

## APPENDIX 1 – GLOSSARY

**Alternative** organising refers to ways of co-ordinating services, products and other forms of social benefits which do not rely on state or capitalist forms of ownership, hierarchies and management (Barin-Cruz et al 2017:322). Although the term can include a wide range of civil societies, charities, voluntary groups, social movements, mutuals, co-operatives or social enterprises, I focus on models using different forms of collective ownership and non-managerial ways of organising. Following Barin-Cruz et al (2017) and Esper et al (2017) I retain a broad definition of alternative without restrictive criteria. For example, unlike open networks and other forms of common ownership, mutuals control intangible knowledge by defining them as member goods. They lock in knowledge assets by locking out the private-sector. For Parker et al (2014:23), alternative organisations should not be narrowly defined but embody the principles of autonomy (and the rejection of coercion), solidarity (and the promotion of collective mechanisms to decide and act) and positive notions of freedom (rather than focus solely on freedom from hierarchy).

**Collective-ownership** refers to property owned jointly by agreement by more than one individual and can be in non-state forms whereas **common-ownership** normally denotes open access to anyone and is sometimes referred to as non-ownership. See Kelly and Hanna (2019:5-7) for an overview of the different non-private ownership models.

**Community healthcare** are non-acute NHS services outside hospital settings which do not include GP or primary care. Services are often delivered in smaller community hospitals, in the patient's own home and from a number of clinics, health centres and GP surgeries. All four case studies employ a wide variety of professional groups, including District Nurses, Learning Disabilities Staff, Allied Health Professionals (Therapists including Occupational, Physio, Speech and Language, Podiatry) Medical Doctors, Care Workers and Specialist Nurses plus all the staff who deliver care in day care and supported employment settings.

**Cooperative** can be defined as autonomous association of persons united to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs and aspirations through jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprises. Commonly they are enshrined by meeting the seven cooperative values and principles (voluntary and open membership, democratic member control, member economic participation, autonomy and dependent, education training and information, cooperation among cooperatives and concern for the community). ([www.uk.coop/the-hive/is-a-co-op-right-for-you/getting-started/co-op-movement/values-principles](http://www.uk.coop/the-hive/is-a-co-op-right-for-you/getting-started/co-op-movement/values-principles)). Accessed 12/05/19.

**Co-option** - how management (which needs to achieve efficient production and control) secure commitment, creativity and innovation from staff. Co-option is an attempt by management to share responsibility rather than share power, giving the illusion of change but keeping things the same and under control. Co-option is not authentic staff control, is it how management resist pressure from staff by bringing 'you in' (Hjorth 2016:299).

**Co-ordination** is a neutral term for organising people and resources to achieve ends or facilitate valuable means as opposed to management which is often considered to be coordination plus hierarchy. Coordination is often used interchangeably with organisation in contrast to the pejorative term management.

**Control systems** - All organising involves control in some form as it implies sufficient unity of purpose and integration of diverse activities. Although problems caused by partially divergent individual interests interfering with collective goals are inevitable, this does not determine the type and form control systems used. Management control systems are specific tools of managerialism; the use of techniques and mechanisms to direct, measure, commodify, survey and test the action of staff.

**De-naturalisation** - In terms of identifying the critical value of alternative models and whether more authentic forms of staff control exists two concepts are relevant, de-naturalisation and prefiguration. The former denotes a radical confronting of perceived common-sense ways of

thinking about management and organising. For example, are employees able to challenge assumptions about staff being accountable to managers and owners? Do management maintain their monopoly of specialist skills, roles and knowledge? Are new forms of organising more localised, democratic and less-hierarchical? (Also see Prefiguration below).

**Employee-ownership** is a form of collective and social-ownership where there is a group of staff who retain and control productive means and share the proceeds. Employee-ownership is an exclusive form of ownership and not common ownership. Staff have significant, equal and controlling rights over the formation of strategies; the distribution of surpluses/benefits and the disposal of assets (Birchall 2012:263, Cumbers 2012:3-8). Employee-ownership can also be indirect (with equity held in Trust which acts on behalf of workers) and direct (where employees are shareholders with no intermediaries).

**Hierarchy** refers to the vertical distribution of authority among positions such that each is subordinate to another. For mainstream scholars it is unavoidable *common-sense*; a necessary component in all social coordination. This is based on a belief in the natural tendency towards social stratification (even in theoretically democratic organisations) and the extraordinary capacity of hierarchism and division of labour to produce efficiency.

**Management prerogative** refers to the mainstream view that managers have the legitimate power not only to define, control and monitor human, physical and capital resources but to do so justifiably. Management prerogative is therefore about their levels of privilege discretion (and is not fixed) because invariably a vacuum of decision-making in organisations will be filled by those called ‘managers’ (or self-titled ‘doers’ and ‘leaders’).

**Operational and organisational work** - An important distinction is made between staff involvement in *operational* work (how individual and team work is planned and scheduled, labour is divided to general and specialised tasks, physical settings, ergonomics and how services monitored) and *organisational-wide* issues such as administration separate to production, strategic

decision-making and investment, departmental structure and surplus distribution (Fernandez, Marti and Farchi 2017:217, Whyte and Blasi 1982:150). The former is closely linked to ‘day-to-day activities’ (Heras-Saizarborria 2014:645) and front-line ‘street-level’ clinical care (McCann, Granter, Hyde and Hassard 2013:773). Moreover, power over operations is not only crucial to staff perceptions of control but also to notions of self-organising teams with the discretion to direct their work without supervision (Lyness, Gornick, Stone and Grotto 2012:1023).

**Organisations and Organising** – The former is a noun (an entity), the latter a verb, the process of collecting, framing and ordering activities that occasionally, but by no means always, results in semi-objects called organisations. Hatch (2011:10) distinguishes between being and becoming which I have reproduced modified with relevant examples below:

|                 | <b>BEING</b>  | <b>BECOMING</b>   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| <b>ABSTRACT</b> | <p><b>Organisation (an entity)</b><br/><i>‘A legal body called Red City’</i></p>  | <p><b>Organisation (the act of organising)</b><br/><i>‘We can improve the AGM with more organising’</i></p> |
| <b>EXAMPLES</b> | <p><b>Organisation (specific cases)</b><br/><i>‘Your employer, professional college and family are organisations’</i></p> | <p><b>Organising (a process)</b><br/><i>‘Let’s start to organise this project now’</i></p>                  |

**Post-structuralism** is defined as containing interpretivist epistemology stressing an anti-realist ontology, the importance of language in constructing meaning, power as a set of relationship rather than something possessed and individuals in a constant struggle for subjectivity in the face of managerial pressure to conform (Benozzo 2017). I acknowledge post-structuralism is a term subject to contestation (Fleetwood 2005:198).

**Power** - Although not exclusively Marxist, for many critical scholars power is a feature of owning the means of production and emancipation comes from its eradication, due to its inherently oppressive nature. Power is possessed by individuals, groups and systems and therefore legal ownership rights can change how power is used. Foucauldian perspectives see power and knowledge as mutually reinforcing, as the latter is synonymous with social relationship and therefore impossible to eradicate. If power shifts from one person to another and is always asymmetrical, it is without recourse to structural changes (such as the transfer of legal ownership to employees). I adopt a critical realist position and adapt the example used by O'Mahoney and Vincent (2014:8) to explain. Power is possessed simply due to its properties (the state has the power to spy), exercised (the state may attempt to spy) or actualised (the state may not actualise due to countervailing powers such as anti-spy software). A power requires a mechanism for the potential exercise of that power.

**Prefiguration** refers to contesting the existing domination of instrumental reasoning which sees value in work based only on its ability to produce more and better ends (Swain 2019:47). Prefiguring involves staff considering and imagining in advance the purpose of organising and deciding on organisational strategy (and therefore combines the ends of democracy with its democratic means). Staff control is about *how* to rule and for *what* purpose; not just deciding *who* rules and *how* productive means are best organised (Kokkanidis 2012:247).

**Private ownership** can signify ownership as both an individual (a single shareholder) and a group of shareholders. The key distinction of private ownership is shareholders are external to the organisation while equity is not distributed equally (and therefore decision-making rights restricted to the amount of equity owned). This form is referred to as the conventional-investor-owned capitalist firm (Storey et al 2014:626).

**Professionalism** denotes the competence or skill expected of a professional (i.e. obtaining its body of knowledge and securing the category of being a professional) and the practising of an

activity (being professional about work/labour). The concepts of professionalism, profession, and professionalization have received considerable and sometimes critical attention in sociology (Martimianakis, Maniate and Hodges 2009). Although disagreement continues they commonly refer to specific characteristics including: claims about public service, peer-group and self-regulation, a socially accepted knowledge base, code of ethics and non-market or bureaucratic values and logics, jurisdiction control over entry as well as individual autonomy over many aspects of operational work (such as scheduling, layout, patient/users interactions and definitions of performance). There are of course counter-examples and nuanced notions of 'true' professions; fully developed professions and pseudo or para-professionals. Martinmianakis et al (2009) maintained professionalism is central to the identity of clinicians, while the factors that constitute professionalism are not static as they evolve and modify over time in specific social settings and industries. Professionalism is also a nexus of power with dimensions of gender, race and class. For Kuhlman (2008:47) professionalism occupies an ambiguous space of being both officers and servants of the public. Therefore, professionalism is too complex a construct to be reduced to a simple checklist of individual characteristics and behaviours.

**Resistance** – A discussion and definition of resistance in organisational settings is contained in Section 2.7, however in this glossary I would like to explore in more detail the different dimensions and how they are used within the Thesis. In describing resistance scholars often use concepts such as intention, overt/covert, agency, articulation, recognition and scale (Raby 2005:157; Hollander and Einwohner 2004:542; Lloyd 2017:269; Mumby et al 2017:1164). I have assumed both intent and unintended acts are relevant because actions not intended to be resistance can be recognised as threatening by its targets and observers. Further, an employee may only become conscious of their criticisms as resistance post-event in the sense you learn how to resist (and that you are a resister) when you resist. Secondly, resistance must also have a sense of action and therefore agency as it does not just happen and cannot be a quality of an actor or a state of being (Paulson 2015). Thirdly, resistance does require actors to articulate their

claims, expressing what is being resisted and why even though it is accepted verbalisation may not be done openly (if intention is absence) or if resisters are fearful of losing their job because the target is management. Ultimately resistance does require a language that ultimately shapes collective action and shared experience. Fourthly, while recognition by targets and observers is important, I reject definitions that require acknowledgement as it is often unclear the type and level required and by whom.

I also acknowledge the scale of resistance is an important manifestation. Raby (2005:158) argued there are 'thick' and 'thin' forms, with the former representing opposition against wider, structural and societal patterns while the latter signifying micro-resistance to local practices. However, I do not judge a resistant act as inherently *good* because it is large-scale or *bad* because it is small and individual. As my focus is alternatives, it is the propensity to develop non-managerial replacements that is important rather than simple thick/thin binaries.

**Responsibility** in an organisational context is defined as a duty or obligation to satisfactorily perform or complete a task (often in conventional terms assigned by someone, or created by one's own promise or circumstances) that one must fulfil. Commitment to the organisation (or other staff-owners) is the strength of the feeling of responsibility that an employee has towards the mission of the organization or to others. McKenna (2012) argued accountability is always entangled with notions of responsibility citing Derrida's aporia of both concepts. For a conventional definition see <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/responsibility.html>).

**Retroduction** - Rather than the conventional mix of deduction and induction, retroduction involves a relentless focus on the underlying roots of a phenomena to unravel complication and ambiguity (which appear at the surface) and to concentrate on the reasons why something occurs (O'Mahoney and Vincent 2014:16). By reconstructing the conditions for the occurrence of an empirical outcome, retroduction can draw upon data previously unobserved or deemed irrelevant and distinguish between essential and incidental conditions. As a result, the problem of

understanding unobservable outcomes (and the reliance on truthful disclosure by participants of their intentions) is mitigated (Miller and Tsang 2010:148). For example, I used the accounts of non-owners and focus group members to challenge and compare self-justification by individuals.

**Social ownership** is defined not by who owns the equity, but the extent to which control over the enterprise is socially regulated (Davies 2009).

**State ownership** is the nation state (or state agencies) possessing the means of production, the direct employment of staff and legal decision-making powers in terms of assets and the distribution of benefits.

**Workplace democracy** is defined as the participation of (and control by) workers in organisation decision-making and benefits realisation at all levels of the enterprise and job. For Malleson (2013:86) economic democracy is wider than the workplace and includes the general idea that economic power should be accountable to those significantly affected by it.