From: Gordon, G. and C. Whitchurch (Eds.) (2009, forthcoming). Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce: 167-183. International Studies in Higher Education. New York, Routledge.

Chapter 10

Convergence and Divergence in Professional Identities

Celia Whitchurch

Introduction

This chapter considers issues arising for staff who are loosely termed 'professional', who are likely to have both management responsibilities and specialist knowledge, but who are also increasingly mobile with respect to their career paths, spheres of interest, and portfolios of activity. At the same time as universities have employed increasing numbers of specialist staff with expertise to deal with functions such as business development, marketing and public relations, roles and identities have also become more fluid. Diversification, therefore, has been accompanied by a convergence, not only between functions such as student recruitment and the promotion of the institution to new student markets, but also between professional and academic spheres of activity.

The chapter suggests that amid (and perhaps in spite of) pervasive discourses of 'managerialism', joint working between professional and academic colleagues, which may include overlaps and crossovers of activity, is increasingly common, facilitating opportunities and outcomes for both groups of staff. However, such joint working tends to remain hidden from view because it is not easily articulated via formal

organizational structures and processes. It is, therefore, likely to depend on individual initiatives, the skillful use of networks, and tacit understandings. In this context, the concepts of 'managerial' and 'borderless professionals' offered by Rhoades and Middlehurst respectively in Chapters 3 and 13, are reviewed, alongside that of the 'blended professional' (Whitchurch, 2009). While faculty are not excluded from these considerations, for the purposes of this chapter the focus is on people employed on professional contracts (albeit some of these may have shifted from academic contracts earlier in their careers).

These developments have been recognized in the UK, to some extent at least, in the introduction of a national Framework Agreement (Universities and Colleges Employers' Association [UCEA], 2003), one aim of which was to give greater flexibility to institutions in rewarding and developing the different contributions that might be made by a range of staff. Such changes raise issues for both individuals and institutions about what it means to be a 'professional', and also 'a manager', in contemporary higher education. These are considered, alongside the implications of a loosening of boundaries, which may, as suggested by Strike in Chapter 5, lead to accommodations in formal structures, such as the creation of 'career climbing frames' alongside step-by-step career ladders.

A Melting Pot?

While Becher's classic account (1989) of academic identity gives primacy to knowledge groupings ('territories') and disciplinary cultures ('tribes'), its second edition acknowledges that it is difficult to maintain firm parameters for these 'tribes' and 'territories' in more fluid, contemporary environments: '…these properties are not

only relative rather than absolute … their attributions may change over time and space' (Becher and Trowler, 2001: 184).

Furthermore, Becher and Trowler (2001: 194, 197) acknowledge that more identity work is needed to take account of the increasing diversity of institutional functions and locations, and the implications of these for institutions. Since 2001, evidence has accumulated that rigid boundaries are becoming less sustainable, not only between academic disciplines, but also between academic and other forms of professional activity. Increasingly, staff without academic contracts contribute to teaching and learning (Rhoades, 2007), research spin out (Allen-Collinson, 2007; Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2009), and a range of institutional projects in quasi-academic areas such as widening participation, outreach, and regional partnership (Whitchurch, 2008a; 2008b). Likewise, Law in Chapter 11 demonstrates how those occupying converged library and information roles undertake teaching and research in relation to information literacy and digital resources. In common with staff in academic practice or educational development (Land, 2004; 2008), and institutional research (Harrington and Chen, 1995; Whitchurch, 2008b), these groups have their own professional associations, bodies of knowledge, and literatures.

These movements arise partly from the development of broadly based, extended projects across the university, which are no longer containable within clear boundaries, and create new functional portfolios (Whitchurch, 2008b). These projects, such as student transitions, community partnership, and professional development, require staff who are capable of moving across boundaries and understanding ways in which different elements impact on the project as a whole. For instance, the student

transitions project now encompasses contiguous activities such as marketing and recruitment, widening participation, student funding, welfare and disability, careers advice and alumni relations. The human resources function, as well as encompassing all the legislative requirements associated with employing staff, incorporates staff development, equality and diversity, and work-life balance. These extended projects split and re-form to create new fields of activity. Professional staff in these types of areas are, therefore, increasingly mobile, and become involved in activities that in the past might have been regarded as the sole preserve of academic faculty, such as:

- Authoring documentation associated with, for instance, major funding bids and learning support.
- Speaking at outreach, induction and study skills events.
- Conducting recruitment visits at home and overseas.
- Conducting negotiations with community and business partners.
- Representing their institutions on national and international agencies.

Thus, increased functional specialization to meet legislative and market requirements is accompanied by less boundaried forms of working.

Both groups of staff are also likely to work and study side by side on senior management and leadership programs run by, for instance, the US Harvard Graduate School of Education, the UK Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, and the Australian L H Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management. Furthermore, a growing number of professional staff have, or are acquiring, academic credentials, including doctoral qualifications, and/or teaching or management experience in post-compulsory education. Some of these people see themselves as

moving into senior management roles such as have been occupied traditionally by academic faculty, for instance a pro-vice-chancellorship or provostship.

At the same time as changes are occurring for professional staff, academic faculty with traditional portfolios including teaching, research and third-leg activity, work alongside other academic colleagues who may focus primarily on teaching or research, as well as with, for instance, contract workers who move from project to project (research or other types of project). Some faculty may move in the direction of 'management', taking on a top team role; others may move in a 'professional' direction, teaching on and researching into professional development or learning support. Such people may be co-located in a department of educational development that also caters for professional staff seeking management development.

No doubt because of the movements described above, it has proved difficult to encapsulate professional groupings within generic employment classifications, which contributes to a lack of clarity in understandings about roles, functions and identities (Whitchurch, 2006). Kehm (2006) suggests that 'new higher education professionals' represent emergent expertise, and Whitchurch (2008a; 2008b) has described the development of a 'third space' between professional and academic spheres of activity, in which 'blended' roles occur, comprising components of what have been thought of traditionally as purely academic or purely professional activity (Whitchurch, 2009). Middlehurst (Chapter 13) demonstrates how the globalization of higher education has led to greater fluidity, and even instability, between academic disciplines, functional responsibilities, and institutional approaches to role definition, leading to concepts of

professionals and professionalism that are ‘borderless’, in that they cannot be fixed in time and space.

The following posts, advertized in a single issue of the UK *Times Higher Education* (2009a), offer a snapshot of the trend towards an increasingly fluid mix of activity within individual roles:

- *Learning and Teaching Manager in an academic department* (page 57)
- *Head of Employer Led Curriculum Development* (page 57)
- *Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Operations)* (page 61)

Between them, these roles demand:

- A facility for developing networks.
- A confidence to operate in different milieus.
- Ability to conduct bridging activity with external partners.
- Organisational skills, as well as an appreciation of the specific teaching and learning environment.
- Management of multiple functions in complex environments.
- Ability to ‘deliver a sweeping transformational agenda.’

Only one of the advertizements specified an academic qualification, although all required a track record in management. Furthermore, the fact that management roles are increasingly incorporated within academic schools, faculties and departments, and are therefore embedded in Clark’s ‘academic heartland’ (Clark: 1998), implies an expectation of joint working alongside academic colleagues, in management arrangements that are increasingly distributed (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008).

It is also significant that another post, advertized in the same issue of *Times Higher Education* (2009a), which is described as what might be thought of as a traditional Director of Student Services role, places greater emphasis on experience of matrix management and customer relations *per se*, than on experience in higher education, requiring someone 'who may currently be leading a customer service function in the public or private sectors… [and] have experience of leading multifunctional teams and of developing and improving systems and processes…' (page 62). Another role, entitled Project Manager (Academic Development), which might well in the past have been seen as a 'service' role in relation to quality assurance, curriculum management and governance, requires project experience in a higher education setting. The latter is written in a way that indicates an expectation of developmental rather than process-oriented activity, and is framed in terms of 'work[ing] effectively in complex situations and with changing priorities… build[ing] alliances for change among stakeholders… liaison with colleagues in similar roles at other HE institutions…' (page 78).

This increasingly diverse mix of activities within and between roles may be parallel, complementary or even conflicting. It has impacted on both professional identities and working practices, as described in Table 10.1, and contributes to a more complex institutional dynamic.

[Insert Table 10.1 here]

The movements described above might also be seen as having a political dimension, in that they give rise to a broad spectrum of views. At one extreme, professional staff

are seen primarily as having a service or support role, in which they '…provide services and are therefore subservient … They are not initiators or developers of the institution' (Pro-vice-chancellor, post-1992 UK university, quoted in Prichard, 2000: 190). Such views derive from an 'academic civil service' tradition (Sloman, 1964; Lockwood, 1986). In this scenario, professional staff would be expected to provide technical, regulatory and policy advice as members of a homogeneous cadre, whether they were in generalist or specialist roles. The prime purpose of these functions was to support decision-making by academic colleagues, whose management responsibilities were likely to be additional to their academic interests, and to be for fixed terms of office. Such traditions may, in part, be responsible for claims of 'invisibility' in an Australian context (Szekeres, 2004: 7), and also in a US context (Rhoades, Chapter 3). They also continue in a number of European countries, where professional (and also academic) staff are employed directly by the government as civil servants, and in Japan, where they are, however, subject to change as the government relaxes the regulatory environment so as to permit recruitment of individuals from a greater diversity of backgrounds, as described by Oba in Chapter 6.

Such arrangements offer a system-wide framework, so that an individual in one institution is assumed to have similar skills and knowledge sets to those of someone occupying a similar post in another institution. In some cases there are national pay structures, reflected in generic job titles and career paths. In this scenario, professional identities are primarily positional, and common understandings about roles, relationships and legitimacies derive from formal organization charts. One legacy of this overarching framework is that professional staff are seen as a source of continuity, as 'guardians of the regulations' (Barnett, 2000: 133), and 'keeper[s] of the

community memory' (McNay, 2005: 43). However, the increased accessibility of information via the internet, and its rapid outdating, mean that this type of function has reduced in significance in contemporary institutions.

At the other end of the spectrum, professional staff have been linked directly to the rise of 'academic capitalism' and the generation of institutional income (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004), a transfer of power to 'managerial professionals', and a consequent 'de-professionalization' of academic faculty. Thus, information technology specialists who assist with 'instructional production' in the USA are referred to as '"unbund[ling]" traditional faculty instructional practices… reducing professors to content [ie information rather that knowledge] experts' (Rhoades, 2007: 6). This view parallels the concept of 'managerialism' in the UK, a government approach that obliges public sector organizations to operate in accordance with market imperatives (Ferlie et al, 1996; Ranson et al, 1998; Deem, Hillyard and Reed, 2007). This is framed in terms of:

- Government policies that require universities to bid competitively for public sources of funding, as well as to compete in external markets.
- The introduction of an ethos of 'enterprise', whereby institutions are expected to foster activities the prime aim of which is to generate income (rather than solely on the basis of their academic merit).
- Increased accountability to government via, for instance, quality assessment processes.
- Government policies that stress the role of universities in serving socio-economic agendas.
- Increased regulation of the work of faculty by those with management

responsibilities, be they professional or academic managers.

'Managerial' approaches, therefore, reinforce the sense of a separation and even a polarisation of academic and management activity, and an 'othering' of management. In this scenario, professional staff are seen as 'pivotal for the new self-understanding of higher education institutions as increasingly autonomous actors in the emerging global markets for knowledge and education' (Kehm, 2006: 10).

Competing perceptions about the roles of professional staff, which can and do occur simultaneously, set up tensions that provide an edge to day-to-day working relationships. These tensions arise partly from problems of definition, partly from a lack of understanding about roles and identities, and also from the way that professional staff are perceived in relation to academic faculty. The fact that they are portrayed as providing a service to academic colleagues, and also as agents of 'managerialism', with variations in between, illustrates the difficulty of developing clear understandings about such a diverse grouping. Tensions also arise from issues of comparability, and the way that these are managed can be critical to local cultures. For instance, where professional staff and faculty work side by side in a department such as learning partnerships or professional/academic practice, staff without academic contracts may not have the same rights as their academic colleagues in relation to, for instance, intellectual property or study leave. However, it is argued in this chapter that, while these dichotomies and tensions continue, substantial numbers of professional staff are operating in partnership with academic colleagues, and that such forms of joint working enhance the opportunities available to both groups, and to their institutions, in achieving their goals.

A Case Example of Joint Working

The following case example illustrates ways in which convergence between the roles of two colleagues, one on a professional and one on an academic contract, achieved an outcome that was of benefit to all parties. The collaboration was voluntary; neither individual was line managing, or being line managed, by the other; and both were attuned to what the other might be able to offer in putting together a complex bid for funding.

A Case Example of Joint Working Between Dr Celia Whitchurch (CW), Lecturer, Institute of Education, University of London, and Jack Peffers, European Development Officer (EDO), Institute of Education, University of London

Profiles

CW, who is employed on an academic contract, and the European Development Officer (EDO), who is employed on a professional contract, collaborated on the submission of a bid to the European Union (EU) for research funding. Both had mixed academic and professional backgrounds. CW had had a career as a professional higher education manager before becoming a lecturer, and in this capacity had submitted bids on behalf of academic colleagues to agencies such as the UK National Health Service and Regional Development Agencies. She had been involved in the development of professional staff at national level, and had published regularly on higher education management.

However, she was relatively new to the process of profiling her own academic work in a way that would attract funding, and had no experience of bidding to the EU. The EDO had undertaken research, education and training in the context of education/business collaboration and the development of international partnerships. He had spent a significant period of time in senior research roles, had published regularly on education/industry partnerships, had detailed knowledge of European funding opportunities, and an extensive international network of contacts, facilitated by his knowledge of several European languages. Our combined experience, therefore, maximized the joint contribution we were able to make to the submission of a major bid to the EU for research funding.

Background

Research funding from the EU for higher education projects is commonly tied to policy initiatives aimed at creating opportunities for people in the European Higher Education Area. To achieve a successful outcome, therefore, academic proposals need to be written in such a way that they contribute to EU policy, for instance in relation to knowledge transfer, student mobility, or professional development. The bidding process is complicated and time-consuming. Not only do the policies, programs and criteria change year on year, but deadlines are often relatively short, and bids usually require a minimum of half a dozen or

so European partners. Higher education institutions, therefore, often have a dedicated European officer with knowledge of the process, who publicizes calls for proposals, and has extended networks through which they can bring together partners in areas of common interest, to access appropriate sources of funding. Such professionals are able to assist faculty in the application of their research in new (and perhaps un-thought of) areas, to enhance their and their institutions' research profile, and to generate income.

Process

CW became involved in the bidding process after attending one of a series of seminars run by the EDO about funding streams offered by the European Lifelong Learning Directorate. This led to a series of conversations about an idea that CW had had to extend her research into Europe. In all, the process took three months, and involved weekly meetings, interspersed with email contact. Activities included:

- *Inviting five European partners to join the bid, and gaining their agreement to the allocation of work and anticipated income.*
- *Collecting detailed information about each partner and their institutions, and incorporating this appropriately.*

- *Completing a 100-page proposal, on an interactive online form, with detailed specifications in relation to: alignment with European higher education policy objectives; practical benefits for institutions and individuals; project milestones; the development of workpackages that met EU criteria; and the division of each workpackage into components that were allocated among the partners.*
- *Developing a budget that costed each component of each workpackage, and allocated the associated income among the partners.*
- *Inputting the budget on an interactive online spreadsheet in such a way that it was accepted by the online system (if there were inconsistencies between the various costing elements, the spreadsheets were automatically rejected).*
- *Submitting the bid electronically, with accompanying legal documents, again in such a way that it was accepted by the system.*

Analysis

On the one hand, the EDO was alert to the potential of CW's work in the context of European policy initiatives (and had her draft a 'pilot' early on in the process to verify this). Having substantial experience of how an academic piece of work was likely to map onto EU priorities, he was able to help her orient the application towards the appropriate EU

program. On the other hand, CW was sensitive to advice proffered that the EU would not fund the proposal solely on the basis of its being high-quality or original research, and that the application should be written in such a way as to be aligned to European policy thinking. As part of this process she 'learnt the language' of the EC Lifelong Learning Framework so as to make the case.

The EDO acted as 'pacemaker' in relation to the agreed critical path and in encouraging regular contact with partners to keep them informed and in agreement. He also acted as 'critical friend' in reviewing the ambitiousness of the proposal in the light of budgetary implications and constraints. CW for her part continuously revised drafts so that judgments could be made about its shape, and so that the various strands (balance of partner contributions/research and professional practice; workpackages and costs) could be adjusted on an ongoing basis. The proposal, and the final budget, went through multiple iterations. Both of us were willing to 'go the extra mile' in order to achieve an outcome, which at times involved 24/7 working and availability.

Although we submitted the bid thirty-six hours before the deadline, we received an email the following day to say that in view of the fact that significant numbers of applicants had had difficulty in completing the

online form, the Agency was extending the deadline by two weeks, and reverting to paper submissions. Although we had not worked together before, we attribute our success in completing the online application on time and according to the due process to the adoption of a critical path, and the building of confidence step by step via our respective contributions. Thus, the EDO made himself available on a regular basis, and as the need arose, to offer mechanisms for solving specific problems, and CW followed up advice given at each stage. Both had an appreciation of the academic, policy and practical issues arising from the bid, and by crossing over into each other's territory, moved forward with an application that played to all three considerations.

The process illustrates elements of 'managerial', 'borderless' and 'blended' working as described earlier in this chapter. In a 'managerial' capacity, the EDO acted as entrepreneur in spotting the potential of an academic idea for income generation, and helping to translate this into a 'Mode 2' form of research that would be eligible for funding. There was also a sense in which the project was then 'sold on' to European partners by CW, on the basis of its funding potential. CW was able to self-manage so as to accommodate the bidding requirements, editing her material so that it was oriented towards innovation in professional practice and multilateral institutional co-operation, and writing it in a language that 'spoke to' EU agendas.

'Borderlessness' was demonstrated by the fact that the project involved working with partners (who might or might not be known to each other) across geographic boundaries, in which CW's academic networks and the EDO's European networks were critical. In a different sense, the project required both of us to adopt a 'borderless' approach to the work required to frame the proposal in accordance with EU requirements. This involved specifying, for instance, 'milestones', 'deliverables', 'workpackages', partner contributions, and ways in which it met EU award criteria and policy objectives; putting together a budget that related costs both to partners and to the individual components of the workpackages (neither of us had an accounting background); and getting to grips with the technical aspects of the online submission process, which was being used by the EU for the first time.

The EDO's 'blended' background enabled him to:

- *Act as 'ideas broker' in developing the institution's intellectual capital.*
- *Act as mentor and guide in empowering an academic colleague to take advantage of a funding opportunity by offering clear signposts, timely assistance, enthusiasm and encouragement.*
- *Use the 'social capital' conferred by internal and external networks to open doors.*

- *Be client-focused in bringing together the aspirations of an academic colleague, the institution for which we both worked, and the prospective funding body.*

CW's 'blended' background enabled her to:

- *Accommodate and adapt to EU requirements and specifications.*
- *Respond to advice, especially in relation to pragmatic aspects of the bidding process.*
- *Remain sensitive to the needs, aspirations and academic interests of prospective partners.*
- *Write the proposal so that its academic originality was extended to incorporate innovatory professional practice that would optimize the chances of success.*
- *Adopt a systematic approach, for instance assembling all the material before entering it on the online form (a process that itself took several days).*

We do not suggest that we, or the process of collaboration described above, are exceptional, but we use it to illustrate the type of joint working that enabled a complex process, conducted under tight time and workload constraints, to be completed successfully. It was made more manageable by an appreciation of the need to contextualize research in an appropriate policy framework, and a willingness to pool resources.

Therefore, a combination of imagination, pragmatism and political understanding, together with an ability to work systematically in addressing problems as they arose, enabled us to deliver what we considered to be an innovative proposal, according to the requirements of a potential funding body. In this type of scenario, therefore, where each might defer to the other in one instance, and take the lead in another, traditional notions of who might be managing whom do not apply. Although the immediate aim was to generate research income, from which our institution as well as ourselves would benefit, motivations also included 'social' objectives of extending and developing CW's research in a European context, of benefiting professional practice, and of creating development opportunities for fellow professionals. By sharing the tasks involved, whether at the more creative or operational end of the spectrum, we were able to develop a synergy that we could not have achieved single-handedly.

Re-conceptualizing the Professional Manager in Higher Education

It is suggested that the case example offers an alternative to approaches that are seen primarily as 'service and support' or as 'managerial', in which professional staff might be characterized respectively as 'uncritical friends' or 'power brokers'. However, both of these concepts imply a division of labor, whereas in joint working a professional member of staff is more likely to be seen, rather, as a critical friend and

dealmaker. This process might be seen as fulfilling a definition of 'management' that 'multipl[ies] human accomplishment' by 'amplify[ing] and then aggregat[ing] human effort' (Hamel, 2007: 250). It also might be seen as addressing the challenge noted by Florida (2002: 22) in which '…the biggest issue at stake in this emerging age is the ongoing tension between creativity and organisation. The creative professional is social, not just individual, and thus forms of organisation are necessary, but elements of organization can and frequently do stifle creativity.' The case example demonstrates how space might be found for a less divisive approach that brings together 'creativity' and 'organization'.

Joint working also raises questions about what it means to be 'a professional', or 'a manager' in contemporary institutions. As suggested in Whitchurch's study (2008b), it is possible not to know 'what sort of professional I am any more'. Despite the process of 'professionalization' that is seen to have occurred in countries such as the UK and Australia, the Whitchurch study (2008b) suggests that younger staff saw the concept of 'professionalism' as conveying an elitism with which they were not comfortable, and which was felt to militate against a common purpose of colleagueship. Thus, one person suggested that 'Professionalism is "old school" '. This reflects the less hierarchical approaches said to be favored by Generations X and Y, described in Chapters 4 and 13, who, it is said, value interest and work-life balance above the organizational status they may have.

The case example also suggests that the concept of 'democratic professionalism' (Whitty, 2008) may have currency in higher education as well as in the schools sector, to which it was originally applied. As Whitty (2008: 42) suggests:

> it is not necessarily appropriate to view such developments [inter- and multi-agency working in schools] as an example of de-professionalization, but rather as an attempt at re-professionalization – that is, the construction of a different type of professionalism, perhaps more appropriate to contemporary needs.

Higher education might, therefore, adopt for its own purposes Sachs' (2003) concept of the 'activist professional', who 'works collectively towards strategic ends, operates on the basis of developing networks and alliances… these alliances are not static, but form and are re-formed around different issues and concerns' (Whitty, 2008: 45). The adoption of this type of agency may well be critical to staff working across professional and academic boundaries, to the development of a 'community of professionals' (Association of University Teachers [AUT], 2001), and to Rhoades' (2005: 5) call for 'non-faculty' to become more integrated in decision-making processes:

> Faculty are not the only professionals on campus; the number of non-faculty managerial professionals is growing rapidly. Increasingly, they participate in institutions' basic academic work, and like faculty, they have important expertise about the academy to contribute in shared governance. In short, we need a more inclusive, democratic academic republic.

A 'networked' approach to professional life is also linked to the potential for greater movement between higher education and other sectors, of which there is already evidence (Whitchurch, 2008b). In the UK, a traffic of professional staff can be observed between higher education and the National Health Service, regional development agencies, further and adult education (the college sector), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the charitable sector. An influx of staff from

outside has brought new forms of expertise into higher education. There is also some evidence of senior staff being imported in areas such as human resources and finance, because of a perceived lack of qualified applicants for posts (Lauwerys, 2009).

In Australia, and also to some extent in the UK, the concept of the 'internal consultant' also appears to be gaining currency, in which people move from project to project, and are paid on that basis, with or without an institutional retainer. Individuals in this position might have a number of concurrent, part-time contracts with different sections of an institution or institutions, have a 'special projects' portfolio with one employer, or spend part of their time as a private consultant. In addition, it is becoming more common to employ 'interim managers', a practice that is common in other sectors, and may become more widespread as the global economic environment impacts on institutional finances. An advertizement by a firm of management consultants illustrates that there is a pool of people looking for these types of roles:

> Our team at Veredus has particular expertise in providing Higher Education clients with experienced senior interim management consultants in the following areas:
>
> - Directors of HR
> - Directors of Finance
> - Directors of ICT
> - Heads of Estates/Facilities
> - Heads of School and Faculties
> - Programme/Project Managers in a variety of disciplines (eg HR)
> - Organisational change and policy development specialists.

(Times Higher Education, 2009b: 11).

'Interim managers' may be people who have worked in higher education, or they may come from outside. Their presence is likely to raise boundary issues about their relationships with both professional and academic colleagues. There may be dependencies on both sides as interim managers seek to understand and work in local cultures, and existing staff may have to cope with discontinuity, particularly if interim managers are employed as change agents. Professional staff also work increasingly with colleagues outside the university, for instance with information system providers, partners in local communities, and colleagues on offshore campuses. Such relationships may involve professional staff working at boundaries to perform a translational function with external colleagues, again with mutual dependencies. All these developments could be said to parallel the casualization observed in relation to academic faculty (Rhoades, Chapter 3). They also raise questions about whether or how the concept of allegiance or belonging to an institution, a function, or the higher education sector itself, might pertain. New loyalties may emerge, for instance to teams and projects, which may be short- or long-term, and there may also be re-entry issues if and when individuals return to the mainstream.

Whereas the twentieth century was dominated by large-scale bureaucracies, it has been suggested that the twenty-first century will increasingly be characterized by working 'on the move' (Moynagh and Worsley, 2005); ethical leadership (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007), and innovative organizational practice (Dodgson, Gann and Salter, 2005). Moynagh and Worsley (2005: 3) also suggest that social capital, as opposed to organizational structure, will be paramount in twenty first century

working: ‘As human interactions become more central to work, organisations employing individuals who work well together will secure a competitive advantage.’

Thus, and if as Hamel (2007) claims, ‘the work of managing will be less and less performed by “managers”’, institutions are likely to become increasingly cognisant of ways in which, as demonstrated by the case example above:

> Capability counts for more than credentials or titles…
>
> Commitment is voluntary…
>
> Authority is fluid and contingent on value-added…
>
> Ideas compete on an equal footing…
>
> Decisions are peer based… (Hamel, 2007: 253-254).

To this might be added the possibility of sourcing information, or understandings about how to perform a specific task or process, on a need-to-know basis, without relying unduly on specialist experts, bureaucratic solutions, or precedents. The internet has, since the turn of the century, made this increasingly possible, and has thereby had a levelling effect in relation to the capabilities of individuals.

In considering the recruitment and development of professional staff, and the conditions under which they work, therefore, institutions may wish to review:

- How organizational structures might inhibit or encourage lateral forms of working.
- How professional staff might be accommodated in a ‘career climbing frame’ (as described by Strike in Chapter 5), and how crossovers between professional and academic spheres of activity might contribute to a career portfolio, whichever type of contract is held.

- Critical success factors associated with joint working between professional and academic spheres of activity.
- The aspirations and relationships of people undertaking joint working on projects or in teams.
- Issues of ‘parity’ between people working in mainstream and boundary space.
- Appropriate management and leadership styles.
- The use of:
    - Internal and external networks.
    - Consultancy or interim management roles.
    - Job titles, job descriptions and employment categories.

Conclusion

It would appear that there are forces for both divergence and convergence around the identities of professional staff in higher education. In addition to recognized cadres of staff in generalist, ‘academic civil service’ roles, which exist to a greater extent in some countries than in others, there are now also specialist staff in a wide range of fields including, for instance, enterprise, marketing, widening participation and quality. Alongside a divergence in the composition of and expectations around individual roles, however, there is also evidence of convergence and crossover, particularly between activities traditionally associated with either professional or academic spheres of activity, as exemplified by the case material in this chapter. Such a complex scenario leaves the way open for fissures to open up between ‘managers’ and ‘managed’, and for regroupings to occur when, for instance, teams or partnerships form around specific projects, and joint working takes place.

The global economic downturn may foster such divisions, for instance between those in permanent posts and those in short-term, project-specific roles. If the funding environment becomes increasingly uncertain, as seems likely, with a continued squeezing of units of resource, institutions will wish to have the scope to adjust their salary commitments year on year. Not only will they be less willing to take a chance on loss-leading activity, but restructuring of existing activity may be ongoing. Relationships between a permanent core of staff and those on fixed-term contracts, therefore, are likely to be critical to maintaining teaching and research programs, with associated comparability issues vis-a-vis workloads and career prospects. Notwithstanding what commentators say about the predilections of younger staff for flexible portfolio lifestyles, there could also be a retreat towards a desire for greater clarity and certainty about career paths and futures. Nevertheless, it may be that resource constraints also help to stimulate joint working from the bottom up, between colleagues who perceive advantages in pooling their resources to maximize the chances of successful outcomes.

Finally, it is suggested that as well as augmenting the 'revenue generating capacity of academic faculty and their units' (Rhoades, Chapter 3), professional staff are also responsible for generating non-financial rewards, for instance in the form of social capital, represented by friends of the institution in local communities, as well as wider national and international networks and partnerships. Such connections may lead to new spin-off activity, or extensions of existing activity, such as bespoke programs for local business or international partners. In particular, when involved in joint working with academic colleagues, they may provide a stimulus for innovation and growth, bringing together colleagues so as to add synergy to current portfolios. Thus, joint

working could be said to be an example of how the higher education workforce might be 'reconceptuali[zed]… as a key source of intellectual capital…' (Rhoades, Chapter 3). A critical issue for institutions, therefore, is to create the conditions through which tensions might be used creatively. Maintaining this delicate balance might be described as the key challenge for both 'professionals' and 'managers' alike.

Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge the collaboration of my colleague Jack Peffers, European Development Officer, Institute of Education, University of London, in constructing the case study used in this chapter.

References

Allen-Collinson, J. (2007) '"Get yourself some nice, neat, matching box files!" Research Administrators and Occupational Identity Work.' *Studies in Higher Education* 32(3): 295-309.

Association of University Teachers (AUT) (2001) *Building the Academic Team: A Report on the Contribution of Academic-Related Staff to the Delivery of Higher Education*. London: Association of University Teachers.

Barnett, R. (2000) *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Becher, T. and P. Trowler (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Bolden, R, G. Petrov and J. Gosling (2008) *Developing Collective Leadership in Higher Education*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Clark, B. (1998) *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation.* Paris: International Association of Universities Press and Elsevier Science.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S. and Reed, M. (2007*) Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.