert every power you can to bring the Cadets to that state of submission … let it be God's will, let it be the Army's will [rather than the cadet's] then … they will be ready to do what God and The Army require… Train them in submission' (The Salvation Army 1925, p24).

P2 also noted how obedience is a highly valued organisational commodity that was

expected to be part of an officer's repertoire for acting and being in the organisation. Failure to embrace this value would result in various critical constructions concerning the worth and value of the individual as an officer, and the possible assignment of an identity (for instance 'trouble maker,' 'immature') that would locate the individual to the margins of organisational life. Yet it appears that the organisation is able to tolerate some level of resistance (most regularly interpreted as disobedience), but it would seem that this was most often the case when the disobedience was offered in ways that were less likely to be interpreted as *direct* contestation. P1 employed the metaphor of 'flying under the radar' of those surveilling from a position of power.

> *'…they just fly under the radar. So they do as much as they can that might be seen as rebellious but because they think that is what God wants them to do, but might be seen as rebellious by the Army. But they just keep under the radar so they know how far to go…'* [P1:316]

While there may be instances of some officers who disobey in such a way that does not draw attention to themselves (below the level of detection), given the level and scope of structural surveillance within The Salvation Army, it is unlikely that this is the case for all those to whom P1 refers. It is more likely to be associated with how disobedience is manifested (I will attend to this in greater detail under 'resistance'), but for now suffice it to say that as long as the disobedience falls within domains rated as low risk and is not done in such a way as to publicly and directly challenge those in positions of authority, then a public response is less likely warranted. However, this is not to suggest that such disobedience is not organisationally 'remembered.' We might also note how in this excerpt the notion of the divine will and the organisational will rather than being collapsed (see further in chapter seven) are teased apart, so that (at least according to P1) it is conceptually possible for the divine and the organisational wills to be in dissonance, opening up possibilities for divinely authorised resistances to the organisation.

In terms of the organisational lexicon, 'commitment' implies the surrender of self determination to God's purposes manifest through organisational leadership. As P3 expressed it, '*but again for me, that this is a life long commitment I've kind of guess is stepping up in my ministry, which is not about the job because that may vary depending on my appointment, but being prepared to pretty much go wherever, do whatever, in whatever role that God requires of me I guess through the Army*' [P3:47]. Again we note that in the officer discourse, commitment is coloured by the notion of divine call. Within the officer discourse 'the call of God' is used as leverage in an

attempt to produce total obedience and commitment in the officer. The logic flows that if God calls to a particular organisation (in this instance The Salvation Army) then it must follow that God endorses the values, practices and understandings that form the basis of that organisation. Thus there is a measure of confluence between the divine will and organisational expectations. P2 offered a glimpse of the way in which the organisation stands in proxy for the divine will when she commented upon her experience of life in the Training College: *'I guess I …, it feels like some time God kinda gets taken out of the picture. We say we feel called by God to be an officer and then we go to college and then, I'm not saying God… that they replace God with (the) Leadership but, sometimes it's the way it seems.'* [P2:217]

This commitment and thus availability to organisational utility is a defining truth of officership, and as such is generally transparent as the way things naturally are. Any lack of commitment, loyalty or obedience to these organisational norms is constructed as aberrant behaviours that require correction. While this is the case, what was interesting was the way in which the organisation espouses a valuing of individuality in its officers. In an attempt to counter a commonly held perception among Salvationists that individuality and officership are mutually exclusive, as part of its marketing apparatus to secure new novices, the organisation has developed promotional materials that are stamped with the slogan message: 'What makes you, makes a good officer' (The Salvation Army 2010d). The materials appear to endorse individuality, innovation and creativity as key components of effective officership. Yet some novices expressed a dissonance in their experience in the training space, referencing an inability of the organisation (in their experience of the training setting at least) to embrace individuality in terms of character traits and behaviours that did not align with those expressed in the officer discourse.

> *… and so I think that it is for me a really clear example of where we are saying 'we want you to be individual and unique -what makes you makes a great officer', but at the same time once we actually get you in there.., into college, we are going to try and form you into something. And I don't think they want to form us into something that is completely different to who we are, but there are going to be parts of who we are, that is not going to necessarily fit into the shape that they want us to be. And so I think that makes for a complicated relationship…* [P2:73]

'So that there is I know very much last year I had this sense of 'sausage factory' type feel that we were being expected to all turn out at the end ' [P1:198].

'I feel like … we're asked to dream big dreams, but not too big. Not bigger than what we're allowed to.' [P2:77]

Within the officer discourse commitment as an officer is understood normatively a 'life long' commitment. That is life long from the point of acceptance. This implies that life long can represent 40+ years of service, or as little as 10 years (depending upon age at commencement of service). Resignation from officership is regularly constructed as disobedience or a lack of commitment (to the divine will). According to the 1922 edition of Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of The Salvation Army, the idea that God would call an officer to something else was an impossibility '…and that God, in directing him to solemnly promise that he [the officer] would live and die beneath its Colours [the Salvation Army flag] at one time would never tell him to abandon those Colours at another' (The Salvation Army 1922, p36).

Again P1 who was relatively new to The Salvation Army, offered a contemporary example of disrupting this idea:

P1: 'God calls you to follow him and discipleship … this is really good to clarify this [softer voice] …. discipleship means following him to whatever it is that he calls you to [a little upset].

Interviewer: So for you there is a possibility and openness to a future in which you could be called to something else other than officership?

P1: yes very much so

Interviewer: If I might pursue that a bit further, how do you feel the organisation understands that notion?

P1: umm … I think they would be, they are disappointed when people do that. I think they view it as a betrayal, they view it as… and I don't think this is just the hierarchy as such… I have heard comments from soldiers as well, that if you leave the Army, like if you leave officership or you leave the Army it's like you have left the church. Umm…. and you are in the wilderness and there could be no possible way that you could be growing in God or being used by God so I think there is a narrowness about it that is there… that's a generalisation.' [P1:179-183]

While it would be impossible for any novice or officer to be unaware that officers do in fact resign (9 in 2008 and 14 in 2009), thus undermining the notion of life long commitment, it is rarely the subject of substantial organisational speak from leadership. However among officers in general, it is a common subject for chatter. The 'officer' discursive reality that leadership seeks to maintain is one in which officers are constructed as loyal through obedience and life long commitment as an ideal.

Life long officership was so powerful a truth that E2 sought to reinterpret her experience of resignation from officership as somehow continuous with this regime of truth,

> *Interviewer: When you answered the call and became an officer did you frame that as lifelong?*
> *E2: yeh, yeh*
> *Interviewer: so what changed?*
> *E2: just this God's breaking in and disrupting that*
> *Interviewer: so now you would say it isn't life long then?*
> *E2: well we are still life long serving God but it is not within the framework of the Army* [E2:49-53]

For E2 life long as a truth is no longer connected solely with officer, but is refashioned so that it becomes a symbol of commitment to God *beyond* the normalised boundaries of the organisation. This provided E2 with a way to preserve the twin truths of a divine call and life long calling. Similarly I noted how E2 readily adapted other Salvation Army discursive truths connected to life as officer in an attempt to transition her identity to life outside the organisation. E2 refrained from using the term 'resignation' instead replacing it with 'moving on' (as if it were no more than the next appointment). When I asked how long it was since she had resigned E2 reframed the experience in terms of receiving a new 'appointment' from God directly (rather than the Army).

> *Interviewer : how long has it been since you resigned?*
> *E2: two and a half years , yeh, … we call it 'moving on', … it's our next appointment, a God appointment* [E2:4]

In terms of her resubjectfication post officership (Butler 1997, p11), throughout the interview E2 sought to produce an identity that was continuous with her officer identity which included the elements: loyalty, commitment, availability and life long calling. The discourse had been so powerful that she did not reference any fundamental disruption to this identity save that she is no longer organisationally authorised as 'officer.'

Power and Authority

Organisational knowledge produced through a 19th century British reading of the 'Army' military metaphor is generative for the hierarchical leadership model which supports the distinction between officers and not officer, as well as the relative speech positions that officers experience as a function of organisational life. Novices have neither organisational 'markers' - rank or appointment, generally attached to the exercise of organisational power. All novices referred to how they noted that rank operated as a device to differentiate the worth and value of officers, and / or as a mechanism through which organisational power was exercised and recognised as valid by those of lesser organisational location. In their responses most tended to express a certain 'distain' if not open criticism of these organisational practices. *'... I think there are people who use rank as a way of asserting power and authority, whether or not they have any right to power or authority over you.'* [P2:314]

Title, rank, and positional power are discursive realities that constitute organisational life and function to maintain the stability of a particular organisational order. One very senior officer referenced the way that one of the prime duties of middle to upper leadership is to preserve a particular form of organisational identity advocated and enshrined in organisational directives called Orders and Regulations (O&Rs) which originate centrally from the office of the General (in the UK). One set for Divisional Commanders (middle management) and another set for Territorial Commanders (CEO level). *'...you are responsible to ensure the ongoing expression of the Salvation Army in the traditional Salvation Army form..... 'there's a responsibility laid on the shoulders of the person coming into those medium to senior leadership roles to ensure that the Army is protected in that sense'* [O1:41].

This responsibility to which O1 refers is effectively the centralised controls of the General exercised through the medium of various Orders and Regulations (originally derived in form and content from the British Army). O&Rs are the written form of the discourse that defines what is acceptable and what is not in terms of policy, process, values and even down to the micro structures of individual life. For instance O&Rs affect not only organisational operational concerns but questions of marriage to someone not an officer (The Salvation Army 1987, p76), the adoption of children (a single person may not adopt at all) (The Salvation Army 1987, p85), the ordering of family life (The Salvation Army 1987, p79-80). Such centralised mechanisms are a potent and effective medium for the flow of power/knowledge throughout the

organisation. Clearly representing the view of the founder William Booth the following excerpt suggests the high place given to O&Rs in the organisation (even implying a similar status normally reserved for the Scriptures),

> 'I do not, of course, place them on the same level as the Scriptures; but, just as new thought and new light on problems comes to us whenever we refer to the Bible, so are new thought and new light likely to break forth whenever we study the Regulations … the Regulations *as a whole'* (The Salvation Army 1925, p41).

Primal under the heading 'conditions of advancement' in the 1922 edition of *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers* is the instruction for officers to, 'receive the spirit of the Army, and give himself up, without reserve to learn and practise its methods. He must study Orders and Regulations for Field Officers, and obey them' (The Salvation Army 1922, p18). Ideally as a technology of the self, the organisation would have Orders and Regulations inscribed upon the soul of the individual officer to ensure the production of a particular way of being in the world and indeed construction of the world – a peculiarly Salvation Army way. The principles manifest in O&Rs are expected to 'become a part of the inner force and whole activities of life' (Booth 1924, p6), while later in the same book the exhortation is made 'as officers, The Salvation Army should possess us' (Booth 1924, p73).

Part of the formation of the novice officer identity, is learning to recognise the power that is embodied in particular organisational positions and how one is expected to negotiate it in terms of respect and compliance. Novices experience the positional power of Territorial leadership as seeking to modify their personal preferences, predispositions and behaviours. Possibilities for resistance are minimised as 'the rules of the game' dictate that overt resistance would be met with strategies to ensure compliance (see 'confession' in chapter seven) including the threat of the loss of opportunity to become officer at all. One novice recounted how the Territorial Commander in an lecture emphasised this point, *'The first-year cadets - there is no guarantee that you will go into your second year, and second-year cadets there is no guarantee that you will be commissioned'* [P3:88], unless there is full compliance with training discourse expectations [implied].

Many novices referenced this example of the flow of power as contrary to what they believed are the espoused values (Lundberg 1990, p20; Schein 1992, p21) of mutuality and equality that are part of the modern Salvation Army organisational discourse which

are commonly captured through the metaphor of the 'priesthood of all believers.' However, novices reported that this metaphor while articulated often, did not appear to significantly inform the hierarchal practices and systems in the organisation in a way that they recognised. This was a source of confusion and frustration for many novices as they attempted to take up their officer identity which is an interim form of subjectivity (Davies 1994, p4). This is not to suggest that power is simply exercised by those who inhabit particular privileged positions within the organisational structure, upon those whose discursive position makes them 'power-less'. As Foucault identified, the distribution and effects of power are far more complicated than this, writing its effects upon all (Foucault 1979, p93-94). At the risk of offering a vast oversimplification, the positional power exerted by territorial leadership is a function of those who through their willingness or otherwise embrace that power. In other words, power only exists because we are all complicit in its effects and flows through resistance. In terms of the officer discourse it is those who are assigned a less influential speech position who actually substantially create the very power that acts upon them though accepting the discursively produced organisational reality in which hierarchy should be (must be) obeyed. Indeed it is the organisational discourse itself which acts upon all, creating them as discursive objects and agents within organisational life. In effect officers form a connected power distribution network of intelligent nodes (ie. not so determined by the discourse that they do not have any choice, and yet not so free that they are not constructed by the discourse). One participant (an ex-officer) was able to speak of her experience of officer as formed for the purpose of mediation of organisational power. *'I think [an officer] it's somebody whose role is to, I don't know if 'enforce' is too strong a word, or is to enact the wishes of the organisation'* [E1:61]. Within this network of power relationships individual officers as nodal points may respond to, and channel power, in quite different ways (Butler 1999).

Officer 'norms' produce organisational equilibrium which maintains relative power structures and hierarchies. The good officer is one who preserves the status quo through doing what they are told. Loyalty as a key attribute of the Salvation Army officer identity implies obedience and compliance which is most readily manifest in not questioning organisational decisions / directions. *"…we're not encouraged to be critical thinkers, and we're actually encouraged to just accept that that's the way that is"* [P2:77]. This reference to unquestioning loyalty and obedience was also echoed among officers. In particular E1 refected upon how she felt that unquestioned hierarchical power tended to produce a silencing around how power/knowledge is exercised within the organisation. *'I think that most processes in the organisation lack*

authenticity and lack honesty and they're not transparent processes' [E1:35]. The vast majority of officers lack participation in the operation and direction of the organisation (even more so for laity!). The exercise and flow of power prefers to hide itself from view, camouflage itself, naturalise itself so that subjects come to accept and embrace the internal and natural necessity of how the discourse operates. The hierarchal organisation tends to invest wisdom in particular persons who inhabit discursively prepared subject positions. Again E1 expressed this quite succinctly,

> *'I have some huge troubles accepting that power is only found…, all wisdom is only found, in a few. And they're usually people at the top.. and that there is no acknowledgement or use of the … umm… there's no sense of wisdom being part of the greater the organisation, that you know, the wisdom is at the top ... And that you somehow magically get this wisdom when you get to the top'* [E1:25,26].

The officer discourse creates a class of office holders who generally attain that office through their ability to reflect back to the organisation its own discursive values - loyalty, obedience, compliance. As I read in one recent Salvation Army publication, an officer newly appointed to a very senior position was described in terms of their 'pedigree' (their acclimatisation through their family linage which included past senior officers in The Salvation Army) (Simpson 2010, p8). They become not only custodians of the tradition but agents for continuity and stability. If I might be so indulgent as to offer a paraphrase based upon biblical language (inspired by Genesis 1:27):

> 'the officer discourse creates agents in its own image,
>
> compliant and loyal it constructs them,
>
> instruments of stability it makes them.'

However the data provided from novice responses indicated that generational change is bringing with it suites of values arising from different social discourses (ie. liberal democratic, postmodernism) that may contest the ways that power operates and its range of productive effects within The Salvation Army officer discourse. This I think has contributed to the flux of organisational identity, values and practices that The Salvation Army currently experiences. Interestingly though, this is no new phenomenon. In a selection of addresses by the General and senior leadership to *The First International Training Staff Council* in 1925, one leader observed,

> 'Some of you are dealing with cold, self-centred, democratic people, self-confident, acknowledging but few loyalties. It is difficult to convince them that they should be submissive and humble. But the standards which God

> has set up cannot be changed because we find that times have changed' (The Salvation Army 1925, p25).

This 'meta-truth' continues to have its effects in the present where those social and cultural changes that threaten the stability of current organisational discourses are framed as something to be resisted, to be fought against, and finally redeemed, according to organisational perspectives of officer identity. It is not the organisation that must adapt to changing cultural values, but rather individuals must accept and embrace the discursive reality of the organisation.

Models of Officer

Novices are engaged in an ongoing process of re-formation of identity which is discursively produced. We might conceptualise novices as entering into a dialogue with the various examples or models of officer that are available to them to observe. Through 'reading' the range of officer narratives that are available to them, novices re-form their own officer identity based upon a dialectic of 'sameness' or 'otherness' that informs their interim form of subjectivity (Chappell 2003, p47f). This reading of course is undertaken through the interpretative lenses provided by individual predispositions, and the multiple discourses that have been inhabited prior to and during training.

The data suggested that senior leadership provided particularly influential models of officer for both the novice and experienced officer cohort alike, largely concerning the use and exercise of power and the validation and constitution of knowledge within organisational relationships. This modelling resulted in participants reflecting upon two essential aspects: how power/knowledge from above (in a hierarchical sense) operates upon them, and how power/knowledge is (or 'will be' in the case of novices) exercised by themselves within their particular domains of responsibility.

Novice responses generally focused upon senior leadership as providing models of officer who exercise their leadership in particularly autocratic ways. In relating his experience of how he experienced the Territorial Commander, P6 expressed, *'… she was talking about leadership and it's the first time, … a very different type of lecture to what she would have…., than what we've ever had before. And it was very much 'you can do this, you can't to do that' - very autocratic'* [P6:93]. Similarly P3 described her perspective of how senior leadership model officer as, *'… authoritative… kind of having to toe the line, it's much more about power kind of play where this status has become…*

their position is more important than….. I would say to people, but that makes them sound heartless. But it seems to be more about that position and authority' [P3:119].

Novices expressed feeling caught between a modality of leadership based upon the exercise of an absolute 'positional' power that is essentially incontestable, and recognition that from their perspective this provides a flawed model for their own ministry (the dialectic of sameness and otherness).

> *'Cause I think there is a disconnect between the front line corps officer and territorial leadership. People sitting up on the 10th floor of THQ [leadership], … and I think there is a disconnect. And I don't think that's a good thing. But I guess I do see that as two different sides of officership in a way'* [P3:121].

Interestingly, the majority (but not all) novices constructed the 'models of officer' they observed in senior leadership along the lines of 'otherness' in relation to the self narration of their own emergent officer identity. Nonetheless it appears that novices were at least to some degree aware of the way that the officer discourse was acting upon them to produce an officer identity that reflected or embodied particular 'officer' ways for power/knowledge to circulate.

P1 offered a partial narrative construction of herself as one who resists the autocratic models she observes and yet recognises that in some way she herself might actually be constructed by them. *'But I think … that temptation will be open to me next year too. To just say 'I'm the officer we're going to do it this way and that's all there is to it.'* [P1:375]. Yet not all were entirely negative in describing the models of leadership offered by organisational hierarchy. P4 saw such modelling of leadership as almost natural, implying that there is no other way to be: *'there needs to be those people who are making the decisions, and needs to be those people where the buck stops there. Just for that logistical purpose of being able to run effectively. And I wonder whether the Army in that sense, I don't think is probably much different, that there needs to be someone with whom the buck stops…'* [P4:223] While this appears to simply endorse the hierarchy of decision making, the general tenor of P4's responses suggested an acceptance of the way that Territorial leadership modelled officer.

Many novices recognised that beyond the models they experienced in the hierarchy, there were also a rich diversity of officer practices and expressions of officer identity among the general officer cohort. Generally, novices referred to encounters with

officers in their field placements as offering models quite different for those articulated in the College training discourse as normative. P2 reflected upon the practices around uniform wearing as an example. At College the practices of uniform wearing reflect the organisational 'minute' (the official documents that authorise Territorial practices and procedures). It is expected that cadets follow the official practice at all times. However in her field placement (more distant from the direct authoritative gaze) P2 noted that such practices are modified by officers to suite personal values and local contexts. *'We're kind of told this here [at College], but then you look out at Corps officers even around… like our corps now where we go… quite regularly our officers are in jeans and an 'I'll Fight' kind of Red Shield T-shirt or something [symbols of the organisation]. And we kind of sit there feeling silly with her in our ... even just in this uniform [approved informal summer uniform] let alone something more formal. So it is that kind of weird disconnect'* [P3:81] (jeans and T shirts are not authorised as official uniform). While these alternate officer identities are recognised (in terms of their actual existence), they are officially named and constructed as aberrations and thus not part of the range of 'official' Salvation Army officer identities and yet nonetheless they exist. The discourse requires that cadets and officers conform to the identity that uniform scaffolds. To resist this self evident reality of officership is to position one self on the margins where organisational life becomes manifestly uncomfortable.

> *'I think it's bizarre that we have to wear a uniform and that we have to wear a particular uniform at a particular time for no particular reason other than it is said so. That it is frowned on that those who don't want to wear uniform are somehow 'less than'…*' [P1:356].

> *'an officer looks a certain way. Which…. clothes wise everyone looks the same, which is one of my struggles because prior to college…. or it's still is, I value independency so people being themselves. Umm… clothing is a part of representing who you are…'* [P5:116]

P5 experienced the requirements around uniform as the officer discourse normalising individuals into one common identity. The uniform externally represents the internalisation of power/knowledge that produces the officer identity. One officer of ten years experience related how they had been reported to the hierarchy for failing to wear the appropriate uniform (an example of surveillance).

> *'… just two weeks ago, 'X' and I were called into a meeting with …., because someone had dobbed on us to the Commissioner that at […] we weren't wearing the proper Salvation Army uniform'* [O4:112]

The organisation responded to ensure compliance. The reason given was that O4 and partner are models of officership, in effect carriers of organisational values. Divergent expressions of officer, which 'not wearing authorised uniform' represents could not be tolerated as it hints at something less than complete obedience and dedication to the organisation. As E2 now removed from The Salvation Army by more than two and half years observed regarding what she perceived to be the organisationally ideal Salvation Army officer,

> *'I suppose they [the hierarchy] would be happy with someone who has 100% dedicated to the Army and its principles and doctrines. Willing to go where they are sent… Umm… I suppose they get jack of people coming in and contesting their appointments, 'I want to go here,' and 'I want to go there,' and 'I do not want to do this.' I think their ideal officer would be someone who just accepts what they are told and does it.'* [E2:45]

An important part of cadet training has been the field (on the job) placement. In the past the selection of appropriate training locations has been significantly based upon such factors as geographic location, the range and types of programs and potential training opportunities, and of course the suitability of the Corps Officers themselves. However in 2010 a directive was articulated by the Territorial leadership team that rather than the suitability of the corps being a determining factor, it must now be the selection of the Corps Officers themselves. The language that was employed (as reported) was interesting. The instruction was that the leadership team wanted to 'clone' particular officers.

> *'… they [leadership] said that they wanted to identify officers that they wanted to 'clone'…. they said well, they are great corps officers and we would like more of those particular corps officers…. we want cadets sent to the officers rather than the corps, because we want the cadets to learn from them their leadership style, their people skills, their vision, all of that. We want them to catch something of what they have.'* [source withheld to protect anonymity]

Presumably cadets became the blank template upon which this cloning would materialise. This appears to be an attempt to exclude discursive aberrations of officer that in the view of leadership had emerged among recently commissioned officers. The belief appears to be that the emergent or transitional identity of cadets can be managed through various techniques including appropriately selected and monitored

modelling.

Interestingly P1 referred to this as a process of *'breeding those who will maintain the status quo'* [P1:346]. As a metaphor, breeding implies intentionality to 'breed out' identity traits excluded by the officer discourse, and thus produce the docile identity of officer. Breeding is intentional, deliberate, strategic and organic, which of course has some similarities with the notion of cloning officers as an intentional strategy.

Novices generally recognised and referred to the conflicted nature of organisational practices exemplified by the alternative officer models that they cited. Not all officers follow the officially endorsed modes of organisational practice that are articulated as normative and expected in the training discourses. Yet even within this training space there was room for the unspeakable to be said.

> *….. some of the training officers will say ' you just do it for the two years, and we know that when you're out there things will be bit different.'* [P3:81]

> *'…. with speaking with officers, yeah, you will hear them say 'Oh, you do it there [in Training College] but you will never do it when you're out in the field'* [P6:182].

'Training officers' (job title – officers who are appointed to train cadets) represent the lowest place in the officer hierarchy at the Training College. Their function is to monitor the formation of novices both in the College residential setting and in their field placements. It appears that at least some training officers recognise the dissonance between the college space and their 'field of practice' space. Their solution is to comply while under the close surveillance of College hierarchy, in which the training officers themselves feel the organisational gaze. As P1 noticed about the training staff, *'the thing I see modelled here [in the Training College] is compliance to hierarchy…. and quite often against the better judgment of the individual officer'* [P1:248]. P1 observed how powerfully the discourse works to ensure compliance as a fundamental organisational value. This observation was confirmed by officers such as O2 whom I asked about the expectations he feels from those above him in the hierarchy, *'a good officer [reference to a particular organisational position removed] is a compliant officer [reference to a particular organisational position removed], 'and toes the party line.'* [O2:165]. O2 admitted that this surveillance designed to produce compliance was constantly in his mind shaping and determining his practices and behaviours. The much adulated 'team player' is a conforming participant in the officer discourse.

Summary

The ‘weird disconnect’ between what is organisationally required and the actual lived practices and experiences of officers, places novices in the position of negotiating different projected identities of themselves. One identity which is necessary to progress from novice to officer is loyal, obedient, compliant, committed to the organisation, respectful of organisational position. The modelling of these values and the ways that power is organisationally exercised were important to novices as they attempted to construct their interim form of identity through a dialectic of ‘sameness’ and ‘otherness.’ The majority expressed to varying degrees an institutional necessity to project particular forms of identity, one which is ‘told’ to the organisation to satisfy the authoritative gaze. The other identity (itself one among many) narrated in the space of these interviews consisted of loyalty to their personal construction of organisational ideals and values: the creation of authentic human community through ‘living out’ the gospel, leadership through service, egalitarian values, and genuine concern for the poor and marginalised. Officers are themselves agents of power/knowledge and constructed by the flow of power/knowledge through the discourse. The discourse works to achieve and maintain a discursive equilibrium within which officers are produced through established regimes of truth that regulate how officers approach themselves.

In the next chapter I turn my attention to the mechanisms that discourse employs to write its constitutive effects upon the individual to produce particular normalised subjectivities (through technologies of self and discipline). Yet the officer discourse does not have things all its own way. Individuals who are produced through the intersection of multiple discourses can and do resist the circulation of power/knowledge which itself has the effect of producing individualisation.

Chapter 7

Officer – Resistances and Power/Knowledge

Individual identity is an unstable, multiple and fragmented entity. In this research I have attempted to frame cadetship as the processes of negotiating a series of interim identities which constitute a trajectory toward an officer identity (which itself remains unstable). Cadets are required to take up the novice officer identity that is prefabricated for them by the officer discourse. In fact a common experience reported among novices was the way they felt that their 'past selves', 'working identities' and 'experiences' prior to entering training, were not valued or respected. *'….which is really interesting given that there is so many of us that have come in from work environments where we've had responsible positions and how quickly we fall back into doing as we were told like schoolkids'* [P1:314]. This late adolescent child / parent relationship comes to define the way that the organisation views cadets. Cadets (irrespective of actual age) are assigned interim identities that construct them as adolescent children that need to be 'protected' from adverse experiences in the organisation and 'guided' into taking up a suitable (authorised) officer identity.

One cadet recounted how he experienced the entire group (that year's intake or session) of cadets being reprimanded for some indiscretion that an individual had committed,

> *'You know… you've done a naughty thing. And so, especially at this point, where I'm about to leave [complete training] I'm thinking, 'I've just got into trouble, I've got into strife for something that I didn't do. The way that it was delivered to me, I don't think was a good example for me of how to deal with that situation. Cause I'm still in that thing of 'I'm here to learn, I'm still respectful, I'm a cadet'* [P6:77].

Yet his acquired cadet identity would not allow him to contest how he felt he was treated. The discourse frames cadets as learners who in response to God's call have given themselves over to be formed into Salvation Army officers. They are obedient, loyal, compliant and open (in varying degrees) to embracing the identity that is assigned to them in the College training system.

Yet cadets are not simply complaint docile individuals. In commenting on her colleague cadets P3 (who was born into a Salvation Army family) observed that among those with lower prior exposure to the Salvation Army there were generally higher levels of

resistance. Initially P3 found this resistance rather tiresome in that it challenged not only the way things are, but in her mind 'how they were meant to be.' Yet as time went on, the questioning started to produce in her a developing scepticism and to some extent destabilisation of her assumptions about the organisation

> *'… umm listening to some of the other cadets when they challenge things because they're newer to the Army and I guess are challenging some of these things because they're learning about them to the first time. My first thought is kinda that 'its the way it is' then sometimes I do have to stop and go… why do we do that … am I too placid in just accepting it because it's just always has been, and it's always been my life and it's always been around that I haven't stopped to challenge it enough'* [P3:156].

The organisational training space appears to place little value upon the past professional identities of novices, which is concisely reflected in the following comment made by P6, *'But when it came down to it, my previous knowledge and previous abilities meant nothing to her [an instructor] because I was a 'cadet… all this past experience all this past knowledge was useless because people just said, 'oh you're a cadet''* [P6:67], and supported by P1 *'… yeah I'm not sure that past lives are really valued'* [P1:332]. Pedagogical practices appear to institutionalise strategies that reflect the belief that for the officer professional identity to emerge, past identities must be destabilised and deconstructed so that they can ultimately be written over (Foucault 1984, p.123). This appears to be endorsed by a training college officer for whom officership was constructed in terms of breaking with the past lived experience. 'Full time' in this discourse implies a giving over of the very soul; that personhood itself can be shaped and made available to the organisation, *'another aspect of what is an officer is almost 'a leaving behind of a previous life', of previous employment…. to sort of commitment themselves to full time …'* [O2:9]. Values, attitudes, practices, ways of being which are incommensurable with the transitional identity of 'cadet' that are assigned by the discourse are challenged and surgically excised with the scalpel of surveillance and personal introspection (see 'confession' below). The unrelenting effectiveness of these techniques was indicated in the response offered by P2 to my question inviting her to comment on the strangeness or any dissonances within The Salvation Army world view and practices that she may have experienced. P2 (who had a relatively low prior experience of The Salvation Army prior to entering training) reflected upon how quickly she had been normalised, *'…but the interesting thing is that the longer I go in college I feel assimilated. Like I've been assimilated quite quickly'* [P2:278].

Individual officer identity is constituted by the power of all the discursive practices in which we speak and which in turn 'speak' in us' (Chappell 2003, p41). Individual novices, whose 'pre-training' identity flows from the nexus of their previous experiences produced in multiple discourses, are acted upon by the Salvation Army officer discourse to produce a new identity – The Salvation Army officer. There are some theorists (Fernie & Metcalf 1998; Sewell & Wilkinson 1992) who maintain that a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis results in a overly deterministic view of the production of subjectivity which limits its usefulness in organisational settings. As stated in my theorisation, I conceptualise identity as multiple, evolving and produced through narrative. From a Foucauldian perspective, subjectivity is produced through the discourses that an individual inhabits over the period of a life time. Within these discourses, individuals are at one and the same time positioned by, and yet also choose to position themselves, in terms of their interim form of subjectivity which is relatively unstable. This subjectivity is in effect a hermeneutical act of imagination (Ricouer 1988), through which identity is socially constructed through excluding as 'other' what is not us. This 'storied self' is not a stable unitary self, but rather is multiple and continuously emergent and dynamic each situated in different and particular contexts, and working strategically to resist those contexts (Andrews et al. 2007, p104). Identity as a modality of self is produced through an individual's capacity to render outside what is other and thus not part of the process of identification (Elias 2000, p.295). We may consider this ability to 'render outside', the power to exclude – 'resistance.'

All novices and officers that I interviewed expressed some level of desire to challenge the organisationally constructed reality they experienced. Although among the officers there was a broader range of degrees of resistance, ranging from a general acceptance that this is the way things are and individuals need to find ways to 'fit in', to a direct and public challenging of what is normative, expected and taken for granted. However among the novices in particular, there was an expression of general reluctance to offer resistance in ways that would draw organisational attention to themselves (of course the degree and forms of resistance varied across the cohort). As stated in chapter six, compliance is a core organisational value, indeed a 'truth of officership' which predates novices entering training. It is written into the fabric of organisational life even for laity. Loyalty and obedience form part of the requirements for becoming a member (soldier), as indicated in the following excerpt from the earliest version of the Articles of War which originate from between 1878-1882 and remained

current until 1988:

> ‘I do here declare that I will always obey the lawful orders of my officers, and that I will carry out to the utmost of my power all the orders and regulations of the Army …’ (Card 1997)

A revision of the Articles of War appeared in 1988 in which the paragraph above was removed and the following added:

> ‘I will be true to the principles and practices of The Salvation Army, loyal to its leaders,…’ (The Salvation Army 2010b)

The pressure to conform is so powerful that at least for one novice, to resist became an unthinkable option, the possibilities for nonconformity were written out by the discourse. ‘… *there is actually no option to not do it.....There is no option for us to say we don't want to do it and we're not going to* [P2:147] . Resistance or non-compliance is discursively constructed as a 'lack' or 'deficit' in the character of the novice, which can only be rectified or remediated through recognising this for themselves followed of course by compliance. Novices were not alone in this assessment of organisational life. Similarly officers expressed a reluctant compliance that was generated from the fear of consequences which while not clearly articulated, form part of the unspoken reality,

> *'that we do, do things that we don't like to do sometimes. That we do toe the party line sometimes when we don't want to, because of whatever consequence might be. That there are times when we just have to suck it up and do it…. Yeah we don't like it, I don't like it sometimes'* [O2:64]

Other novices spoke variously of the discursive forces that acted upon them to ‘shape’, ‘mould’, ‘hone’, 'round off the sharp edges' or even create ‘a vision of officership’ which they did not entirely share. They spoke of their resistance in terms of 'survival' strategies. In this context survival implies projecting a particular kind of transitional novice identity/subjectivity which manifests the appearance of conforming to the expected discursive patterns, but in fact is simply a kind of 'hibernation' of individual predispositions which were to be taken up later when commissioned as an officer.

> *'I think that it's funny because in thinking in terms of authority and power there is always this level of rebellion, that we’re just waiting until we get out and then their authority and the power exists less, or has less influence'* [P2:247].

If the data provided by the officer cohort was indicative of how the officer discourse

shapes officer identities, I am left to ponder the extent to which one can talk meaningfully of ‘reanimating’ individual predispositions by novices. The more likely effect is as we have already observed, power/knowledge circulates silently and hidden from view producing officer objects in ways that individuals are not even conscious (again another possible trajectory for future research).

Others referenced a more variegated approach that reflected identity as a tool to achieve individual political ends.

> *'Interviewer: okay, so you're trying to create a particular identity that you project to the organisation that isn't the same as the ‘real you’ - so to speak. P5: yeah… I tried to portray the real me, umm… but then I toe line as well. There's that tension... yeah…'* [P5:314]

To be heard, to have any hope of effecting change in the organisation, the individual is required to conform, or at least be seen to conform. P5 believes one earns a speech position by first conforming and appearing to embrace the discursively produced reality. He therefore constructs himself as someone who 'sacrifices' to some degree his identity in the expectation that he will gain respect (a speech position) from which to instigate, encourage, or inspire change. P5 projects a chameleon like portrayal of self to the organisation depending on who is observing and what are his objectives. In effect this is one of the many selves that we all narrate into being relative to environment, context and socio-political intentions.

Notwithstanding the above, within the narratives offered by novices I detected two rationales invoked for resolving to comply rather than contest. Novices expressed a sense that while the possibility to engage in dialogue was offered by those in power, it rarely resulted in any significant observable change and was thus seen as fruitless. The general sense was that the purpose of such dialogue was to convince the questioner of the virtues of the position taken by those in power. *'... in the end nothing changes'* [P2:377], *'you could write a letter till you are blue in the face and it wouldn't get [you] anywhere'* [P3:113]; '*what's the use'* [P6:176]. Perhaps not surprisingly, significant change in The Salvation Army organisation is slow and difficult to realise. In commenting on how she struggled with an unusual appointment that demanded initiative and inventiveness, E1 referred to the lack of support and understanding from the organisation that placed her in that situation and expected results. While there was a language of change and even an admission that for the organisation to survive change is inevitable, nonetheless there remained a significant ‘discursive inertia’ that

sought to maintain its own stability and system. *'If I were to describe in a few words my experience of officership it would be static. There was not a lot of changing or movement or growth or learning'* [E1:153].

The officer discourse is one which is relatively stable. It seeks to maintain its equilibrium in the face of broader social changes and of course other discourses. Through the circulation of power/knowledge the discourse employs a form of language with represents itself as open to contemporary engagement, but in many instances this serves only to mask the resistances to change that flow beneath the surface. Current organisational language is a good example. Recently there has been a very heavy promotion of a strategy/program called, 'doing what ever it takes' which gives the impression of setting aside anything that would hinder the organisation from achieving its goals (espoused - evangelical objectives). In practice 'doing whatever it takes' tends to be bounded by the limitations of the discourse. There are certain things, certain ways of thinking, certain understandings and knowledges which are not possible, so even when change is written large upon the organisational consciousness; it serves to preserve the stability of the discourse through internal sense making. Again E1 expressed her growing frustration with 'the system' that from her perspective, was resistant to change. *'I just felt trapped into a system that I couldn't change, but I couldn't make any difference in, that didn't make sense to me'* [E1:232]. The flow of power/knowledge works to maintain the status quo, the social stability and order of the organisation, and all are expected and required to contribute to this ordering. This analysis is also supported by the observations of O1 concerning the reasons why, in his experience some officers had resigned. Citing one example in particular O1 reflected upon the resistances of one individual who could not conform to the discursively constructed reality that is Salvation Army officership. *'…but he just didn't fit the mould, you know. He had great difficulty complying with the Army structure'* [O1:110]. And so in the end was either forced out or chose to resign (depending on one's perspective).

Organisational Response to Resistance

A powerful modifier of behaviour was that of the consequences (both real and imagined) that contestation might bring '…*because you're not sure what the consequences of that [contestation] are going to be'* [P2:381]. There was significant concern particularly among novices that non-compliance or resistance would lead to the termination. At least three novices referred directly to a recent event (prior to the time of the interviews). It was reported that in one of her lectures to cadets, the

Territorial Commander directly stated that if cadets did not live up to expectations they could find their cadetship terminated: *'… and that she then kind of said people need to know that there's no guarantee here of going from first year to second year, no guarantee of being commissioned'* [P3:95]. It was made clear that if *'you don't shape up'* (reflect and embody organisational values and practices) then despite the significance of divine call, cadets could have their training (and personal aspirations) terminated. The implication was of course that cadets are expected to conform to their assigned organisational identity. As novice officers, cadets are required to embody the discursively created officer values – radical availability, obedience, hard working, conformity and loyalty. The use of threat appears to be an intentional organisational strategy to ensure compliance within the training setting for cadets (and one can only presume for officers).

When asked why they decided not to speak up and contest why certain practices and behaviours are required within the organisation, P6's response was typical: *'….the fear…. because that fear was planted [raised voice] … there's been things that I've wanted to question but with having that underlying fear of, … well what could happen…'* [P6:176]. However, while I name this as an 'organisational strategy' this is not to suggest that leadership co-operatively, reflectively and intentionally acts in particular ways to ensure compliance. Rather the compliance strategies are themselves produced by the discourse which operates equally upon those who seek organisational compliance (ie. officers acting upon other officers). In discussing how one officer experienced the methods and practices used by the organisation to ensure compliance she observed, *'…I think maybe they did because that's all they knew. I mean they had been in the system long enough to know that's how we do it…'* [E1:220]. 'The system' produces particular responses after all, as everybody knows (who are participants in the officer discourse) 'that's how it's done.'

One of the effects of the circulation of power/knowledge is to produce certain practices that are named as 'Salvation Army' (reflecting its values and assumptions about itself) and practices that are named as 'non-Salvation Army' and therefore pushed to the margins if not forbidden to be practiced. Cadets expressed some concern over the way that certain practices named as 'non-Salvation Army' were so simply prohibited. For example P3 commented, *'this whole thing of forbidding people to do something and if you do it we will kick you out kind of thing. It seems to be very harsh, toe the line, laying down the law, kind of role, and that worries me a little bit'* [P3:95]. Yet underneath this observation lies a deeper question over how power/knowledge is distributed and

exercised within the organisational discourse. As power/knowledge circulates in the discourse one of its effects is to privilege certain speech positions like the office of the Territorial Commander, who then is authorised to assign values through determining what constitutes 'knowledge' and 'practice' within the organisation.

All novices are formally 'reviewed' regularly during training. Although the review process is framed positively by College staff as 'simply a development tool for the benefit of cadets,' among cadets themselves there is a strong focus on the 'discipline dimension' associated with being reviewed (as a technology of performance). Through employing 360 degree review techniques, 'the system' constructs colleagues (fellow cadets who are likewise the subjects of review) together with reports from their field placements, as agents of surveillance (Rhodes, Iedema & Scheeres 2007, p89). The whole notion of 'review' has a powerful effect upon cadet behaviours. Cadets are required to make 'themselves' (their souls and dispositions) known to the ('benevolent') system primarily through surveillance (Foucault 1977) and 'confession' (Fairclough 1995, p53). Cadets are required to reflect deeply upon and assess their own behaviours against the discursively created 'ideal officer' which is really a fictive projection. The objective of this technique of power is to focus the novice's gaze upon themselves and thus produce individuals who self regulate their bodies, thoughts and actions. One cadet recounted the experience of being threatened (in their mind with being asked to leave training) as a result of failing to comply with some aspect of training which was brought to the fore during 'the review' - *'so I was called in and there was a threat. And I'm like, 'so where did this come from?''* [P6:158]. Generally cadets understood that it was incumbent upon them to conform to all aspects of the 'training system' or risk the implied consequences. As P4 expressed it so succinctly concerning those who resist and question, '… *to some degree they dig their own grave'* [P4:140].

All interviewees (cadets and officers) offered examples from their own experience of how the organisation responded to resistance. Without exception these narratives represented resistance, viewed from an organisational perspective, as entirely negative and (based upon organisational response) something that needed to be overcome, to be ameliorated, or excised from the personal repertoires of being officer in the organisation. Resistance in these narratives was never represented as something productive or generative for the organisation but rather as 'threat'. *'I see resistance, not as something that needs to be opposed and pushed out. I actually see resistance as a voice that needs to be heard, that actually brings formation to our decisions. I don't know if that makes sense…. whereas in the organisation resistance was seen as*

something that was a blockage, you know a gatekeeper, it was in the way, it needed to be removed' [E1:36]. Resistance is overwhelmingly negative, undesirable, representing a danger to the stability of the organisation or perhaps at best a distraction 'from getting on with the job.' *'Resistance is seen as the enemy, whereas I actually think resistance is a gift and something that we need to listen to'* [E1:37].

In previous chapters we noted the ways in which The Salvation Army sought to create an organisational identity historically distinct form the Churches of the period. One of the distinguishing features was the non-sacramental position that the Army espoused (particularly in terms of Eucharist – Communion). While Eucharist was indeed part of the practices that Booth carried over from his Methodist New Connection days, this practice was later excluded. In the contemporary setting the non-practice of the sacraments has become a dominate feature, tied to the very identity of The Salvation Army. The practice of the Eucharist is explicitly 'forbidden' and this position is made no where clearer than in the training space. Recognising this P3 spoke of training in terms of a place where he expected to inculcate the organisational rules and practices that defined Salvation Army officership. In the strategically created training space, ways of being are inscribed upon the psyche of the novice. *'…and so it is just about that, some of the answers are about learning to follow the rules, learning to toe the line, whatever. This is the place to do that. This is the place to learn to follow the rules so when you get out there it's... ingrained already'* [P3:75]. To become officer is 'to follow the rules - internally.' This suggests some awareness that one of the technologies at work in the training discourse is that of writing the 'officer script' upon the conscious and preconscious self. The discourse acts upon the novice and officer alike from within, shaping and determining the boundaries and elements of acceptable professional identity. *'I think the Army has been very good in the past in making people conform to particular outward standards of behaviour…'* [P1:232].

In this organisational context the formation of officer identity in officially sanctioned training spaces is substantially about the writing of the discourse upon the very soul of the novice. In this context 'soul' represents the depth at which the discourse attempts to effect individual identity. Soul is also a helpful metaphor (particularly in this religious context) as it has strong connections with the concept of 'confession' as a technique for control of identity. Compliance that is driven by internal desires, rather than simply imposed from external forces, produces an identity that is far more docile in the way it manifests organisational discourses. Confession can only take place when the individual recognises for themselves, that is internally constructs certain behaviours,

attitudes, and practices as detrimental to their individual emergent officer identity.

Another technique of power to ensure compliance that was detected in the data was that of being labelled pejoratively, thus demonstrating one's incompatibility with the officer identity. Those who regularly question the status quo can be potentially labelled as *'whinger'* [P4:140], *'trouble maker'* [P5:292, 296], '*immature'* [O3:115]. Such ways of naming enable a particular discursive reality to be created which invites if not demands that such individuals be treated in a particular way – marginalised by those in power. As P1 observed among cadets:

> *'if you have a whinge at college it will impact... you'll get assigned to 'Upper Woop Woop' next year* [a reference to their first appointment]. *I think there's a sense of fear that what you do at college will reflect on where you go in your first appointment that it'll be something that is marked on your…, it will be like a black mark on your report card that will follow you. And so you toe the line and you don't question'* [P1:314].

Both novices and officers appeared to believe that there was a link between appointments and the degree of loyalty and compliance (or lack thereof) that was perceived by leaders. While there is a general organisational silence around how appointments are in fact made (exactly what issues are considered and what influences decisions (apart from the truth of the 3-4 year term)), there is a general belief that the kind and location of appointment can be used as a management tool to attempt to control resistance. Again it is clear that the effectiveness of this technology of performance is located in the utility and radical availability of the object officer generated out the concept of divine call.

One senior officer reflected upon how a reputation as 'non-compliant' inhibits the range of possibilities for organisational participation. A defining metaphor for the serial 'non-conformer' is that of 'immaturity' as such behaviours are constructed as the typical of youth, which it is implied the individual will eventually grow out of. Thus 'maturity' in organisational terms, equates with acceptance of the organisational reality. From his perspective as a senior leader in the organisation O1 observed, *'you do all you can to try and get them to comply and then you think 'well, they're damaging themselves because they're getting themselves a reputation about compliance. Umm… they're not going to go anywhere'* [O1:101]. Any future pathway to leadership positions or to be assigned more senior positions are not available to those so labelled, which appears to validate the perceptions held by novices. The forces at work against resistance are

indeed powerful in an organisation in which the individual officer identity is primarily constructed as 'fully available' as an instrument of the organisation. Where they work, live, the type of function they perform, how they are rewarded (or not) are all at the discretion of the organisation. In such a context the 'black mark' can feel like it is written with indelible ink upon the identity of the individual. Yet such responses to resistance are not those of one 'in power' simply acting upon the 'power-less', but rather the discourse acting upon and through all. O1 for example felt that at times he was required to act in particular ways that he did not feel predisposed toward because of the range of expectations that had been created and assigned by the discourse.

> *'... sometimes you are asked to insist on compliance on things that you may not feel real strongly about yourself, but umm… but because by virtue of office and responsibility that goes with the office, then there's a sense in which personal preferences have to be put aside in order to maintain what is expected'* [O1:45].

Confession

Similarly, in the training context the discourse seeks to frame resistances as a mark of spiritual immaturity that may be overcome through guidance and personal formation though a modality of 'confession' to oneself, to training staff and ultimately to God (Fairclough 1995, p.53; Foucault 1979, p59-60). The organisation clearly recognises the power of confession as a strategy toward achieving the 'docile bodies' out of which Salvation Army officers can be fashioned. As stated in *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers*,

> 'a sound interviewing and counselling programme is essential to the development of … the cadet. Interviewing should be designed to assist cadets in understanding and achieving the purposes of training, helping them to see and to correct weakness and defects likely to interfere with training' (The Salvation Army 1991, p26).

Confession as a technology of self is not an attempt lay bear the soul as a way toward self discovery or self enlightenment. In the Christian tradition (and one might argue aspects of the 'psy' sciences (Rose 1996)), confession is linked to penance in its various guises and shapes which demand the renunciation of self. At the moment of self revelation, which is itself a discursive product, it is in that same moment a form of self - destruction (Foucault 1988, p43). As one officer on the training staff remarked concerning how he responded to cadet resistances, *'… that although they don't see them yet, if they work through those struggles and those issues that we're trying to deal*

with, as they come out the other side, they will see that in dealing with those issues it has helped them to mature spiritually and mature in their leadership and things like that' [O2:39]. Attributes and behaviours that are not in harmony with the discursively produced truths of officer are named as 'weaknesses and 'defects.' A significant aspect of training is to 'guide' cadets so that they recognise for themselves that which was not clear to them previously, to confess, and to seek to conform.

Within the bounds of the training college various confessional techniques are employed which are designed to 'assist' novices 'to work through those struggles and issues' through an intentional process of: naming (by those authorised to speak and question and thus expecting confession and or acceptance of 'the truth' by the novice), framing (of the issues as a problem and thus as a deficit of 'self'), negotiating (implies some form of penance as momentum to change), emerging (as spiritually mature – according to organisational criteria and values, that is normalisation) and finally finding absolution through the acceptance or validation of the authorising voice. In various organisational locations (for example spiritual formation groups, interviews, individual spiritual direction, even in academic assessment tasks, and reflection upon field practice), novices are expected to be truth tellers of the self, a laying bear of the self for examination. Yet speaking the truth of oneself is not only descriptive but constitutive, in that language has a performative function through which the truth about oneself also constructs 'ones' self.' By these discursive means and through these technologies a human being turns him or her self into a particular kind of subject (Besley 2005, p85).

In the training setting confession as a technology of self is located in specifically designed aspects of the training curriculum: 'formation groups', 'personal individual interviews', 'the review process', and in the religious context of 'worship.' Each of these locations seeks to instil in the individual the disciplines of confession that will inhabit them as officers – the observation (surveillance) of self through self evaluation, self talk, self regulation, self inspection and attention to the divine voice (which strangely, normatively echoes organisational voices).

While there was clearly some training staff who appeared to believe that this officer formation work was transitory (in that cadets would soon return to pre-College patterns of behaviours and practices). The senior training officer I interviewed believed that the fruits of formation were longer lasting and more profound,

> *'but after they have been through, been under that surveillance and been through some reviews, and been through the spiritual formation aspect*

each week, and been followed up and been challenged and spoken to. I would hope and I would pray, and I saw even last year where that [resistances], had changed by the end of that two years' [O2:72].

From the interview data I noted a complex and subtle interplay between embracing the discursively constructed officer identity, and the desire to maintain some continuity with the self identity which proceeds from personal stories and histories (the intersections of other discourses). For instance one cadet struggled with the uniform requirements. Cadets and officers are required to be in 'approved' uniform whenever on duty (ie. most of the time via the agency of the doctrine of radical availability). As well as a particular set of clothing expectations there are also requirements around how hair is worn, facial hair maintained and facial piercings displayed. P5 found himself caught between the expectations and requirements of the organisation - compliance (which represented to him anachronistic views out of step with the contemporary world) and the ways in which he had constructed his own identity prior to entering training (non-conformist, questioning the status quo etc). To conform was for P5 the surrender of 'self' as he understood it, yet he also valued respect for leadership (which is theologically overlayed with issues around 'call'). Rather than outright refusal, P5 took up a strategy of 'playing the game' (as he called it), *'…so for me when I came to college I… for the first few months I would probably observe, and just saw what you could get away with and what you can't. So I just played by the rules, did what I had to do. And then learnt where I could get away with being myself and where I had to not be myself so much.'* [P5:232]. P5 like many of his colleagues, responded to certain aspects of the prescribed officer identity with a resistance strategy similar in kind to those identified by Flemming & Sewell: 'foot dragging, false compliance, feigned ignorance … that are conducted below the veneer of legitimacy; covert and seditious acts carried out in the silent spaces of everyday life' (2002, p859)

Surveillance

Key to this strategy is the level and intensity of surveillance that is operating at any particular time. *'When you're at college, you're far more visible*...*and so what you can do, and what you say, and whether you are wearing the right uniform, is far more under scrutiny than when you are perhaps out on the field. Like you're out doing what it is an officer does, there's not always someone watching you'* [P2:234, 236]. Yet while the 'right' uniform may be less of an issue away from direct organisational gaze, one novice spoke about the way that she hoped she would be recognised by members of the public in her first appointment (she was assuming it would be to a small country

community P3:28). What was interesting in her comments was the way in which the 'gaze' of the public that she was the Salvation Army officer (through identification of some recognisable form of uniform), brought with it expectations around behaviour, role, and identity. The 'uniform' acts to make the wearer visually accessible to the normalising gaze of the public and thus potentially vastly extending the range of the organisational panopticon. Even if it is no more than the individual officer's assumptions of how the public perceives them, which of course is itself a discursively created reality, and thus effectively a representation of self surveillance through their own 'internal gaze' (Foucault 1977, p249). All are implicated as both sources and locations of surveillance. In the *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers* 1895, the General implores the Divisional Officer (middle management) to be 'ever on the watch-tower' authoritatively observing the hapless field officers under their command to ensure compliance. He goes even further when he writes, '… it must be so thorough that the officers will feel it is almost impossible to do wrong without being found out… A good Divisional Officer will be a terror to those who neglect their duties and are departing from a life of willing obedience and love…' (The Salvation Army 1895 p197). Later, in the 1922 edition of *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of The Salvation Army*, officers are directed as their duty to 'report' those (fellow officers or soldiers) who utter disloyal sentiments against the Army or its management (The Salvation Army 1922, p37). These represent systemic controls through the expansion of the panopticon of organisational surveillance that encompasses all members of the organisational discourse and beyond.

It appears that the object 'officer' is defined through the perpetual eddy currents of control, in a vast encompassing sea of surveillance. Irrespective of rank or position all are implicated. As indicated in the comments of an senior experienced officer on the Training College staff who spoke of the way that he felt the authoritative gaze operating upon him to produce a particular form of officer identity. *'Being an officer is looking over your shoulder to see who's watching'* [O2;183]. Thus O2 is at the one and the same time one who is surveilled and yet also one who surveills others in an effort to produce a particular officer identity in them.

As far as novice experience goes, surveillance and technologies of performance appear to have the effect of producing an officer identity through which the individual inhabits organisational locations. However, through the narratives that cadets and officers tell about themselves (to themselves) it is equally apparent that there are other identities, and modalities that co-exist with the officer identity in varying degrees of

tension (Somers & Gibson 1994, p.59). The officer discourse through technologies of self seeks to produce a normalised officer appearance - uniform, facial hair, body piercings, even weight (BMI) etc. The discourse seeks to write upon the actual bodies of cadets as it assigns identity (Foucault 1980a, p39), ideally arising from a state of 'self surveillance' (Danaher 2000, p.54).

Yet generally novices resisted the idea that they would be different persons when they took up the authorised position of officer. While they were willing to speak about and embrace notions of personal spiritual growth and even transformation, they were less inclined to speak about change due to becoming officer. Any 'change' in identity relating to the organisation authorising the novice officer was mostly described in terms of external relational changes. P2 reflected upon the commissioning of the group (session) ahead of her, *'… all of a sudden [they] have red on our shoulders [red represents officer as against blue representing soldier], and we're some other kind of creature, and we move into some other place where things are somehow different'* [P2:255]. When asked how would she be different as a result of 'the speech act' of commissioning she responded, *'I think I will be **seen** differently'* [P2:257], *'I don't think it'll change who I am, but I think it changes the way you're looked upon'* [P2:259]. From this perspective P2 represented a view that cadets are being prepared to take up a particular organisational space within which the organisation treats them differently because identity is a social phenomenon (Gergen & Kaye 1992, p.255). As a consequence of organisational recognition and validation it is the *nature and form* of organisational relationships which change, reflecting the new officer identity that is being taken up. Of course to be seen differently, is to be treated differently, which inevitably produces a different officer self that is manifest to the world of the organisational. There was however one notable exception who understood the officer identity to be almost inscribed upon their 'soul', *'see an officer is who I am and it will be a full lifestyle and not just a job or not just a ministry it's kind of who I am 24/7'* [P3:26].

As cadetship may be conceived of as the taking up of an interim form of officer identity, so we might frame resignation from officership as perhaps the ultimate act of resistance (although I am not sure E2 would necessarily agree with this). And yet even in this space, the effects of discourse continue to have long lasting effects. When asked if she still experienced some connection with the Army after eighteen months since resigning and not being part of an Army congregation E1 responded:

'… yeah I do, it's part of who I am, it's part of my identity, I carry the value

system of the Army in lots of ways. I think I would be naive to say that it's not part of me still… I think it always will be' [E1:138].

When asked whether she felt she was still 'officer' in any sense,

'it's kind of like the analogy of I've taken off the clothes of the Army, but I'm still pretty naked, like I haven't put anything else back on yet. So it's what I've known but it…, I'm hesitant to actually clothe myself in the new…. ' [E1:140]

While the analogy of clothing and reclothing is helpful, the fact that E1 remains 'naked and vulnerable' suggests that the effects of officer discourse are much more than skin deep. The discourse which created the officer identity in E1 inscribed its effects upon her soul (Foucault 1977). In this sense it is doubtful whether its effects can ever be totally erased.

Structural Affects of Discourse

Officers are provided with a basic allowance so as to relieve them of the need to work outside the bounds of officership (and as referenced earlier, are indeed forbidden from doing so thus maintaining availability to the organisation). This encompasses a modest allowance for food etc, provision of a car and insurances, home and furnishings, and a particular ordering of life (many decisions are made by the organisation ie. where to live, etc). This serves to create a kind of 'cultural bubble' within which there is relative order and stability. *'And it's almost like this dependency that it creates. And I mean, the result of it is glaringly obvious the results of how it affects the organisation*' [E1:248]. For many officers, life within this bubble produces dependence, and hence a pressure to comply with organisational expectations, so when E1 actually took the step of resignation, she spoke of her experience as being like a *'caged bird', 'that sense of [organisational] control had been so strong, become so familiar, that when I left I felt like the door was open but I was standing at the door, had no idea what to do. My finances are controlled. I'm not even an 'adult' who pays rent, adults pay rent. I wasn't an adult who paid rent, or electricity, or make decisions about my home or car'* [E1:236].

While many maintain that it is organisational cost benefit factors that have produced this situation (the benevolent organisation), it is also clear that it tends to produce officers who are dependent materially and psychologically upon the organisation. While the discourse might construct this as 'release' and 'freedom' from material distractions

thus allowing the full focus of the officer to be upon the appointment at hand (The Salvation Army 1987, p1), for some it functions to close off other options, other possibilities. In the context of a discussion upon this created dependency, I posed the question:

> *Interviewer:… 'and with dependence comes compliance? Do you think that that is actually an organisational strategy?'* [I:123].
> *O2: 'I think it is very true… personally I agree with that. You become wholly dependent. If it did come to the stage where I had to leave the organisation I would have nothing. So there is part of you that says 'that can't happen''* [O2:124].

The organisational dependence that is created by the officer discourse serves to minimise outright resistances and acts of non-compliance. To consider resignation is costly psychologically in terms of personal identity and financially in terms of a lack of fiscal and material resources. In fact as O2 elaborated further, such a dependency could lead to a *'…yeh, a very real sense of feeling trapped'* [O2:131].

Power/Knowledge creates individuality

While it is clear is that in taking on a subject position the individual assumes that she is the author of the ideology or discourse which she is speaking, nonetheless what we have observed above is that the effects of power/knowledge are neither universal nor totalising within the officer discourse. The degree and extent of resistance which is part of an individual's narrative represents a clear indicator of individualised identity. Instead of a 'discursive determinism' within which all are but blank slates upon which discourse simply and completely writes it effects. The narratives of compliance and resistance represent the individual's attempt to render external those aspects of the discourse that do not align with the narrated self (Elias 2000, p295). Through this process of resistance and exclusion, power, rather than simply normalising every position, actually produces a variegation of differences, peculiarities, deviance and eccentricities (McHoul & Grace 1993, p72). All the narratives participants co-created through the interview process, revealed the struggles around taking up an officer identity and the desire to make that identity unique. It is these very points of resistance which individualise the officer identity that is assumed. Resistance to the discursively generated power/knowledge which acts to discipline the non compliant produces the very object it seeks to normalise: the idiosyncratic individual (Foucault 1977, p193).

Resistance strategies varied among the novices and officers, yet they were always

strategic and intentional even if the individual did not reflected upon their practices. Strategies such as passive resistance, the pretence of compliance, subversive behaviour, and outright non-compliance were employed to varying degrees. I offer one example of the many that could be referenced. As previously explained there are clear and detailed 'regulations' around physical appearance when on duty. Among these regulations are those relating to limiting the wearing of jewellery and piercings. For one individual their body piercings represented a particular identity that was narrated to the world via speech patterns, personal preferences, and also 'written' upon his body via the agency of his piercings. He clearly understood the requirements that in fact excluded the possibility of wearing his choice of piercings, yet nonetheless continued this practice unless directly challenged by an officer in authority. When asked about this, at first P5 offered various explanations that were propagated in an attempt to project an identity of compliance with organisational expectations (simply forgetting to take them out, in his field placement away from the direct gaze of the College he deemed it was culturally appropriate, it was in harmony with the level of uniform wearing of the officers in his field placement and they offered no objection). In the interview P5 attempted to construct himself according to the core organisational values of the officer discourse: loyalty, obedience, commitment and conformity.

> *'…for myself I always will toe the line so if leadership tells me to do a certain thing I will, because one my values is honouring leadership'* [P5:254].

Yet when pressed concerning why his practices and behaviours did not appear to align with this espoused value, what surfaced after an extended dialogue, was a strategic, and systematic attempt to not only preserve (perhaps renegotiate) a new interim identity, but to bring about change within the organisation itself through *'knowing how to play the game'* [P5:230-232]. P5 experienced a substantial conflict between his understanding of his 'personal' identity and the organisational officer identity that he was expected to take up. This conflicted space had the effect of ultimately producing an individualised identity, yet within the 'boundedness' of what is an acceptable variance within the officer discourse.

The Divine Will in the Officer Discourse

As I have previously noted, resistance to the demands of the officer discourse must also be understood against the profoundly powerful theological legitimisation of 'divine calling.' A fundamental statement (*énouncé*) that constitutes the discursive object 'officer' (Foucault 1972, p.8) is that officers are divinely called by God (relative to a

particular view of God which is beyond the scope of this research). The normative construction is that God calls the individual to become a Salvation Army officer. In response to this call the candidate (once approved by the organisation which determines the veracity of the said call) enters into an interim form of subjectivity – cadet. The interesting aspect relevant to our discussion at this point, is how the organisation takes up the position and prerogatives of the divine. The unspoken logic proceeds that if God calls an individual to a particular organisation (in this instance The Salvation Army) then it must follow that God endorses the values, practices and understandings that form the basis of the organisation (making them appear 'natural' to organisational insiders). Thus there is a measure of confluence between the divine will, organisational expectations and organisational power/knowledge. For instance beliefs and practices around the status of officership as a higher calling are juxtaposed with ideas of simple functionality; the making of appointments relying upon a radical availability on behalf of the officer to receive 'divinely inspired' appointments. This construction of 'call' functions as a mechanism to encourage the novice to embrace rather than contest, the prescribed officer identity assigned by the discourse. Again, early *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers* (1895) offer insight into the 'historical conditions of this possibly',

> 'When the Divisional Officer finds that Officers are not obeying the Orders and Regulations, let him charge them directly with the fact … He must then show them how inconsistent their conduct is with a profession of the favour of God, and endeavour to produce in their minds the conviction of their unfaithfulness, bring them to repentance, and obtain fresh consecration, seeking the power from God to enable them to fulfil their sacred obligations' (The Salvation Army 1895, p196).

Failure to comply with organisational requirements is directly equated with disobedience to the divine will and thus the individual concerned can only be redeemed through 'confession and repentance.' Following which they must again express their loyalty to the divine voice which now represents the organisation and its interests.

Thus key organisational values such as availability, loyalty and obedience are expressed in terms of ***to*** God ***through*** The Salvation Army, which privileges those who are assigned a position of relative power within the discourse (and are knowledge 'producers' and 'authorisers'). This can raise all kinds of dilemmas and dissonances. If God calls individuals into The Salvation Army then this 'naturally' implies that the Army is authorised to represent the divine interests (or to frame this another way;

organisational interests and divine will are collapsed).

> Interviewer*: Earlier on I thought I heard you say, to be called by God meant or implied that you would do as the organisation requires….. By answering that call you are committed to organisational expectations [of compliance and loyalty]?*
>
> O2:135 *'if you choose to become a Salvation Army officer, yeah'*

To question or resist certain directions, practices or truths is tantamount to rebelling against the divine will (even if it is recognised as manifest through flawed human agency). Thus when I posed questions around the issues raised by earlier interviews with cadets in which they challenged the model of leadership they observed in senior Territorial leadership, officer O2 appeared to retreat to the idea that such questions are not appropriate because leadership is directly appointed by God.

> *'…as my appointed leader, as God's appointed leader at this time. And I think, … when I've felt that way [wanted to contest] I have just been dealt with by God to say, look that's God's appointed leader for that time.'* [O2:68]

The phase 'dealt with by God' suggests the incontestability of leaders as they exercise power/knowledge in The Salvation Army as a function of divine intent, thus to contest, resist, or disagree with the leader maybe to contest the divine will. Accordingly the officer discourse is undergirded by the theology of God's immediacy and involvement in the human affairs of The Salvation Army to the point where God endorses the operations of the organisation (even allowing for human fallibility). Therefore according to the contemporary version of *Orders and Regulations for Salvation Army Officers*, 'loyalty and obedience are expected of all officers – loyalty to the Lord who called them, loyalty to Salvation Army principles, doctrine, regulations …' (The Salvation Army 2004). This is the powerful 'regime of truth' that frames the very nature of loyalty, commitment and obedience in The Salvation Army. The silent imperative writ large upon the organisational collective consciousness: 'obedience to God is manifest through obedience to the organisation.'

Linked to this truth of obedience is the narrative fragment that to be called by God to officership offers a [the] 'life of fulfilment.' To refuse to be either obedient to this call, or to resign from officership is to take one's self to some degree outside the divine purpose for the individual. This leads to the powerful notion that if called by God, only

life as a Salvation Army officer can be offer a life of contentment and completion.

> *'… this is what I had to work through in order to leave officership is that, my calling to officership… I would never be fulfilled,… this is what we hear, the truth we hear. I would never be fulfilled in doing anything else if I stopped being an officer. And I didn't realise how that had become truth for me '* [E1:146]

This power/knowledge is clearly articulated on The Salvation Army's 'Explore the Calling' website.

> 'If you're not called to be an officer, then you shouldn't be one, but if you **are** called, then anything else becomes second best' (The Salvation Army 2010c).

This idea was also referenced by another officer in responding to my invitation to clarify what they meant by the term 'call':

> *'the call, you know without a doubt that you are meant to be a Salvation Army officer. That and nothing else would satisfy that inner yearning for fulfilment and for purpose. ….. That you would not be happy doing anything else. … nothing else will satisfy'* [O2:23].

And also represented among cadets

> *'its always been part of a sense of peace that that is what I'm supposed to do and that's where I'm supposed to be. That sense of nothing else is good enough, or nothing else will fulfil kind of what I am supposed to do'* [P3:20].

This truth was written so deeply upon E1 that she did not realise the power of this 'knowledge' until she came face to face with the possibility of resignation. *'But I actually had to leave, not knowing if it was true or not'* [E1:146]. Such a strong and ingrained truth, acts as a powerful inducement for organisational compliance, drawing its power again from the idea of the divine call and purpose, which is employed to bring closure to other possibilities or ways of being in the world.

A relatively common narrative fragment heard among officers is 'God will use you where ever you are appointed' [P1:336]. This fragment seeks to hold together the concepts of divine will and human agency manifest through the organisation. It attempts to recognise that on the face of it sometimes it appears that poor appointment decisions are made, while at the same time seeking to legitimise the use of power by

the organisation in terms of appointments (which is a fundamental use of power - as it embraces the type of work/job, breadth of work demands, the location, the kind of accommodation, the distance from established social and support networks, family etc), because they effect the divine purpose, *'...but I think there's a perception that sometimes it's a bit arbitrary and we use that statement 'that God will use you where ever you go' to sort of like softened the blow'* [P1:340].

This raises some interesting ways of constructing resistance. No one in the research cohort remotely referred to resisting God as part of their story, except as a narrative fragment in their 'call story' (which as discussed previously is constructed positively as part of the process of authorising the legitimacy of the call). Yet without exception all expressed that they had to some degree resisted the will of The Salvation Army as it is brought to bear in the officer discourse. Some of those interviewed expressed the view that there were footholds for resistance within the organisational structure (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, p.190) that allowed for officers to act in ways that might run contrary to the expressed directives of organisational leadership if it can be shown that this is in fact the direction of God (however this is determined).

> *'I think the people that I see as strong leaders the ones who are flying under the radar who are doing…. who are listening to God and following what God wants them to do and there's stuff happening in their Corps, but they're not sticking their heads above the line because they know they'll get their heads chopped off. '* [P1:344].

The question of obedience is not in play here, rather it is the struggle for *the right* to construct what obedience to the 'divine will' looks like. Yet even though P1 constructs those who resist as the one's authentically 'listening to God' and thus legitimising their actions, nonetheless, she recognises that such resistance actually occurs 'below the radar' (I presume of those who exercise organisational power and surveillance). The metaphor of resistance as 'below the radar' was a relatively common belief and practice among those interviewed. It appeared that part of playing the organisational 'game' is not to be *seen* overtly, or publicly questioning or resisting within the officer discourse. The officer discourse does not embrace or welcome 'open resistance' as this is generally interpreted as self interested defiance. This found support in the experience of officers. As discussed in detail above, model officers are compliant, *'…they don't show resistance. They do resist, but they don't publicly show resistance I think that's important to the organisation.' ... 'Publicly they give compliance, because you're worried about your next job or your next appointment so you can't be seen to*

resist' [E1:111]. The more easily observable or measured compliance areas, that is where the discourse writes its effects upon bodies, gave rise to the strongest organisational responses (for instance uniform wearing, moral behaviours, articulation of beliefs/doctrine). While those who resisted covertly (below the radar of surveillance), or through passive resistance strategies were less likely to be constructed in negative terms even if the organisational gatekeepers were aware of such resistances.

Interestingly, a representative of senior leadership constructed his past experiences of personal resistances as the *'arrogance of youth'* and that he *'grew out of it'* [O1:83,84], implying that maturity as an officer leads to less resistance and embracing the legitimacy of officer identity, a settled form of officer subjectivity. From among the novices there emerged a concept of compliance as a reflection of 'spiritual formation' (whereby God is shaping the 'personhood' of the individual). To surrender resistance was conceptualised as embracing spiritual growth and development (maturity). In this sense discourse acts upon the very 'soul' of individuals (Foucault 1977, p201). As mentioned previously cadets are regularly and formally reviewed by the organisation. In one example P2 was requested to address things that were to her *'completely out of left-field'* [P2:159] at the time (they did not make sense to her and she thus resented the implication of deficit). She expressed how she wanted to contest the 'evaluative comments' with the Training Principal, but upon reflection constructed the experience as an opportunity to embrace personal spiritual growth and formation. To surrender resistance is understood as embracing spiritual growth and development (maturity). Thus the officer discourse acts upon the very soul of individuals to ensure compliance through making the self surveillance of their soul the issue rather than resistance of circulating power/knowledge. *'… my response to that review, that God was using what was going on for me in another way, to form me spiritually I guess. And so after that, I didn't feel the need to contest it.* [P2:196]

Summary

Most novices referred to the belief that distance from centres of surveillance offers greater opportunities to manifest aberrant officer identities. However the data from the experienced officer's suggests that while there are indeed those who are known for 'eccentric' behaviours, nonetheless the vast majority appear to offer a fairly 'normal' set of officer identities. Perhaps this reflects something of the illusion that discourse creates about itself. Power/knowledge works best when it goes about silent and unnoticed. Concealed from consciousness it etches its effects through various technologies upon the soul so that individuals believe that they are independent,

making their own choices, even drawing upon the available stock of stories that reinforce that belief. Yet the officer discourse appears to manifest itself in the values, practices and behaviours in relatively consistent ways. Without suggesting any form of discursive determinism, for clearly there are demonstrable resistances, yet one is left to ponder the practical bounds of agency in the officer discourse.

Chapter 8

The Generation of a Salvation Army Officer Identity

At the commencement of this study I referred to how The Salvation Army conceptualised the training of Salvation Army officers. The objective of training is to produce in the individual what the organisation calls the 'blood and fire spirit' (The Salvation Army 2005). In the main the organisation while declaring that this 'blood and fire spirit' is a particularly Salvation Army mode or way of being in the world (as clearly there are other possibilities), nonetheless envisages this as naturally occurring. Being 'Salvation Army officer' while originating in a particular historical context and socio-cultural location, inevitably generates a specific set of predispositions that define 'officer' and to which all organisational members are bound to reflect.

However, I do not accept that any social network, group, organisation or community is 'natural', but is rather constructed by a complex interaction of historically contingent social forces and influences. In this research I have elected to utilise the insights provided by the social theorist Michel Foucault. One of Foucault's insights was that social life is produced by discourses through the circulation of power/knowledge. Thus the object of this study – the Salvation Army officer is not an historical necessity (cultural or divine), but a construction produced by social/historical forces. This 'officer' object continues to be sustained by the same organisational discourses that seek to maintain their own stability through the very objects that they generate. Thus there is no natural necessity for the object officer to be any one particular way, save that it is constrained by the intersection of multiple discourses such as religious/evangelical Christian, liberal humanist, and various other social discourses.

Foucault's approach to discourse analysis has provided the theoretical and methodological scaffolding necessary to undertake this complex task of conceptualising 'Salvation Army officer' as a product of socio-historical forces, and yet also offer an account of how individual officer professional identity comes to be. This has enabled me to produce a coherent account in which I have rendered visible some of the transparent and normalised ways that define being officer that are manifest through discourse. All subjectivity is the result of technologies of power which circulate via discourse and through discursive practices. Discourse defines and produces the objects of our knowledge and thus does not describe social reality as if it were a pre-existent object, but rather creates it within the 'boundedness' of our shared taken-for-granted assumptions which are themselves discursively created. In effect the objects

we come to know as ‘officer’ and the identity positions they take up are ‘talked into being’ through the discursive resources available to them

I recognise that through taking up a Foucauldian approach to this research interrogation I have immediately foregrounded certain questions and backgrounded others. In other words through a Foucauldian approach I have produced one version of organisational reality, one account among the many that could be offered via different conceptualisations and theorisations. However, I equally maintain that a Foucauldian approach in this particular research space has been particularly generative for appreciating the ways through which historical/social discourses produce effects in ‘the real’ such as in this instance producing objects called Salvation Army officers and their attending subjectivities.

Yet I acknowledge that there are always methodological and analytical choices to be made in establishing boundaries around any form of research. Clearly my research interest has been in the generation of a particular form of professional identity – that of the Salvation Army officer. While the experiences of novices (cadets) have been a significant and rich source of information, I have not engaged in detailed analysis of the actual training program as curriculum. Some may judge this to be a shortcoming of this project, as the classroom and sites of practice (and the curriculum that scaffolds these) are significant locations for the circulation of power/knowledge through normalised statements of truth. This may be a fair critique however, such a study would be an entire project in and of itself and so the best I could attempt to achieve was to listen carefully for examples of how normalised truth was contested through the narratives of subjects. That is those locations in the narratives of participants where the circulation of power/knowledge produced a response in the individual. These I have referenced in the analysis chapters five, six and seven. Another important limitation of this study has been that I have not been able to adequately address the predispositions with which the novices entered into the organisational training space. A more detailed appreciation and understanding of the nuances of individual predispositions would have significantly enhanced my analysis of resistances to the circulation of organisational power/knowledge, together with a deeper appreciation of the ways that individuals chose to resist. This may have been generated through attending to the psychological perspective through which cognition and affective aspects are manifest in human behaviours. And also through giving greater attention to the categories of race, class and gender which also significantly impact identity. Although I have sought to address the religious aspect in terms of my analysis of calling in particular, I think much more

could have been done in examining the way that the 'spiritual' element contributed to the formation of a Salvation Army officer identity, embracing particular clusters of values and practices. Another aspect relevant to the formation of individual professional identity is that of curriculum design and implementation and how such learning has a profound political dimension. Equally it has not been possible to examine how in terms of their emergent officer identity, cadets (and officers) become not only nodes for the circulation of power/knowledge and thus reflect a normalised officer identity, but through their resistances how they also become modifiers of the very same officer discourse.

In chapter five I offered a brief introduction to the historical forces that provided the space in which The Salvation Army emerged and later produced the objects of this study - 'officers.' The historical context which birthed this organisational object 'officer' had its genesis in the revival movements of second half of 19th century England. Arising from the Crimean War of the mid 1850's, preachers in Victorian Britain began to parallel Christian virtues with military ones. Professional soldiering became seen as not only compatible with Christian values but productive as a source of metaphors such that Christianity itself was reconfigured according to these military metaphors - the rise of 'Christian soldiers.' It is from this historical scape that The Salvation Army emerged as an organisational entity on the margins of the established Church and which produced the discursive soil from which the seeds of officer have grown and mutated. In this study I have sought to examine how the object officer is constituted as 'real' in contemporary officer discourses, in other words to explore 'the conditions of its continuing possibility.' Employing a Foucauldian perspective has produced a fruitful approach with which to explore the way that power/knowledge acts to create the conditions of possibility for specific narratives to emerge as dominant, and for others to be marginalised or silenced (Tamboukou 2008, p104).

The object officer is a discursively produced object which has come to be an organisational truth that in turn defines the organisation itself. Following Foucault, a reading of the data revealed a combination of disciplines, commentary, and authors which cohere together to produce 'the' (rather than 'a') truth of 'Salvation Army officer' and work to silence any position which fails to conform within the discursive formation (Danaher 2000, p31). Among the list of recognised authors it is interesting to note how many have held very senior positions, and in particular the highest office, that of The General. They represent revered names that carry more weight and influence than others, and have themselves become subjects for commentary and study (one thinks

particularly of the Founder William Booth whom I have cited on a number of occasions in this regard). There are a limited number of those who have a speech position which enables them to act as the keepers of the disciplines and institutions and who are authorised to name and describe what constitutes officer.

While it has not been possible to undertake an historical archaeological examination of the discourses that produced the Salvation Army, I have sought to show how the organisational historical archive consisting of official minutes; various forms of orders and regulations; conference papers; commission reports; histories; training instructions etc. produce truth statements that seek to programmatically constitute the object Salvation Army officer as real. Such materials assume, and work to maintain the Salvation Army officer as a natural and inevitable object, and thus contribute to 'the conditions of its continuing possibility.' Through my analysis flowing out of many careful re-readings of the data I have sought to deconstruct (render strange) the various 'natural' truth statements and discursive formations that constitute the object 'officer' revealing it to be historically contingent. Through destabilising these truths I have produced a map of the discursive terrain and the 'truths' that produce Salvation Army officer identity.

The Origins of Officer

The principal landmark that dominates the discursive landscape is that of the 'divine call.' The officer discourse emphatically defines the object 'officer' as constituted as an object of divine fiat in two ways. First, according to what has become a defining narrative fragment (or regime of truth), so much so it is in many quarters a test of orthodoxy, 'God raised up The Salvation Army.' Rather than someone who resisted and eventually moved out of the structures of the Methodist New Connection (which would be an equally legitimate reading of the narrative), William Booth is constructed as 'called by God to commence something new' that eventually lead to the emergence of The Salvation Army. Such a narrative continues to simultaneously justify the existence of the organisation, and to effectively authorise its practices. The construction of a particular divine call is fundamental to the production of the object - Salvation Army officer. Secondly in so doing, God *calls* (continuous present tense) Salvation Army officers into being to serve him in and through the agency of the authorised organisation. The organisational narrative of the divine call has the powerful effect of constructing, controlling and normalising the interpretation of individual experience. Not only must there be a divine call, it must be a particular call to serve as a Salvation Army officer which of course implies a very particular organisational

location. This call to serve as officer is normatively constructed as 'life long' which draws it potency through what I name as 'the doctrine of radical availability' that is securely located at the heart of the officer construct. Life long, radical availability *to* God *through* The Salvation Army serves to make the officer an instrument of the organisation, totally available to satisfying institutional needs and the execution of organisational directions. Understood this way 'divine calling' provides the discourse with powerful leverage to form, shape and fabricate an officer identity suited and equipped to sustain the discourse itself.

The standardisation of the call narrative identified in chapter five, has the effect of pre-conditioning the candidate to embrace the discursively generated social world of The Salvation Army. The 'call' has a profound standardising effect through which the individual is ordered and arranged as an organisational object even prior to commencing training with all its normalising technologies. Thus divine calling becomes a truth (device) through which the discourse produces individuals who are arranged as objects or instruments of the organisation to be directed, and deployed according to organisational will. According to this construct of officer, the individual is radicalised as a servant of God whose will is revealed and manifest through the organisation. The call of God to become a Salvation Army officer is in effect a mechanism through which one becomes an instrument of the organisation. The discourse allows for no middle ground in this. An officer must be called by God to serve as a Salvation Army officer, totally available and directed by the organisation.

It was surprising to discover how profoundly powerful and tenacious these truths are as indicated in the personal narrative of the ex-officer E2. Some two and half years after resigning and attending another denomination (quite different from The Salvation Army) she still framed her personal narrative in terms 'calling' and 'moving on' (which when I queried, she clarified as a synonym for 'change of appointment' a Salvation Army officer related idea). As far as E2 was concerned she was still called by God, (and thus fully obedient, loyal, committed and available), to take up another appointment (only this time outside The Salvation Army). According to her narrative, E2 and her husband's resignation was a direct result of God's calling (out of The Salvation Army) and thus 'moving onto' another appointment (echoing in some ways the organisational narrative of William Booth's move outside the Methodist New Connection). She continued to interpret her experience through the same discursive lens indicating that at least to some extent the officer discourse was still generative and provided stability for her current self understanding.

While the organisation maintains that the only essential difference between officer and non-officer organisational members (soldiers) is the concept of 'availability' (to the organisation), it became clear from the data that organisational practices fail to support this strongly espoused value. Soldiers are not represented on the major decision taking, policy creation boards or councils. There are certain positions/appointments that past practice indicates are clearly the domain of officers only (although in more recent times due to lower officer numbers some positions that were once traditionally the domain of officers have become employee positions).[5] Nonetheless when it comes to decision making, policy design, vision casting, and setting direction, these are in the main the domain of officers (and even here one might observe, a certain group of officer leaders). As indicated in chapter five, pervasive organisational narratives suggest that the effectiveness and indeed the future of The Salvation Army are directly tied to its officer strength, which is (problematically in my view) constructed as God's ongoing validation of the organisation. It appears that soldiers are discursively constructed in such a way that they accept, and expect this to be the normal way of operating. The discourse has effectively produced docile bodies who for the large part, accept their lack of influence at the macro level and readily embrace the notion of the officer leadership class as normative.

A fundamental discursive truth is that of the divine call, both of the organisation into being, and of the officers that sustain it. This study has revealed the integral degree to which organisational direction/controls are effectively collapsed with divine direction/controls. Via the authorising processes of the Army's 'infancy narrative' (referred to above), God not only calls the organisation into being, but also (it is implied yet generally unspoken) authorises its practices and ways of being in the world. Thus if God calls an individual to serve in The Salvation Army, it must therefore follow that the organisation itself is an instrument of the divine will. The organisation in effect mediates divine interests that unsurprisingly manifest themselves in ensuring organisational stability through exercising control over its member officers (and non-officers). In a sense through this circulation of power/knowledge the discourse itself is elevated into the sphere of divinity, a sphere in which open contestation becomes problematic as it may imply some level or aspect of disobedience to the divine will. The magnitude of generative power of this truth for organisational stability was quite unexpected.

[5] If the declining number of officers continues, this potentially will make for some very interesting modifications to the officer discourse and associated practices. Statistically the number of individuals entering training remains relatively stable as a percentage of the total cohort of Salvationists from whom cadets are drawn.

Occasionally there are dissonances detected in this ordering, arising from some dissention among officers and laity, and yet nonetheless these dissonances that draw attention to the elements of human fallibility are relatively minor and are quickly overwritten by the normalising effects of the discourse – 'God is still in control.'

Clearly the discourse is powerful, producing affects upon all who come within its domain. Of course not all are entirely convinced of this view, but among participants who attempted to deconstruct this power/knowledge there was a reluctance to go as far as to name this as primarily a device for control and compliance. I speculate that this reluctance was due to the psychological need to avoid destabilising their own discursively produced position. They desired to maintain cooperation between the divine and the human organisation, otherwise the notion of a religious vocation is put at risk because this is how the religious vocation is constructed and lived out in this particular organisation. To disrupt this would be to destabilise their own officer identity.

One of the mechanisms for producing the object officer is through the issuing of Orders and Regulations (O&Rs) and official minutes. From the very early period The Salvation Army has been governed and its institutional identity formed, through the production of these documents for just about every foreseeable situation and contingency. O&Rs, Official Minutes and the like are discursively produced artefacts that seek to describe a particular vision of the world, and within which it is assumed that the described objects – the world, The Salvation Army and officers are real. In this thesis I have shown how such documents rest on this assumption and seek to inscribe this reality upon the souls of organisational members (a technology of self). This makes The Salvation Army 'world' at least, coherent and meaningful, justifying its own existence. What we experience as The Salvation Army world view today is the result of the struggle between competing discourses for dominance to produce this truth, with official documents representing the artefacts of such dominance.

The Elements of Officer Identity

In terms of identifying the discursively produced contours of the object officer, the data revealed a complex synergy of individual values/attributes that manifested themselves in particular suites of characteristics, behaviours and practices. The officer discourse works to produce these defining attributes so that all officers as objects are normalised and standardised within acceptable parameters defined by the discourse. This study has revealed that through the fundamental conception of divine call, the officer life is marked by a narrative that focuses on the elements of *costliness*, *sacrifice* and *loss*.

This narrative produced within the officer discourse acts as a mechanism to ensure that any possibilities for an as yet unimagined future outside officership are excluded and overwritten by the truth of divine calling. Aligned with this is the notion of 'sacrifice' which also suggests the loss of particular personal identities that are not in harmony with the discursively produced officer identity. This sacrifice of possible narratives through which various selves (identities) could be produced is a form of self destruction (Foucault 1988, p43). These are the self(s) that an individual 'willingly' surrenders and discards through their attempts to take up the identity of Salvation Army officer because they are deemed not to be in harmony with the discursively produced ideal. Costliness in these terms is the production of a particular narrated self that reflects the modes of identity acceptable within the officer discourse. The account of 'costliness/ sacrifice' functions as a kind of narrative feedback mechanism which serves to reinforce the veracity of the initial divine call. Two narrative fragments that support this conception of costliness are those of 'burning your bridges' (ie. making it difficult to return to a past form of life) and 'the sacrificial lifestyle' of officership (expending one's self and capacities for the sake of the officer life (organisation)). Both these fragments appear quite regularly in discourses addressed primarily to potential candidates for officership. Costliness/sacrifice/loss as constructed in these narratives have a productive effect in that they function as an indicator of the worthiness, value and authenticity (again relating back to divine call) of the officer life.

Another common theme that was detected within participant narratives was that of 'working hard' or 'busyness.' The worth or effectiveness of officer was measured in terms of the individual's ability to produce an identity that projects a narrative of being 'the hard worker.' This attribute has become a form or organisational 'currency' which is indicative of individual value (to themselves and the organisation). I would venture to suggest that this attribute derives at least in part from the organisational narrative that creates a corporate identity for The Salvation Army as 'Christianity with its sleeves rolled up.' This narrative fragment portrays an organisation that is pragmatic, available and always ready to intervene and offer assistance. Thus the objects through which this corporate narrative identity is sustained must be (or at least project the narrative of) 'hard working', available and pragmatic.

All participant narratives worked to produce in varying degrees a normative officer identity that embraced the attributes of *loyalty, obedience, commitment* and *conformity* as being fundamental (even if they also referenced varying levels of resistance to their absolutising effects). In chapter six I examined how these defining attributes form part

of The Salvation Army's historical archive and how they are carefully linked in the discourse to the divine call which as a fundamental concept forms the nucleus of the discourse, and around which all other truth statements appear to orbit. These foundational attributes form the template upon which the object officer is produced and are normatively expressed in terms of 'to God'. That is obedience to God, loyalty to God, commitment to God etc. *through* The Salvation Army. Through this discursive mechanism the divine is fore grounded, while the organisation is effectively backgrounded as no more than the vehicle through which the officer lives out the divine will. While organisationally this is often articulated in various forums, nonetheless the research data both from participants and the historical archive revealed that the divine will is understood to be operative through the directions of the organisation. This invests the discourse with tremendous, almost irresistible power as it acts upon novices and officers alike. This power is everywhere and affects everybody so that from organisational novice to organisational leadership, all are the products of its normalising effects. 'The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent that it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle' (Foucault 1980a, p98).

In terms of how this officer identity is discursively formed, my analysis revealed various strategies and technologies that acted upon individual subjects. Firstly it appears that the officer discourse seeks to destabilise and deconstruct the very identities with which novices enter training. As stated above, it has already operated to produce a particular version of experience named 'the call.' Generally past identities, experiences and histories are ignored or given but token acknowledgement so that a new emergent officer identity can be written upon the individual. This of course again reflects Foucault's observation that education is a political device for the appropriation of discourses (Foucault 1984, p.123). Novices appear to be inculcated into an adolescent child / parent relationship within the training setting experiencing a lack of personal controls and responsibility together with various organisational strategies to ensure compliance with all aspects of training and the suite of dispositions and identity that this assumes.

Identity construction as a social or discursive process draws upon the range of socially and culturally available narrative identities and their attendant practices (Chappell 2003, p49). There are two aspects to this identity construction that became visible through this research. First there was a reflexive identification which are the identities

that are created through self narration, and the second was relational identification which is the construction of a self narrative derived from available external sources such as other individual officer narratives (Chappell 2003, p.47). I observed that relational identification was taken up as an important organisational strategy to achieve a normalised officer identity. Through 'modelling' the novice is offered a limited range of 'authorised' officer narratives with which to engage. In the main these included the organisational hierarchy, Training College staff, and officers who supervised the novices' field practice placements. Exposure to these interactions was carefully controlled through the selection of (appropriate) officers for these tasks. Identities that are deemed aberrant or deviant of the discursively normalised officer identity are as far as possible excluded as exemplars, and where such narratives come to the fore they may be discussed or inculcated as examples of deviancy (sometimes framed as learning 'what not to do'). As indicated in chapter six, field placements for novices were largely selected based upon the degree to which the incumbent officer in those placements reflected the normative Salvation Army officer as defined by organisational leadership. Through controlling or regulating the range of available narratives, the officer discourse attempts to limit the scope of officer identities that will emerge through self narration (Loseke 2007, p763).

In their narratives in which these practices were described, participants employed the metaphors of 'cloning' and 'breeding' which were both surprising and informative, indicating the strategic and very intentional way the discourse operates to replicate 'officer' in novice subjectivities (and of course their consciousness of it). These metaphors indicate the clear and deliberate intentionality of the discourse to 'breed out' behaviours/values that are incompatible with the standardised officer object (diversity). Clearly too much diversity is problematic as it threatens to destabilise the organisational reality. Novices and officers alike are expected to replicate the standard patterns of being officer that are articulated and rewarded. However, the very discursive forces that marshal to produce a normalised object, somewhat ironically lead to genetic mutations (to continue with the cloning metaphor). It appears that through interaction with multiple discourses and the internal evolving nature of the officer discourse itself, not only are reasonably standardised officers produced, but also those who push at the margins of the officer construct like participants P5 and E1. As the officer discourse works to normalise subjectivities through the 'resubjectification' of individuals (Butler 1997, p11), it is met with various forms of individual resistances. These resistances emerge from the self as a location or intersection for a number of 'pre-inhabited' discourses (Linstead & Grafton Small 1992, p225). Individuals in one

sense become the sites of struggle for the dominance of one set of discursive truths (power/knowledge) over others with the net effect of producing various shades of individuality (McHoul & Grace 1993, p72).

Cloning and breeding were among a selection of metaphors that participants employed through which they sought to express how they experienced the officer discourse acting upon them. Most of these I have examined in detail in the analysis chapters. What I offer here is an attempt to organise and map these productive metaphors relative to the fundamental 'values of officer' as operationalised through power/knowledge.

conformity compliance	**loyalty**	**obedience**	**commitment**
moulding (forced into a predetermined shape/identity)	*club membership* (once a member one is obligated to loyalty to the power that grants membership)	*pawns in chess game* (objects that do not resist controls and are in fact expendable for some greater good or objective)	*survival* (despite significant personal difficulties with the system remain committed to God's call to serve in the organisation)
sausage factory (the objective of training is to produce a 'natural' conformity)		*game* (playing according to the established rules, even when they remain unclear or not openly discussed)	*testing* (a fundamental aspect of the training discourse is to test novices commitment to the organisation)
breeding (to produce compliant individuals, from current organisational members)			
growing up (maturity is marked by accepting discursive norms)			
cloning – attempts to transfer all the values and behaviours associated with the idealised officer construct through selective relational identification.			

Discursive Technologies

Through technologies of discipline, self and performance officer subjectivities are co-created by means of surveillance, assessment and confession. In such a centralised and hierarchal organisation there are few spaces that are free from the normalising effects of surveillance. The organisation employs a variety of surveillance strategies to ensure compliance with expectations around identity and practice. Among the many are reviews both appointment and personal, various reporting/monitoring strategies, special events/meetings at which attendance is mandatory, reporting (formal and informal) from line managers, colleague officers and lay Salvationists, and of course

good old fashioned ‘gossip’ which should not be overlooked as it can produce powerful effects, particularly in those who have no immediate first hand knowledge of the individual who is the subject of such talk.

In their experience of these discursive apparatus all participants referred to their experience of the ways that they had informed their identity formation. Of these, I was particularly surprised by the way that the research revealed how organisationally pervasive the technology of confession was, drawing its potency from theological/religious sources including again the notion of ‘calling.’ The subtle yet powerful messages which define officer values, practices and character that circulate within the discourse and flow over the very soul of individuals, seek to inscribe upon them the normalised officer identity. As a technology confession seeks to instil in the individual a mode of continual self awareness (assessment) against prescribed discursive norms (the fictional ideal officer), in effect a form of permanent internal visibility of self, to self. Through confession individuals are expected to cultivate the ability to be ‘truth teller’ to themselves, about themselves to mentors and assessors (Foucault’s educator-judge (Foucault 1977, p201)), and ultimately to God – perhaps the definitive site of self surveillance. Through this technique the self becomes the object of the individual’s constant gaze, the goal of which is to produce individuals who self regulate their thoughts, actions and bodies.

Confession relies in significant part upon the notion of change (often expressed theologically and in some psy ‘sciences’ as transformation). At its heart particularly in the Christian tradition, the purpose of confession is to bring about change in the individual’s life be that in terms of view, perspective, behaviours or practices leading to self actualisation. However, in this study I found myself confronted with questions over how decisions for change were arrived at? And how was a particular trajectory of change embraced? Participant narratives suggested that this was achieved by the circulation of power/knowledge through mentors, confessors and even the particular theological construction of God that effected particular changes leading to the re-formation of identity that aligns with organisational expectations. In speaking the truth of one’s self to one’s self (and/or another) the truth itself is a product of what is normalised through discourse, thus it is not simply descriptive, but constitutive, in that the language one employs to speak of one’s self has a performative function through which the truth about one’s self also constructs or forms one’s self.

Confession as a strategy for identity formation allows every point of personal

discontinuity with the discursively produced norm, to become the subject of introspection. Mentors, coaches, spiritual directors, interviewers, managers attempt to reproduce what is normal and acceptable in the one who confides. The self becomes a location where through self surveillance/assessment, the officer discourse inserts itself into the very grain of the individual, its effects reaching into their body, attitudes, thoughts, actions and learning processes in everyday life (Foucault 1980a, p39). Thus confession in this context is not a benign approach to self awareness, but is rather constructed, directed and intentional as a mechanism to create and control individual identity. While it is true that as a technique, confession seeks to guide individuals toward recognising themselves, it is a very particular and discursively formed self that becomes the object of this introspection – the officer self. Interestingly I noted that among some participants surrender of resistance to this discursively actualised self was conceptualised as embracing spiritual growth (as framed by the discourse), thus aligning with the organisational 'truth' that resistances are a mark of some form of personal immaturity.

Resistance

Yet while the officer discourse is clearly potent, it is not completely deterministic. If identity formation is the rendering of what is outside, different from or separate to the individual's narrative, then this may be named resistance. The novices and officers I interviewed all expressed at least some degree of resistance to the flow of power relations that were prescribed in terms of norms and practices. Often these resistances which were framed in terms of the struggle for the right to construct what obedience to the divine will looks like, on occasion led to contestation of the organisational will. Power/knowledge tends to flow silently, out of view, such that its effects only surface when it is met with some form of resistance. Thus the locations of personal resistance identified in participant's narratives acted as points of light that indicate the operation of otherwise invisible power/knowledge. This also suggests that the notion of the normalised object – the Salvation Army officer is a dispersed rather than absolute idea.

As identified above, the officer discourse works to produce a particular kind of Salvation Army officer identity. Supported by the notion of divine call and the doctrine of radical lifelong availability, the discourse works to produce an identity that is based upon the values of obedience, hard work, loyalty, commitment and conformity. My evaluation of the data indicates that resistance (from an organisational perspective) is often framed as the disregarding or deconstructing of one or more of these operationalised values and is normally experienced as detrimental to, or the

undermining of, the stability and effectiveness of the organisation. The self preservation of organisational stability is a prime concern for those who are the guardians of organisational life which aligns with the necessity of the discourse to maintain its own equilibrium through the circulation of power/knowledge.

Such resistances to the circulation of power/knowledge are almost always named negatively and thus met with various strategies to ensure compliance. Resistance to the will of the organisation, it practices, knowledges, polity and governance is regularly framed as a lack or deficit of character in the person who challenges or resists. In organisational discourses 'resistance' is rarely framed as a positive, or generative event. It is to be overcome because resistance pushes one toward the boundaries of accepted organisational norms. Thus there is a tension between the individuality produced through resistance to the circulation of power/knowledge, and the tendency of discourse to normalise and seek to (re)produce the standard officer identity. These organisational responses manifest through those who hold senior organisational positions, are not simply the exercise of power by these individuals. Rather they (like those of other organisational locations) were nodes through which power as a product of discourse flows. Interestingly, participants regularly constructed the operation of power/knowledge in abstract rather than personal terms. Although some identified particular persons as individuals who exercised power in the organisation (many focused particularly upon the Territorial Commander), others referred to this as 'the system' operating upon them which to some degree recognises the depersonalised nature of power operations and its effects throughout the organisation. 'The system' represents an experience of organisational reality which is diffuse and to some extent undifferentiated. 'The system' is in effect incontestable, recognising the quite pervasiveness of the ways things are (must be). Generally references to the system were nuanced and represented two basic operations. First the system could simply refer to 'the way we do things', that is recognising that all social communities have their shared ways of being. Secondly, the system was employed by some participants to represent the ways in which discourse operates upon them through the circulation of power/knowledge. In these instances the metaphor 'the system' indicated those personal locations where individuals encountered 'discoursal incoherence.' This language was a way of naming resistances to power/knowledge, of destabilising the natural. For it is only through recognising that there is in fact a system that works upon individuals that what was transparent and natural becomes a site for contestation and resistance.

Somewhat ironically however, resistance to power/knowledge and the attendant strategies employed to ensure discipline and conformity, actually have the effect of producing the very object that they are designed to normalise, the distinctive and unique individual. I recognise that 'the self' manifested by participants in the context of the interview is itself a narrative co-construction in the terms of the identity work that the interview facilitates. However, it is clear that this is not an entirely 'fictive' self that is created in the moment on the interview, but rather draws upon past organisational (and extra-organisational) experiences of the participant which is supported by the organisational narratives told by other participants. These identities are the products of discursive interventions within a particular organisation at a particular moment in history (Chappell 2003, p.29).

In terms of how power/knowledge acts to produce conformity and normalisation, I located in the narratives of some novices a belief that they could in fact 'hide' or 'hibernate' their 'real self' (as they understood themselves) while under surveillance, and instead reflect back to the organisation the officer identity that was expected. This remains problematic and could perhaps become a future extension of this study. However since I theorise identity as multiple and unstable, that is manifold selves told in different social contexts and multiple connections (Gergen & Kaye 1992, p.255), this 'hibernated self' is but another narratively constructed identity deployed in a particular context and situation serving socio political interests.

This research indicates that to speak of 'officer identity' as if it were a stable, singular object is misleading. Participants appeared to produce various subjectivities that were not determinable by a singular or even consistent stance (Rhodes, Iedema & Scheeres 2007, p.95). While it is clear that in response to discursive pressures / influences certain values, behaviours, knowledges and practices are located centrally as part of a normalised officer identity, nonetheless the data indicated that the individual's notion of officer is itself fragmented, plural and contextual. Participants appear able and willing to manifest many potential 'officer' identities according to particular contexts and social space. Through deploying different officer identities individuals were able to take up different locations in the discursive world (Scanlon 2007, p.227).

Over time individual resistances which represent the struggle for domination of multiple intersecting discourses will produce reciprocal effects upon the officer discourse. I detected changes over time in the nature of the officer discourse particularly around the nature and constitution of 'discursive truths' or knowledge and a move from imposed

and overt structural surveillance control techniques to attempts to instil the self regulation of self surveillance. At first appearance these changes appear to be slow to evolve, but this is not to suggest some slow linear change. The struggle for dominance of discursive 'truth' and knowledge/power is marked by violence. Individuals leave their mark upon the discourse through their struggles and resistances which may impact and reshape discursive practices (Volkmann & Anderson 1998, p296). Such effects are often generational and outside the scope of this present inquiry however they could form the basis of some future longitudinal study.

As stated in the introduction, through this study my desire has been to render visible the transparent and normalised ways that define being officer and that are manifest through discourse. Through applying a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis I have deconstructed and disrupted the 'invisible and pervasive necessity' that discursively defines the object Salvation Army officer. I have shown that there is no overarching 'realist' necessity for the object 'officer' to be any particular way, save for the historical particularity that acts to produces it in the contemporary world. The Salvation Army officer is called by God to service in a particular organisation – The Salvation Army. While there is no legal or contractual relationship between officer and organisation (very clearly and prominently articulated in many organisational documents that I have cited), this divine call is normatively constructed as lifelong, out of which flows the officer value system which via various technologies, attempts to inscribe its effects upon the soul of the individual. The organisational narrative of being effective and pragmatic ('Christianity with its sleeves rolled up') seeks to produce in officers the identity element of hardworking and a life that is visible through the creation of personal narratives around 'costliness,' 'sacrifice,' 'loss' which are interpreted to provide validation of the call. The object officer is constituted by the identity elements of 'obedience,' 'loyalty,' 'commitment' and 'compliance' which produce an object that is an instrument of the divinely instituted organisation. This cluster of elements is fundamentally supported by the doctrine of radical availability *to* God, *through* the organisation (which in effect manifests the divine will).

While discourse deploys the technologies of discipline, self and performance which tend to have as their focus the soul of the individual, discourse also produces what we might call 'structural effects.' Some of the significant structural effects that emerged from the data included how obedience and compliance led to (loyally) embracing the instructions of the organisation with regards to where to live, the nature of their work, the provision of house, car, furniture and a modest salary (though there is no

contractual relationship between the officer and organisation). These structural effects of the officer discourse conspire to create a dependence upon the organisation. While it was not clear that this is indeed an intentional strategy to ensure control and compliance, emerging from their own experience a majority of participants referred to a form of dependency that acts as an incentive to conform to organisational expectations. Ex-officer E1 best represented this sense when she referred to her experience just after resigning from officership. She spoke of her experience as 'like a bird in a cage with the cage door open – not knowing what to do next,' referencing an almost 'institutionalisation' effect. Resistance can potentially have quite catastrophic results for those who have come to be defined by a dependence upon the organisation for physical, psychological and religious needs. Related to this idea of organisational structural dependence is that of a psychological dependence that the narrative fragment 'if you are called to be a Salvation Army officer, only obedient response will allow you to live a fulfilled life', attempts to create. While such narratives are apparently satisfying for those who attend to the call and live out their life within the organisation, for those who leave they are often left to work out for themselves how to pull the pieces of life back together. For some, to leave officership brings with it feelings of guilt, disobedience, loss, and questions such as can one be fulfilled apart from officership? All these are powerful incentives to remain a compliant and loyal officer.

Officers and cadets are in ongoing ways member participants of multiple social and cultural institutions and discourses beyond the boundary of the organisation which potentially exert influence over values, beliefs and behaviours (the struggle between discourses). However I detected a strategy of control that is manifest through 'the doctrine of radical availability' (discussed above) which in effect limits the ability of officers to effectively participate beyond the bounds of the organisation. While in no way totalising, through this device (which includes not being permitted to work outside the Army, total availability to appointment, regular changes in appointment – job and location) the discourse effectively minimises the potential for officers to engage in, or come to inhabit, other extra-organisational discursive locations at any depth. Thus limiting the potential for the destabilising effects of inter discourse conflict and struggle for dominance. A potent example of this is the way the organisation directs officers who wish to engage in further theological training to attend a limited range of institutions that have been approved because they align Army's theological tradition (The Salvation Army 2010g). This is an attempt to control the exposure of individuals to other traditions (discourses) that are constructed as potentially introducing discursive conflict and thus leading to the destabilisation of the officer discourse.

Domains of silence

As stated under the objectives of this study I have sought to attend to participant responses that appeared to dance around 'domains of silence,' the things that that seem to be on the horizon of articulation but fall short of actual speech perhaps because in the officer discourse it *cannot be said*. Through intersecting my 'inter-discursive positioning' which gave me at least an tenuous foothold from which to destabilise the officer discourse, and the trajectory of participant narratives, I believe that I detected relative silences in the discourse around the following aspects of officer:

- The construction and positioning of non-officer in relation to officer.
- The relative powerlessness of non-officer laity (Salvationists)
- The possibility of an 'officer less' Salvation Army.
- The way that the organisation subsumes the divine voice and prerogatives mediating the divine will to organisational members.
- How power/knowledge produces real effects that are contrary to the espoused organisational values of mutuality, equality, justice etc.
- The way that power/knowledge seeks to hide its own effects through naturalising them as 'expected' 'required' and just accepted as the disciplines of officership.
- A general silence around the incontestability of organisational discursively produced knowledge, and the reaction of the organisation to what is deemed 'invalid' knowledge.
- The organisational response to non-compliance and its effects for the individual officer (ie. in terms of appointments, promotion, opportunities etc.)

One of the significant limitations of the Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis is that it does not permit the formation of relative judgements across discourses. It is not possible to formulate or offer a 'better' vision or alternative to what is, as such claims would by implication be understood as the product of power/knowledge, and thus the site for competing dominance of discourses. On one level this has been particularly unsatisfying, however it may be legitimate to form epistemological judgements for statements asserted within particular discourses (Howarth 2002, p128). Particularly through destabilising these silences and the statements through which the object 'officer' is spoken into being, there is perhaps the possibility for reconstructions or change (Boyes 2004, p113). By means of attempting to verbalise and surface these

domains of silence it may be possible to form judgements within the officer discursive formation concerning the relative value, productiveness or otherwise of these aspects of the officer discourse. For instance the fundamental narrative that supports the collapsing of the organisational and the divine wills such that the discourse takes on a voice that is divinely authorised, which through the standardising template of 'the call' leads to the doctrine of radical availability and officer as an instrument of the organisation. These sets of statements are central to any discussion of change as they assume an organisation that exists as a result of divine fiat. What is silently implied is the belief that this divine call serves to validate a particular system, structure or discourse that must therefore remain stable over time. Even if this were true, what it fails to recognise is the notion of stability is an illusion as indicted in this study. The Salvation Army as it was, and The Salvation Army as it is now, are not the same thing. If we accept that there has been some change over time, then the question becomes how and in what ways does change come about? If the future organisational identity is not predetermined what factors, influences and individuals determine future organisational direction and identity? While a critical awareness of our own social construction as an organisation does not free us to simply choose how we answer such questions, on the other hand it does offer us some possibility for navigating a course through the determinism and constraints of discourse.

It appears to me that as broader social changes and attending discourses continue to impact the Salvation Army officer discourse, over time change will emerge. The contest between discourses for dominance will leave its transformative marks upon the organisation. Even now in the interview data produced particularly by the novices, their questions and the resistances that these generate are emerging as footholds for change. For instance the flow of power/knowledge through organisational structures like rank and position; rigid conformity to the external indicators of a compliance driven system such as uniform, physical appearance and organisational practices; challenging the instrumental view of officer as objects that exist solely to fulfil organisational objectives and needs; the normative understating of officership as lifelong and different in kind (status) from soldiership in general. All these have appeared as self evident discursive knowledge that is being contested. What emerges from the struggle is yet to be.

Organisationally, the knowledge produced through this thesis may prove useful in appreciating the historical/cultural dimension of discourse that constructs organisational reality. The Salvation Army, officers, soldiers are products of a particular set of socio-

historical locations and are therefore not predetermined objects, but are generated by complex social processes. Such knowledge offers the possibility of generating new ways of being The Salvation Army in contemporary socio-historical contexts. Appreciating the power/knowledge dimension of discourse may offer liberation from the preconceived, the pre-structured, perhaps even for some the notion of the 'preordained'. Organisational members might become more intentional and indeed liberated in how they continue to construct themselves organisationally and individually. It might even be possible to come to terms with the long espoused organisational values of mutuality, equality, justice (while recognising that these also are socially and historically located).

Through this mapping of the discursive terrain that produces 'officer' the resistances and the individual subjectivities that generate them may be embraced as opportunities for opening up new possibilities, for new ways of being officer and the attending professional practices. Recognising that organisational life is a construction rather than a given, resistances and contestations of 'what is' may in fact prove productive for constructing a present and future organisation that is more able and willing to embrace socio-cultural and philosophical diversity both within and external to itself. This research offers a critical consciousness of the discursive nature of organisational life which might lead to an organisational space for voicing what may have previously remained unthought and unspoken, and previous 'natural necessities' challenged.

As expressed in various locations throughout this study there emerged various openings and possibilities to advance this research. The most significant trajectory for further study would be around the issue of the way in which novice members are pre-constituted in terms of identity and predispositions. This could be approached discursively but also taking into account the categories of race, class and gender and how these contribute to the identity forming process. I also think that since this present study was significantly situated within an adult training context, that further exploration of the political dimensions of learning in terms of creating identity would prove most instructive.

Appendices

Appendix1
Semi Structured Interview Questions
For Novices

Occupation prior to College

Prior to College how long had you been a Salvationist?

What factors influenced your decision to become an officer?

What is the difference between a ‘soldier’ and an ‘officer’ in The Salvation Army?

How is officership different from any other vocation?

What kind of person do you think a Salvation Army Officer is (or should be)?

Have you noticed any differences between how officership is officially represented and your personal experience of it?

If the college experience is intended to prepare you for life as an officer, in what ways have your experiences here changed you?

In what ways have you experienced college life as forming your professional Salvation Army officer identity?

Are there any practices (things the College does or requires you to do) that you experience as directed toward shaping who you are in a particular way?

What techniques have been used to ensure conformity with Salvation Army ideals, values etc.?

As a result of your college experience thus far what values and practices do you think The Salvation Army desires (requires) you to hold and maintain?

Has anything in your current experience of The Salvation Army (ways of operating, values, practices) struck you as “strange”?

In your experience of College, have there been any taken for granted assumptions that you have not shared?

Have you questioned whether you are willing (or have the ability to take on) the officer identity the organisation wants you to become?

Have you resisted (or modified) the identity The Salvation Army wants you to take on? If so, in what ways and why?

Have you had any doubts about becoming an officer? If so what are they?
Does the College know? If so how have they responded?

Do you know of others who have commenced training or even become an officer only to resign at some stage, if so why do you think they didn’t make it?

Appendix 2
Semi Structured Interview Questions
For Experienced Officers

How many years have you been a Salvation Army officer?

How would you describe what a Salvation Army Officer is? Can you give any examples from your own experience?

What kinds of values and character do you think a Salvation Army officer should have? How have you acquired this knowledge?

How would you characterise your relationship with The Salvation Army?

Are you aware of any strategies the organisation uses to form or shape you as a Salvation Army officer?

Have you ever felt that there was a difference or conflict between your Salvation Army officer professional self, and who you are (or want to be) apart from your job/function?

Can you tell me about a time that you felt 'out of place' or as if you didn't belong within The Salvation Army? How did the organisation respond?

Can you tell me about a time when you felt you had to resist what The Salvation Army expected you to be and/or do?
Have you ever felt pressured in some way by the organisation to be someone you are not completely comfortable with?

Is there anything that strikes you as being strange about Salvation Army ways of operating, values, or practices?

Do you know of any colleague officers who have resigned and the reasons why?

Have you ever had any doubts about remaining an officer? If so what were they?

Appendix 3
Semi Structured Interview Questions
For Past Officers (resigned)

How many years were you an officer?

When did you resign?

Why did you become an officer?
Call? What does this mean to you now?

How would you frame Salvation Army Officership?

- what is an officer?
- how are they different from a soldier?

In what ways did you experience the organisation acting upon you to shape and form you into an 'officer' with an 'officer identity'?
Were there particular ways you were expected to behave and simply ‘be’ in the world?

In terms of how an officer relates to the organisation, what values/characteristics do you think the organisation expects of a ‘good’ Salvation Army officer? (ie. compliant?)

Were there ways you were required to think, knowledges you were expected to (or perhaps just did) take on board as if they were the assumed 'truth'?

Are there 'truths' about officer that you now no longer hold to?
Are there things about being an officer in the Salvation Army, which now might seem strange?

Were there points of resistance for you and if so, how did you resist?
How did the organisation respond?

I am also interested (if its OK) in exploring what was it in your experience as officer, that led you to resign (and no longer 'be' officer).

Some have spoken about life within this officer bubble produces dependence, and hence compliance with organisational expectations. Looking back did you experience anything like this?.

Appendix 4
The Officer's Covenant

CALLED BY GOD

to proclaim the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ

As an Officer of The Salvation Army

I BIND MYSELF TO HIM IN THIS SOLEMN COVENANT

to love and serve Him supremely all my days,

to live to win souls and make their salvation the first purpose of my life,

to maintain the doctrines and principles of The Salvation Army,

and, by God's grace

to prove myself a worthy officer.

Appendix 5
UNDERTAKINGS ENTERED INTO BY AN OFFICER OF THE SALVATION ARMY

The relationship between The Salvation Army and its officers is sacred. This needs to be cherished and preserved as a means of achieving God-given common spiritual purposes. Therefore, in addition to the promises made on becoming a soldier and those in the officer's covenant, a Salvationist is commissioned and ordained as an officer on condition that the following promises and declarations are made:

1. In response to the call of God, I give myself of my own free will to be an officer on The Salvation Army, and to engage in its ministry. As an officer I acknowledge that the fundamental nature of my relationship to the Army and of the Army to me is spiritual.

2. I understand and agree that there is no contract of service or of employment nor any other legal relationship between the Army and me. Accordingly the Army shall have no legal claims upon me nor I upon the Army.

3. I understand and agree that although I may expect to receive, and every attempt will be made to provide, allowances according to an official scale no allowance is guaranteed to me. I accept that any such allowance is not a wage, salary, reward or payment for services rendered but is a means of freeing me from the need to engage in secular employment.

4. I will observe the orders and regulations of The Salvation Army as issued from time to time. I recognise that the Army seeks to create and administer orders and regulations in a manner consistent with Christian Principles.

5. I declare my beliefs in the truths of the doctrines of The Salvation Army. I will teach them faithfully and will seek to make my life a reflection of those truths.

6. I will look to my leaders in the Army to be sensitive to the guidance of God in giving me appointments and responsibilities. I will accept the direction of my leaders under the appointments system knowing that they will try to place me where I can best advance the cause of Jesus Christ. I will faithfully fulfil all the requirements of my appointments to the best of my ability.

7. I will trust my leaders in the Army to provide me the opportunities for personal development in order to enhance my service and its effectiveness. I will use responsibly and wisely all such opportunities accepting that my leaders have a duty to encourage me, enlarging my vision of all I can become in Christ.

8. I will expect my leaders to evaluate periodically my progress and personal effectiveness in ministry. I acknowledge that I am accountable to them under God for the mature and proper discharge of my duties. I will accept and act upon formal recommendations for my improvement, knowing that persistent ineffectiveness as an officer could lead to the termination of my service.

9. Unless clearly authorised by my leaders in accordance with orders and regulations, I will not engage in secular employment, paid or unpaid, knowing

that I have committed all my days and hours to Salvation Army officer mission and ministry.

10. I will respond wholeheartedly to efforts by my leaders to encourage me in the use and development of my creative abilities. I agree to place any such abilities at the disposal of the Army for the furtherance of its mission, and in accordance with orders and regulations.
11. I will not seek or encourage any presentation, gift or testimonial to myself, or use my position as a Salvation Army officer for personal gain.

12. I undertake to account for all monies and other assets entrusted to me and to keep and make available for inspection and audit purposes all records, accepting my responsibilities as a Christian steward of the resources placed under my control.

13. I will conform to the Army's requirements regarding the wearing of uniform.

14. Supported by the pastoral care and respect of my leaders, I will seek to be a worthy minister of Christ's gospel and officer of the Army. I will avoid in word and action anything likely to injure the body of Christ or that part of which is The Salvation Army.

DECLARATION

1. PRAYFULLY RESPONDING TO THE GUIDANCE OF GOD, AND WILLINGLY ACCEPTING THE UNDERTAKINGS ENTERED INTO BY AN OFFICER, I MAKE THIS APPLICATION FOR TRAINING AND SERVICE AS AN OFFICER OF THE SALVATION ARMY.

2. IN MAKING THIS APPLICATION, I AM UNAWARE OF ANY CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH, IF KNOWN, WOULD PREVENT MY ACCEPTANCE BY THE SALVATION ARMY.

3. I DECLARE IT TO BE MY INTENTION, AS GOD SHALL HELP ME, TO GIVE LIFELONG SERVICE AS A GOOD AND FAITHFUL OFFICER OF THE SALVATION ARMY. SHOULD UNFORESEEN CIRCUMSTANCES COMPEL MY WITHDRAWAL, I DISCHARGE THE SALVATION ARMY FROM ANY OBLIGATION.

Signed _ Date _ _ __ _ _ _ _ _ _

RE-AFFIRMATION

(To be signed at the School for Officer Training, prior to Commissioning)

AT THE CONCLUSION OF MY TRAINING AS A CADET, I AM HAPPY TO CONFIRM THE LIFE OF DEDICATED SERVICE AS AN OFFICER OF THE INTERNATIONAL SALVATION ARMY.

Signed _ Date _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Bibliography

Ainsworth, S. & Hardy, C. 2004, 'Discourse and Identities', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London.

Alvesson, M. 2004, 'Organizational Culture and Discourse', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London, pp. 317-335.

Alvesson, M. & Karreman, D. 2000, 'Varieties of Discourse: On the Study of Organizations through Discourse Analysis', *Human Relations*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 1125-1149.

Alvesson, M.G., Hardy, C. & Harley, B. 2004, 'Reflecting on Reflexivity', paper presented to the *Creating Actionable Knowledge*, New Orleans, Retrieved from http://group.aomonline.org/cms/Meetings/New%20Orleans/NO_Papers/ReflexivityAoM.doc, Date: 16.9.10.

Anderson, N. 2003, *Discursive Analytical Strategies*, The Policy Press, Bristol.

Anderson, O. 1971, 'The Growth of Christian Militarism in Mid-Victorian Britain', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 86, no. 338, pp. 46-72.

Andrews, M., Sclater, S., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M. 2007, 'Narrative Research', in C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, Sage, London, pp. 97-112.

Andrews, M., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M. 2008, 'Introduction: What is narrative research?' in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 1-40.

Antonek, J., et. al. 1997, 'The Student Teacher Portfolio as Autobiography: Developing a Professional Identity', *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 81, no. 1, pp. 15-27.

Apesoa-Varano, E. 2007, 'Educated Caring: The Emergence of Professional Identity Among Nurses', *Qualitative Sociology*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 249-274.

Argote, L. 2005, *Organizational Learning: Creating, Retaining and Transferring Knowledge*, Springer, New York.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. 1996, *Organisational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts.

Atkins, K. (ed.) 2005, *Self and subjectivity* Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Azmitia, M., Syed, M. & Radmacher, K. (eds) 2008, *The intersections of personal and social identities*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Bakhtin, M. 1981, 'Discourse in the novel', in M. Holquist (ed.), *The dialogic imagination* University of Texas Press, Austin.

Ball, S.J. (ed.) 1990, *Foucault and Education. Disciplines and Knowledge*, Routledge, London.

Barnett, R. 1999, 'Learning to work and working to Learn', in D. Boud & J. Garrick (eds), *Understanding Learning at Work*, Routledge, London, pp. 29-44.

Barretti, M. 2004, 'What Do We Know About the Professional Socialization of Our Students?' *Journal of Social Work Education*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 255-283.

Bathmaker, A. & Avis, J. 2005, 'Becoming a Lecturer in Further education in England: The Construction of Professional Identity and the Role, of Communities of Practice', *Journal of education and Teaching*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 47-62.

Beckett, D. & Hager, P. 2002, *Life, work and learning: Practice in postmodernity*, vol. 14, Routledge, London

Beech, N. & Sims, D. 2007, 'Narrative methods for identity research', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 288-301.

Beijaard, D., et.al. 2004, 'Reconsidering Research on Teacher's Professional Identity', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 107-128.

Benefiel, M. 2003, 'Mapping the Terrain of Spirituality in Organizations Research', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 367-377.

Bergstrom, O. & Knights, D. 2006, 'Organizational discourse and subjectivity', *Human Relations*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 351-377.
Bernstein, R.J. 1983, *Beyond objectivism and relativism: science, hermeneutics, and praxis*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
Besley, T. 2005, 'Foucault, truth telling and technologies of the self in schools', *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 76-89.
Billett, S. 2004, 'Learning Through Work: Workplace Participatory Practices', in H. Rainbird, A. Fuller & A. Munro (eds), *Workplace Learning in Context*, Routledge, London.
Blackwell, H. 1955, *Essentials of Officership*, The Salvation Army, London.
Boje, D.M. 1995, 'Stories of the Storytelling Organization: a postmodern analysis of Disney as "*Tamara*-land"', *Academy of Management Journal* vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 997-1035.
Bonner, A. & Tolhurst, G. 2002, 'Insider-outsider perspectives of participant observation', *Nurse Researcher*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 7-19.
Booth, F. 1924, *Powers of Salvation Army Officers*, 2nd edn, Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, London.
Booth, W. 1900, *To My Field Officers Throughout the World*, The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.
Booth, W. 1907, *The Seven Spirits*, The Salvation Army Supplies and Purchasing Department Atlanta.
Boud, D. & Middleton, H. 2003, 'Learning From Others at Work: Communities of Practice and Informal Learning', *Journal of Workplace Learning*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 194-202.
Bourdieu, P. 1977, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Bourdieu, P. 1986, 'Forms of Capital', in J.G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, New York.
Bourdieu, P. 1990, *The Logic of Practice*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
Bourdieu, P. 1994, *In Other Words*, trans. M. Anderson, Polity, Cambridge.
Bourdieu, P. 1994, 'Structures, Habitus and Practices', in, *The Polity Reader in Social Theory*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
Bourdieu, P. 1998, *Practical reason: On the theory of action*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. 1992, *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Boyes, C. 2004, 'Discourse analysis and personal/professional development', *Radiography*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 109-117.
Branaman, A. (ed.) 2001, *Self and society* Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
Brooks, I. 2006, *Organisational Behaviour Individual, Groups and Organisation (3rd ed)*, Pearson, Essex.
Brown, A. & Starkey, K. 2004, 'Organizational Identity and Learning: A Psychodynamic Perspective', in K. Starkey, et. al. (ed.), *How Organizations Learn (2nd ed)*, Thomson, London.
Brubaker, R. 2000, 'Social Theory as Habitus', in D. Robbins (ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu*, vol. II, Sage, London, pp. 33-53.
Buchanan, D. & Huczynski, A. 2004, *Organizational Behaviour An Introductory Text (5th ed)*, Prentice Hall, Essex.
Budd, J. 2006, 'Discourse Analysis and the Study of Communication in LIS', *Library Trends*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 65-82.
Burack, E. 1999, 'Spirituality in the Workplace', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 280-291.
Burgoyne, J. 1999, 'Design of the Times', *People Management*, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 38-44.
Burwood, S. 2007, 'Imitation, Indwelling and the Embodied Self', *Education, Philosophy*

and Theory, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 118-134.
Butler, J. 1997, *The psychic life of power: theories in subjection*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Butler, J. 1999, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*, 10th edn, Routledge, New York.
Butts, D. 1999, 'Spirituality at work: an overview', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 328-331.
Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. & Iedema, R. 2008, *Identity trouble: critical discourse and contested identities*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Calhoun, C. 1995, *Critical Social Theory*, Blackwell, Cambridge Mass.
Cameron, D. 2001, *Working with Spoken Discourse*, Sage, London.
Car, D., Taylor, C. & Ricoeur, P. 1991, 'Discussion: Ricoeur on Narrative', in D. Wood (ed.), *On Paul Ricoeur: narrative and interpretation*, Routledge, London.
Carabine, J. 2001, 'Unmarried Motherhood 1830-1990: A Genealogical Analysis', in M. Wetherell, et. al. (ed.), *Discourse as Data*, Sage, London, pp. 267-310.
Card, J. 1997, *The Salvation Army - Articles of War*, viewed 2.9.10 <http://jdcard.com/artclwar.htm>.
Chan, A. 2000, 'Redirecting Critique in Postmodern Organization Studies: The Perspective of Foucault', *Organization Studies*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1059-1075.
Chaousis, L. 2000, *Organisational Behaviour*, Prentice Hall, Frenchs Forest.
Chappell, C., et. al. 2003, *Reconstructing the lifelong learner: pedagogy and identity in individual, organisational, and social change*, Routledge Falmer, London.
Chase, S. 2008, 'Narrative Inquiry', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, Sage, London, pp. 57-94.
Cheek, J. 2004, 'At the Margins? Discourse Analysis and Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 1140-1150.
Cheek, J. & Porter, S. 1997, 'Reviewing Foucault: possibilities and problems for nursing and health care', *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 108-119.
Cherryholmes, C. 1993, 'Reading Research', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1-32.
Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. 2000, *Research Methods in Education (5th ed)*, Routledge Falmer, London.
Cook, S. & Yanow, D. 1993, 'Culture and Organizational Learning', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 373-390.
Coupland, C. 2007, 'Identities and interviews', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 274-287.
Coutts, F. 1973, *The Better Fight - The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. 6 (1914-1946), Hodder and Stoughton, London.
Coutts, F. 1986, *The History of The Salvation Army - The Weapons of Goodwill*, vol. 7 (1946-1977), Hodder and Stoughton, London.
Crotty, M. 1998, 'Introduction: The Research Process. Chapter 1', in, *Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in Research Process*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Crowe, M. 2005, 'Discourse Analysis: Towards an Understanding of its Place in Nursing', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 55-63.
Danaher, G., et. al. 2000, *Understanding Foucault*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Daniel, G.O., Julianne, M.S. & Tina, L.M. 2005, 'Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Towards Reflection in Qualitative Research', *Social Forces*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 1273-1289.
Darra, S. 2008, 'Emotion work and the ethics of novice insider research', *Journal of Research in Nursing*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 251-261.
Davies, B. 1994, *Poststructuralist theory and classroom practice*, Deakin University Press, Geelong.
Deal, T. & Kennedy, K. 1983, 'A Culture: A New Look Through Old Lenses', *The*

Journal of Behavioural Science, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 498-505.
Deetz, S. 1996, 'Describing Differences in Approaches to Organization Science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and Their Legacy', *Organization Science*, vol. 7, pp. 191-207.
Deutsch, J. 1996, 'The behavioral scientist: insider and outsider', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 172-191.
Dijk, T.A., van. 1997, *Discourse as structure and process*, Sage, London.
Dingwall, R. 1997, 'Accounts, Interviews and Observations', in G. Miller & R. Dingwall (eds), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 51-76.
Dreyfus, H. & Rainbow, P. 1983, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Drummond, G. 1996, 'Understanding organisation culture, leadership, conflict, and change', Ph.D thesis, Swinburne University of Technology.
du Gay, P., Evans, J. & Redman, P. (eds) 2000, *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London.
Elias, N. 2000, 'Homo clausus and the civilizing process', in P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds), *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London, pp. 284-296.
Elkjaer, B. 1999, 'In Search of a Social Learning Theory', in M. Easterby-Smith, et. al. (ed.), *Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization*, Sage, London, pp. 75-91.
Ezzy, D. 1998, 'Theorizing narrative identity: Symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics', *Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 239.
Fagerberg, I. 2004, 'Registered Nurses' work experiences: personal accounts integrated with professional identity ', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 284-291.
Fagermoen, M. 1997, 'Professional identity: values embedded in meaningful nursing practice', *Journal of Advanced Nursing* vol. 25, pp. 434-441.
Fairclough, N. 1995, *Discourse and Social Change*, Polity, Cambridge.
Farquhar, S. 2008, 'Narrative Identity: Ricoeur and Early Childhood Education', University of Auckland, Auckland.
Fealy, G. 2004, '"The good nurse": visions and values in image of the nurse', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 649-656.
Fenwick, T. & Tennant, M. 2004, 'Understanding Adult Learners', in G. Foley (ed.), *Dimensions of Adult Learning*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, pp. 201-218.
Fernie, S. & Metcalf, D. 1998, *Not hanging on the telephone: Payment systems in the new sweat shops*, Centre for Economic Performance, LSE, London.
Fina, A.D., Schiffrin, D. & Bamberg, M. (eds) 2006, *Discourse and identity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
Flemming, P. & Sewell, G. 2002, 'Looking for the good soldier, Svejk: alternative modalities of resistance in the contemporary workplace', *Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 857-873.
Fogarty, T. & Dirsmith, M. 2001, 'Organizational Socialization as Instrument and Symbol: An Extended Institutional Theory Perspective', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 247-266.
Fontana, A. & Frey, J. 2008, 'The Interview', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, SAGE, London, pp. 115-159.
Foster, C. 2007, 'Teaching and Learning in the Service of Transformation', *Change*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 38-45.
Foucault, M. 1972, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. A. Smith, Pantheon, New York.
Foucault, M. 1974, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Tavistock, London.
Foucault, M. 1977, *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*, trans. A. Sheridan, Pantheon, New York.
Foucault, M. 1979, *The History of Sexuality, Vol 1: An Introduction*, trans. R. Hurley, Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault, M. 1980a, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Harvester, Brighton.
Foucault, M. 1981a, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Foucault, M. 1981b, 'The Order of Discourse', in R. Young (ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 48-78.
Foucault, M. 1984, 'The Order of Discourse', in M. Shapiro (ed.), *Language and Politics*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
Foucault, M. 1988, 'Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault', in L.H. Martin, H. Gutman & P.H. Hutton (eds)Tavistock, London, pp. 16-49.
Foucault, M. 1997, *The politics of truth*, Semiotext(e) MIT Press, New York.
Foucault, M. 2000, 'Questions on Method', in J.D. Faubion (ed.), *Power / Michel Foucault* New Press, New York.
Frank, M. & Armstrong, T., (trans) 1992, *On Foucault's Concept of Discourse*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
Fuller, A. & Unwin, L. 2004, 'Expansive learning environments: Integrating organisational and personal development', in H. Rainbird, A. Fuller & A. Munro (eds), *Workplace Learning in Context*, Routledge, London, pp. 126-144.
Gariepy, H. 1999, *Mobilized For God - The History of the Salvation Army*, vol. 8 (1977-1994), The Salvation Army USA Southern Territory, Atlanta.
Gee, J. 1999, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Routledge, London.
Geertz, C. (ed.) 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
Gerald, V. 1994, 'Participant Observation: A Model for Organizational Investigation?' *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 30-38.
Gergen, K. & Kaye, J. 1992, 'Beyond Narrative in the Negotiation of Therapeutic Meaning', in S. McNamee & K. Gergen (eds), *Therapy as a Social Construction*, Sage, London, pp. 166-185.
Goopy, S. 2005, 'Taking account of local culture: limits to the development of a professional ethos', *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 144-154.
Gowans, J. 2000, *General's Response and Action Plan to the International Commission on Officership, Final Report*.
Graham, L. 2005, 'Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault ', paper presented to the *Australian Association for Research in Education 2005 Annual General Conference*.
Graham, S. 2003, 'Instructional Design for Affective Learning in Theological Education', *British Journal of Theological Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 58-77.
Griffith, A. 1998, 'Insider/outsider: epistemological privilege and mothering work', *Human Studies*, vol. 21, pp. 361-376.
Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. 1997, *The New Language of Qualitative Method*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. 2002, 'From individual interview to interview society', in J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (eds), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Hager, P. 2005, 'Current Theories of Workplace Learning: A Critical Assessment', in N. Bascia, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood & D. Livingstone (eds), *International Handbook of Educational Policy*, Springer Dordrecht.
Halford, S. & Leonard, P. 2003, 'Space and place in the construction and performance of gendered nursing identities', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 201-208.
Hall, S. 1990, 'Cultural identity and diaspora ', in J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, pp. 222-237.
Hall, S. 2000, 'Who needs 'identity'?' in P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds), *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London, pp. 15-30.
Hardy, I. & Lingard, B. 2008, 'Teacher professional development as an effect of policy and practice: a Bourdieuian analysis', *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 63 - 80.

Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. 2007, 'Discourse analytic practice', in C. Seal, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, SAGE, London, pp. 168-184.
Herackous, L. 2004, 'Interpretivist Approaches to Organizational Discourse', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London.
Hergenhahn, B. 1997, *An Introduction to Theories of Learning*, 5th edn, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River.
Hess, L. 2008, 'Formation in the Worlds of Theological Education: Moving from "What" to "Who"', *Teaching Theology and Religion*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 14-23.
Hibbert, P., MacIntosh, R. & McInnes, P. 2007, 'Identity trajectories in participative organizational research', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 237-249.
Hill, H. 2006, *Leadership in the Salvation Army: A Case Study in Clericalisation*, Paternoster, Milton Keynes: UK.
Hodge, B., et. al. 2003, *Organizational Theory A Strategic Approach*, 6th edn, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
Holmes, J. 2006, 'Workplace narratives, professional identity and relational practice', in A. de Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (eds), *Discourse and Identity*, Cambridge Uinversity Press, New York, pp. 166-187.
Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. 2000, *The self we live by. Narrative identity in a postmodern world*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Hooper, B. 2008, 'Stories we teach by: Intersections among faculty biography, student formation, and instructional processes', *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 228-241.
Hoskin, K. 1990, 'Foucault under Examination: The Crypto-Educationalist Unmasked', in S.J. Ball (ed.), *Foucault and education : disciplines and knowledge*, Routledge, London.
Howarth, D. 2000, *Discourse*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
Howarth, D. 2002, 'Discourse Theory', in D. Marsh & G. Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in political Science*, Macmillian, New York.
Hull, G. & Zacher, J. 2007, 'Enacting Identities: An Ethnography of a Job Training Program', *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 71-102.
Iedema, R., Rhodes, C. & Scheeres, H. 2006, 'Surveillance, Resistance, Observance: Exploring the Teleo-affective Volatility of Workplace Interaction', *Organization Studies*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1111-1130.
Illeris, K. 2003, 'Towards a contemporary and comprehensive theory of learning', *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 396-406.
Ivancevich, J. & Matteson, M. 2002, *Organizational Behaviour and Management*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
Jacobs, K. 2006, 'Discourse Analysis and its Utility for Urban Policy Research', *Urban Policy Research*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 39-52.
James, N. 2004, 'Power-Knowledge And Critique In Australian Legal Education : 1987 - 2003 ', Ph.D thesis, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
Janks, H. 2002, 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool', in M. Toolan (ed.), *Critical Discourse Analysis (Vol IV)*, Routledge, London.
Jaquelina, H.-T. 2002, 'Inside knowledge: Issues in insider research', *Nursing Standard*, vol. 16, no. 46, p. 33.
Jenkins, R. 1992, *Pierre Bourdieu*, Routledge, London.
Johnson, G. 2006, 'The discursive construction of teacher identities in a research interview', in A. de Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (eds), *Discourse and Identity*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 213-232.
Johnsson, M. & Hager, P. 2008, 'Navigation the wilderness of becoming professional',

Journal of Workplace Learning, vol. 20, no. 7/8, pp. 526-536.
Johnstone, B. 2008, *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edn, Blackwell, Oxford.
Jones, G. 2004, *Organisational Theory, Design, and Change*, 4th edn, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle.
Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. 2002, *Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London.
Kanuha, V.K. 2000, ''Being' Native versus 'Going Native'', *Social Work*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 439-447.
Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. 1999, *Using Foucault's methods*, Sage, London.
Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. 2007, 'The Foucaultian framework', in C. Seal, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, SAGE, London, pp. 129-138.
Kent, C. 1996, 'Victorian social history: Post-Thompson, post-Foucault, postmodern', *Victorian Studies*, vol. 40, pp. 97-133.
Kerby, A. 1991, *Narrative and the Self*, Indiana, Bloomington.
Kiesling, C., et. al. 2006, 'Identity Research and Psychosocial Formation of One's Sense of Spiritual Self: Implications for Religious Educators and Christian Institutions of Higher Education', *Christian Education Journal*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 240-259.
Kiesling, S. 2006, 'Hegemonic identity-making in narrative', in A. de Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (eds), *Discourse and Identity*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 261-287.
King, N. & Ross, A. 2003, 'Professional identities and interprofessional relations: evaluation of collaborative community schemes ', *Social Work in Health Care*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 51-72.
Knight, P. 2006, 'Quality Enhancement and Educational Professional Development', *Quality Higher Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 29-40.
Knights, D. & Willmott, H.C. 2002, 'Virtue or vice? Reflecting on competing discourses of autonomy', in M. Parker (ed.), *Utopia and organization*, Sage, London, pp. 59-81.
Kolb, D. 1984, *Experiential Learning: Experiences as the Sources of Learning and Development*, Prentice Hall, Engelwood Cliffs.
Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. 2009, *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*, 2nd edn, Sage Publications, Los Angeles.
Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. 2001, *Hegemony and socialist strategy; towards a radical democratic politics*, 2nd edn, Verso, London.
Lena Aléx, A.H. 2008, 'Shift in power during an interview situation: methodological reflections inspired by Foucault and Bourdieu', *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 169-176.
Linstead, S. & Grafton Small, R. 1992, 'On reading organizational culture', *Organizational Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 331-355.
Loseke, D.R. 2007, 'The Study of Identity as Cultural, Institutional, Organizational, And Personal Narratives: Theoretical and Empirical Integrations', *Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 661-688.
Lundberg, C. 1990, 'Surfacing Organisational Culture', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 19-26.
MacIntosh, J. 2003, 'Reworking Professional Identity', *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 725-741.
Mackey, H. 2007, ''Do Not Ask Me to Remain the Same': Foucault and the Professional Identities of Occupational Therapists', *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, vol. 54, pp. 95-102.
Manuel, J. & Llamas, C. 2006, 'Technologies of Disciplinary Power in Action: The Norm of the 'Good Student'', *Higher Education*, vol. 52, pp. 665-686.
Martin, R. & Barresi, J. (eds) 2002, *Personal identity*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
Mary, C.J. & Paul, H. 2008, 'Navigating the wilderness of becoming professional', *Journal of Workplace Learning*, vol. 20, no. 7/8, pp. 526-536.

Mauss, M. 2000, 'A category of the human mind: The notion of person, the notion of self', in P. duGay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds), *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London, pp. 325-345.
McAdams, D. 1995, 'Introductory Commentary', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, vol. 5, pp. 207-211.
McHoul, A. & Grace, W. 1993, *A Foucault primer: discourse, power and the subject*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Vic.
McIntyre, J. & Grudens-Schuck, N. 2004, 'Research in Adult education and Training', in G. Foley (ed.), *Dimensions of Adult Learning*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, pp. 167-186.
Mercer, J. 2007, 'The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1-17.
Merriam, S. & Caffarella, S. 1999, *Learning in Adulthood* 2nd edn, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
Mertens, D.M. 1998, 'An Introduction to Research, Chapter 1', in, *Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Sages, Thousand Oaks, pp. 1-31.
Merton, R. 1972, 'Insiders and outsiders; a chapter in the sociology of knowedge', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78, no. July, pp. 9-47.
Miller, G. 1997, 'Contextualizing Texts: Studying Organizational Texts', in G. Miller & R. Dingwall (eds), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 77-91.
Mills, S. 2003, *Michel Foucault*, Routledge, London ; New York.
Mishler, E. 1986, *Research Interviewing. Context and narrative*, Harvard University Press, London.
Mishler, E. 1995, 'Models of Narrative Analysis: A Typology', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, vol. 5, pp. 87-123.
Newton, T. 1998, 'Theorizing Subjectivity in Organizations: The Failure of Foucauldian Studies?' *Organization Studies*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 415-447.
Nicols, A.M. 1911, *General Booth and The Salvation Army*, Herbert and Daniel, London.
Niemi, A. & Paasivaara, L. 2007, 'Meaning contents of radiographers' professional identity as illustrated in a professional journal - A discourse analytical approach', *Radiography*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 258-264.
O'Farrell, C. 2005, *Michel Foucault*, Sage, London.
Öhlen, J. & Segesten, K. 1998, 'The professional identity of the nurse: concept analysis and development', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 720-727.
Ostrow, J. 2000, 'Culture as a Fundamental Dimension of Experience: A Discussion of Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Human Habitus', in D. Robbins (ed.), *Pierre Bordieu*, vol. I, Sage, London, pp. 302-322.
Palmer, J. 1998, 'The Human Organization', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 294-307.
Parker, M. 2007, 'Identification: organisations and structuralism', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 61-82.
Peters, T. & Waterman, R. 1982, *In Search of Excellence*, Warner, New York.
Pettinger, R. 2007, *Introduction to Management* 4th edn, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
Phoenix, A. 2008, 'Analysing narrative contexts', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 64-77.
Polanyi, M. 1966, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Potter, J. 1996, *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*, Sage, London.
Potter, J. 2004, 'Discourse Analysis as a Way of Analysing Naturally Occurring Talk', in

D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research*, vol. 2nd, Sage, London, pp. 200-218.
Potter, J.A. 1998, 'Qualitative and discourse analysis', in A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds), *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology*, vol. 3, Pergamon, Oxford.
Poynton, C. & Lee, A. 2000, *Culture & text: discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, N.S.W.
Pullen, A., Beech, N. & Sims, D. (eds) 2007, *Exploring identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Rapley, T. 2007, 'Interviews', in C. Seal, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, SAGE, London, pp. 13-33.
Reed, M. 1998, 'Organizational Analysis as Discourse Analysis: A Critique', in D. Grant, T. Keenoy & C. Oswick (eds), *Discourse and organization*, Sage, London, pp. 193-213.
Rex, L., et. al. 2002, 'Teachers' Pedagogical Stories and the Shaping of Classroom Participation: "The Dancer" and "Graveyard Shift at the 7-11"', *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 765-796.
Rhodes, C. 2000, 'Reading and Writing Organizational Lives', *Organization*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 7-29.
Rhodes, C., Iedema, R. & Scheeres, H. 2007, 'Identity, surveillance and resistance', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 83-99.
Rhodes, C. & Scheeres, H. 2003, '*Changing Pedagogy: Culture and Identity in Organisations*', *OVAL Research Working Paper 03-19*
Ricoeur, P. 1981, *Hermeneutics and the human sciences : essays on language, action, and interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Ricouer, P. 1988, *Time and Narrative*, trans. K. Blamey & D. Pellauer, vol. 3, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Robbins, S., et. al. 2008, *Organisational Behaviour*, 5th edn, Pearson, Frenchs Forest.
Rollinson, R. 2005, *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis*, 3rd edn, Pearson, Essex.
Rose, N. 2000, 'Identity, Genealogy, History', in P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds), *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London, pp. 311-324.
Rose, N.S. 1996, *Inventing our selves: psychology, power, and personhood*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Rosen, M. 1985, 'Breakfast at Spiro's: Dramaturgy and Dominance', *Journal of Management*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 31-48.
Samuelsen, H. & Steffen, V. 2004, 'The Relevance of Foucault And Bourdieu for Medical Anthropology: Exploring New Sites', *Anthropology & Medicine*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 3-10.
Sandall, R. 1947, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. 1 (1865-1878), Thomas Nelson, London.
Sandall, R. 1950, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. 2 (1878-1886), Thomas Nelson, London.
Sandall, R. 1955, *The History of The Salvation Army - Social Reform and Welfare Work*, vol. 3 (1883-1953), Thomas Nelson, London.
Sawyer, K. 2002, 'A Discourse on Discourse: an Archaeological History of an Intellectual Concept', *Cultural Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 433-456.
Scanlon, L., et. al. 2007, ''You don't have like an identity … you are just lost in a crowd': Forming a Student Identity in First-year Transition to University', *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 223-241.
Scheeres, H. 2003, 'Learning to Talk: From Manual work to Discourse Work as Self-Regulating Practice', *Journal of Workplace Learning*, vol. 15, no. 7/8, pp. 332-337.
Schein, E. 1992, *Organizational Culture and Leadership* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
Scheurich, J. & McKenzie, K. 2008, 'Foucault's Methodologies', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, SAGE, London, pp. 313-349.

Scholarios, D., et. al. 2003, 'Anticipatory Socialisation: The Effect of Recruitment and Selection Experiences on Career Expectations', *Career Development International*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 182-197.
Schon, D.A. 1987, *Educating the reflective practitioner*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
Sewell, G. & Wilkinson, B. 1992, 'Someone to watch over me: Surveillance, discipline and the JIT Labour Process', *Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 271-289.
Shulma, L. 2006, 'From Hermeneutic to Homiletic', *Change*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 28-31.
Shulman, L. 2005, 'Signature Pedagogies in the Professions', *Daedalus*, vol. 134, no. 3, pp. 52-59.
Silverman, D. 2000, *Doing Qualitative Research*, SAGE, London.
Simpson, B. 2010, 'New Chief's Pioneer Pedigree', *Pipeline*, pp. 8-11.
Smith, J. 2007, 'Critical Discourse Analysis for Nursing Research', *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 60-70.
Smith, K. 1982, 'Philosophical Problems in Thinking about Change', in P.S. Goodman (ed.), *Change in organizations : new perspectives on theory, research and practice*, 1st edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. xv, 446 p.
Solomon, N. 1999, 'Culture and Difference in Workplace Learning', in D. Boud & J. Garrick (eds), *Understanding Learning at Work*, Routledge, London, pp. 119-131.
Somers, M. & Gibson, G. 1994, 'Reclaiming the Epistemological "Other": Narrative and Social Constitution of Identity', in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 37-99.
Sommerlad, H. 2007, 'Researching and Theorizing the Processes of Professional Identity Formation', *Journal of Law & Society*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 190-217.
Squire, C. 2008, 'Experience-centred and culturally-oriented approaches to narrative', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 41-63.
Sugrue, C. 1997, 'Student Teacher's Lay Theories and Teaching Identities: Their Implications for Professional Development', *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 213-225.
Tamboukou, M. 2008, 'A Foucauldian approach to narratives', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 102-120.
Taylor, S. 2001, 'Evaluating and Applying Discourse Analytic Research', in M. Wetherell, et. al. (ed.), *Discourse as Data*, Sage, London, pp. 311-330.
Taylor, S. 2001, 'Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research', in M. Wetherell, et. al. (ed.), *Discourse as Data*, Sage, London, pp. 1-48.
Teresa, B. & David, C. 2007, 'In Defense of Being "Native": The Case for Insider Academic Research', *Organizational Research Methods*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 59-74.
Thachankary, T. 1992, 'Organizations as "Texts": Hermeneutics as a Model for Understanding Organizational Change', *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, vol. 6, pp. 197-233.
The Salvation Army 1895, *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1900, *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, Headquarters of the Salvation Army, London.
The Salvation Army 1904, *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1922, *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, The Salvation Army, London.
The Salvation Army 1925, *Training Salvation Army Officers: Training Staff Council Lectures 1925*, The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1938, *Orders and Regulations for Territorial Commanders and Chief Secretaries*, International Headquarters, London.

The Salvation Army 1960, *A Modern Pilgrim's Progress - The Story of Salvation Army Officership*, The Salvation Army National Headquarters, New York.
The Salvation Army 1987, *Orders and Regulations for Officers*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1991, *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers*, The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 2000a, *International Commission on Officership - Final Report*, Report, 20.7.2000b edn, The Salvation Army.
The Salvation Army 2000, 'Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers', viewed 19.12.08.
The Salvation Army 2004, 'Orders and Regulations Salvation Army Officers', viewed 1.5.10.
The Salvation Army 2005a, 'Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers ', viewed 18 December 2008.
The Salvation Army 2005b, 'Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers', viewed 19.12.08.
The Salvation Army 2008, *Undertakings Entered into by an Officer of The Salvation Army*.
The Salvation Army 2010a, *ALA 0809 Scale of Weekly Allowances for Active Officers*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, August 2009 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010b, *Articles of War for Salvation Army Soldiers*, viewed 28.10.10 <http://www1.salvationarmy.org/heritage.nsf/1e66c5a3687a37638025692e00500ad4/fea4acf97c61102c80256a2200443120?OpenDocument&Highlight=0,doctrines>.
The Salvation Army 2010c, *Explore the Calling*, viewed 4.6.10 <http://www.salvationarmy.org.au/action/LANDING?pc=PC_62698>.
The Salvation Army 2010d, *Make your Mark*, viewed 29.6.10 <http://salvos.org.au/makeyourmark/>.
The Salvation Army 2010e, *Officer's Covenant*, The Salvation Army, viewed 5.6.10 <http://www.salvationist.org/poverty.nsf/vw_sublinks/BD3B682EB177EEF680256ABE002DD930?openDocument>.
The Salvation Army 2010f, *SSO 0210 Single Spouse Officership*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, February 2010 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010g, *THS 1210 Theological Studies*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, Dec 2010 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010h, *Your Commission*, The Salvation Army, viewed 5.6.10 <http://www.salvationarmy.org.au/explore-the-calling/your-commission.html?s=1993871275>.
The Salvation Army International Doctrine Council 2002, *Servants together: Salvationist perspectives on ministry*, The Salvation Army, London.
Threadgold, T. 2000, 'Poststructuralism and discourse analysis', in A. Lee & C. Poynton (eds), *Culture and text: discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, N.S.W., pp. 40-58.
Titscher, S., et. al. 2000, *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*, trans. B. Jenner, Sage, London.
Traynor, M. 2006, 'Discourse analysis: theoretical and historical overview and review of papers in the Journal of Advanced Nursing 1996-2004', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 62-72.
Trefry, M.G. 2006, 'A Double-Edged Sword: Organizational Culture in Multicultural Organisations', *International Journal of Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 563-575.
Usher, R. 1996, 'A Critique of the Neglected Epistemological Assumptions of Educational Research', in D. Scott & R. Usher (eds), *Understanding Educational Research*, Routledge, London.

van der Water, D. 2005, 'Transforming Theological Education and Ministerial Formation', *International Review of Mission*, vol. 94, no. 373, pp. 203-211.
Volkmann, M. & Anderson, M. 1998, 'Creating Professional Identity: Dilemmas and Metaphors of a First-Year Chemistry Teacher', *Science Education*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 293-310.
Wagner-Marsh, F. & Conley, J. 1999, 'The Fourth Wave: The Spirituality-Based Firm', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 292-301.
Watson, C. 2006, 'Narratives of Practice and the Construction of Identity in Teaching', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 509-526.
Webb, J., Schirato, T. & Danaher, G. 2002, *Understanding Bourdieu*, Sage, London.
Weedon, C. 1987, *Feminist Practice & Poststructural Theory*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
West, L. 2009, 'New Workers - Depressed Workers: A Discursive Investigation of the Experience of Depression in the Workplace ', University of Technology, Sydney, Sydney.
Wetherell, M., et. al. 2001, *Discourse as Data*, Sage, London.
Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S. 2001, *Discourse theory and practice: a reader*, SAGE, London.
Wiggins, A. 1964, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. 4 (1886-1904), Thomas Nelson, London.
Wiggins, A. 1968, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. 5 (1904-1914), Nelson, London.
Wilmott, H. 1993, 'Strength is Ignorance: Slavery is Freedom. Managing Culture in Modern Organisations', *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 515-551.
Wilson, F. 2004, *Organizational Behaviour and Work: A Critical Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Winch, C. 1998, *The philosophy of human learning*, Routledge, London.
Winston, D. 1999, *Red-Hot and Righteous*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
Woods, M. 2008, 'Parental resistance : mobile and transitory discourses: a discursive analysis of parental resistance towards medical treatment for a seriously ill child' , Ph.D thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. Massey University, Palmerston North.
Young, R. 1981, *Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston.

Ainsworth, S. & Hardy, C. 2004, 'Discourse and Identities', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London.
Alvesson, M. 2004, 'Organizational Culture and Discourse', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London, pp. 317-335.
Alvesson, M.G., Hardy, C. & Harley, B. 2004, 'Reflecting on Reflexivity', paper presented to the *Creating Actionable Knowledge*, New Orleans, Retrieved from http://group.aomonline.org/cms/Meetings/New%20Orleans/NO_Papers/ReflexivityAoM.doc, Date: 16.9.10.
Anderson, N. 2003, *Discursive Analytical Strategies*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
Anderson, O. 1971, 'The Growth of Christian Militarism in Mid-Victorian Britain', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 86, no. 338, pp. 46-72.
Andrews, M., Sclater, S., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M. 2007, 'Narrative Research', in C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, Sage, London, pp. 97-112.
Andrews, M., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M. 2008, 'Introduction: What is narrative research?' in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 1-40.
Antonek, J., et. al. 1997, 'The Student Teacher Portfolio as Autobiography: Developing a Professional Identity', *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 81, no. 1, pp. 15-

27.
Bakhtin, M. 1981, 'Discourse in the novel', in M. Holquist (ed.), *The dialogic imagination* University of Texas Press, Austin.
Ball, S.J. (ed.) 1990, *Foucault and Education. Disciplines and Knowledge*, Routledge, London.
Barretti, M. 2004, 'What Do We Know About the Professional Socialization of Our Students?' *Journal of Social Work Education*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 255-283.
Beijaard, D., et.al. 2004, 'Reconsidering Research on Teacher's Professional Identity', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 107-128.
Bernstein, R.J. 1983, *Beyond objectivism and relativism : science, hermeneutics, and praxis*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
Besley, T. 2005, 'Foucault, truth telling and technologies of the self in schools', *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 76-89.
Booth, F. 1924, *Powers of Salvation Army Officers*, 2nd edn, Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, London.
Bourdieu, P. 1994, 'Structures, Habitus and Practices', in, *The Polity Reader in Social Theory*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. 1992, *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Boyes, C. 2004, 'Discourse analysis and personal/professional development', *Radiography*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 109-117.
Budd, J. 2006, 'Discourse Analysis and the Study of Communication in LIS', *Library Trends*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 65-82.
Burwood, S. 2007, 'Imitation, Indwelling and the Embodied Self', *Education, Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 118-134.
Butler, J. 1997, *The psychic life of power: theories in subjection*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Butler, J. 1999, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*, 10th edn, Routledge, New York.
Cameron, D. 2001, *Working with Spoken Discourse*, Sage, London.
Car, D., Taylor, C. & Ricoeur, P. 1991, 'Discussion: Ricoeur on Narrative', in D. Wood (ed.), *On Paul Ricoeur: narrative and interpretation*, Routledge, London.
Carabine, J. 2001, 'Unmarried Motherhood 1830-1990: A Genealogical Analysis', in M. Wetherell, et. al. (ed.), *Discourse as Data*, Sage, London, pp. 267-310.
Card, J. 1997, *The Salvation Army - Articles of War*, viewed 2.9.10 <http://jdcard.com/artclwar.htm>.
Chan, A. 2000, 'Redirecting Critique in Postmodern Organization Studies: The Perspective of Foucault', *Organization Studies*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1059-1075.
Chappell, C., et. al. 2003, *Reconstructing the lifelong learner: pedagogy and identity in individual, organisational, and social change*, Routledge Falmer, London.
Chase, S. 2008, 'Narrative Inquiry', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, Sage, London, pp. 57-94.
Cheek, J. 2004, 'At the Margins? Discourse Analysis and Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 1140-1150.
Cheek, J. & Porter, S. 1997, 'Reviewing Foucault: possibilities and problems for nursing and health care', *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 108-119.
Crotty, M. 1998, 'Introduction: The Research Process. Chapter 1', in, *Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in Research Process*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Crowe, M. 2005, 'Discourse Analysis: Towards an Understanding of its Place in Nursing', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 55-63.
Danaher, G., et. al. 2000, *Understanding Foucault*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Davies, B. 1994, *Poststructuralist theory and classroom practice*, Deakin University Press, Geelong.
Deal, T. & Kennedy, K. 1983, 'A Culture: A New Look Through Old Lenses', *The*

Journal of Behavioural Science, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 498-505.
Deetz, S. 1996, 'Describing Differences in Approaches to Organization Science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and Their Legacy', *Organization Science*, vol. 7, pp. 191-207.
Deutsch, J. 1996, 'The behavioral scientist: insider and outsider', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 172-191.
Dingwall, R. 1997, 'Accounts, Interviews and Observations', in G. Miller & R. Dingwall (eds), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 51-76.
Elias, N. 2000, 'Homo clausus and the civilizing process', in P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds), *Identity: a reader*, SAGE, London, pp. 284-296.
Ezzy, D. 1998, 'Theorizing narrative identity: Symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics', *Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 239.
Fairclough, N. 1995, *Discourse and Social Change*, Polity, Cambridge.
Fernie, S. & Metcalf, D. 1998, *Not hanging on the telephone: Payment systems in the new sweat shops*, Centre for Economic Performance, LSE, London.
Flemming, P. & Sewell, G. 2002, 'Looking for the good soldier, Svejk: alternative modalities of resistance in the contemporary workplace', *Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 857-873.
Fogarty, T. & Dirsmith, M. 2001, 'Organizational Socialization as Instrument and Symbol: An Extended Institutional Theory Perspective', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 247-266.
Fontana, A. & Frey, J. 2008, 'The Interview', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, SAGE, London, pp. 115-159.
Foucault, M. 1972, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. A. Smith, Pantheon, New York.
Foucault, M. 1974, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Tavistock, London.
Foucault, M. 1977, *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*, trans. A. Sheridan, Pantheon, New York.
Foucault, M. 1979, *The History of Sexuality, Vol 1: An Introduction*, trans. R. Hurley, Pantheon Books, New York.
Foucault, M. 1980a, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Harvester, Brighton.
Foucault, M. 1980b, 'Two Lectures', in C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*, Pantheon Books, New York, pp. 78-108.
Foucault, M. 1981, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Foucault, M. 1984, 'The Order of Discourse', in M. Shapiro (ed.), *Language and Politics*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
Foucault, M. 1988, 'Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault', in L.H. Martin, H. Gutman & P.H. Hutton (eds)Tavistock, London, pp. 16-49.
Foucault, M. 1990, *The history of sexuality, Vol 1*, Penguin, London.
Foucault, M. 1997, *The politics of truth*, Semiotext(e) MIT Press, New York.
Foucault, M. 2000, 'Questions on Method', in J.D. Faubion (ed.), *Power / Michel Foucault* New Press, New York.
Geertz, C. (ed.) 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
Gergen, K. & Kaye, J. 1992, 'Beyond Narrative in the Negotiation of Therapeutic Meaning', in S. McNamee & K. Gergen (eds), *Therapy as a Social Construction*, Sage, London, pp. 166-185.
Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. 2002, 'From individual interview to interview society', in J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (eds), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Hall, S. 1990, 'Cultural identity and diaspora ', in J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, pp. 222-237.
Hall, S. 2000, 'Who needs 'identity'?' in P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (eds),

Identity: a reader, SAGE, London, pp. 15-30.
Herackous, L. 2004, 'Interpretivist Approaches to Organizational Discourse', in D. Grant, et.al (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*, SAGE, London.
Hibbert, P., MacIntosh, R. & McInnes, P. 2007, 'Identity trajectories in participative organizational research', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 237-249.
Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. 2000, *The self we live by. Narrative identity in a postmodern world*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Hoskin, K. 1990, 'Foucault under Examination: The Crypto-Educationalist Unmasked', in S.J. Ball (ed.), *Foucault and education : disciplines and knowledge*, Routledge, London.
Howarth, D. 2002, 'Discourse Theory', in D. Marsh & G. Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in political Science*, Macmillian, New York.
Hull, G. & Zacher, J. 2007, 'Enacting Identities: An Ethnography of a Job Training Program', *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 71-102.
Jacobs, K. 2006, 'Discourse Analysis and its Utility for Urban Policy Research', *Urban Policy Research*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 39-52.
Johnstone, B. 2008, *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edn, Blackwell, Oxford.
Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. 2002, *Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London.
Kanuha, V.K. 2000, ''Being' Native versus 'Going Native'', *Social Work*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 439-447.
Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. 1999, *Using Foucault's methods*, Sage, London.
Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. 2007, 'The Foucaultian framework', in C. Seal, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, SAGE, London, pp. 129-138.
Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. 2001, *Hegemony and socialist strategy; towards a radical democratic politics*, 2nd edn, Verso, London.
Linstead, S. & Grafton Small, R. 1992, 'On reading organizational culture', *Organizational Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 331-355.
Loseke, D.R. 2007, 'The Study of Identity as Cultural, Institutional, Organizational, And Personal Narratives: Theoretical and Empirical Integrations', *Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 661-688.
Lundberg, C. 1990, 'Surfacing Organisational Culture', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 19-26.
Mackey, H. 2007, ''Do Not Ask Me to Remain the Same': Foucault and the Professional Identities of Occupational Therapists', *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, vol. 54, pp. 95-102.
McAdams, D. 1995, 'Introductory Commentary', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, vol. 5, pp. 207-211.
McHoul, A. & Grace, W. 1993, *A Foucault primer: discourse, power and the subject*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Vic.
Mercer, J. 2007, 'The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1-17.
Mertens, D.M. 1998, 'An Introduction to Research, Chapter 1', in, *Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Sages, Thousand Oaks, pp. 1-31.
Merton, R. 1972, 'Insiders and outsiders; a chapter in the sociology of knowedge', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78, no. July, pp. 9-47.
Miller, G. 1997, 'Contextualizing Texts: Studying Organizational Texts', in G. Miller & R. Dingwall (eds), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 77-91.

Mishler, E. 1986, *Research Interviewing. Context and narrative*, Harvard University Press, London.
Mishler, E. 1995, 'Models of Narrative Analysis: A Typology', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, vol. 5, pp. 87-123.
Phoenix, A. 2008, 'Analysing narrative contexts', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 64-77.
Potter, J. 1996, *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*, Sage, London.
Potter, J.A. 1998, 'Qualitative and discourse analysis', in A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds), *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology*, vol. 3, Pergamon, Oxford.
Poynton, C. & Lee, A. 2000, *Culture & text: discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, N.S.W.
Rapley, T. 2007, 'Interviews', in C. Seal, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, SAGE, London, pp. 13-33.
Reed, M. 1998, 'Organizational Analysis as Discourse Analysis: A Critique', in D. Grant, T. Keenoy & C. Oswick (eds), *Discourse and organization*, Sage, London, pp. 193-213.
Rhodes, C., Iedema, R. & Scheeres, H. 2007, 'Identity, surveillance and resistance', in A. Pullen, N. Beech & D. Sims (eds), *Exploring Identity: concepts and methods*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, pp. 83-99.
Ricoeur, P. 1981, *Hermeneutics and the human sciences : essays on language, action, and interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Ricouer, P. 1988, *Time and Narrative*, trans. K. Blamey & D. Pellauer, vol. 3, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Rose, N.S. 1996, *Inventing our selves: psychology, power, and personhood*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Rosen, M. 1985, 'Breakfast at Spiro's: Dramaturgy and Dominance', *Journal of Management*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 31-48.
Sawyer, K. 2002, 'A Discourse on Discourse: an Archaeological History of an Intellectual Concept', *Cultural Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 433-456.
Scanlon, L., et. al. 2007, ''You don't have like an identity … you are just lost in a crowd': Forming a Student Identity in First-year Transition to University', *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 223-241.
Schein, E. 1992, *Organizational Culture and Leadership* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
Scheurich, J. & McKenzie, K. 2008, 'Foucault's Methodologies', in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 3 edn, SAGE, London, pp. 313-349.
Sewell, G. & Wilkinson, B. 1992, 'Someone to watch over me: Surveillance, discipline and the JIT Labour Process', *Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 271-289.
Simpson, B. 2010, 'New Chief's Pioneer Pedigree', *Pipeline*, pp. 8-11.
Somers, M. & Gibson, G. 1994, 'Reclaiming the Epistemological "Other": Narrative and Social Constitution of Identity', in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 37-99.
Sommerlad, H. 2007, 'Researching and Theorizing the Processes of Professional Identity Formation', *Journal of Law & Society*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 190-217.
Squire, C. 2008, 'Experience-centred and culturally-oriented approaches to narrative', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 41-63.
Tamboukou, M. 2008, 'A Foucauldian approach to narratives', in M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (eds), *Doing Narrative Research*, SAGE, London, pp. 102-120.
The Salvation Army 1895, *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1922, *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, The Salvation Army, London.

The Salvation Army 1925, *Training Salvation Army Officers: Training Staff Council Lectures 1925*, The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1938, *Orders and Regulations for Territorial Commanders and Chief Secretaries*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1960, *A Modern Pilgrim's Progress - The Story of Salvation Army Officership*, The Salvation Army National Headquarters, New York.
The Salvation Army 1987, *Orders and Regulations for Officers*, International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 1991, *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers*, The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.
The Salvation Army 2000, *International Commission on Officership - Final Report*, Report, 20.7.2000 edn, The Salvation Army.
The Salvation Army 2004, 'Orders and Regulations Salvation Army Officers', viewed 1.5.10.
The Salvation Army 2005, 'Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers ', viewed 18 December 2008.
The Salvation Army 2008, *Undertakings Entered into by an Officer of The Salvation Army*.
The Salvation Army 2010a, *ALA 0809 Scale of Weekly Allowances for Active Officers*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, August 2009 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010b, *Articles of War for Salvation Army Soldiers*, viewed 28.10.10 <http://www1.salvationarmy.org/heritage.nsf/1e66c5a3687a37638025692e00500ad4/fea4acf97c61102c80256a2200443120?OpenDocument&Highlight=0,doctrines>.
The Salvation Army 2010c, *Explore the Calling*, viewed 4.6.10 <http://www.salvationarmy.org.au/action/LANDING?pc=PC_62698>.
The Salvation Army 2010d, *Make your Mark*, viewed 29.6.10 <http://salvos.org.au/makeyourmark/>.
The Salvation Army 2010e, *Officer's Covenant*, The Salvation Army, viewed 5.6.10 <http://www.salvationist.org/poverty.nsf/vw_sublinks/BD3B682EB177EEF680256ABE002DD930?openDocument>.
The Salvation Army 2010f, *SSO 0210 Single Spouse Officership*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, February 2010 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010g, *THS 1210 Theological Studies*, *Official minutes (Australia Eastern Territory)*, Dec 2010 edn.
The Salvation Army 2010h, *Your Commission*, The Salvation Army, viewed 5.6.10 <http://www.salvationarmy.org.au/explore-the-calling/your-commission.html?s=1993871275>.
The Salvation Army International Doctrine Council 2002, *Servants together: Salvationist perspectives on ministry*, The Salvation Army, London.
Trefry, M.G. 2006, 'A Double-Edged Sword: Organizational Culture in Multicultural Organisations', *International Journal of Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 563-575.
Volkmann, M. & Anderson, M. 1998, 'Creating Professional Identity: Dilemmas and Metaphors of a First-Year Chemistry Teacher', *Science Education*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 293-310.
Watson, C. 2006, 'Narratives of Practice and the Construction of Identity in Teaching', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 509-526.
Weedon, C. 1987, *Feminist Practice & Poststructural Theory*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.