Managerial discourse to control professors in private higher education institutions: a critical analysis

Bárbara Novaes Medeiros[1]
Marcus Vinicius Soares Siqueira[1]

[1] Universidade de Brasília (UNB) / Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Brasília – DF, Brazil

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the managerial discourse used to control professors in private higher education institutions (HEIs). The aim is to verify the characteristics of the managerial power and individuals that influence the production of the managerial discourse, apprehend the mechanisms of the promotion of the discourse in the researched organizations, and to understand how the managers symbolize the managerial role operated within the managerialist ideology in the HEI and make it subjective. A qualitative and exploratory-descriptive research was carried out based on a study with twelve managers of three private HEI in a city located in the state of Minas Gerais, Brazil. The data was collected through interview, based on a semi-structured and in-depth script. The analysis of data was based on the Critical Discourse Analysis inspired by the theoretical-methodological assertions by Fairclough (2016) together with the mode of inductive analysis under the perspective of the Clinical Sociology. The results revealed that the managerial discourse used to control professors is permeated by characteristics of managerial power in the ideological, cultural, political, economic and psychological domain. It is produced by the managers with the influence of the owners/board of directors/executive director. It was observed that the managers need to promote the discourse using mainly mechanisms of mediation. Managers subjectivized and symbolized the work and the institution positively in order to promote them based on a point of view of pleasure. Then, shortly afterward when questioned about working conditions, they revealed that they work in a context permeated by the managerialist ideology.

Keywords: Management discourse. Managerialist Ideology. Private Higher Education. Professor Control. Work Meanings.

Managerial discourse to control professors in private higher education institutions: a critical analysis

Resumo

Este estudo tem por objetivo analisar o discurso gerencial no controle de docentes em instituições de Ensino Superior (IES) privadas. Pretende-se verificar características do poder gerencialista e indivíduos que influenciam a produção do discurso gerencial, apreender os mecanismos de sua promoção nas organizações pesquisadas, além de compreender como os gerentes simbolizam e subjetivam o papel gerencial exercido no âmbito da ideologia gerencialista das IES. Desenvolveu-se pesquisa qualitativa e exploratório-descritiva, baseada em estudo com 12 gerentes de 3 IES privadas realizado em 1 cidade de Minas Gerais. A entrevista foi utilizada como técnica de coleta de dados, a partir de roteiro semiestruturado e em profundidade. Para a análise de dados, adotou-se a Análise Crítica do Discurso (ACD), inspirada nas asserções teórico-metodológicas de Fairclough (2016), junto com o modo de análise indutivo sob a perspectiva da Sociologia Clínica (SC). Os resultados revelaram que o discurso gerencial é perpassado por características do poder gerencialista no domínio ideológico, cultural, político, econômico e psicológico no controle dos docentes. É produzido pelos gerentes com influência de proprietários/conselho/direção executiva. Observou-se que os gerentes têm necessidade de promover o discurso utilizando, principalmente, mecanismos de mediação. Constatou-se que os gerentes subjetivaram e simbolizaram o trabalho e as IES de modo positivo a fim de promovê-los apenas sob a ótica do prazer. Entretanto, logo em seguida, questionados acerca das condições de trabalho, revelaram que trabalham em um contexto permeado pela ideologia gerencialista.

Palavras-chave: Discurso Gerencial. Ideologia Gerencialista. Ensino Superior Privado. Controle de Docentes. Sentidos do Trabalho.

Discurso gerencial en el control de docentes en instituciones de enseñanza superior privadas: un análisis crítico

Resumen

Este estudio tiene como objetivo analizar el discurso gerencial en el control de docentes en Instituciones de Enseñanza Superior privadas (IES). Se pretende verificar las características del poder gerencialista y de individuos que influyen en la producción del discurso gerencial, aprehender los mecanismos de su promoción en las organizaciones investigadas, además de comprender cómo los gerentes simbolizan y subjetivan el papel gerencial ejercido en el ámbito de la ideología gerencialista de las IES. Se desarrolló una investigación cualitativa y exploratoria-descriptiva, basada en un estudio con 12 gerentes de 3 IES privadas en una ciudad del estado de Minas Gerais. La entrevista se utilizó como técnica de recolección de datos, a partir de un guión semiestructurado y en profundidad. Para el análisis de datos se adoptó el Análisis Crítico del Discurso, inspirado en las aserciones teórico-metodológicas de Fairclough (2016) junto con el modo de análisis inductivo bajo la perspectiva de la Sociología Clínica. Los resultados revelaron que el discurso gerencial está permeado por características del poder gerencialista en el dominio ideológico, cultural, político, económico y psicológico en el control de los docentes. Es producido por los gerentes con influencia de los propietarios/junta directiva/dirección ejecutiva. Se observó que los gerentes tienen necesidad de promover el discurso utilizando, principalmente, mecanismos de mediación. Se constató que los gerentes subjetivaron y simbolizaron el trabajo y las IES de forma positiva a fin de promoverlas solamente bajo la óptica del placer. Sin embargo, al ser cuestionados sobre de las condiciones de trabajo, revelaron que trabajan en un contexto impregnado por la ideología gerencialista.

Palabras clave: Discurso gerencial. Ideología gerencialista. Enseñanza superior privada. Control de docentes. Sentidos del trabajo.

INTRODUCTION

Brazilian higher education has gone through substantial changes since the 1990s, especially in terms of the growth of the number of private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (MARTINS, 2013). The more they expand, the more they are beholden to capital and their exchange value, and the more competition grows between them (SEVERINO, 2009). This has solidified their mercantile nature, instituting new modes for the organization and control of work in the search for productivity, which involves professors and students in a new disciplinary framework (BRUNO, 2011).

By virtue of this, the discourse produced and promoted by managers is the way in which they channel the energies of their professors to execute the objectives of HEIs (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987). The intention of these managers is to strengthen the commitment and ties of these professors to HEIs, in order to benefit themselves (guaranteeing their employment) and these HEIs (making them more productive and profitable) (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007b). To make this logic function within the context of managerialist ideology, they are put under pressure with evaluations based on indices (TONON and GRISCI, 2015). In the name of returns on investment and competitiveness, they sacrifice subjectivity and all its qualities (DEJOURS, 2004). Instrumental rationality assumes a primordial role (SIQUEIRA, 2009). The result of this is the tendency to harm the physical and mental health of these individuals (DEJOURS, 2004).

To combat this, this managerial discourse must be critiqued, and this must be elaborated by all those who have to deal with these people (campus/unit managers, human resource and research managers, courses of study coordinators) in HEIs. Based on qualitative and exploratory-descriptive research, this article seeks to analyze the managerial discourse for controlling professors in HEIs. We seek to verify the characteristics of managerialist power and the individuals who influence the production of this managerial discourse to learn the mechanisms of its promotion in the examined institutions, as well as understand how managers symbolize and perceive the managerial role that they exercise in the context of HEI managerialist ideology.

Sought to keep away from the functionalist approach by performing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on the theoretical-methodological assertions of Fairclough (2016), to clarify the relationship between managers and professors in these institutions, instigate change, affect the order of societal discourse, improve working conditions and prevent harm to physical and mental health within the HEI environment. Thus, this study constitutes a reference for field studies, including in terms of its methodological choices.

After this introduction, we will present its theoretical references, following the methodological and data analysis procedures followed for CDA. Lastly, we will offer our final considerations.

THE MANAGERIAL DISCOURSE AND MECHANISMS OF SOCIAL CONTROL WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

The managerial discourse is organized and constructed to serve propaganda which seeks continuous and repetitive action on the part of the worker, in order to offer a euphemistic depiction of the work environment (DEJOURS, 2006). In other words this discourse may be spoken or written, unspoken (occult, implicit, tacit, imaginary or symbolic) (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007b), manipulated, impure or distorted (DEJOURS, 2006). It is understood that all of this discourse hides a symbolic network of domination relationships based on ideology and power (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007b), with the aim of social control (MOTTA, 1993).

To Motta (1993), this social control involves power and authority, and its universe is based on the essence of organizations themselves, starting with the cultural standards institutionalized by a company's leaders and elite. Fleming and Spicer (2014) understand power as the capacity to influence other actors based on political interests. Without it, an organization cannot function.

Greckhamer (2010) states that strategic organizational discourses are performance based and promote certain realities as well as establish the criteria of what constitutes the truth. They do this in such a manner that this reality appears to be inevitable and natural. It could be said that HEIs use countless discourses in their favor (SIQUEIRA, 2009), "under the profile (or mask) of a pragmatic, idealistic, omnipresent or good Samaritan organization" (IRIGARAY, CUNHA and HARTEN, 2016, p. 931). The imagination of professors becomes the main objective of management (GAULEJAC, 2014). Soon, "the object of control tends to change from being the body to being the mind" (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 124).

It's important to understand that, according to Pagès, Bonetti, Gaulejac et al. (1987), the production of a managerial discourse can go beyond an HEI's domains in terms of economics (conceded advantages), politics (conformity with principles and controlled autonomy), ideology (the legitimization of managerial practices and the hiding of objectives such as profit, domination and control) and psychology (managing emotions in favor of organizational domination of the individual's psyche). In addition, this also occurs on a cultural level when there is a fusion of the HEI's cultural values and those of the individual (SIQUEIRA, 2009). These domains are considered multidimensional mediation levels of human resource policies which act in opposition to the channeling of the energy of professors, favoring voluntary servitude and free adherence to proposed ideas (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987).

There are countless mechanisms used for the promotion – manipulation – of this discourse. Alvesson and Willmott (2002) consider the regulation of identity to be a modality that is more and more important to organizational control. Enriquez (2001) identifies some of these mechanisms as "identification", which makes it possible for each member of the HEI to feel a part of it; "indoctrination", which is an attempt by the HEI to block certain desires from provoking ruptures with it; "repression", which is installed when indoctrination is not sufficient for the groups which are the authors of the evil that circulates; "denial" as a mode of social regulation when things are observed but denied even though reality confirms their existence.

The mechanism of total identification or expression of confidence – through love – presents itself in two ways: fascination and seduction (ENRIQUEZ, 1990). Fascination is close to hypnosis, "what is at stake is the possibility that men have lost themselves in a *being* and *find themselves* in it" (ENRIQUEZ, 1990, p. 286, author's italics). Thus, "in seduction what is at stake is something else. Seduction resides in appearances and the game of appearances" (ENRIQUEZ, 1990, p. 286).

Eckman (2013) states that management practices and human resources management explore the seductive effects of the domination of subjectivity – "emotional" technologies, vocabularies and tendencies, but also disciplinary and fantasy technologies (of desire, identification and the anxiety of identity formation). Therefore, through these mechanisms, HEIs "succeed in imposing their culture in a subtle manner and dominating the individual's subconsciousness" (SIQUEIRA, 2009, p. 83).

In considering the subtle influence of this behavior, Onuma, Zwick and Brito (2015) argue that it is, in fact, the best way to wield power and ensure obedience to the capitalist system. There is also a subtle influence in the expression of confidence in work relationships between managers and professors, observed by Zanini and Migueles (2014) as a mediator of performance from an economic perspective.

Moreover, there is also organizational control (through the bureaucratic machine) of results (incentives for economic competition), saturation (a single text repeated indefinitely), and dissuasion (installation of an intervention device) (ENRIQUEZ, 1990). In this sense, Tragtenberg (1979) states that "school administration" is nothing more than the application of an administration system to a school and putting Taylor's theories into practice, with professors treated as "productive workers" (BRUNO, 2011).

MANAGERIALIST IDEOLOGY AND SUBJECTIVITY

The contemporary organizational environment is marked by the intensification of the "managerialist" ideology (GAULEJAC, 2007), which utilizes discourses of efficiency and effectiveness in order to create a false neutrality of management (TONON and GRISCI, 2015). This model introduces instability, ruptures, precariousness and insecurity to the working relationships established between managers and professors. It contemplates the emergence of new forms of (hourly) work for professors (MANCEBO, SILVA JUNIOR, LÉDA, 2016), as well as new forms of management (GAULEJAC, 2007).

This ideology tends to encourage performance, quality, effectiveness and competition (GAULEJAC, 2007). It requires a new professional profile from a professor, one that is more flexible, multitasking, and adaptive, as well as reactive to a routine which is not exclusive to an HEI (GAULEJAC, 2007). As human capital, professors are measured quantitatively based on their output (scientific production) and are accompanied by managers "to evaluate their work and register their aspirations and complaints" (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987, p. 100). They become responsible for their own realization and career based on the propagation of imaginary success (GAULEJAC, 2007), which seeks excellence and overcoming obstacles as primordial factors (FREITAS, 2000). In this manner, they are practically forced to adopt individualism, which has the powerful effect of breaking collective labor agreements, cooperation and solidarity (DEJOURS and DERANTY, 2010).

An HEI tends to present itself as the best HEI to work for (SIQUEIRA, 2009), as being responsible for a "noble mission" (FREITAS, 2000), in order to seduce and kidnap professors and managers, to the point at which they lose themselves (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007a), giving their bodies and souls to their requests, but they do not do this for money, because speaking of profit/money is taboo, that "makes companies distance themselves from the real aspects and objectives and strengthens their symbolic and emotional dimensions" (IRIGARAY, CUNHA and HARTEN, 2016, p. 931).

When subjected to these managerialist tendencies, "professional burnout, stress, and suffering at work become banal" (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 32). As a result of this, countless implications (conflicts, problems, pressures and suffering) affect the individuals who exercise managerial roles in HEIs, due to their being subjected to the glamorization of the executive world (TONON and GRISCI, 2015).

In this sense, McCabe (2014) affirms that the dark side of organizations has become an integral characteristic of their everyday lives, which tend to present managers as people who exercise power over their subordinates who are seen as victims. On the other hand, this reinforces the idea that it is important to identify that managers are also victims of a flawed and contradictory work regime, or in other words, the "dark side".

Finally, management is performed by people with their own histories, desires, aspirations, anguish, families and emotions (GAULEJAC, 2014). This occurs to such an extent that the subjective dimension of work in their lives interferes with their intellectual construction, discoveries and production (LHUILIER, 2005). Ardoino and Barus-Michel (2005, p. 204) mention that "*subjectivity* is a natural attribute that is not exhausted, it consists of states of consciousness, an 'experience' in which effects and imagination are largely preponderant, at the cost of objectivity". In this way, work leads managers to create, manifest and recognize their singularity through their practices (LHUILIER, 2005).

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

This article is of a qualitative and exploratory-descriptive nature, and is based on a study of 12 managers in three private HEIs (four managers in each HEI) in a city in the Brazilian state of Minas Gerais. These seven women and five men are denoted for analysis purposes as: Interviewee 1, Interviewee 2 [...] Interviewee 12.

Most of these managers are between the ages of 40 and 49, have advanced degrees, have worked for between 10 and 19 years at an HEI, with one to nine of those years as a manager. Most of them had experience as professors and managers before they assumed a management role in their current HEI. The total duration of the interviews was 11 hours and 54 minutes.

The city selected has a population of approximately 400 thousand inhabitants. It is an important university center in the region with a wide variety of majors in many different disciplines which attracts students from all over the country. The city is a center of higher education within the state and the country as well as private initiative. Within this context, the selection of the three HEIs was made intentionally because they offered the largest number of in-person majors approved by the Ministry of Education, which signals a possible competition between professors and students. All three of these HEIs are for-profit institutions, which offer more than 15 majors (in-person) and have more than 5 thousand students and more than 500 employees.

The interview was utilized as the data collection technique, based on a semi-structured in-depth script. These interviews were transcribed in their entirety (*ipsis litteris*) with help from the free computer program *Express Scribe Transcription*. To analyze the data in terms of critical points in the discourses of these managers, we adopted CDA inspired by the theoretical-methodological assertions of Fairclough (2016), together with a mode of inductive analysis from the perspective of Clinical Sociology (CS). This consists of listening to the subjects in their emotional and social dimensions in order to uncover the determinants of their behavior, mainly in terms of their work environment (GAULEJAC, 2014).

The originality of Fairclough's approach (2005, 2016), which determined the selection of CDA for this study, considers discourse to be molded by social structure as well as being part of social structure, in the light of the conception of the organization as an interactive realization of managerial discourse. In this way, CDA should be oriented in a three dimensional manner, because any "discursive event (that is any example of a discourse) is considered simultaneously to be a text, a practical discursive example and an example of social practice" (FAIRCLOUGH, 2016, p. 22). In terms of a textual analysis, which can

also be termed a *description*, four criteria were prioritized based on this author's work, in order to identify possible ideological structures within the discourse:

1. **Vocabulary:** analysis of the choice of vocabulary and of the meaning of its words and metaphors;
2. **Grammar:** analysis of the transitivity (direct and indirect), of voices (active and passive), of the degree of nominalization (converting processes into names), and of its modalities (affinity relationships between producers and propositions);
3. **Cohesion:** analysis of repetitions, emphases made, the use of synonyms (meaning of a common semantic field), the use of conjunctions (therefore, however, but...), the use of reference and substitution mechanisms (pronouns, articles...);
4. **Textual structure:** analysis of the manner and order in which the elements or episodes are combined.

In terms of the analysis of the practical discourse dimension, which involves the concepts of "text" and "interaction", three criteria were prioritized based on this same author in order to identify clues and resources used by managers in interpreting social realities:

1. **Force of statements (also related to textual analysis):** an act or acts of speaking (giving an order, asking a question, threatening, promising), politeness (amelioration strategy of acts of speaking), *ethos* (behavior/construction of self);
2. **Coherence of the texts (also related to textual analysis):** infer relationships in the meaning of the text as a whole in light of ideological functions of coherence;
3. **Intertextuality:** identification of what the discourse can assimilate, contradict, echo ironically and so on, based on the relationships that the text establishes with other texts.

Finally, we seek to evaluate, based on Fairclough (2016), the analysis of social practice which deals with the organizational circumstances of the discursive event, or in other words:

1. How social practices construct themselves and are constructed by discursive practices based on elements of the social lives of the managers;
2. In what ways are the texts (manager discourses professed during the interviews) cloaked in ideology, control and power;
3. The social effects that the texts suggest.

It should be noted that greater emphasis was given to the analysis of discursive and social practices (FAIRCLOUGH, 2016). The results were analyzed based on three categories: the production of the discourse, the promotion of the discourse, and the symbology and subjectivity of the work displayed by the managers.

ANALYSIS OF THE PRODUCTION OF THE DISCOURSE

The analysis of the production of the discourse category seeks to indicate the influence of characteristics of managerialist power in the economic, political, ideological, psychological (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987) and cultural (GAULEJAC, 2007) domains in the discursive formations of HEI managers. It also analyzes indications of the influence of other individuals in this production.

Given that the "time of hiring" is the first contact established by discourse between managers and professors, we will begin the discussion of this section with the following discourse production:

> [...] *at the time of hiring, I speak with each professor that I have hired and say "Look, at the moment I am the person who is hiring you, and from now on the one who is going to fire you is YOU. So I'm only going to fire you if you give me a reason. I'm going to fire you if you haven't been a good professor, if you haven't been dedicated, if you haven't been committed, so it won't be me who's firing you, it will be you who is leaving. So to tell the truth, I am only here to hire you. Being fired in reality is just the communication that you have not performed well. I won't be the one who fires you"* (Interviewee 7).

Interviewee 7 narrates a social practice based on conversational genre, using informal vocabulary in order to establish social relationships of partnership and reliability with the future professor at the moment of hiring, omitting the role that domination and submission play in subtly influencing behavior (ONUMA, ZWICK and BRITO, 2015). They act in this way because they are conscious of the fact that confidence is essential to performance (ZANINI and MIGUELES, 2014), which is understood

here as the propaganda of managerialist power within an HEI. The force of the statements used to reach the imagination of the professor is in the promise of hiring – "*I am the one who is hiring you*" – and in the promise not to fire the professor – "*I won't be the one who fires you*". The professor is asked: "*to try*", "*to be good*", "*to be dedicated*" and "*to be committed*". Individualism (DEJOURS and DERANTY, 2010) and the cult of excellence and performance (FREITAS, 2000) are characteristics of managerialist power propagated by making professors exclusively responsible for their permanence and careers at the HEI (GAULEJAC, 2007) – "*from now on the one who is going to fire you is YOU*". In this manner, the manager annuls the managerial role in firing and tempers the firing with the expression "just the communication that you have not performed well" (MANCEBO, SILVA JUNIOR and LÉDA, 2016). As a result, the managerialist *ethos* in their behavior is strong and only reinforces their positions of command within the HEI (MOTTA, 1993). This type of managerial discourse tends, through an emphasis on causality – "*if you don't*" – to involve the professor in voluntary servitude to the organization and willing adherence to what is proposed at the time of hiring (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987). In this way, we can perceive a relationship based on ideology and discursive power, which has the social effect of blaming the professor for not fulfilling the work "contract" (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007b).

The social practice of managers is also signaled by this speech:

> [...] *he isn't viewed as much as monitored, isn't he? In fact, I try to act like, "Look, you're my partner in this course of study, I need you, if you don't fulfill your duties, the others won't either, and what will I say? So everyone will be penalized"* (Interviewee 5).

The pronoun "*he*" substitutes the figure of the professor in this passage, "*isn't viewed as much as monitored*" and is the "*partner in this course of study*". In reality, "*monitored*" comes from *monitor*, which is equivalent to *being watched* (nominalization as a discursive resource) and "*partner*" places the professor as the accomplice of the manager. That is, this is a subtle expression of confidence to stimulate performance (ZANINI and MIGUELES, 2014). It is a strategy of using the ideological naturalization of the idea that there is no control over the professor's work (BRUNO, 2011) in order to persuade this person to be a "model" for others in the HEI (FREITAS, 2000), given that, under the effect of causality and the combination of episodes in this textual structure, if a person "*does not fulfill*", one's duties, "*the others will do the same thing*" and "*that way everyone will be penalized*". Thus as a social effect, the individual professor is being made responsible for the collective performance of the HEI (DEJOURS and DERANTY, 2010).

In a similar manner, Interviewee 1 affirms that the culture of the HEI should serve as a "bible" (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987) for professors, "*in a natural manner*" in order for them to act in the way that the managers wish, "*without effort, WITHOUT A MANUAL*", believing that this is the "*only way for things to get done*", so that "*no one needs to stand behind you*", because "*we know that you will give it your best effort*". The choice of the vocabulary ("*natural*" and "*only way*") reinforces the ideological naturalization of the construction of a reality that appears to be inevitable within the HEI (GRECKHAMER, 2010) to achieve psychic control (GAULEJAC, 2007). Here it proposes a culture of controlled autonomy (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987), in which professors need to always do their best (FREITAS, 2000). The managerialist *ethos* can be perceived as an assertive modality of discourse (FAIRCLOUGH, 2016) when Interviewee 1 says: "*we know that you will do your best*". Belief here is synonymous with political power and interest (FLEMING and SPICER, 2014).

The HEI's social nature (the educational/formative function of the HEI) and social responsibility appear in the discursive strategies that symbolize work as "a noble mission" (FREITAS, 2000), as expressed in these statements:

> [...] *it's as if they're reminding us as professors and directors that we have this mission, that we have this function within the institution "who we are", you know? "what are we creating?", "what are we constructing", "what are we expecting outside?"* (Interviewee 3).

> [...] *commitment is a function of what he understands to be an organizational benefit, like a social responsibility policy, it's along these lines that we try to capture this professor* (Interviewee 5).

Possibly, hidden within the statement of Interviewee 3 are the owners of the HEI – subjects – who, intertextually, have their voice manifested by statements that echo the noble "mission" and "function" that "professors and directors" have "within the institution" (FREITAS, 2000). The vocabulary chosen for this is full of expressions such as "*who we are*", "*what are we creating*", "*constructing,*" "*expecting outside*", which thus symbolize strategies of seduction and fascination (ENRIQUEZ, 1990) and psychological mobilization of the imagination of these individuals (GAULEJAC, 2007). The managerial discourse explores

the seductive effects of domination, of subjectivity and individual fantasies (ECKMAN, 2013). Interviewee 5 on the other hand seeks intertextually with the mathematics of a "function" – a metaphor – that is directly proportional to a "*social responsibility policy*" and "*commitment*", or in other words, the greater the "*organizational benefit*" offered as a "*social responsibility policy*" by the HEI, the greater the commitment that tends to be displayed by professors in relation to their work. Control through love (ENRIQUEZ, 1990) is the proposal of a common social project (GAULEJAC, 2007) which is woven between the lines of these productions which have been manipulated in an impure and distorted manner (DEJOURS, 2006).

It may be perceived that various advantages have been conceded to capture the professor, based on mediation (reward) mechanisms, as postulated by Pagès, Bonetti, Gaulejac et al. (1987), expressed through the use of synonyms ("*incentives*", "*help*", "*fulfilling*") in the managerial discourse. For example:

> [...] *every time in relation to the professor is distinctive* (Interviewee 8).
>
> [...] *many people have gone through college without paying a dime* (Interviewee 10).
>
> [...] *have incentives to participate in external events* (Interviewee 5).
>
> [...] *help for specialization degrees* (Interviewee 1).
>
> [...] *in reaaallity everything is POSSSIBBLE and what we ask of our professors, we can provide, you know? It's the small details, you know?"* (Interviewee 1).

In this last statement, "*small*" describes "*details*", that in truth are not of little importance, and reverberate in terms of the intensity of the mediation strategies.

We can observe the influence of the owners/board/executive directors (through substitution mechanisms such as the pronouns "he" or "they") in the discursive production of managers based on the tasks that they request. "*Order in the house*" (Interviewee 2), "*resolve some things*" (Interviewee 5), "*pass some information regarding some command, some instruction that has already been determined*" (Interviewee 3), "*they forward the guideline that they wish to convey, the indicator that they want*" (Interviewee 5), are some of these commands. "*Order*", "*instruction*", "*guideline*" and "*indicator*" are examples of vocabulary that announce the administrative principles that still rule in HEIs (TRAGTENBERG, 1979). These are the social effects of organizational and bureaucratic control as well as control over managers' results (ENRIQUEZ, 1990).

"*It's nothing distant, it's VEERRY close, it's very close to us*" (Interviewee 3) and "*the employees provide feedback, and I present feedback to them in meetings*" (Interviewee 9) are discursive formations that indicate through the tone of voice ("*VEERRY*"), of location ("*close*") and the order of events (textual structure of Interviewee 9), the link between managers and the owners/ board/executive directors. The social expression of ideological domination and power (FARIA and MENEGHETTI, 2007b), mainly by the monitoring of the professors' work (euphemistically termed "*employees*") by managers (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987). Here the cycle of social control, of owners over managers, and managers over professors, closes (MOTTA, 1993), remembering that the dark side of organizations is exercised by both of these parties (MCCABE, 2014).

ANALYSIS OF THE PROMOTION OF DISCOURSE

This analysis category seeks to learn the mechanisms such as identification, indoctrination, repression and denial (ENRIQUEZ, 2001) and mediation (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987) present in the discursive formations of managers in order to influence the individual and collective behavior of the HEI professors. Thus we begin the discussion with the following statement:

> [...] *the professor BECOMES, BECOMES part of the company, you understand? So this person IS NOT in the company, he IS the company, isn't he? And maybe that, you know? That's what makes them spend so much time inside here* (Interviewee 1).

Interviewee 1 adopts a very strong tone of voice when pronouncing the words "*BECOMES*" and "*IS NOT*", emphasizing the main argument – the professor "*IS the company*". You could say, based on the context of this interview, that the pronoun "*he*" is substituting the subject "professor". The verb "to become", conjugated in the present indicative gives the idea of going from one state to another, of movement. This confers organizational identity to the professor, personified as the company – "*he IS the company, isn't he?*" The way in which the word "*maybe*" is used is a resource to bring them closer to subjectivity to not make it

clear that the fusion of the identity (and cultural values) of the professor with the HEI is a key requirement of his remaining on the job (SIQUEIRA, 2009). The regulation of identity (ALVESSON and WILLMOTT, 2002) is revealed here as a social effect.

This search for the subjective identification of the individual is reinforced by the discursive promotion of the ideal of perfection (deification) of the HEI (GAULEJAC, 2007). There are managers who profess the "the best companies to work for" discourse (SIQUEIRA, 2009), presenting the HEI as a "*model for Brazil*" (Interviewee 9). Interviewee 10 asserts "*pride in working here, to see this institution as big as it is*"*.* In many statements, what is most visible is the valuing of the HEI name and its institutional brand as something important to its "*good image and they take pride, you know, in being able to write that they work at* [HEI name] *on their resume*" (Interviewee 11), "*so people want to go there. People want this name, 'I want to be a child of* [HEI name]*, you know?*" (Interviewee 7). As expressed by Gaulejac (2007), the managerialist ideal proposes that the name of the company inspires "things such as 'pride and confidence.'"

On the other hand, there is discursive promotion to not allow certain desires to emerge which may provoke a rupture with the HEI (ENRIQUEZ, 2001), such as the following:

> [...] *in life in general 70% is common sense and 30% is technique, you know? In anything, even surgery.*
> *So if we use this common sense, when to pull and when to release the strings, you maintain a balance,*
> *you see?* (Interviewee 1).

Interviewee 1 describes metaphorically the indoctrination of how "*to pull*" and "*release the strings*", which is even denominated *"common sense"* to maintain organizational "control" – a term hidden by the word "*balance*". In this way, the managerialist *ethos* shows its force by not being needed as a mode of control by dissuasion, in order to avoid transgressions and maintain order in the HEI (ENRIQUEZ, 1990, 2001). This is a clear example of the false neutrality of management (TONON and GRISCI, 2015).

Repression in the promotion of the discourse to professors that do not behave in the expected manner, which is repeated infinitely in the HEI, appears in an attenuated mode, personifying the HEI as a "mother", under the profile (or mask) of a "good Samaritan" (IRIGARAY, CUNHA, HARTEN, 2016, p. 931).

> I say that here, that [name of HEI], *is very much like a mother, and we need to take care of her, right?*
> *It's just with a professor, or even an employee, "let's try another approach?" "let's try this way?", "let's*
> *try this", I ask them to talk and when we can't find any other alternative, it's time to let the person go,*
> *isn't it?* (Interviewee 3).

Note the use of the plural, using and emphasizing the repetition of "*let's*"*,* indicates a collective decision or an attempt to take the responsibility for firing from the manager, given that the manager narrates ("*I say that here*") the control process of saturation – the emerging social effect – in terms of the reality of the HEI (ENRIQUEZ, 1990, 2001).

The denial of the managers' discursive promotion flees reality in the exclusive search for pleasure. This can be confirmed by the statements that deny the difficulties and challenges of everyday work, to cover up any possible disorder, in accordance with what Greckhamer (2010) says about discourses being performed to promulgate certain realities, such as:

> [...] *the university it's like this, I can't even see where it can be improved, you know? Unless you create*
> *something superfluous* (Interviewee 7).

> [...] *in general, the work conditions are very good; everything here is very well taken care of* (Interviewee 12).

In these discursive formations, a curtain is used to hide the reality of the workplace (DEJOURS, 2006):

> I can't talk about IDEALS as such, but they're very close to ideals, aren't they? (Interviewee 2)

This last example shows that the manager is not firm in this argument, even when using a strong voice ("*IDEALS*"). This manager admits the existence of a work contradiction through the use of the adverse conjunction "*but*" (ENRIQUEZ, 1990, 2001).

We can verify that in the discursive promotion of the managers, they need to mediate privileges to get the professors engaged. For example:

> [...] *here's the resource, here's everything you need to do this. So the professor is inspired, isn't he?* (Interviewee 7).

> [...] *if the professor publishes two articles in a B5 magazine he receives two thousand* (Interviewee 4).

> [...] *you can't demand performance from professors if you don't pay them properly* (Interviewee 1).

> [...] *and I think that's where it comes in, doesn't it? It's the view of business leaders, isn't it? If I don't provide the proper conditions, I can't expect something spectacular from my subject* (Interviewee 4) .

This type of discourse is characteristic of the concession of privileges to the detriment of dedication to work, relying on overall measurement processes (PAGÈS, BONETTI, GAULEJAC et al., 1987) as a way to guarantee social control within the HEI (MOTTA, 1993), given that professors are considered here to be productive workers (BRUNO, 2011) who can possibly be measured by the quantity of products that they manage to deliver (GAULEJAC, 2007).

ANALYSIS OF THE SYMBOLOGY AND SUBJECTIVITY OF MANAGERS' WORK

This category of analysis seeks discursive formations that indicate symbolic aspects – the attribution of a meaning to a word – related to work and the HEI. They also seek to understand how managers make work subjective, the managerial role and the conditions within which they work.

In these statements, symbology can be perceived through the managers' use of adjectives which are positive (for the most part), in relation to work as well as the institution, as a way to value them without revealing that they are working in a context that is permeated by the HEI's managerialist ideology. In terms of work, they symbolize it with words such as: "*excellent*" (Interviewee 1), "*essential*" (Interviewee 2), "*quality and I'd even use improvement instead*" (Interviewee 9) and "*innovative*" (Interviewee 12). In relation to the institution the words used were: "*great*" (Interviewee 1), "*driver*" (Interviewee 5), "*spectacular*" (Interviewee 7), "*successful organization*" (Interviewee 10) and "*a company of excellence*" (Interviewee 6). This indicates the social effect of glamorizing the executive world (TONON and GRISCI, 2015).

At one moment work helps "*construct life*" (Interviewee 11) and "*escape craziness*" (Interviewee 11), and is also a synonym for "*liberation*" (Interviewee 5). At another, its importance is in "*the recognition that the institution and/or people receive*" for the work performed (Interviewee 3), which makes managers feels like active subjects. There are also moments in which "*you don't see life passing, you don't grow old*" because you're working (Interviewee 1). There also exist moments in which work allows you "*to act in other peoples' lives*" (Interviewee 1). This work is also an escape from the "*empty nest*" (Interviewee 6), and also energy for those who "*love*" to work, or better, are *workaholics* – addicted to work (Interviewee 7). These discursive formations make up a paradoxical universe of work (GAULEJAC, 2007), and also manifest the singularity of these managers (LHUILIER, 2005).

The managerial role has been made subjective with expressions of their flexibility, multitasking, adaptability and reactive qualities (GAULEJAC, 2007). As an example:

> [...] *the issue is managing a company of this size, isn't it? It takes so much time, because you have to stay focused, many times you, it appears that you aren't doing anything, but you have to be focused on small details the entire time, because we've already arrived at a degree of organization that we have today where you are regulating small details the entire time, because the institution is already all set* (Interviewee 1).

This statement expresses how much this manager is devoted to the organization. After all, managerial work consists of controlling "*small details the entire time*". This demands countless abilities and availability from the manager "*the entire time*" in favor of the needs of the HEI. The way in which one narrates one's activities reveals the particular style of a manager, "*being attentive*", being "*focused*", controlling "*small details*". When the interviewee spoke about "*regulating small details the entire time*", he also made gestures as if taking care of screws, which recalls intertextually the work performed in factories (TAYLOR, 1980).

At this point, the narratives about work conditions reveal that managers work under pressure and take their work home with them, and also have trouble letting go of work. For example:

> [...] *we're accustomed to taking a lot of work home with us in our heads, aren't we? Without mentioning that I've already brought work home myself, but today I manage to get out of here and forget about work more, unless when it's something small and I feel like "God, I have to resolve this, God I have to"* (Interviewee 11).

In this statement, Interviewee 11 uses the word "*accustomed*", which has the sense of repeating to inform us that she takes "*a lot of work home in his head*". This means that your time with your family is reduced, due to your continuing to think about work. This manager uses an element of cohesion – "*unless*" – which in being linked to prayers, uses the intention of excluding something that has previously been said, or in other words, she cannot stop thinking about work, because it seems to be "*something small*", that makes her reflect in her narrative voice – intertextuality – "*God, I have to resolve this, God I have to*". The repetition of the interjection "*God*" ratifies how much she is preoccupied with the work she has to do.

As a contradiction, managers tend to treat these as natural conditions which are part of the job, as we can tell from this statement:

> [...] *pressure, it's inherent, isn't it [pause] in what you do, right? I think the higher the position, the greater the pressure, but it's a normal controlled pressure* (Interviewee 4).

For managers, this may be understood as a "normality", as a "banality of evil", for managers who "become zealous collaborators in a system that functions through an organization which is regulated by, and makes deliberations in accordance with lies and injustice" (DEJOURS, 2006, p. 76).

The social effect of this can be observed in this statement:

> [...] *it's IMPOSSIBLE to have professional success and personal success. You can do WELL professionally and do WELL in your personal life. Success you can only achieve in one or the other; there's no way. In fact, I've had this problem with my family and I consider myself to be a workaholic and I love what I do, and to tell the truth, I haven't been able to do it. Today I have my children, I just got separated [x] days ago* (Interviewee 7).

In this excerpt, Interviewee 7 asserts with a strong tone of voice that "*it is IMPOSSIBLE to be successful professionally and personally*" and even repeats the word "*success*" at the end of the statement, to ratify that it is impossible to have "*success*" in both. He considers himself to be "*a workaholic*" who loves what he does. A *workaholic* is someone addicted to work, but he soon justifies this addiction with love – "*I love what I do*". This is why he couldn't continue with his family, but could continue to work. Based on the differentiation that he makes between "*having success*" and "*doing WELL*" professionally, we can say that Interviewee 7 made space for excellence in his career (FREITAS, 2000). The effects of this have been felt in both his personal and social lives. Thus, he agrees with Dejours and Deranty (2010) when he affirms that work can generate not only pleasure but also suffering.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This article has analyzed and interpreted, in the light of CDA, the managerial discourse of 12 managers of professors from three private HEIs, and has clarified that the production of the managerial discourse is pervaded by characteristics of managerialist power in ideological, cultural, political, psychological and economic domains, under the influence of the owners/board/executive directors of HEIs.

The mechanisms of discursive promotion are in the "mythic and ideological" force – of mediation – to mobilize the psychology of the professors, feeding their imagination of success and making them responsible for their achievements. In addition to being seen as a partner, professors are considered examples for others in terms of work, and are required to act in conformity with the HEI's culture based on the principles of controlled autonomy and vigilance, as a way to legitimize the control, domination and power of these HEIs. It should be emphasized that this social control is articulated in their objective and subjective processes in order to involve them in all of its dimensions.

We have seen that managers make their work and HEIs subjective and symbolic to support them only through the lens of pleasure. However, soon afterward, they reveal that they work in a context that is permeated by managerialist ideology. We have been able to reveal the dark side of these organizations not only for professors, but for managers as well.

The main contribution of this study consists of its dissemination of a new critical way of looking at managerial discourses in private HEIs that often seek to hide their nature. It is hoped that this study will stimulate reflection on the part of both managers and professors, given that the assertive path to change begins with reflection (FAIRCLOUCH, 2016). We believe that the protocol we have used for CDA can also become an example for the realization of future studies. In addition, we would like to propose a research agenda featuring a CDA focused analysis of how partnership and confidential relationships can be mediated and propagated by HEI managerialist ideology.

REFERENCES

ALVESSON, M.; WILLMOTT, H. Identity regulation as organizational control: producing the appropriate individual. **Journal of Management Studies**, v. 3, n. 5, p. 619-644, 2002.

ARDOINO, J.; BARUS-MICHEL, J. Sujeito. In: BARUS-MICHEL, J.; ENRIQUEZ, E.; LÉVY, A. **Dicionário de psicossociologia**. Lisboa: Climepsi, 2005. p. 203-209.

BRUNO, L. Educação e desenvolvimento econômico no Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 16, n. 48, p. 545-562, 2011.

DEJOURS, C. Subjetividade, trabalho e ação. **Revista Produção**, v. 14, n. 3, p. 27-34, 2004.

DEJOURS, C. **A banalização da injustiça social**. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. FGV, 2006.

DEJOURS, C.; DERANTY, J.-P. The centrality of work. **Critical Horizons**, v. 11, n. 2, p. 167-180, 2010.

ECKMAN, S. Fantasies about work as limitless potential: how managers and employees seduce each other through dynamics of mutual recognition. **Human Relations**, v. 66, n. 9, p. 1159-1181, 2013.

ENRIQUEZ, E. **Da horda ao Estado**: psicanálise do vínculo social. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1990.

ENRIQUEZ, E. Instituições, poder e "desconhecimento". In: ARAÚJO, J. N.; CARRETEIRO, T. C. (Org.). **Cenários sociais e abordagem clínica**. Belo Horizonte: Fumec, 2001. p. 49-74.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. Discourse analysis in organization studies: the case for critical realism. **Organization Studies**, v. 26, n. 6, p. 915-939, 2005.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Discurso e mudança social.** Brasília, DF: UnB, 2016.

FARIA, J. H.; MENEGHETTI, F. K. Sequestro da subjetividade. In: FARIA, J. H. (Org.). **Análise crítica das teorias e práticas organizacionais.** São Paulo: Atlas, 2007a. p. 45-67.

FARIA, J. H.; MENEGHETTI, F. K. Discursos organizacionais. In: FARIA, J. H. (Org.). **Análise crítica das teorias e práticas organizacionais**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2007b. p. 119-141.

FLEMING, P.; SPICE, A. Power in management and organization science. **The Academy of Management Annals**, v. 8, n. 1, p. 237-298, 2014.

FREITAS, M. E. Contexto social e imaginário organizacional moderno. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 40, n. 2, p. 6-15, 2000.

GAULEJAC, V. **Gestão como doença social**: ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social. Aparecida, SP: Ideias & Letras, 2007.

GAULEJAC, V. Pour une sociologie clinique du travail. **La Nouvelle Revue du Travail**, n. 4, 2014.

GRECKHAMER, T. The stretch of strategic management discourse: a critical analysis. **Organization Studies**, v. 31, n. 7, p. 841-871, 2010.

IRIGARAY, H. A. R.; CUNHA, G. X.; HARTEN, B. A. Missão organizacional: o que a análise crítica do discurso revela? **Cadernos EBAPE.BR**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 14, n. 4, p. 920-933, 2016.

LHUILIER, D. Trabalho. In: BARUS-MICHEL, J.; ENRIQUEZ, E.; LÉVY, A. **Dicionário de psicossociologia.** Lisboa: Climepsi, 2005. p. 210-219.

MANCEBO, D.; SILVA JUNIOR, J. R.; LÉDA, D. B. O trabalho nas instituições de Educação Superior. **Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação**, v. 32, n. 3, p. 739-757, 2016.

MARTINS, C. B. Reconfiguring Higher Education in Brazil: the participation of private institutions. **Análise Social,** v. 208, n. 48, p. 622-658, 2013.

MCCABE, D. Light in the darkness? Managers in the back office of a Kafkaesque bank. **Organization Studies**, v. 35, n. 2, p. 255-278, 2014.

MOTTA, F. P. Controle social nas organizações. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 33, n. 5, p. 68-87, 1993.

ONUMA, F. M. S.; ZWICK, E.; BRITO, M. J. Ideologia gerencialista, poder e gestão de pessoas na administração pública e privada: uma interpretação sob a ótica da análise crítica do discurso. **Revista de Ciências da Administração**, v. 17, n. 42, p. 106-120, 2015.

PAGÈS, M. et al. **O poder das organizações**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.

SEVERINO, A. J. Expansão do Ensino Superior: contextos, desafios, possibilidades. **Revista da Avaliação da Educação Superior**, v. 14, n. 2, p. 253-266, 2009.

SIQUEIRA, M. V. S. **Gestão de pessoas e discurso organizacional**: crítica à relação indivíduo-empresa nas organizações contemporâneas. Curitiba: Juruá Editora, 2009.

TAYLOR, F. **Princípios da administração científica**. 7. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 1980.

TONON, L.; GRISCI, C. L. I. Gestão gerencialista e estilos de vida de executivos. **Revista de Administração Mackenzie**, v. 16, n. 1, p. 15-39, 2015.

TRAGTENBERG, M. Administração, poder e ideologia. In: REZENDE, A. M. (Org.). **Iniciação teórica e prática às ciências da educação**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1979. p. 165-192.

ZANINI, M. T. F.; MIGUELES, C. P. O papel mediador entre confiança e desempenho organizacional. **Revista de Administração**, v. 49, n. 1, p. 45-58, 2014.

Bárbara Novaes Medeiros

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2262-8208

Completing a PhD in Administration at the University of Brasília (UNB), Brasília – DF, Brazil. E-mail: barbaranovaesmedeiros@hotmail.com

Marcus Vinicius Soares Siqueira

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4787-7016

Post-Doctorate in Clinical Sociology at the Laboratory of Social Change – Paris VII; Professor in the Graduate Program of Administration at the University of Brasília, Brasília – DF, Brazil. E-mail: marc-vs@uol.com.br