

# **Taming the Tiger: Power and Resistance in Academic Supervision**

Xijie Fu

Department of Management and Marketing

Faculty of Business Administration

University of Macau

Macau S.A.R.

China

Email: [yc27023@um.edu.mo](mailto:yc27023@um.edu.mo)

&

Jacky Hong

Department of Management and Marketing

Faculty of Business Administration

University of Macau

Macau S.A.R.

China

Email: [fbaflh@um.edu.mo](mailto:fbaflh@um.edu.mo)

# **Taming the Tiger: Power and Resistance in Academic Supervision**

## **Abstract**

The marketization of universities has intensified supervisory power, yet little is known about how PhD students resist. This qualitative study investigates the covert resistance strategies of doctoral students navigating exploitative power dynamics. We introduce the concept of the "subversive apprentice identity," a mode of agency where students feign compliance while strategically accumulating academic capital to subvert dependency over time. This identity is enacted through two sets of practices—"scholastic shenanigans" and "guerrilla tactics"—which are deployed against specific supervisory power mechanisms. Our findings reconceptualize power and resistance as mutually constitutive and illuminate the sophisticated organizational "underlife" of academia. We challenge traditional resistance binaries, revealing how structurally weaker actors navigate precarity through calculated, veiled agency.

**Key Words:** Power and Resistance, Case Study, Qualitative Method

Word Count: 8033

# **Taming the Tiger: Power and Resistance in Academic Supervision**

*'Where there is power, there is resistance.'* (Foucault, 1980a, p. 95)

## **INTRODUCTION**

Universities worldwide have become increasingly marketized by embracing neoliberal policies that prioritize economic efficiency and measurable outputs (Bristow et al., 2017; Lorenz, 2012). This shift has fostered audit cultures, performance-based funding, and heightened emphasis on publications in prestigious "A journals" (Shapiro, 2017). According to Kumar et al (2024), such neoliberal practices not only deepen socio-economic inequalities but also solidify power imbalances in academic institutions, affecting marginalized groups and early-career researchers. Scholars often face the dilemma of balancing managerial demands with their professional identity, a tension that Alvesson and Szkuclarek (2021) describe as an "honorable surrender". The ripple effects of these systems changes have profoundly impacted doctoral supervision. What was once primarily a mentorship-based, collegial relationship has increasingly become transactional (Cohen & Baruch, 2022). Under pressure from institutional demands and individual career pressures, this transformation has led to a rise in supervisory exploitation (Cohen & Baruch, 2022; Meng et al., 2017; Martin, 2013).

Although extensive research has addressed how increased managerialism affects established academics (Aguinis et al., 2020; Callahan, 2018; Lorenz, 2012), relatively little is known about how PhD students navigate and respond to these pressures. Current studies often focus on 'decaf' resistance forms, such as identity work or humor (Contu, 2008; Hou & Feng, 2019; McCabe, 2023), or examine "hidden resistance" in the context of senior researchers (Rintamäki & Alvesson, 2023), overlooking how PhD students with less institutional power might employ covert resistance to manage the pressures they face.

This research gap is particularly concerning given the vulnerable position and limited bargaining power of PhD students since they often rely on supervisors for resource support and future career opportunities. As early-career researchers navigating both their professional development and institutional power structures, PhD students' experiences of and responses to power dynamics significantly impact not only their individual trajectories but also the future of academic culture and practice. Addressing these issues is essential for fostering equitable and inclusive academic environments.

This qualitative study examines how power and resistance co-exist within the knowledge production process, mentorship, and career progression in academic settings (Buchanan & Badham, 2008). In particular, our findings reveal how PhD students can employ subversive apprentice identity. We introduce the concept of "subversive apprentice identity" to capture how PhD students comply with supervisory demands on the surface while covertly resisting exploitative power dynamics. This identity emerges as students accumulate academic capital (skills, publications, networks) that enables future agency and gradual subversion of supervisory power. Our analysis identifies four distinct power mechanisms (standardization, prescription, supervision, and segregation) and two corresponding resistance strategies (scholastic shenanigans and guerrilla tactics).

This study offers two contributions to the field of organization studies. First, it reconceptualizes the conceptual relationships between power and resistance as mutually constitutive by developing a typology that maps specific resistance strategies to their corresponding forms of power. In this way, it extends existing power theories beyond a unilateral top-down approach (Fleming & Spicer, 2014). We achieve this by developing a typology of "subversive apprentice identity" that explicitly maps specific forms of subordinate resistance to the distinct forms of power they target. Second, by detailing how this subversive apprentice tactics unfold in academia, our study provides rich empirical account of the

organizational “underlife” among knowledge workers. We unravel micro-level power dynamics and challenges the traditional view of resistance as either explicit or implicit (Contu, 2008). This contributes to the call for integrating critical perspectives on inequality and social justice within management education (Kumar et al., 2024).

## **THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT**

While early studies of power emphasize dominance and control (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Fligstein, 1985), contemporary perspectives recognize individuals’ capacity to reshape power relationships in institutions through agency (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; DiMaggio, 1988). This actor-centric approach has sparked significant interests on the potential agency role of various actors in transforming institutions (Greenwood et al., 2017) and driving change through institutional entrepreneurship (Battilana et al., 2009) and institutional work (Lawrence et al., 2012).

This study adopts a relational and socially constructed view (Clegg, 2023; Clegg et al., 2006; Foucault, 1995) to classify power in organizations on two dimensions: means of exercise (personal vs. non-personal) and forms (overt vs. covert). Drawing on French and Raven’s (1959) seminal typology, personal power emerges from individuals’ characteristics and relationships, including expertise, charisma, and interpersonal influence. Non-personal power operates through institutional structures and formal mechanisms (French & Raven, 1959). According to Lukes (2005), overt power manifests in observable decision-making processes, whereas covert power operates through agenda-shaping and preference formation (Bachrach & Baratz, 1970). This 2x2 framework acknowledges the ‘intimate’ relationship between power and institutions (Buchanan & Lawrence, 2017: 477), where institutional practices both drive and are driven by power dynamics (Jepperson, 1991).

Accordingly, resistance has evolved from classical labor-capital struggles (Marx et al., 1976) to more complex processes that both challenge and reinforce power structures (Foucault, 1980a; Mumby et al., 2017). Contemporary studies illustrate a dialectical relationship where overt protests coexist with subtler identity-based resistance (Fleming, 2014a; Fleming 2014b; Frayne, 2021). However, this apparent diversion constitutes ‘decaf resistance’ (Contu, 2008), providing momentary relief of symbolic opposition without fundamentally altering power relations. Current scholarship reveals two significant gaps: the predominance of top-down perspectives in power studies (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017; Clegg, 2023) and insufficient attention to the nature of resistance and their diverse manifestations (Courpasson, 2017; Thompson, 2016). Hence, we ask the following research question: *How do PhD students resist under asymmetric power relationships?*

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study adopts a qualitative case study to examine the dynamic interactions between power and resistance under PhD supervisor-student relationships in academic institutions. The multiple-case research design is particularly suitable for the construction and interpretation of social experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), while enabling data triangulation through diverse sources (Yin, 2009) and replication logic across cases (Eisenhart & Graebner, 2007). This approach facilitates the development of robust theoretical insights (Davis et al., 2007).

The academic context is particularly relevant, given recent shifts toward neoliberal corporate models (Butler & Spoelstra, 2012). Traditional tenure models face increasing pressures and criticisms to be replaced by causal labor arrangements (Tourish & Willmott, 2015) with market-driven logic and heightened performance accountability (Butler & Spoelstra, 2012). We focus on PhD supervisor-student relationships due to their inherent hierarchical structure and asymmetrical power relationships (Rintamaki & Alvesson, 2023).

Our research was mainly conducted at universities located in Macau and mainland China (see Table 1). Between August 2024 and June 2025, we carried out 37 semi-structured interviews with PhD students at various stages and their supervisors. Each interview lasted between 20 minutes and 75 minutes. All were conducted in Chinese (Mandarin), and subsequently translated and transcribed verbatim into English. Table 2 summarizes the profile of the interviewees.

= Insert Table 1 about here =

= Insert Table 2 about here =

The interview questions were open-ended, such as “Can you share an instance when your supervisor guided/forced you in adopting an idea or taking an action? This approach allowed the interviews to unfold by allowing some novel ideas to emerge and pursuing concepts raised by respondents (Luo & Wildemuth, 2009). Supervisors’ interviews focused on the sources of power, use of power and how they handled resistance, while students’ interviews explored their resistance strategies. By tracking their behavioral patterns and social interactions, observational data was used to supplement the interviews for triangulation, (Yin, 2009).

We employed a systematic two-stage approach combining within-case analysis and cross-case analysis (Eisenhardt, 1989). The within-case analysis organized individual cases into comprehensive case files. Initial codes were derived from power theories and emerging themes from the data. Inductive analysis (Gioia et al., 2012) was conducted to combine these first-order codes into broader resistance strategies categories (See Table 3). The cross-case analysis systematically compared cases to identify common and unique resistance patterns (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2009). The research team comprised of two members. Each member analyzed the data independently and strived to reach consensus throughout the process. The whole analytical process continued until reaching theoretical saturation (Strauss, 1987).

= Insert Table 3 about here =

## FINDINGS

Our data analysis suggests a dynamic relationship between supervisory power and doctoral students' resistance strategies in academic settings. When confronted with different forms of power exerted by PhD supervisors, doctoral students develop sophisticated resistance responses that allow them to negotiate their academic apprenticeship while preserving their sense of agency and autonomy.

We introduce the concept of "subversive apprentice identity" (See Figure 1) to capture how PhD students comply with supervisory demands on the surface while covertly resisting exploitative power dynamics. This identity emerges as students accumulate academic capital (skills, publications, networks) that enables future agency and gradual subversion of supervisory power. Our analysis identifies four distinct power mechanisms (standardization, prescription, supervision, and segregation) and two corresponding resistance strategies (scholastic shenanigans and guerrilla tactics).

The subversive apprentice identity is constructed through these resistance strategies in complementary ways. Scholastic shenanigans are where students creatively interpret academic expectations, allowing students to maintain an outward appearance of conformity while secretly creating spaces for agency. Meanwhile, guerrilla tactics are characterized by calculated moments of covert resistance through backstage negotiations and strategic efforts to provide students with opportunities to develop counternarratives that gradually build parallel power

structures, gaining leverage for future academic independence. Together, these strategies foster an identity that is neither fully compliant nor openly rebellious, but rather strategically subversive in ways that preserve long-term academic viability while protecting students' intellectual agency.

= Insert Figure 1 about here =

### **Supervisors' power**

To analyze supervisors' power, we constructed our findings according to existing literature, classifying power along two dimensions: means of power (personal vs. non-personal) and forms (overt vs. covert). Drawing on French and Raven's (1959) seminal typology, personal power emerges from individuals' characteristics and relationships, including expertise, charisma, and interpersonal influence, while non-personal power operates through institutional structures and processes (Lukes, 2005; Fleming & Spicer, 2014).

Our analysis revealed four distinct power mechanisms employed by supervisors.

### **Standardization**

*Standardization* emerges as non-personal overt power to enforce uniformity. This aligns with what Weber (1978) termed bureaucratic authority and what French and Raven (1959) described as legitimate power through formal rules and accepted organizational structure. However, the rigid application of these universal rules often causes students to perceive them as arbitrary and disconnected from their individual research needs. We observe faculty implementing rigid policies, such as making seminar attendance a prerequisite for conference funding or dissertation approval (See Figure 2). The rationale for this rule is overshadowed by the students' experience of it as a hoop-jumping exercise. One interviewee articulates the performative nature of these requirements:

"This implies sometimes attending events that aren't relevant to our research just for the sake of attendance." (SU6)

= Insert Figure 2 about here =

Other interviewees express the same concern about these requirements constituting a waste of valuable research time.

These standardized mechanisms can reach extreme levels, as illustrates by one interviewee's account of a research group's strict meeting practices:

"At minimum [the group meeting takes] an entire day, and they can't even eat meals. Regarding their phones, their professor specifically built cabinets to make them hand over their phones, to prevent them from playing with their phones during group meetings. But that large group has several hundred people." (WU8)

This example demonstrates how standardization extends beyond mere attendance policies into comprehensive behavioral control systems. Doctoral students are treated as subjects requiring discipline rather than emerging scholars deserving agency. The cabinets created specifically for surveillance and compliance reveals the institutionalization of these power dynamics. Other interviewees must remain in the lab 24 hours for equipment calibration and monitoring (See Figure 3), even when constant present is not technically necessary. The students need to compromise autonomy and work-life boundaries for the practice.

= Insert Figure 3 about here =

### **Prescription**

*Prescription* implies the increasing work demands the academia environment imposes on doctoral students. This resembles Foucault (1995) concept of disciplinary power, where power is not just held by a person but is embedded within routines and knowledge in an institution. It functions through what Lukes (2005) calls the third dimension of power by shaping people's perceptions and desires, leading students to internalize the dominant values of their field. This power extends to fundamental expectations about research outputs and time allocation. As one interviewee explains:

"If you haven't published in UTD or ABS4, even if you have a good idea and are developing it slowly, no one will buy it, or collaborate with me, no matter how fancy my words are." (SU1)

These publication metrics of research performance somehow narrow the meaning of academic success and entrenching the "publish or perish" culture.

The temporal dimension of prescription further emerges in supervisors' expectations of total dedication, as one interviewee notes:

"Basically, aside from your sleeping time and some necessary matters, you should spend the rest of your time working. I feel that most teachers think this way." (WU6)

This normalization of work without boundaries establishes an academic culture where publishing output outweigh intellectual development and wellbeing. This demand transforms doctoral education from a developmental process into a publication factory.

### **Supervision**

*Supervision* represents personal and overt power through individualized monitoring practices. It is the direct application of supervisors' personal power bases: expert power is used when giving direct guidance, while referent power is used to motivate through charisma (French & Raven, 1959). However, our data reveals a more coercive expression of this dynamic. As Fleming and Spicer (2014) note, coercion is an overt and direct form of power, and in our context, it manifests through supervisors' personal demands that encroached upon doctoral students' agency and personal lives. For example, supervisors assert power over a student's time, demanding immediate availability regardless of context, as one interviewee notes with evident frustration:

"Because their professor would just call whenever he wanted to call, and you'd have to come over within ten minutes. I think that's inhumane. You would definitely feel restricted and depressed..." (WU8)

This close supervision extends beyond academic spaces into students' personal spaces, particularly regarding living arrangements. Supervisors strategically mandate physical proximity for close supervision, as illustrated in this account:

"For example, he might say something like moving dorms. When we were first-year grad students, we were at Innovation Port, which is actually very far from here (The main campus) ... So, he said that when we became second-year

students, we had to move here, and so we had to... If you stayed over there, it would be very difficult for the supervisor to manage you.” (WU1)

The power structure is further reinforced through reprimands that carry implicit or explicit threats to academic progression. One interviewee described a troubling incident:

“He (a student) was the host, but then one day his supervisor knew, he stopped letting him host anymore. The supervisor said if he found him hosting again, he wouldn't let him graduate.” (WU8)

These moments of disciplinary action demonstrate how supervisors wield their gatekeeping power to regulate students' behavior beyond academic matters. Meanwhile, extra work demands blurs professional boundaries. Tasks unrelated to doctoral development become normalized obligations:

“He might ask us to help with some personal chores... Booking tickets or handling things like booking train tickets.” (SU7)

The practice transforms PhD students into a real personal assistant, disrupting the professional nature of the supervisory relationship.

These power dynamics cultivate an environment where unquestioning obedience becomes the expected norm: “What he says are all demands... Whatever he asks you to do, you have to do”, with supervisors' needs “definitely come first” regardless of students' schedules or commitments. For example, students must often accommodate late-night meetings due to professors' unavailability during daytime, disregarding students' temporal boundaries.

Beyond direct expression of power, supervision often manifests through more subtle ways of surveillance, operating through indirect supervision and covert monitoring practices. Indirect supervision emerges when supervisors orchestrate work assignments through seemingly benevolent framing. As one interviewee said:

“Sometimes there are collaborative papers with others, and he decides that I need to write them. He'll just tell me he's putting me on the project and what I need to do. He starts by saying nice things, like how it can expand my academic network or enhance my reputation since it's an international collaboration. But I know his main goal is just to get me to do the work, which I'm not too concerned about, so I just do it.” (SU7)

The strategic use of academic opportunities masks underlying labor extraction while maintaining a veneer of mentorship.

The indirect nature of supervision extends to communication patterns, where supervisors employ intermediaries rather than engaging directly with students. One interviewee describes this triangulated oversight:

“He doesn't talk to me directly, but he uses all the senior students to gather information about me.” (WU5)

This practice creates information asymmetries while simultaneously infantilizing the student and establishing surveillance networks within research groups.

Covert monitoring operates through subtle behavioral cues that communicate disapproval without explicit reprimands. As one interviewee notes:

“He will ask me, seeking my opinion. But when I offer a different opinion, he might not accept it.” “Feels like a fake democracy?” “I feel that way... I said

no, but he didn't look good... Even though he didn't say that explicitly, he would make you feel that he is unhappy.” (SU9)

This performance of democratic engagement masks an underlying expectation of compliance, with emotional responses functioning as disciplinary mechanisms.

Similarly, affective displays become instruments of control, as illustrated by another participant:

“Although he wouldn't put us through trouble, he also wouldn't show us a friendly face.” (WU4)

The strategic withholding of approval creates a persistent state of uncertainty, compelling students to continuously adjust their behavior to seek validation. These surveillance practices reveal how supervisory power operates not only through direct commands but through psychological and emotional channels that shape student conduct through anticipatory compliance.

### **Segregation**

*Segregation* emerges from the use of personal and covert power. This power operates through the strategic inclusion and exclusion of individuals, which describes how supervisors create ‘in-groups’ receiving preferential treatment and ‘out-groups’ that are often marginalized (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This embodies the political nature of organizations described by Pettigrew (1973), where individuals leverage their position to control information flows and access. The segregation operates mainly through marginalization and dominant practices. One example is the marginalization of students working with qualitative research in academic environments that favor quantitative methods. Qualitative students are sidelined in their discussions or overlooked in collaborative projects:

“But for those of us doing qualitative research, there are only a few of us... So, we feel very lonely. We're just a small presence, and I feel like I'm a marginalized researcher.” (SU4)

Institutional and cultural preferences for a certain research approach (e.g., survey) perpetuate this bias, subtly discouraging diverse perspectives and limiting opportunities for alternative methodologies (e.g., ethnography) to gain a similar standing and recognition among students and faculty members.

The experience of marginalization extends beyond methodological orientation to social integration within research groups. One interviewee describes the painful experience of exclusion:

“They collaborate with each other, but I don't work with them, I'd like to collaborate and discuss, but I don't have any ideas to work on with them” (SU9).

This account reveals how exclusion from informal networks directly impacts scholarly opportunities, creating cycles where marginalization begets further marginalization. The same interviewee expresses frustration with indirect communication:

“It's fine if you want to say, ‘I can tell you're under a lot of pressure,’ or if you directly ask me... But I don't like when people gossip about me behind my back” (SU9).

This practice of gossiping rather than engaging with marginalized members reinforces their outsider status.

Gender emerges as another form of segregation, creating distinctive supervisory experiences. One female interviewee describes how gender differences shape social integration:

“Of course, this could be due to gender differences. Additionally, they love playing computer games, but I don't... Anyway, the supervisor thinks I am in a disadvantaged position, so he calls it 'looking after you,' and I guess it is a form of looking after you in a way, as he doesn't assign me any work. He can go two months without contacting me.” (WU5).

This account illuminates how purported protection becomes a mechanism of exclusion, with reduced workload translating to reduced engagement and development opportunities.

Perhaps most troublingly, supervisors sometimes express explicitly biased views that rationalize segregation:

"But overall, in my group there are more female students now, and the execution ability is still not enough... Girls are weaker, definitely it's like that" (WUProf2).

Such statements reveal how personal prejudices become embedded in supervisory practices, creating differential expectations and evaluations based on ascribed rather than achieved characteristics. These ideological frameworks naturalize exclusion by attributing it to inherent differences rather than structural inequities or biased practices.

Ranking within academic hierarchies also contributes to segregation. Seniority often dictates authorship order, regardless of students' actual contributions, thus reinforcing a system where rank and tenure outweigh merit. Within research groups, internal hierarchies further exacerbate these inequities, with senior students dominating decision-making processes and research direction:

“For the juniors, the projects you (seniors) work on can be used for your thesis, while they (juniors) have to find their own direction. I think some people might find this a bit unfair, but there are definitely projects that need to be done. However, if there are, to put it bluntly, it feels a bit like cheap labor.” (WU3)

This explicit characterization of junior members as "cheap labor" reveals how hierarchical arrangements facilitate exploitative practices where contributions are extracted without commensurate benefits.

The most troubling manifestation of in-group hierarchy emerges when junior students' academic trajectories are subordinated to seniors' needs:

"The junior student is assigned to help the other senior. Then, our supervisor talked to the junior that he shouldn't graduate based on the previous senior's research direction, but rather on this senior's research direction. This actually has a bit of a coercive nature to it — you can't stick to your current path and have to start over with another senior's research" (WU3).

This subordination of junior members' interests reveals how hierarchical arrangements can fundamentally reshape academic pathways, with career progression contingent upon servicing the needs of higher-status group members.

These ranking practices collectively establish formalized systems of stratification that distribute resources, recognition, and responsibilities according to position rather than merit, reinforcing power differentials among students and institutionalizing a parallel hierarchy that mirrors and extends supervisory authority.

### **Resistance to Supervisors' Power: Subversive Apprentice**

In response to supervisory power, doctoral students do not remain passive. They actively construct a strategic identity we term the subversive apprentice. This identity is neither fully compliant nor openly rebellious, but is instead built through two complementary sets of resistance strategies: scholastic shenanigans and guerrilla tactics. The subversive apprentice is a strategic identity constructed by doctoral students to navigate the fundamental power imbalances of the supervisory relationship. This identity is defined by a core paradox: the student must perform as a dutiful learner to secure the mentorship, resources, and credentials essential for academic survival, while simultaneously operates as a subversive agent to cultivate a covert, inner agency to protect their own intellectual vision.

A key defensive tactic is the deliberate performance of incompetence—a scholastic shenanigan designed to manage supervisor expectations and workload. This involves creating a specific persona, as one student articulated, to appear willing but not overly capable, thereby avoiding unwanted labor. As one student explains:

"I think you still need to be smart about it (the relationship with supervisors), so even if you don't like it, you have to pretend that you really like it, and you will work very hard at it... But you can also choose not to be smart. You know, like 'I'm working really hard, but I really don't know how to do this kind of thing...' Then he'll think you're just a hardworking but not-so-bright student. If he sees that you're capable, he will definitely make you do more work, one hundred percent it's like that...To create such a persona to make your supervisor think you're just a hardworking but not-so-bright student..." (WU8)

While such shenanigans ensure daily survival, long-term independence requires more proactive guerrilla tactics. The subversive apprentice is neither a passive victim nor an open revolutionary; instead, they are a pragmatic actor who understands that long-term academic independence is won not through direct confrontation, but through subtle maneuvering. As another student explains, one must first accumulate academic “capital” before attempting to negotiate:

“... I definitely feel that you need to have some capital first... You definitely need to have the confidence that you can write two articles, for instance... you present your ideas, and then you tell professor that you're just stuck with the calculations, and that this issue is limiting your ability to publish articles... You can spend money, but the key is that it should bring results... You still need to ensure that the things that need to be done are done well, and only under these circumstances can you negotiate for other conditions.” (WU3)

By mastering this duality, they play a long game, using the formal structures of the apprenticeship to quietly build the intellectual and social capital needed to eventually transcend the very system that constrains them.

Together, these two sets of tactics allow the student to balance the demands of the present while actively constructing for the future. We turn first to the immediate acts of survival: scholastic shenanigans.

### **Scholastic Shenanigans**

Scholastic shenanigans are the subtle, everyday arts of self-preservation that allow the subversive apprentice to function. Rather than challenging power directly, these maneuvers are designed to protect a student's time, energy, and psychological space without triggering open conflict. They are the defensive tactics used to endure the daily pressures of the apprenticeship. These maneuvers fall into two main categories: deflecting and surface acting.

### **Deflecting**

Deflection is a key tactic used to counter supervision, often by strategically distracting from the supervisor's immediate focus.

### ***Distraction***

Instead of refusing a directive, students reframe the issue to render the supervisor's suggestion irrelevant, thereby seizing control of the narrative. One student, when told to move their seat for better monitoring, masterfully pivots the conversation:

"My response to him was that I felt my lack of progress had nothing to do with this seat. I said that even if I moved over there, it wouldn't necessarily lead to more communication with them, and might actually cause other issues. I explained to him that I didn't believe changing seats would improve my research efficiency or significantly advance my research progress. I felt that what's important is that my current research problems remain unsolved, and that has nothing to do with where I'm sitting." (WU5)

Here, the student sidesteps a close guidance by shifting the focus from the supervisor's concern (physical proximity) to their own (unsolved research problems). The deflection works because it appears reasonable and task-oriented, while successfully thwarting the supervisor's attempt to assert control. A different version of distraction involves performing confidence to stop micromanagement before it starts, as another student notes:

"Because if you appear weak and just listen to the supervisor, you'll probably end up just following what he says, since he'll think you lack confidence and try to give you advice...This is about your demeanor, not the actual issue." (SU1)

This performance is a conscious strategy. By projecting self-assurance, the student keeps the supervisor at a distance to manage the supervisor's perception and thus control the terms of engagement.

### ***Venting Frustration***

When faced with feelings of segregation, students turn to indirect methods of venting frustration. One of the forms of this is the "exit threat," a dramatic signal of distress meant to break through neglect. As one student says:

"I'm just saying I might not be able to continue PhD anymore, and I need to take a break." (BAU5)

This statement is not a genuine resignation but a calculated act of desperation. It is a bid to make an invisible struggle visible, forcing the supervisor to acknowledge a problem they may otherwise ignore. A less risky approach involves planting "clues" of distress.

"I hope he notices some clues, like I might indirectly mention something. For instance, during group meetings, if I'm not in a good state, I might just rest on

the table. He would ask what's wrong recently, and I would say things are a bit overwhelming. He might think, "But I didn't assign you much work," and then he might wonder, "Who else could it be?" Right?" (SU1)

This student uses non-verbal cues to signal a problem without lodging a direct accusation. The student communicates their unhappiness through body language and vague complaints, leaving the supervisor to connect the dots and minimizing the personal risk of a direct confrontation.

### ***Humor***

Finally, humor serves as a critical tool for resisting prescriptive academic norms. With irony and sarcasm, students create a "hidden transcript"—a coded critique of power that fellow students understand but authorities might miss. Faced with increasing work demands, one student jokes about their escape plan:

“Worst case, don’t work in the school, open a small store, and use the money to do your research, right?” (SU1)

By hyperbolically suggesting they abandon academia for retail, this student mocks the precarious conditions of academic labor. The complaint is transformed from insubordination into a shared, cynical joke. Students also use humor to resist the power of the institution, particularly the pressure to publish in journals they deem worthless:

“They (other students) also don't care about it... They would think, 'I published five core Chinese papers in a year, how impressive!' And I would think that's like garbage... many people from Zhongshan University... don't recognize Chinese journals at all.” (BAU2)

This mockery is an act of intellectual self-defense. By aligning with the standards of more elite universities and scorning local ones, the student builds a protective shield around their own sense of worth, devaluing the currency of the very system trying to control them.

### ***Surface Acting***

Another key survival tactic is surface acting, where students carefully manage their outward performance to supervision while protecting their true thoughts. This performance creates a deliberate gap between their public actions and their private beliefs. It can be defensive, as in feigning innocence to deflect an unethical request, or proactive, as in performing surface compliance to build rapport.

### ***Feigning Innocence***

Feigning innocence is a subtle form of resistance. When faced with a request that feels questionable, students pretend not to understand the underlying intention, forcing the supervisor to either state their improper demand or abandon it. One student, asked to add an undeserving master’s student to a paper, plays dumb to the request:

“Actually, most of the time I just play dumb. I asked him why I should add a master student’s name in authorship, and he said he wanted me to help him out a bit. I actually got it; he just wanted me to add his name.” (SU9)

Here, the student fully understands the supervisor’s unspoken agenda. By asking for an explicit, academic justification, they put the supervisor in a bind: either admit the unethical

motive or drop the matter. The feigned confusion is not passive, and it is a strategic act of defiance that preserves the student's integrity without starting a direct conflict.

### ***Surface Compliance***

More broadly, students engage in surface compliance, consciously adjusting their behavior to align with their supervisor's expectations—but only when necessary. This is a form of social camouflage, adopted for survival and then discarded as soon as the supervisor is gone. The goal is to appear agreeable and avoid being labelled as difficult or isolated.

“However, in social settings where he's present, I make an effort to talk more... If he's there, I make sure to engage in conversations, so I'm not seen as isolated... But when he's not around, I feel more at ease.” (SU1)

This student's social energy is a resource they deploy strategically. Their talkativeness is not genuine but a calculated performance to manage how they are perceived. The moment the surveillance ends, the performance stops, highlighting the sharp distinction between their public persona and private self.

This performance can go beyond simple social adjustments to a detailed imitation of the supervisor's personality. One student describes becoming a social chameleon, mimicking her supervisor to create an illusion of shared values:

“No, she thinks that's just how I am, but I was acting... It's more like repeating things she agrees with, pretending to agree with her... You can notice what she's interested in, like food, or observe her speaking style, like if she enjoys making grand statements... But I rarely agreed with her.” (SU2)

This is surface acting at its most sophisticated. The student becomes a kind of anthropologist, studying her supervisor's habits and speech patterns just to mimic them. By mirroring interests and communication styles, she manufactures rapport. It's exhausting emotional labor—a constant performance of agreement that shields her private resistance and preserves her sense of self.

### ***Guerrilla Tactics***

When subtle deflections and private resistance aren't enough, students shift from defensive shenanigans to proactive guerrilla tactics. These tactics are designed to subtly alter the balance of power by building alliances, creating leverage, and evading the power from supervisors and institutions.

### ***Uniting***

The first and most critical of these tactics is uniting, the realization that they cannot win these battles alone. Students unite by seeking external validation, building peer solidarity, and strategically aligning their interests with those in power.

### ***Seeking External Endorsement***

A supervisor's power often feels absolute. To counter it, students cleverly seek endorsement from external authorities whose judgment the supervisor must respect. By invoking academic gatekeepers like journal editors or other senior professors, students can transform a personal disagreement into an objective, professional debate. One student, stuck resubmitting a weak paper, uses rejection letters as a shield:

"It was rejected maybe five, six, seven, or eight times... So, all my efforts went to waste because neither the editors nor reviewers agreed with the perspective... I find it difficult to persuade my supervisor. We can only rely on external feedback because we are still students." (SU7)

The student essentially uses the peer-review system as a weapon. The rejections prove their point and give them the leverage to challenge their supervisor without appearing insubordinate. It's no longer their opinion, and it's the opinion of the academic community. This move also works internally. When faced with pointless work, another student found an ally in a collaborating professor:

"Sometimes, because these projects are actually a collaboration between the supervisor and another professor who is very knowledgeable, you can directly approach that professor. If the professor agrees that it's unnecessary, then you don't need to do it... Yes, sometimes referencing their expertise supports our case." (WU1)

The student avoids a direct fight by finding someone whose expertise the supervisor has to respect. The issue shifts from one of obedience to one of professional judgment.

### ***Peer Support***

Students also find strength by uniting with each other. A single student complaining is easy to dismiss, but a group is a problem. Peers act as advocates and form "protective coalitions" that reduce individual risk. When one student feels unfairly treated, their lab mates intervene:

"Some of the other group members spoke up for me. They helped relay to the supervisor that this didn't feel fair or appropriate... the students with strong communication skills spoke to the supervisor, saying I should be ranked higher." (SU7)

This group provides a shield. The risk of speaking out is distributed across the group, and the complaint gains legitimacy. It is no longer one student's grievance but a shared concern about fairness, forcing the supervisor to take it seriously.

These alliances are often built in secret. One student describes how they use a private group chat:

"In these cases, we post in a group chat to ask how others see the situation... Then I would usually ask the senior students what they think, and then I'd ask one of them to come talk to the professor with me... professors trust the senior students more... If you're new and try to speak up directly... the professor isn't really convinced." (WU2)

The WeChat group is a strategic space for collective sense-making. They diagnose the problem, build consensus, and choose the best person to deliver the message. It is a calculated move, turning one person's frustration into a coordinated action.

### ***Aligning Interests***

The smartest tactic is not always to fight back, but it is to make your supervisor's goals work for you. Students learn to align their own needs with their supervisor's agenda, turning a power struggle into a partnership. One student dangles their own project as an incentive:

"I have tried using the resources I have on hand to test things out, like when I have a project, I'll see if she wants to work on it together, and this way she can help me publish a paper." (BAU4)

This is an entrepreneurial move. The student is not just asking for help, but they are offering an opportunity that benefits the supervisor, creating an incentive for her to invest in their success. It's a clever way to secure resources by framing personal need as a shared goal.

Ultimately, this alignment is a pragmatic calculation. As another student explains, survival depends on understanding how to make yourself useful:

"I think first you need to understand what your boss is doing... look at the resources your supervisor has and see how she can help you. If her resources fit your interests, then communication may be more effective." (SU5)

This student recognizes that the path of least resistance is to link their own ambitions to their supervisor's work. By positioning their research as an asset to the supervisor, they make themselves indispensable. It co-opts the system's logic to serve their own ends, ensuring that by helping themselves, they are also helping the person in power.

### **Hedging**

Not every tactic is about confrontation. Some of the most effective responses are about future leverage. Students who hedge are playing the long game. They understand the system's instability and their supervisor's power, so they create backup plans and secret escape routes. They bypass power, buy themselves time to get stronger, playing lip service, and developing entirely different futures for themselves.

### ***Bypass***

Bypassing involves creating parallel channels of activity that circumvent formal supervisory oversight. Students engage in covert intellectual work, deliberately keeping projects outside the range of their supervisor to retain future authorship. As one student explains, the goal is to outlast the supervisor's power:

"I thought about working with my friend on writing a paper secretly and publishing it after we graduate so we wouldn't need to ask for the supervisor's approval." (SU7)

This is a strategy born of the realization that a supervisor's power has an expiration date, diminishing upon graduation.

Bypassing can also be about prevention, heading off a pointless argument before it starts:

"We need to say no early... we need to intervene before he makes a decision."  
(SU7)

It's far easier to shape a decision than to reverse one. By getting involved early, students can steer things in the right direction, sidestepping a potential future conflict.

### ***Buy Time***

When students perceive a significant power imbalance and lack the immediate capital to challenge their supervisor, they may adopt a posture of strategic compliance. They don't have the leverage or the expertise to win a direct fight. So, they play along, accepting constraints while quietly gathering the skills they need for future agency.

“At the beginning... we didn't have the right to argue... It's only after you've learned something yourself... that you have the right to argue... For me, the most important thing was that I gained the experience of doing this project... Once I had this experience, there wouldn't be a next time.” (BAU2)

This represents a calculated trade-off: enduring present limitations in exchange for future agency. Each assigned task, even if frustrating, becomes an opportunity to learn institutional processes and acquire skills. This is a form of capacity-building, allowing students to strengthen their position without drawing premature attention or opposition from their supervisor.

### ***Playing Lip Service***

When students can't say no, they can still refuse to truly say yes. They offer superficial agreement while withholding their genuine effort. One student, assigned a project they deemed meaningless, performs the task with minimal investment:

“Honestly, I didn't put much effort into it because I couldn't convince myself. I...ended up writing a rather short research note.” (SU7)

This minimal effort constitutes a form of passive resistance. A more active way is strategic underperformance, where a student leverages their institutional knowledge to orchestrate a desired failure, thereby avoiding an undesirable task:

“He (a senior student) didn't want to do this project, so he ultimately let it fall through... He probably didn't put proper effort into his bid... which ultimately resulted in the project not being secured.” (WU4)

This behavior mirrors the concept of "restriction of output" (Roy, 1954), where overt obedience masks a deliberate withdrawal of genuine contribution. The student's compliance is a performance, and their sophisticated understanding of bureaucratic processes is used not for success, but for sabotage.

### ***Fallback Plans***

Another form of hedging is the creation of a future that doesn't depend on academia at all. In response to academic precarity and competitive job market, students actively protect themselves by diversifying their professional options:

“To be honest, I don't think many people go to mainland China (universities) unless you have connections... It's really competitive now... There are companies, many like BYD are now involved.” (WU2)

This isn't just pragmatic; it's a form of resistance. By exploring careers in industry, students weaken the institution's hold over them. Their self-worth and future are no longer tied exclusively to academic success:

“I see two possible paths. I might pursue a corporate career or work in international schools. Academia is an option, but not necessarily the only one.” (SU4)

This mindset is an act of self-preservation. When the academic system is perceived as exploitative or offering limited opportunities, preparing for exit becomes a powerful form of

resistance. Each step taken to build an alternative career represents a strategic withdrawal of investment from the academic system, thereby reducing its leverage over the individual.

### **Evading**

Beyond alliance-building or developing future leverage, students employ a third set of guerrilla tactics centered on *evading*. These strategies are not about winning a battle but about avoiding it altogether. They are subtle, often individual acts of resistance designed to preserve agency, manage energy, and create distance from undesirable demands or toxic environments. By making themselves elusive targets, students evade supervisory power by passing responsibility, practicing deception, manipulating time, and detaching from the group.

### ***Passing Responsibility***

When faced with undesirable or excessive workloads, one evasive tactic is to redirect the responsibility to others. A particularly shrewd strategy involves leveraging the supervisor's own resources to deflect demands, as one student explains:

“I let my boss(supervisor)’s RA do it... using her money to hire someone.”  
(SU2)

Here, the student covertly redistributes labor by manipulating the supervisor's financial assets (the grant money funding the research assistant). This act aligns with resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), where the student turns the supervisor's control over resources into a liability, using it to resist demands without outright refusal.

A more common version of this tactic involves a downward redistribution of labor, exploiting the internal hierarchy:

“If you slack off, your junior or senior lab mates have to pick up the slack... sometimes when you're working on a project and you feel like you don't want to do anything today, you just have your junior do it instead... Generally, it's easier to ask someone below you.” (WU1)

This illustrates how students, in resisting pressure from above, can replicate oppressive power dynamics. The student leverages their limited social capital and positional power over junior students to manage their own workload, revealing how resistance can be a complicated act that is not always aimed at the primary power holder.

### ***Deception***

To protect their autonomy from what they perceive as surveillance, students may resort to deception. These are not merely falsehoods, but deliberate strategies of counter-surveillance designed to create and maintain information gaps. One student lives off-campus against their supervisor's preference:

“I've been living off-campus the whole time... he still doesn't know... I think rather than letting him worry and ask you every time... it would be better to just pretend and tell him that I've moved back.” (WU5)

By providing false information ("I've moved back"), the student neutralizes the supervisor's attempts at monitoring and preserves their personal agency. More commonplace deceptions, such as feigning illness (BAU5), function as simpler tools to reclaim time and agency on a smaller scale.

### ***Delaying***

Students also weaponize time itself, using delay as a subtle but effective form of resistance. Calculated procrastination becomes a method to assert control over their schedule and priorities.

"I do delay sometimes... Procrastination might help drag things out for a week, and once I have some free time, I can get it done." (BAU8)

This act of "time work" enables students to exert temporal agency. By delaying low-value tasks, they preserve cognitive and emotional resources for their own higher-priority research, a form of energy management. A more sophisticated form of temporal manipulation involves re-engineering the workflow to create hidden pockets of time:

"You could immediately analyze your current results, but often what we actually do is acknowledge the request without analyzing right away. Instead, we wait until we have 10-20 results... before analyzing them all together. This middle period is essentially time we can use for other things... we might secretly work in a way that doesn't follow the professor's instructions." (WU2)

Here, the student creates temporal zones invisible to the supervisor. By batching tasks, they reclaim blocks of time that can be covertly repurposed, effectively resisting demands for constant, fragmented attention.

### ***Detachment***

Finally, when faced with segregation, students engage in detachment as a form of self-preservation. This can begin as an internal, psychological strategy of limiting information intake:

"I feel that sometimes knowing a little less means I won't feel as uncomfortable inside." (BAU6)

The student creates a psychological buffer by choosing ignorance over the emotional cost of knowing about group politics. This internal retreat often manifests as physical and social withdrawal. Students report actively avoiding communal spaces and activities to shield themselves from negative dynamics:

"So, I didn't participate much in discussions. For example, when they wanted to have a meal together, I didn't join... They got the hint that I wasn't in the mood to participate, so they stopped inviting me." (SU9)

This establishes a clear separation between their personal life and the group's social environment. By reducing physical presence—"I spend less time there (office)" (SU4)—students establish a firm boundary. The statement, "They do their thing, and I do mine" (SU4), captures this decisive withdrawal into self-protective space, marking a quiet but purposeful disengagement from the group.

## **CONCLUSION AND CONTRIBUTION**

First, this study contributes to our understanding of the intertwined relationships between power and resistance strategies within academic supervisor-student relationship. By identifying four distinct types of power and their corresponding resistance strategies (scholastic shenanigans and guerrilla tactics), this typology illuminates the mutually constitutive nature of power and resistance. We achieve this by developing a typology of "subversive apprentice identity" that explicitly maps specific forms of subordinate resistance to the distinct forms of power they

target. It is a mode of agency where PhD students feign compliance with supervisory demands while strategically accumulating academic capital (skills, publications, networks) to subvert dependency over time.

We demonstrate how this identity is enacted through two sets of practices—“scholastic shenanigans” and “guerrilla tactics.” By developing a typology that maps these specific resistance strategies to the distinct forms of power they target, we reveal how subordinates’ tailored responses actively shape and co-create the organizational power dynamics, moving beyond a simplistic top-down view (Foucault, 1980b; Mumby et al., 2017).

Second, by detailing these strategies, our study provides a rich empirical account of the organizational “underlife” of vulnerable knowledge workers. In particular, our findings extend existing theories on power by demonstrating that depending on the form and means of power encountered under a dyadic relationship (Lukes, 2005; French & Raven, 1959), PhD students as subordinates at a powerless position can still engage in active agency and resist the dominant control from their supervisors. This conceptualization goes beyond ‘decaf resistance’ (Contu, 2008) and offers a more substantive approach for countering the mechanisms of surveillance and discipline at other non-traditional workplace, such as academia.

We unravel the micro-level dynamics of this hidden world, challenging the prevailing view that resistance must be categorized as either explicit or implicit (Contu, 2008). The tactics we identify—such as playing lip service, creating temporal zones, or developing quietly—occupy a sophisticated liminal space. They are too deliberate and strategic to be merely “implicit,” yet too subtle and veiled to be “explicit.” They are calculated acts of agency that operate below the threshold of direct confrontation but are far from passive. By giving voice to a marginalized group, we unravel the micro-level dynamics of this hidden world and answer the call to integrate critical perspectives on inequality into management studies.

As universities increasingly adopt neoliberal models, understanding these power dynamics becomes crucial not only for improving PhD experiences but also for fostering environments where academic freedom and effective mentorship might be preserved. Future research could explore these strategies in diverse contexts to further validate and refine the proposed typology.

## References

- Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S. and Cummings, T. G. (2020). “An A is an A”: The New Bottom Line for Valuing Academic Research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1), pp. 135-154.
- Alvesson, M., and Sz kudlarek, B. (2021). Honorable Surrender: On the Erosion of Resistance in a University Setting. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 30(4), pp. 407-420.
- Anicich, E. M. and Hirsh, J. B. (2017). The Psychology of Middle Power: Vertical Code-switching, Role Conflict, and Behavioral Inhibition. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(4), pp. 659-682.
- Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. S. (1970). *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B. and Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), pp. 65-107.
- Bristow, A., Robinson, S. and Ratle, O. (2017). Being An Early-career CMS Academic in The Context Of Insecurity And ‘Excellence’: The Dialectics Of Resistance And Compliance. *Organization Studies*, 38(9), pp. 1185-1207.
- Buchanan, D. A. and Badham, R. J. (2008). *Power, Politics, and Organizational Change: Winning the Turf Game*. Sage Publications.
- Buchanan, S. and Lawrence, T. (2017). Power, Institutions and Organizations, in R. Greenwood (ed) *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 477–506.
- Butler, N. and Spoelstra, S. (2012). Your Excellency. *Organization*, 19(6), pp. 891-903.
- Callahan, J. L. (2018). The Retrospective (im) Moralization of Self-plagiarism: Power Interests in the Social Construction of New Norms for Publishing. *Organization*, 25(3), pp. 305-319.
- Clegg, S. R. (2023). *Frameworks of Power*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D. and Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Cohen, A. and Baruch, Y. (2022). Abuse and Exploitation of Doctoral Students: A Conceptual Model for Traversing a Long and Winding Road to Academia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(2), pp. 505-522.
- Contu, A. (2008). Decaf Resistance: On Misbehavior, Cynicism, and Desire in Liberal Workplaces. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(3), pp. 364–379.
- Courpasson, D. (2017). Beyond the Hidden/Public Resistance divide: How Bloggers Defeated a Big Company. *Organization Studies*, 38(9), pp. 1277-1302.

- Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M. and Bingham, C. B. (2007). Developing Theory Through Simulation Methods. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), pp. 480-499.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest And Agency in Institutional Theory, in L. G. Zucker (ed) *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, pp. 3-21.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), pp. 147-160.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), pp. 532-550.
- Emirbayer, M. and Mische, A. (1998). What is Agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4), pp. 962-1023.
- Fleming, P. (2014a). When ‘Life Itself’ Goes to Work: Reviewing Shifts in Organizational Life Through the Lens of Biopower. *Human Relations*, 67(7), pp. 875-901.
- Fleming, P. (2014b). *Resisting Work: The Corporatization of Life and Its Discontents*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fleming, P. and Spicer, A. (2014). Power in Management and Organization Science. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), pp. 237-298.
- Fligstein, N. (1985). The Spread of the Multidivisional Form Among Large Firms, 1919-1979. *American Sociological Review*, 50(3), pp. 377-391.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated from the French by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M., (1980b). *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 - 1977*. Translated from the French by C. Gordon et al. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1980a). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume I*. Translated from the French by R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.
- Frayne, D. (2021). *The Refusal of Work: The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Work*. London: Zed Books.
- French, J.R.P. and Raven, B.H. (1959). The Bases of Social Power, in D. Cartwright (ed) *Studies in Social Power*. MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 150- 167.
- Gioia, D., Corley, K. and Hamilton, A. (2012). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), pp. 15-31.

- Graen, G. B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-level Multi-domain Perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), pp. 219-247.
- Greenwood, R., Meyer, R. E., Lawrence, T. B. and Oliver, C. (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. UK: Sage.
- Hou, J., & Feng, A. (2019). Juggling Multiple Identities: The Untold Stories Behind a PhD Ethnographic Study. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, pp. 1-12.
- Jepperson, R. (1991). Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism, in W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 143-163.
- Kumar, A., Soundararajan, V., Bapuji, H., Köhler, T., Alcadipani, R., Morsing, M. and Coraiola, D. M. (2024). Unequal Worlds: Management Education and Inequalities. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 23(3), pp. 379-386.
- Lawrence, T. B., Malhotra, N. and Morris, T. (2012). Episodic and Systemic Power in the Transformation of Professional Service Firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1), pp. 102-143.
- Lorenz, C. (2012). If You're So Smart, Why Are You Under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism, And New Public Management. *Critical Inquiry*, 38(3), pp. 599-629.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A Radical View*. 2nd edn. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Luo, L. and Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Semistructured Interviews, in B. M. Wildemuth (ed) *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*. California: Libraries Unlimited, pp. 248-258.
- Martin, B. (2013). Countering Supervisor Exploitation. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 45(1), pp. 74-86.
- Marx, K., Engels, F. and Arthur, C. J. (1976). *The German Ideology. Part One*. London: Electronic Book Co.
- Meng, Y., Tan, J. and Li, J. (2017). Abusive Supervision by Academic Supervisors and Postgraduate Research Students' Creativity: The Mediating Role of Leader-member Exchange and Intrinsic Motivation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(5), pp. 605-617.
- McCabe, D. (2023). Tearing at the Tapestry: An Ethnography of Solidaristic Humour, Academic Strike Action and a New Management Strategy. *Organization Studies*, 44(8), pp. 1353-1375.
- Mumby, D. K., Thomas, R., Martí, I. and Seidl, D. (2017). Resistance Redux. *Organization Studies*, 38(9), pp. 1157-1183.

- Pettigrew, A. (1973). *The Politics of Organizational Decision Making*. London: Tavistock.
- Rintamäki, J. and Alvesson, M. (2023). Resisting Whilst Complying? A Case Study of a Power Struggle in a Business School. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 22(2), pp. 257-273.
- Shapiro, D. L. (2017). Presidential Address: Making the Academy Full-voice Meaningful. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(2), pp. 165-173.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, P. (2016). Dissent at Work and the Resistance Debate: Departures, Directions, and Dead Ends. *Studies in Political Economy*, 97(2), pp. 106-123.
- Tourish, D. and Willmott, H. (2015), In Defiance of Folly: Journal Rankings, Mindless Measures and the ABS Guide. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 26, pp. 37–46.
- Weber, M. (2002). Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, in N.W. Biggart (ed) *Readings in Economic Sociology*. UK: Blackwell Publishers. (Original Work published 1978), pp. 24-37.
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Applied Social Research Methods)*. 3rd edn. London and Singapore: Sage.

**Table 1: Background Information of Universities**

| <i>University</i>            | <i>Location</i>             | <i>Type</i>        | <i>Academic Focus</i>                                                           | <i>Governance</i>           | <i>Cultural/Power dynamics</i>                                                                   | <i>Relevance to study</i>                                                                                         |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Southern University          | Macau SAR, China            | Public University  | Multidisciplinary                                                               | Publicly funded             | Multicultural environment with a mix of Western and Eastern academic practices                   | Offers unique dynamics of bilingual and international education                                                   |
| Western University (WU)      | Xi'an, Shanxi, China        | Public University  | Engineering, technology, and applied sciences                                   | Public, national governance | Highly prestigious with a traditional, hierarchical academic culture focusing on STEM discipline | Provides a contrasting context to other universities, with traditional values and a focus on engineering research |
| Bay Area University (BAU)    | Macau, SAR, China           | Private University | Science, engineering, technology, business administration, and medical sciences | Private governance          | More flexibility in its academic offerings and governance.                                       | Provides insights into a private institution with different governance and expectations                           |
| Pearl River University (PRU) | Guangzhou, Guangdong, China | Public University  | Technology, architecture, business, and design                                  | Public, national governance | Traditional hierarchical governance model and deeply embedded in the region's economic dynamism. | Its performance-driven academic culture shaped by quantitative research preferences tied to the Greater Bay Area  |

**Table 2: Profile of Interviewees**

| <i>University</i>            | <i>Major</i>                 | <i>Position</i>     | <i>Codename</i> |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Southern University (SU)     | Management                   | Professor           | SU1             |
|                              | Management                   | Associate Professor | SU2             |
|                              | Marketing                    | Associate Professor | SU3             |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | SU4             |
|                              | Marketing                    | PhD Student         | SU5             |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | SU6             |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | SU7             |
|                              | Marketing                    | PhD Student         | SU8             |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | SU9             |
|                              | Tourism & Hospitality        | PhD Student         | SU10            |
|                              | Accounting                   | PhD Student         | SU11            |
|                              | Accounting                   | PhD Student         | SU12            |
|                              | Education                    | PhD Student         | SU13            |
| Western University (WU)      | Energy and Power Engineering | Professor           | WU1             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | Professor           | WU2             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU3             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU4             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU5             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU6             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU7             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU8             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU9             |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU10            |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU11            |
|                              | Energy and Power Engineering | PhD Student         | WU12            |
| Bay Area University (BAU)    | Management                   | Associate Professor | BAU1            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU2            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU3            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU4            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU5            |
|                              | Marketing                    | PhD Student         | BAU6            |
|                              | Finance and banking          | PhD Student         | BAU7            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU8            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU9            |
|                              | Management                   | PhD Student         | BAU10           |
| Pearl River University (PRU) | Landscape Architecture       | PhD Student         | PRU1            |
|                              | Food Science and Engineering | PhD Student         | PRU2            |

**Table 3: Data Structure**

| <b>First-order codes</b>                                                          | <b>Second-order codes</b> | <b>Aggregate themes</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Rules and regulations                                                             | Standards                 | Standardization         |
| Increasing work demands                                                           | Expectations              | Prescription            |
| Close guidance<br>Reprimands<br>Extra work demand<br>Obedience                    | Personalization           | Supervision             |
| Covert monitoring<br>Indirect supervision                                         | Surveillance              |                         |
| Marginalization<br>Dominant practices                                             | Exclusion                 | Segregation             |
| Seniority-based authorship<br>In-group hierarchy                                  | Ranking                   |                         |
| Distraction<br>Venting frustration indirectly<br>Humor—prescription               | Deflecting                | Scholastic Shenanigans  |
| Feigning innocence –supervision<br>Surface compliance –supervision                | Surface acting            |                         |
| Seeking external endorsement<br>supervision<br>Peer support<br>Aligning interests | Uniting                   | Guerrilla tactics       |
| Bypass<br>Buy time<br>Playing lip service<br>Fallback plans                       | Hedging                   |                         |
| Passing responsibility<br>Deception<br>Delaying<br>Detachment                     | Evading                   |                         |

**Figure 1: Conceptual Model**

| <b>Power</b>    | <b>Scholastic Shenanigans<br/>(<i>Playful</i>)</b> | <b>Guerilla tactics<br/>(<i>Strategic</i>)</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Standardization |                                                    | Hedging                                        |
| Supervision     | Deflecting<br>Surface acting                       | Hedging<br>Uniting<br>Evading                  |
| Segregation     | Deflecting                                         | Uniting<br>Evading                             |
| Prescription    | Deflecting                                         | Uniting                                        |

## Figure 2: Guidelines of Seminar Attendance in SU

**Please note:**

- PhD students are encouraged to actively attend seminars on different research interests and areas.
- **PhD students admitted in the academic year of 2022/2023 are required to attend a minimum of 80% of the seminars in the Faculty Seminar Series (*incl. Faculty Seminar Series and the APAEM Seminar Series on Smart Tourism and International Finance*) per semester within their discipline-related group for any two semesters before becoming eligible to apply for a conference subsidy.**
- **PhD students admitted in/after AY2023/2024 are required to achieve a minimum attendance of 40 faculty seminars (*incl. Faculty Seminar Series and the APAEM Seminar Series on Smart Tourism and International Finance*) in the discipline-related group.**
- Students should keep good records of their seminar attendance. In the event of any dispute or need for an appeal, students should provide their records and evidence as support; otherwise, the FBA office records will be used for the final decision.
- Students may check out the upcoming seminars at <https://fba.um.edu.mo/events/>.
- **Students are required to check in and out when attending the Faculty Seminars Series.**

Figure 3: Time Arrangement for Lab in WU



注：数据采集人为当班主要负责人。