

**Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A
Work Ideologies Perspective**

Author

Winter, Richard, O'Donohue, Wayne

Published

2011

Conference Title

25th Annual Conference of the British Academy of Management Conference 2011

Rights statement

© 2011 British Academy of Management (BAM). The attached file is reproduced here in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the conference's website for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/46176>

Link to published version

<http://www.bam.ac.uk/>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

**Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies
Perspective**

Dr Richard Winter

School of Management, Marketing and International Business
College of Business and Economics
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
AUSTRALIA
T: +61 2 6125 4721
F: +61 2 6125 8796
E: richard.winter@anu.edu.au

Dr Wayne O'Donohue

Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith Business School
Griffith University
Gold Coast campus
Gold Coast QLD 4222
AUSTRALIA
T: +61 7 5552 7583
F: +61 7 5552 9206
E: w.odonohue@griffith.edu.au

Track: Identity

Word Count: 6,972

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

Summary

Work ideologies represent important frames of reference for understanding what particular occupational groups believe about their work, profession and organisation. Adopting a social constructionist perspective, we utilise the concept of work ideologies to provide insights into identity construction for individuals in management and non-management roles within the same hybrid organisation. We conceptualise hybrid organisations as multiple identity contexts where identity is constructed around competing ideological beliefs and institutional logics. By situating our study within the higher education context, we make explicit those ideological beliefs that anchor managers and academics to their work roles and university (*work-identity integrity*). Ideological states of separation from work and the university are also identified (*organisation-identity disidentification*). Our discussion and conclusion considers how work ideologies may function to shape the identities and behaviour of role occupants in a hybrid organisational context.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

Introduction

This study contributes to the growing body of work dedicated to understanding how identities form in the emerging phenomenon of ‘hybrid organisations’. In such organisations, no one unitary set of values and principles of operation predominates, and separate belief systems and institutional logics underpin different cultures or subcultures that operate in parallel and between which there is ongoing competition for dominance (Foreman and Whetten, 2002; Reay and Hinings, 2009). This competitive interaction may give rise to the emergence of a hybrid form of belief system which fuses together core elements of the competing systems to become the basis of a new institutional logic (Freidson, 2001). While hybrid organisations may arise through collaboration between existing organisations, we focus specifically on the role work ideologies play in identity construction for individuals in management and non-management roles within the same hybrid organisation.

We define work ideologies as connected patterns of “emotionalised, action-oriented beliefs” held by members of an occupation about *aspects of their work and organisation* (Trice, 1993, p. 48). This definition conceptualises ideological beliefs broadly to reflect the “unique psychodynamic processes individuals introject into work settings” as they make sense of their own identities as members of an occupational group (Rousseau and Tijoriwala, 1998, p. 682). Acting in ways consistent with cherished beliefs, ideals and principles is regarded as a valuable lens for understanding what binds occupational groups together and what discourages interaction with other groups (Beyer, 1981). Implicit in this proposition is the notion work ideologies serve to guide and legitimate social action and help individuals and groups connect to particular role identities within *their* organisation (Lok, 2010). It also suggests work ideologies may reveal the cognitive reasoning for understanding why individuals and groups may choose to separate themselves from their roles and organisation (Bunderson, 2001; Elsbach, 1999). As Elsbach (1999) reminds us in her concept of disidentification, not identifying with the role demands of a particular position “may be as important as cognitive connections or identifications in defining a person’s social identity” (p.172).

A key contribution of our study is to make explicit the dynamics of identity construction in a hybrid, multiple identity context shaped by contrasting managerial and professional beliefs systems that do not fit easily together (Foreman and Whetten, 2002; Pratt, Rockmann and Kaufmann, 2006; Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003). Attempting to blend divergent professional and managerial beliefs together around some common purpose or corporate goal is no easy task, given managers and professionals have a long established history of competing to control key aspects of work (Raelin, 1986) and a tendency to identify more with members of their own subcultures rather than as members of the organisation (Lewicki, Greenberger and Coyne, 2007). Given hybrids are highly knowledge intensive organisations, the associated conditions of uncertainty, confusion, and contradiction (Noordegraaf, 2007) mean that potential solutions to problems are easily and often contested as managers and professionals engage in discourses anchored in beliefs that offer a “particular version of the social world” (Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003, p. 1172). In recent years, differences as to what constitutes *productive* and *legitimate* work in hybrid organisations have been brought into sharp relief by reforms drawn largely from large private sector commercial organisations outside the traditional professions (Clarke and Newman, 1997; Exworthy and Halford, 1999). Because these reforms and their associated business principles and practices of cost controls, performance targets, quality models, and value-added indicators privilege a managerial corporate role over a professional service role, they have magnified professional-manager role tensions and ideological conflicts over how best to organise and prioritise work in

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

knowledge-intensive areas of work such as higher education and health care (Barnett, 2003; Deem and Brehony, 2005; Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Reay and Hinings, 2009).

Our study situates identity and its construction in a higher education context reshaped by government and competitive pressures to be more efficient, entrepreneurial and customer (student) focused (Billot, 2010; Churchman and King, 2009; Winter, 2009). The specific type of organisational context is that of a publicly-funded university; a form of hybrid service organisation which in Australia faces unique identity problems arising from external pressures to integrate notions of professionalism and commercialism into one basic entity (Noordegraaf, 2007). In this hybrid environment organised around distinct professional discipline and manager occupational groups (Becher and Trowler, 2001), ideological ‘flare ups’ are common given each occupational group has a strong perception that its own set of activities constitutes the central purpose of the organisation (Barnett, 2003; Deem, Hillyard and Reed, 2008). Following Barnett (2003) and Winter’s (2009) contention that identity in universities is shaped by prevailing ideologies and institutional logics, we root our research in a social constructionist paradigm to draw attention to how professionals (i.e. academics) and managers shape social reality around their own work roles and ideological beliefs (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). In our identity narratives, we aim to show how work ideologies function to govern modes of thought in terms of anchoring (separating) individuals to (from) their work roles and their university. Both aspects of identity construction are seen as central in a hybrid context where different occupational groups compete to shape the institution’s work and key goals and values.

Our paper is organised as follows. First, we identify the function of ideologies and explain the key role work ideologies and institutional logics play in identity construction. Second, we frame our study in terms of managerial, professional, and hybrid work ideologies and explain how they guide the meaning of identity in a hybrid organisation such as a university. Third, we describe our research strategy and methods and present our findings, discussion and conclusion.

Work Ideologies and Identity Construction

The concept of ideology has a long and established history in organisational analysis and the industrial relations literature (Bendix, 1956; Fox, 1966; Turnbull, 2001; Weiss and Miller, 1987). From a sociological standpoint, Weiss and Miller (1987) argue ideology must be defined with reference to its “central theoretical focus” of identifying the bases of political contention “among groups and individuals with different social positions and material interests” (p. 108). Bendix (1956) and Fox (1966) both advanced the idea ideology is an instrument of persuasion that reflects “those ideas which are espoused by or for those who exercise authority in economic enterprises” (Bendix, 1956, p.55). Ideologies can also be conceptualised cognitively as “understandings that represent credible relationships between objects, properties and ideas” (Sproull, 1981, p. 204). This conception of ideology depicts it as a mental construction, as a set of norms and beliefs that help people rationalise and understand their worlds. The linking of beliefs and action “in terms of cause-and-effect relations” is an important function of ideologies as it makes it possible to determine how we expect people to behave in predictable ways (Beyer, 1981, p. 166). In this vein, ideologies are the substance of culture because they explain and justify ongoing behaviour for members of any group including “national cultures, social classes, occupations, professional groups, formal organisations, and organisational subunits” (Beyer, Dunbar and Meyer, 1988, p. 483). When applied frequently by any group, ideologies may become taken for granted and common sense. Indeed, Anthony (1977) argues the “most successful ideology is one which is

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

not recognisable as such, a system of beliefs and assumptions so much part of everyday life that it is not even identifiable, much less open to question” (p. 4).

Work ideologies play a key role in the identity construction of occupations and professional groups by shaping individual preferences and governing particular modes of thought (Anthony, 1977; Sproull, 1981). An important shaping mechanism may be the assignment of moral meanings to concrete actions (e.g. “healthy, productive workers are engaged in intrinsically satisfying work”) or by seeking legitimation for a particular code of conduct (e.g. “managers and workers should collaborate as a team”). By linking emotionalised, action-oriented beliefs together, work ideologies help to shape the *rights* and *wrongs* of work behaviour (Trice, 1993). Linking core beliefs to behavioural intentions provides a means of understanding how individuals and groups manage the inherent “contradictions and conflicts created by the multiple pressures of the institutional environment” (Suddaby, Elsbach, Greenwood, Meyer and Zilbur, 2010, p.1236). Such linkages help provide a chain of evidence from which to infer how and why individual managers and professionals make sense of competing logics such as shareholder value and business-like health care (Reay and Hinings, 2009; Turnbull, 2001). In this sense, active identity work may involve creating a structure or process to form some kind of bridge between the constraints of the new logic (e.g. “serve patients as paying customers”) and by preserving a degree of moral legitimacy for themselves (“assist those in need as sick patients”). Such a bridge is an important way to influence behaviour because it influences identification with a particular logic and its associated practices.

Institutional logics and identity construction

By guiding the management of meaning and identity in organisations through language, symbols, visions, and myths, ideologies mobilise social action and help connect individuals and groups to particular structural arrangements. In an institutionalised form, ideologies represent powerful institutional logics when they “help to explain connections that create a sense of common purpose and unity within an organisational field” (Reay and Hinings, 2009, p.629). For example, the institutional logic of client service may predominate in an organisational context when belief systems and related practices structure goal achievement and organisational success around client service ideals. Ideals such as ‘serving the client better’, ‘adapting to the client’s demands’, and measuring work on the basis of ‘adding client value’ seeps into the everyday life of the organisation through job descriptions, socialisation rituals, training manuals, and formal procedures (Du Gay and Salaman, 1992). Work structures act to clarify professionals’ understanding of their roles by intensifying client contact and working hours and by making promotion decisions dependent on the cultivation of high-status corporate clients (Boon, 2005). As a dominant institutional logic, client service may transform the identities of professionals “into disciplined and self-disciplining organisational members whose work goals, language, and lifestyle come to reflect the imperatives of the organisation” (Covaleski, Dirsmith, Heian and Samuel, 1998, p. 293). Hence, by connecting individual professionals to role behaviour that is deemed highly “desirable, proper, or appropriate” for clients within a corporate setting, the dominant logic of client service legitimises certain behaviour as being the morally right thing to do (Suchman, 1995, p.577). Over time, individual professionals such as accountants and lawyers will internalise these client service ideals as the hallmark of professional practice (Covaleski *et al.*, 1998; Winter, 2011). The legitimacy of client service as a dominant institutional logic goes unchallenged so long as alternative and conflicting ideologies are not proposed to challenge its purpose and operating principles.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

Work Ideologies in Higher Education

As higher education institutions transform in response to government funding directives and competitive market pressures, corporate-commercial activity has taken centre stage as a major identity sensitising issue framing the nature and relevance of university and academic work (Billot, 2010; Deem *et al.*, 2008; Henkel, 2005). Sustaining commercial activity across teaching and research activities at all levels of the university entails the encouragement of more entrepreneurial engagement by academics. Academics able to take on a more commercially-oriented identity and fuse it into their own sense of selves seem able to “internalise the importance of student numbers, grant income, prestige journal rankings and institutional league tables as market signals of the success and prestige of *their* institutions” (Winter, 2009, p. 123). Academics and managers able to align themselves with the corporate university (managerial identity) may see their interests inextricably tied to “the management of student learning” (Henkel, 1997, p. 138), the contribution they are making to research targets (Harley, 2002) and the satisfaction rendered to students and industry (customers) (Sharrock, 2000). Others with an unwavering allegiance to academic ideals may instead see entrepreneurial engagement as an identity change that runs contrary to “what it means to be an academic” (Henkel, 2005, p. 165). Consequently, they may opt to separate their selves from the ideological principles of a corporate enterprise (professional identity) and voice their contributions as scholars and educators in their respective discipline professions (Churchman, 2006; Winter and Sarros, 2002). Recent research into shifting identities in higher education suggests emergence of a hybrid identity is becoming more widespread as professional managers undertake “quasi-academic roles, such as managing student transitions or regional partnerships” (Whitchurch, 2008, p.3). Table 1 identifies managerial, professional and hybrid work ideologies in higher education and contrasts their characteristics in terms of their primary function and key goals and values. A brief explanation of each work ideology now follows.

Managerial work ideology

A managerial work ideology has at its core the promotion and legitimisation of an economic market-based rationality (Deem and Brehony, 2005; Orchard, 1998). Its primary function in universities is to make the provision of educational services more business-like and to offer students more choices as consumers. Underpinning this function are three core assumptions: (1) institutional competition and consumer preferences are the most efficient resource mechanisms for allocating public services, (2) income generation and outcome measures of performance are appropriate for all types of organisation (i.e. the universal management principle), and (3) management can solve almost any problem it faces if it adopts strong governance principles and utilises commercial business techniques such as budgetary control, quality assurance and performance accountability (Clarke and Newman, 1997). The managerialist discourse has a strong performative and instrumental imperative for individuals to emphasise their managerial identities by conversing in management-speak, a language couched in the principles of budgeting, performance indicators, and quality assurance (Bell and Taylor, 2005; Deem *et al.*, 2008).

Professional work ideology

The primary functions of a professional work ideology in universities are: to value education as an end in itself and to offer students programs of study imbued with learning opportunities; and, to pursue excellence in research that both advances the discipline and is of benefit to all in society. These functions can be traced to the traditional notion that universities are first and foremost places of learning whereby a community of educated persons devote themselves to the pursuit of intellectual truth (Coady, 2000; Wenger, 1998). Although economic utilitarian

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

values are not entirely discounted, they are qualified within an ideological lens that stresses normative goals and values such as discipline-relevance and scholarship, knowledge for its own sake, and accountability to peers (Nixon, 1997). Of central importance to a professional ideology is the occupational principle that professionals have the requisite training, knowledge, skills and values to exercise autonomy and self-regulate their own job performance (O'Neill and Meek, 1994). This principle is enshrined in the belief the professional belongs to a closed community of people with similar knowledge, expertise and qualifications. Such knowledge and expertise reflects a systematic and abstract body of specialised knowledge that is codified and applied in requiring academics to possess a PhD to teach and research in their chosen discipline areas (Becher and Trowler, 2001). It also underpins the peer review process whereby academics trust other academics to review and evaluate their work. All of these codified norms and values help to regulate and socialise members into established teaching and research roles.

Table 1: Work Ideologies in Higher Education

Category	Managerial	Professional	Hybrid
Primary Function	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide educational services as a business 2. Offer students more choice as consumers 3. Provide research products and services of benefit to industry 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Value education as an end in itself 2. Offer students learning focused programs 3. Engage in excellent research for the benefit of society 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide educational services that students value in a business-like way 2. Offer students choice and learning focused programs 3. Engage in excellent research relevant to industry and for its social benefits
Key Goals and Values	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic market-based rationality 2. Income generation 3. Performance accountability 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional discipline relevance and service 2. Scholarship 3. Professional autonomy, peer review and trust principle 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic-market rationality, discipline relevance and service 2. Income generation and scholarship partnerships 3. Performance management and semi-autonomy

Note: Adapted from Randle and Brady (1997) and Winter (2009)

Hybrid work ideology

A hybrid work ideology eschews the idea there is any fundamental contradiction between making education more business-like (managerial function) and valuing education as an end in itself (professional function). Indeed, higher education is seen in a much more relational context where managers and professionals engage in constructive coalitions in an attempt to blend academic scholarship with the commercial demands of the university. The primary

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

function of a hybrid work ideology is to offer students more choice and learning focused programs, and to engage co-operatively with industry in research and development that provides commercial and social benefits. By mixing-up control types, a hybrid ideology attempts to re-shape higher education around notions of knowledge sharing across shifting boundaries (Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons, 2001). These control types place value on a 'third logic' (Freidson, 2001) where a broad group of managers and enterprising professionals work cooperatively in response to ambiguous and uncertain work demands. In making these linkages, concepts such as *flexible specialisation* and the *managed enterprise* are employed to encourage managers and academics to utilise their relevant skills and expertise in innovative ways that are highly valued by the market for services (Henkel, 2005).

Research Strategy and Methods

We adopted a qualitative research design to explore how university managers and academics in management and non-management roles constructed their roles in a medium-sized (1,200 staff) Australian public university. The university was founded in the late nineteenth century and is currently pursuing a strategy to "fully embed a high-performance culture" and "create and implement a distinctive [name] teaching and learning model". Ethical consent and access to university participants was made possible by the second author who had previously worked at the institution as both an academic and university administrator.

Within our social constructionist perspective, we positioned identity construction in terms of roles that were both "fixed and largely taken-for-granted positions" and fluid and "negotiable shared understandings" as to what both managers and academics understood constituted legitimate behaviour for a given position in the social structure (Ashforth, 2001, p. 4). Hence our perspective on roles and their social construction recognised identity discourses have both an ideological and structural element (Phillips and Hardy, 2002). Structurally, we surmised managers and academics would voice ideological beliefs consistent with their: (1) position in the university hierarchy (i.e. manager or non-manager), and (2) corresponding membership of a manager and/or professional discipline occupational group (Winter, 2009). Ideologically, we conjectured managers and academics would voice particular ideological beliefs to legitimate their own managerial and professional role identities (Deem and Brehony, 2005; Ibarra, 1999). Finally, we regarded the cognitive processes by which individuals seek to align themselves to, or separate themselves from their roles and university, as integral to identity formation in a hybrid organisational context (Foreman and Whetten, 2002).

As a consequence of our methodological assumptions, we believed university managers would emphasise their managerial identities by making reference to managing budgets and resource allocation decisions consistent with customer service ideals (Golden, Dukerich, and Fabian, 2000). Conversely, we thought academics in their respective teaching and research roles would emphasise their professional identities by voicing ideological beliefs consistent with discipline-based scholarship, learning, autonomy, and community of practice ideals (Churchman, 2006; Wenger, 1998). Finally, we believed academic-managers occupying formal boundary spanning roles would stress their hybrid identities by encouraging innovation and budgetary control while maintaining the importance of academic autonomy and scholarship (Clark, 1998). In order to guide the process of role identity construction, two process research questions were formulated:

1. What particular work ideologies connect (disconnect) managers, academic-managers and academics to (or from) their work and university?

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

2. How do work ideologies explain identity construction for managers, academic-managers, and academics in a hybrid university?

Data collection and analysis

To enable comparisons to be made between work ideologies on the basis of structural role criteria, study participants were designated according to one of three occupational groupings: managers (broad non-academic functional roles), academic-manager (deans, heads of school) and academic (lecturing positions). To provide another point of contrast, study participants were drawn from business and science disciplines. In accordance with this structural frame, 19 interviews were conducted with the following role occupants:

- 4 managers (1 executive manager - planning/development; 1 executive manager – human resources; 1 faculty manager - arts; 1 faculty manager - science);
- 4 academic-managers (1 dean - science; 1 acting dean - business; 1 head of school - science; 1 acting head of school - business); and
- 11 academics (6 senior lecturers/lecturers - business; 5 senior lecturers/lecturers - science).

All participants (14 male, 5 female) consented in writing to a 1-hour recorded interview. The average age (length of time in the university) of managers was 49 years (20.5 years), academic-managers 47 years (5.7 years), and academics 43 years (9.8 years). All participants were employed on a full-time continuing basis.

To ensure questions and responses were structured and analysed around the study's research questions, an interview protocol was developed and piloted with the help of academics from outside the subject university. Interview questions were framed around ideological sensitising topics designed to reveal participants': (1) work roles and identities, and (2) beliefs about the nature and purpose of the university. Participants were asked to describe their key job/role demands, to describe activities they most liked doing, to comment on principals and ideals that they hold dear, and to elaborate on the meaning of success in their work (Archer, 2008; Ibarra, 1999). Using the university as a referent, participants were also asked to describe their feelings towards the university and to comment on the university's purpose, reputation and image. These questions were thought likely to reveal ideological beliefs as to why academics and managers may identify with, or disidentify from, the university (Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994).

Interviews were conducted as guided conversations to capture the vocabulary, anecdotes and stories used by participants to convey their beliefs and feelings about their work roles, identities and university (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). In keeping with our social constructionist approach, analysis and coding of data explicitly took account of "participants' meanings of their views and actions in the coding itself" by using *in vivo* codes as symbolic markers (Charmaz, 2006, p. 55). Larger segments of data expressing ideals of academic and managerial work were captured with *focused* coding. In order to bring the data together and address our second research question, two approaches were employed. First, all initially coded data was theoretically examined using the analytic categories 'contexts' and 'consequences' (Glaser, 1978). Second, partitioning and clustering of data across cases by role, work ideology and organisation referent groups helped identify relationships in the data.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

Findings

The work ideologies of participants were largely in line with the general behavioural patterns associated with the roles that managers and academics occupy in the university hierarchy. There were however some notable exceptions. Of the four managers interviewed, only the two faculty managers expressed their views in terms of a managerial ideology. The senior executive responsible for the university's 'growth agenda' iterated a hybrid work ideology and the human resources executive professed a professional work ideology in describing his desire to connect with the academic staff. All four managers expressed a strong attachment to the university. Three of the four academic-managers (dean - science; acting dean - business; acting head of school - business) reported a hybrid work ideology and the head of school - science indicated a professional ideology. Only one academic-manager identified strongly with the university and this may perhaps be attributed to the acting status of the two participating academic-managers of business.

As surmised, academics professed a strong professional work ideology and attachment to teaching-research activity in their respective disciplines. One academic in business indicated she "closely identified with this university" given she had completed all of her degrees there (B7). Comments below provide indicative examples of the key beliefs and ideals underpinning each work ideology.

Managerial work ideology

Both faculty managers affirmed the primary importance of managing budgets and generating income in their respective roles because their heads of school could "see every dollar, where every dollar goes and why it goes there" (A8). One faculty manager framed his work in terms of playing the numbers game in response to rules that are constantly changing:

...at the end of the day it's just a game... and we're playing the game... the thing is the rules are constantly changing. I mean, you know, maximising the money into the faculty, whether it's through the teaching, whether it's through the research quantum, whether it's from international students... you know the rules will come out and we will be looking to maximise our contribution to that. That's what we do. (A8)

The other faculty manager saw a 'project manager role' as central to his working on a range of tasks that are "cyclical like the university budget process" and which allow him to "generally stick to the same timeframe" (A2). The 12 month university budget process was not the only mechanism for aligning the manager to the university. His conception of management as an activity emphasised unitary, one size fits all principles whereby a faculty manager could work the same way right across the university:

So you know in any admin role...in the school of history, in the school of arts or in the school of management, those admin roles should be 80 to 90 per cent the same, just you know the differences being the bits around the outside that relate to the culture or the disciplines in which the academic staff that you're supporting are dealing with. (A2)

Professional work ideology

Comments made by academics evoked Boyer's (1990) interpretation of academic work as a mixture of scholarship and teaching ideals. Personal connections with students to facilitate learning were seen as satisfying aspects of the academic role:

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

...I'd say that I really do enjoy the teaching component, I enjoy the interaction with the students and I see a great value in what I'm doing in educating engineers of the future and motivating them ...you can see so much growth in the students from first year through to final year and seeing that sort of development as you go through, it's very rewarding so I really enjoy the teaching on a face-to-face level... (B8)

...I mean the thing that really motivates me is ... is learning new things. I've always had a passion for learning...Because it's a relatively small school [and] the groups are small you have a lot more chance for personal interaction. And, yeah, you develop good contacts with the students and you get a lot of satisfaction, you know when you've done a good job, you get positive feedback. (B11)

Academics tended to ridicule the managerial ideal that students were customers and used an anti-customer discourse to affirm distinct aspects of their identities as independent educators (Sharrock, 2000):

I don't care if I have four or two-hundred students. I'm a teacher, I'm not a manager. For me I don't want to look at, you know, there is that much money I get out of this student or of that student. That's ... that's not a consideration for me. I ... I don't see students at all as customers. (B5)

...students are not customers, in no way shape or form. They're vaguely products. I take on board things they think work or don't work via the [evaluation] process...outside of that, no I put the units together as I see fit and try and get them through it to the other end. And when they do figure out 'oh yeah, this is the skill I didn't have before', then that's the reward. (B6)

The head of school - science affirmed his ideals as an academic educator by referring to his decision to teach "first year" and learn "the names of all one hundred students" (A4). In defining his academic identity, he disidentified with the university and its perceived market-based discourse of offering students more choice as paying consumers:

... the university responded very much to what the consumer wanted by having a plethora of science degrees, I have never seen so many named science degrees, it's bullshit... this university followed the track of naming a million different science degrees to attract market share, well it hasn't happened, it's a total failure. It's created a huge workload for staff, you know feeding all of these little ... little amoebas or whatever. (A4)

Indicative comments below illustrate dissonance in terms of the university's strategic agenda and business-focused direction and particularly its lack of connection to what happens in the 'academic heartlands' (Clark, 1998):

...we've got this thing called the [strategic] agenda, which I've read and whilst it sounds very nice on the face of it, it's impenetrable. It actually means nothing. We want growth and we want excellence. You can't have both. Not in our operating system. We pile in more students, we don't get any more support, we

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

don't get any more infrastructure, so if you're getting more students in and overseas students and all that kind of stuff you can't get excellence...(B6)

...I think there's a bit of a disconnect though between what goes on here in the school and what goes on up the hill there in central administration in terms of how they perceive and how they value what work is done... many of the people up there really have no idea what it's like to go in and teach an undergraduate class, they have no engagement with the students, they have no engagement with the research and they make the decisions based on financial matters with too little knowledge of the details of the actual core business of the university. It's ... it's too business-focused... (B11)

Hybrid work ideology

Three of the four academic-managers (both deans and the acting head of school – business) expressed a nuanced, hybrid work ideology whereby business-like growth did not “compromise academic integrity or quality” (A6) and budget inflexibility did not “squash the life out of the creativity that universities are meant to be about” (A1). The mixed belief systems of these participants were such that the budget imperatives of the university “are a given” (A1) and not strong enough to actually take them away from their understandings of other ideals, such as the morale of academic staff members or the university's social justice agenda:

...so at the local level, whilst I recognise that universities have to generate money, it also needs to be in a realistic fashion... the last thing that we should be doing from the point of view of the unit, the faculty and the schools, and from the point of view of individual staff members and their morale is attempting to bleed them dry. (A6)

...I think this place has got a very special onus of responsibility to do a lot more in terms of, or should of, where it is in its community, in not only providing educational services or providing a haven for intellectualism or for people to have academic careers. I think it's got more of an embedded social justice agenda, because of the demographics within the particular community, and needs to always have that on its agenda. (A1)

One executive manager also articulated a diverse set of hybrid values (A3). In expressing support for calls that the university be “entrepreneurial and visionary” when evaluating a range of “partnerships and marketing opportunities”, he also stressed the university's social justice agenda of making opportunities available to the local community:

In terms of the broader community, I think we need to do a hell of a lot more. I mean, if we're going to achieve the Commonwealth target we need to get out into, you know, a range of low socio-economic areas where hardly anyone has an opportunity to even think about engaging with higher education, so there's a hell of a lot more to do. (A3)

In outlining his approach to managing “the academic enterprise”, the executive manager underlined the importance of working with the faculties and their schools and possessing a “detailed appreciation of how the academic world works and what you can achieve” (A3).

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

This understanding translated to support for a range of discipline areas “that you wouldn’t normally support on a managerialist approach” over a limited timespan (A3).

Discussion

Our findings reveal the extent to which corporate-commercial modes of work activity act as an identity sensitising mechanism in terms of connecting (or separating) individual managers and professionals to (from) their roles and hybrid organisation (Brown and Humphreys, 2006; Glynn, 2000; Reay and Hinings, 2009). Essentially, work ideologies shape identity construction by anchoring individuals to beliefs and practices that are considered acceptable and legitimate for a given position in the organisational structure. Taking into account both the structural and ideological elements of their respective identity narratives illustrates managers and academics seek to legitimise their role identities differently (Ibarra, 1999). For managers in this university, this may mean voicing beliefs consistent with managing budgets and customer service ideals; for other managers it may mean crafting a more nuanced hybrid narrative that blends commercial and professional pursuits (Noordegraaf, 2007). For both managerial and hybrid narratives, ideological beliefs do seem to have formed a bridge or connection between the individual manager and her/his role requirements such that work is inimical to that of the corporate management system (Du Gay and Salaman, 1992; McAuley, Duberley and Cohen, 2000). Pratt *et al.* (2006) refer to this positive cognitive state as *work-identity integrity* given it implies strong and consistent emotionalised beliefs have formed cementing who one is, the work one does, and where the work occurs. For managers, work activity is perceived as university-oriented and tends to be shaped by the organisation’s budgetary processes and broader business-social agendas. This broader source of work role identification may explain why managers expressed a stronger attachment to the university in its corporate guise compared to academics and academic-managers in their respective discipline units (Edwards, 2005). Following the tenets of social identity theory, individuals that seek and attain consistency between their work roles and the broader organisation’s goals and [corporate] direction are more likely to categorise themselves as valued members of the organisation (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Dutton *et al.*, 1994).

Integral to the process of identity construction seems to be the extent to which individuals and groups in a professional work context share some common ideological schema as to what constitutes legitimate-ethical work and social conduct (Bunderson, 2001; Thompson and Bunderson, 2003; Winter, 2011). Congruent ideological states and the association to identity presuppose individuals seek out and construct occupational roles around principles or causes that fit individual’s own self-categorisations. In such instances, work roles may be premised on “ideological rewards” (Blau, 1964, p. 239) such as demonstrating to students the “importance (and joys) of teaching and learning” (Brown and Humphreys, 2006, p. 240). This is clearly evident in our study where academics evoke teaching and learning ideals that seem to fit seamlessly into each participant’s own self-identities as educators in their respective discipline units. Here work ideologies function to anchor academics to educational beliefs that affirm the centrality of learning and student development (Nixon, 1997). Learning is not viewed simply “as something that happens to students, but as something that they see themselves must make happen” (Nixon, 1997, p. 94). By conceptualising learning this way and not just as a set of management evaluation targets (expressed in managerial language as ‘KPIs’) to achieve, personal connection with students becomes a major pedagogical concern and thus central to work activity and the task of the university. Because academics are anchored to educational principles in their discipline units, they tend to express a sense of disconnection from a central administration perceived to be distant from the central work of teaching and learning. Previous studies reveal discipline-based academics do disidentify with

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

a market-based discourse that offers students more choice to students as consumers and place faith in strategic plans based on 'growth' and 'excellence' operational ideals (Churchman, 2006; Winter and Sarros, 2002). Ambivalence and separation from managerial ideals of making education more 'business-like' suggests clear cut boundaries have formed between academics and the university, a negative cognitive state referred to as *organisation-identity disidentification* (Elsbach, 1999). States of work-identity connection and organisation-identity separation represent defining elements of a hybrid organisation and illustrate the difficulties of developing management strategies that resonate with occupational groups engaged in activity based on competing beliefs and institutional logics.

Hybrid work ideology (the third logic)

The language of the academic-managers provides support for the notion of a hybrid work ideology and a bridging institutional logic that links the professional and managerial arms of the hybrid organisation. Occupying formal boundary spanning organisational roles as heads of school and deans, academic-managers are placed at a critical point of academic influence; they can exert pressure for change on the organisation in terms of the need for innovation and entrepreneurial activity, whilst also recognising and praising the scholarship and education value of the academic discipline units for which they are responsible (Ramsden, 1998). Linguistically walking this tightrope in the acknowledged 'third logic' (Freidson, 2001) of the hybrid organisation requires managers to have a fairly high degree of cognitive and practical intelligence in order to synthesise managerial and professional beliefs and apply these ideas creatively to problems that are poorly defined, uncertain and contradictory (Sternberg and O'Hara, 1999). A key challenge facing academic-managers in crafting their hybrid discourses is gaining the *moral* acceptance of those academics that see corporate activity as striking against the very foundations of what higher education should be (i.e. valued as a public good). Findings reported here echo those from previous studies (e.g. Deem and Brehony, 2005; Nixon, 1997; Winter and Sarros, 2002) in that they convey a sense of academic disconnection from commercial operating principles and practices conveyed by a distant university administration. Perhaps university managers and academics need to discuss opening the challenges of "living with ideology in the university" (Barnett, 2003) and some of the practical ways of developing and sustaining professional and commercial cultures in one entity. In such discussion, managers and academics might find new ways of talking and making sense of the organisation and themselves rather than focusing exclusively on management tools, strategies and structures (Karp and Helgø, 2008). Discussions may address personal issues and making sense of changing identities, fuzzy roles, and shifting career boundaries associated with institutional change (Fournier, 2000). If anything else, such discussion may provide a useful starting point for sharing managerial and professional ideological perspectives, and for codifying ways of behaving that can reduce the debilitating effect of competing ideologies and institutional logics within the hybrid organisation.

Conclusion

Is the work ideology perspective a useful cognitive mechanism (lens) by which to understand identity construction in a hybrid context? Research in the social identity and psychological contract literatures (e.g. Bunderson, 2001; Dutton *et al.*, 1994; Elsbach, 1999; Foreman and Whetten, 2002; Thompson and Bunderson, 2003) has established the importance of values as behavioural drivers for the individual and, in turn, the nature of the individual-organisation employment relationship. In line with such previous research, our findings point to the potential value a work ideology perspective has for understanding how and why managers and professionals respond to identity threats and/or maintain contradictory identities in hybrid

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

contexts of ideological incongruence (Stiles and Winter, 2008). In reaching this conclusion, we do so with several caveats.

Our own interpretations of the identity content in comments from participants presuppose that when questioned about their work or organisation individuals will articulate action-oriented beliefs that are consistent with a deeper-level emotionalised schema or work ideology framework (Thompson and Bunderson, 2003). This is perhaps a logical assertion to make if we assume ideological beliefs are based on principles that form a coherent logic and can be made “transparent to any questioner” (Barnett, 2003, p.21). However, if we relax that assumption and presuppose ideologies may not be anchored in an individual’s own self-categorisations then alternative interpretations of identity construction are possible. For example, individuals may be espousing an ideology that fits some desirable social identity (i.e. what significant others such as peers and managers expect to hear) rather than articulating one premised on what the individuals stands for and represents in a moral sense (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993). Further, certain ideologies may be voiced on the basis of social desirability and represent an attempt to portray the person in a more uplifting sense (i.e. entrepreneurial leader) rather than capture the drudgery of normal day-to-day existence (i.e. functional manager). It stands to reason emotionalised beliefs take on many guises and those represented here may not be entirely intrinsically significant or truthful, and may merely represent an emotional social identity response to the pressures of a hybrid institutional environment (Suddaby *et al.*, 2010). With this caveat in mind, we suggest work ideologies may govern particular modes of thought but the behavioural intentions of an individual may not be altogether clear. A possible fruitful area of future research is investigating how seemingly contradictory work ideologies (modes of thought) and their associated institutional logics may be fused and actually influence actual behaviour in multiple identity contexts such as hybrid organisations.

References

- Anthony, P.D. (1977). *The Ideology of Work*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Archer, L. (2008). ‘Younger academics’ constructions of “authenticity”, “success”, and professional identity’. *Studies in Higher Education*, **33**, 4, 385-403.
- Ashforth, B.E. (2001). *Role Transitions in Organisational Life: An Identity-Based Perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ashforth, B.E. and Humphrey, R.H. (1993). ‘Emotional labour in service roles: the influence of identity’. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 1, 88-115.
- Ashforth, B.E. and Mael, F.A. (1989). ‘Social identity theory and the organisation’. *Academy of Management Review*, **19**, 20-39.
- Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all Reason: Living with Ideology in the University*. London: Open University Press.
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Inquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keynes, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bell, E. and Taylor, S. (2005). ‘Joining the club: the ideology of quality and business school badging’. *Studies in Higher Education*, **30**, 3, 239-255.
- Bendix, R. (1956). *Work and Authority in Industry*. New York: John Wiley.
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor.
- Beyer, J.M. (1981). ‘Ideologies, values, and decision making in organisations’. In P.C. Nystrom and W.H. Starbuck (Eds), *Handbook of Organisational Design*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 166-202.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

- Beyer, J.M., Dunbar, R.L. and Meyer, A.D. (1988) 'Comment: the concept of ideology in organisational analysis'. *Academy of Management Review*, **13**, 483-489.
- Billot, J. (2010). 'The imagined and the real: identifying the tensions for academic identity'. *Higher Education Research & Development*, **2**, 6, 709-721.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Boon, A. (2005). 'From public service to service industry: the impact of socialisation and work on the motivation and values of lawyers', *International Journal of the Legal Profession* **12**, 2, 229-260.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brown, A.D. and Humphreys, M. (2006). 'Organisational identity and place: a discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **43**, 2, 231-257.
- Bunderson, J.S. (2001). 'How work ideologies shape the psychological contracts of professional employees: doctors' responses to perceived breach'. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, **22**, 717-741.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Churchman, D. (2006). 'Institutional commitments, individual compromises: identity-related responses to compromise in an Australian university'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **28**, 1, 3-15.
- Churchman, D. and King, S. (2009). 'Academic practice in transition: hidden stories of academic identities'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **14**, 5, 507-516.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation*. London: IAU Press.
- Clarke, J. and Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State*. London: Sage.
- Coady, T. (2000). 'Universities and the ideals of inquiry'. In T. Coady (Ed), *Why Universities Matter: A Conversation about Values, Means and Directions*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 3-25.
- Covaleski, M.A., Dirsmith, M.W., Heian, J.B. and Samuel, S. (1998). 'The calculated and the avowed: techniques of discipline and struggles over identity'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **43**, 2, 293-327.
- Deem, R. and Brehony, K.J. (2005). 'Management as ideology: the case of "new managerialism" in higher education'. *Oxford Review of Education*, **31**, 2, 217-235.
- Deem, R., Hillyard, S. and Reed, M. (2008). *Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Du Gay, P. and Salaman, G. (1992). 'The cult[ure] of the customer'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **29**, 615-633.
- Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M. and Harquail, C.V. (1994). 'Organisational images and member identification'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **39**, 239-263.
- Edwards, M.R. (2005). 'Organisational identification: a conceptual and operational review'. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **7**, 4, 207-230.
- Elsbach, K.D. (1999). 'An expanded model of organisational identification'. In Staw, B.M. and Sutton, R.I. (Eds), *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, **21**, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 163-200.
- Exworthy, M. and Halford, S. (1999). 'Professionals and managers in a changing public sector: conflict, compromise and collaboration?' In Exworthy, M. and Halford, S. (Eds), *Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1-17.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

- Foreman, P. and Whetten, D.A. (2002). 'Members' identification with multiple-identity organisations'. *Organisation Science*, **13**, 6, 618-635.
- Fournier, V. (2000). 'Boundary work and the (un)making of the professions'. In N.Malin (Ed), *Professionalism, Boundaries and the Workplace*. London: Routledge, 67-86.
- Fox, A. (1966). *Industrial Sociology and Industrial Relations*. London: HMSO.
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. Cambridge UK: Polity.
- Glaser, B.G. (1978). *Theoretical Sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.
- Glynn, M.A. (2000). 'When cymbals become symbols: conflict over organisational identity within a symphony orchestra'. *Organisation Science*, **11**, 3, 285-298.
- Golden, B.R., Dukerich, J.M. and Fabian, F.H. (2000). 'The interpretations and resolution of resource allocation issues in professional organisations: a critical examination of the professional-manager dichotomy'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **37**, 8, 1157-1187.
- Harley, S. (2002). 'The impact of research selectivity on academic work and identity in UK universities'. *Studies in Higher Education*, **27**, 2, 187-205.
- Henkel, M. (1997). 'Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise'. *Higher Education Quarterly*, **51**, 2, 134-143.
- Henkel, M. (2005). 'Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment'. *Higher Education*, **49**, 155-176.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). 'Provisional selves: experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **44**, 764-791.
- Karp, T. and T.I. Helgø (2008). 'From change management to change leadership: embracing chaotic change in public sector organisations'. *Journal of Change Management*, **8**, 1, 85-96.
- Lewicki, R.J., Greenberger, D. and Coyne, E. (2007). 'Dysfunctional subcultures in organisations: threat or a key to enhancing change?' In Langan-Fox, J., Cooper, C.L. and Klimoski, R.J. (Eds), *Research Companion to the Dysfunctional Workplace: Management Challenges and Symptoms*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 441-459.
- Lok, J. (2010). 'Institutional logics as identity projects'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **53**, 6, 1305-1335.
- McAuley, J., Duberley, J. and Cohen, L. (2000). 'The meaning professionals give to management... and strategy'. *Human Relations*, **53**, 1, 87-116.
- Nixon, J (1997). 'Regenerating professionalism within the academic workplace'. In Broadbent, J., Dietrich, M. and Roberts, J. (Eds), *The End of the Professions? The Restructuring of Professional Work*. London: Routledge, 86-103.
- Noordegraaf, M. (2007). 'From "pure" to "hybrid" professionalism: present-day professionalism in ambiguous public domains'. *Administration & Society*, **39**, 6, 761-785.
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- O'Neill, A. and Meek, L.V. (1994). 'Academic professionalism and the self-regulation of performance'. *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, **16**, 1, 93-107.
- Orchard, L. (1998). 'Managerialism, economic rationalism and public sector reform in Australia: connections, divergences, alternatives'. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, **57**, 1, 19-32.
- Phillips, N. and Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pratt, M.G., Rockmann, K.W. and Kaufmann, J.B. (2006). 'Constructing professional identity: the role of work and identity learning cycles in the customisation of identity among medical residents'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **49**, 2, 235-262.
- Raelin, J.A. (1986). *The Clash of Cultures: Managers and Professionals*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Understanding Identity Construction in Hybrid Organisations: A Work Ideologies Perspective

- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to Lead in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Randle, K. and Brady, N. (1997). 'Further education and the new managerialism'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, **21**, 2, 229-239.
- Reay, T. and Hinings, C.R. (2009). 'Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics'. *Organisation Studies*, **30**, 6, 629-652.
- Rousseau, D.M. and Tijoriwala, S.A. (1998). 'Assessing psychological contracts: issues, alternatives and measures'. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, **19**, 731-744.
- Rubin, H.J. and Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sharrock, G. (2000). 'Why students are not (just) customers (and other reflections on life after George)'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **22**, 2, 149-164.
- Sproull, L. (1981). 'Beliefs in organisations'. In Nystrom, P.C. and Starbuck, W.H. (Eds), *Handbook of Organisational Design*, Vol 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 203-223.
- Sternberg, R.J. and O'Hara, L.A. (1999). 'Creativity and intelligence'. In Sternberg, R.J. (Ed), *Handbook of Creativity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 251-272.
- Stiles, D.R. and Winter, R.P. (2008). Understanding disidentification with multiple identity organisations. *British Academy of Management Proceedings*, 9-11 Sept, Harrogate, UK.
- Suchman, M.C. (1995). 'Managing legitimacy: strategic and institutional approaches', *Academy of Management Review* **20**, 3, 571-610.
- Suddaby, R., Elsbach, K.D., Greenwood, R., Meyer, J.W. and Zilbur, T.B. (2010). 'Organisations and their institutional environments – bringing meaning, values, and culture back in: introduction to the special research forum'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **53**, 6, 1234-1240.
- Sveningsson, S. and Alvesson, M. (2003). 'Managing managerial identities: organisational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle'. *Human Relations*, **56**, 10, 1163-1193.
- Thompson, J.A. and Bunderson, J.S. (2003). 'Violations of principle: ideological currency in the psychological contract'. *Academy of Management Review*, **28**, 4, 571-586.
- Trice, H.M. (1993). *Occupational Subcultures in the Workplace*. Ithaca, New York: ILR Press.
- Turnbull, S. (2001). 'Corporate ideology – meanings and contradictions for middle managers'. *British Journal of Management*, **12**, 231-242.
- Weiss, R.M. and Miller, L.E. (1987). 'The concept of ideology in organisational analysis: the sociology of knowledge or the social psychology of beliefs?' *Academy of Management Review*, **12**, 1, 104-116.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitchurch, C. (2004). 'Administrative managers – a critical link'. *Higher Education Quarterly*, **58**, 4, 280-298.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008). 'Shifting identities, blurring boundaries: the changing roles of professional managers in higher education'. *Research and Occasional Paper Series 10*, Centre for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>
- Winter, R.P. (2009). 'Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **3**, 2, 121-131.
- Winter, R.P. (2011). 'The principled legal firm: insights into the professional ideals and ethical values of partners and lawyers'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **98**, 2, 297-306.
- Winter, R.P. and Sarros, J.C. (2002). 'Corporate reforms to Australian universities: views from the academic heartland'. *Journal of Institutional Research*, **11**, 2, 92-104.