

# 1

## Introduction: How Is Change in Higher Education Managed?

*Bjørn Stensaker, Mary Henkel,  
Jussi Välimaa & Cláudia S. Sarrico*

It is an understatement to argue that the previous two decades have been characterized by an interest in reform and change of higher education. It is thus difficult to find an area of the sector that has not been exposed to policy initiatives aimed not only at changing the surrounding structures, but also at the ways in which teaching and research are organized and function. Reform initiatives have been taken at the supra-national level (exemplified by the Bologna Process in Europe), at the national level and at the institutional level (Gornitzka et al., 2005).

However, the studies conducted so far provide mixed evidence with respect to the impact of all these initiatives at the shop-floor level of higher education. Without doubt, it is not hard to find evidence of change in the way that higher education system study programmes are structured and organized, in the way that governance arrangements are different from before and in the way that new funding systems influence the behaviour of universities and colleges. Most noticeable, perhaps, is the build-up of new forms of accountability, pushed by the growing numbers of ranking lists and performance indicator schemes (e.g. see Kehm & Stensaker, 2009). Moreover, increased institutional autonomy has contributed to more strategic institutions, resulting sometimes in mergers, new collaborative initiatives and much more internationally oriented institutions. Available macro-data also show that productivity and performance of higher education at the system level is increasing in a number of countries, not least in research-intensive universities (Halfman & Leydesdorff, 2010).

While 'change' in the sector can indeed be said to be easily identified, this does not mean that the impact and outcomes of the 'changes' are equally easy to explain. For example, although the Bologna Process has

indeed contributed to change in the study structure and the ways in which quality assurance is conducted in many countries, there is scarce evidence that new study structures or quality assurance processes have radically changed the fundamental ways that teaching and learning is conducted (Witte, 2006). Studies of reform attempts that aim to change governance structures within higher education systems, and within institutions, also indicate that structural reforms do not always contribute to changing the behaviour of academics (Maassen, 1996; Henkel, 2000). Hence, while performance of the sector may have improved, one still faces some challenges in explaining how 'change' takes place at the institutional level and what the consequences of these changes are in universities and colleges (Sarrico et al., 2010).

### **The themes and content of this book**

The current book addresses the challenge of explaining change by employing a threefold strategy. In the first section of the book we problematize and discuss in more depth how we can and should understand the concept of 'change' in higher education. As suggested above, change is a broad and multifaceted concept that goes beyond mere political initiatives and reform attempts to transform higher education. Change also includes the more organic developments in higher education that are triggered by both extrinsic and intrinsic factors, such as demography, technological breakthroughs, globalization, disciplinary developments and how knowledge is organized within the university. As pointed out by Guy Neave in Chapter 2, 'change' can sometimes be unexpected – even for politicians – and brings with it a certain dynamic – changes caused by previous changes – that is part of the explanation for why we currently seem to face a constant stream of new political initiatives and measures trying to keep up with the whole process. How we should – on this basis, and from a more methodological perspective – understand and analyse the concept of change is the theme addressed in Chapter 3. Here, Taina Saarinen and Jussi Välimaa briefly review different ways in which the concept of change has been addressed in previous research. They point out that we may apply different perspectives for grasping and describing change before arguing that we also need to examine critically how 'change' itself can be exposed to discursive power games. Hence, to understand the impacts of changes, we should also bear in mind the ideological power related to 'change' as a concept.

In the Part II of the book, our intention is to provide a broad coverage of areas in which 'change' has occurred within higher education

and how we can interpret and understand the impact of these changes. This part starts by analysing how new administrative and managerial tools are taken up by the institutions. In Chapter 4, Nicoline Frølich and Bjørn Stensaker study the ways in which higher education institutions are adapting to expectations of behaving more like strategic actors. In the following chapter, Cláudia Sarrico and Ana Melo analyse another novel tool in the university – that of performance measurement– and discuss whether the characteristics of such processes can be said to relate to the central characteristics of academic work. Chapters 6 and 7 focus on yet another modern driver for change in higher education – quality and quality assurance. In Chapter 6, Sónia Cardoso takes a closer look at how students perceive quality assurance and whether such instruments change their attitudes and values with respect to student learning. In the next chapter, Maria J. Rosa and Alberto Amaral develop this issue further to look at academic staff and discuss whether there actually is a bridge between being engaged in quality work and being exposed to more formal quality assurances processes. Keeping the focus on the academic staff, in Chapter 8, Amy Scott Metcalfe sets out to examine how we can understand and provide meaning to changes in the research culture of higher education. Finally, in Chapter 9, we take an in-depth look at how academic identities are tackling turbulent times in higher education. Here, Mary Henkel provides a sweeping overview of developments carrying continuity, change and ambiguity, and how academic identities are evolving as a result. Some common denominators of the contributions in this part of the book are questions challenging our – often intuitive – assumptions of how we should understand change in the specific areas addressed, but also that the effects of the changes that have taken place can be quite surprising and unexpected. A core message coming out of all the chapters in this section is that change is an open-ended process – and that this process carries with it both threats and opportunities.

In the final part of our book, we turn to what can be said to be more ‘pro-active’ contributions for dealing with change. Our starting point for this section is that the ambivalence and ambiguity associated with the changes taking place within the sector can be seen as potential room for manoeuvre by those wanting to cater for the central values and norms of higher education. Hence, a more optimistic picture is offered as to how higher education can play a more prominent and distinct role when exposed to change processes which academics only have partial control over. In Chapter 10, Keijo Räsänen argues against the belief that change in higher education can only be externally initiated. Instead, it is

suggested that a renewed focus on academic practices can address many of the issues the sector is confronted with by more critical voices. In a similar vein, Kerstin Sahlin, in the following chapter, suggests that the constant flow of externally driven organizational trends can be translated into functional and relevant concepts in higher education, but that this is very much dependent on the capability for translation and subtle leadership skills. The latter point is also underlined in the final chapter of this section, in which David Dill critically examines the current conditions for upholding what we – for lack of a better word – can call the ‘glue’ of higher education: the ideals of collegiality, but perhaps more importantly, the integrity of academic work.

### **The unpredictability and ambiguity of reform attempts**

Hence, while change certainly takes place in higher education, it is also easy to identify many initiatives to manage change at the institutional level. As noticed in a number of the contributions to the book, such attempts to manage change are often characterized by a high degree of instrumentality and intention, as a carefully planned and highly organized process of instigating reform within the institutions. Hence, in modern universities the capability of reforming themselves can be said to have increased considerably in recent decades. It has been argued that the university is no longer a ‘republic of scholars’, but is steadily being transformed into an organizational actor, fully capable of behaving more strategically within the emerging higher education ‘market’ (Bonaccorsi et al., 2010). Part of the reason for this is related to a systematic build-up of analytical and organizational capacity for organizing and implementing internal reform through increased professionalization (Gornitzka et al., 1998), centralization (Stensaker, 2003) and other developments in governance arrangements (Sarrico, 2010). While this development certainly can be labelled as a distinct ‘reform’ of the university, the prime ambition is still that such ‘first-order’ reforms should only pave the way for ‘second-order’ reforms – in which teaching, research and innovative capacity should also be transformed.

However, as institutions with the purpose of organizing knowledge, universities have for centuries demonstrated their ability for persistence and path-dependency. There are several factors that contribute to this emphasis on continuity. First, reform attempts always carry an element of unpredictability, especially in organizations that have as their prime purpose the development, provision, but also questioning, of knowledge. As Weick (1976) and others have pointed out, universities are – even in a more streamlined design – organizations where much

authority is decentralized and with very powerful individuals. Reforming such organizations is not only about changing formal structures, but also about mindsets and the values of individuals.

Second, since universities are organized around knowledge, the knowledge basis for reform ideas tends to be questioned and discussed in the same way as other knowledge domains. Hence, reform ideas concerning 'quality', 'autonomy' or 'internationalization' will often be confronted with a critical attitude by those affected, questioning the logic and arguments provided in favour of reform. In other words, changing mindsets and values of individuals is not a straightforward task.

Third, even when reform ideas are accepted they still have to be implemented and there is much research pointing out that ideas might be transformed as they are translated (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996) or edited (Sahlin-Andersson, 1996) to fit with the specificities of a given organization or a particular reform setting. Such processes often open up the original ideas to new interpretations and new meanings that can sometimes create ambiguity and paradoxical situations.

The common denominator underlying all of these arguments is that in order to understand the conditions for reform we need to understand better the intangible aspects of the university (Dill, 1982) and the role this dimension plays during reform. In other words, we need to understand better the role culture and identity play during reform.

### **Culture – change promoter or change preventer?**

The intangible aspects of higher education have for several decades been an important object of study in the sector (see Välimaa, 1995; Maassen, 1996, for an overview). Some of the classical studies in the field address how higher education institutions have developed certain cultural characteristics and traits that have made them unique compared to others and how cultural characteristics have also made these institutions more effective and relevant to society (Clark, 1970; 1972).

Burton Clark's interpretation of culture was rooted in the belief that norms and values of the organization were embedded in an almost seamless way, connecting structure and culture, and making the organization into an institution in itself (see Selznick, 1957). Hence, in this version culture was understood as something 'real' and 'deep'. This tradition can be said to belong to a Durkheimian perspective where individual behaviour aggregates into a holistic and institutionalized organizational entity. The development of such a specific culture was believed to take time and although there certainly could be influential

individuals making an impact on the direction of the organization, change was seen mainly as a collective effort in which incremental actions, history and traditions played a vital role. This way of interpreting culture can be said to characterize the analysis conducted by Clark throughout his career. In one of his latest contributions to the field, he wrote:

Organizational culture is the realm of the ideas, beliefs and asserted values, the symbolic side of the material component [...] Always ephemeral, often wispy to the touch, it escapes easy empirical identification. But it is there.

(2004, p. 177)

However, this conception of culture is not the only one dominating the literature. Attempting to create an overview of the whole area of organizational culture in higher education, Tierney (1988, p. 8) suggested that those interested in analysing culture should pay particular attention to certain elements within an organization and among these, missions, strategies and leadership. While these elements are far from the only ones Tierney mentioned influencing the organizational culture, the identification of such elements make strong hints that organizational culture is closely intertwined with and influenced by formal structure and hierarchy. This implies a conception that change can be strongly affected by rational action and decision-making, and is dependent on how one uses organizational resources to implement these processes:

administrators will be in a better position to change elements in the institution that are at variance with the culture.

(Tierney, 1988, p. 19)

This conception of organizational culture can also be found, to some extent, in the 'Quality Culture' project of the European Universities Association (EUA), a project that ran between 2002 and 2006. The quality culture project can be regarded as a spin-off from the Bologna Process with its emphasis on quality assurance and was instigated by the EUA with economic support from the European Commission (EUA, 2006). While the formal description of the project emphasized its bottom-up approach in which the higher education institutions and those working within these institutions should have a voice and be invited to engage in discussions on how to 'establish a quality culture' (EUA, 2006, p. 4), the project also has a clear instrumental side. For

example, the quality culture project should increase awareness of the need to develop an internal quality culture in universities, ensure the wide dissemination of existing best practices in the field and promote the introduction of internal quality management. What this suggests is that a culture can be 'introduced', it can be copied and transferred to another setting – processes that imply that it is even 'manageable'.

Hence, in principle, one can argue that the classical divide between these two conceptions is rooted in their views about how changes occur and to what extent culture is open for manipulation – whether culture is 'manageable'. Is it 'deep' and inseparable from the organization in question or is it an 'attachment' to the organization, an element that can be changed in a more instrumental way?

In posing these questions, studies in higher education echo similar debates within other disciplinary fields studying culture. Thus, since the 1980s studies of culture in organizations have often been divided into two basic camps (Alvesson & Berg, 1992): on the one side, those seeing culture as something an organization *has*, that is, culture as a potentially identifiable and manipulative factor; on the other side, those seeing culture as something an organization *is*, that is, culture as an integrated product of social interaction and organizational life, impossible to differentiate from other factors. In the latter version, culture is an integrated dimension of (most often) sociological and anthropological research into social behaviour. In the former version, culture is emphasized as the new organizational instrument by reformers, consultants and management gurus – sometimes because they had simply 'run out of specifics' (Kogan, 1999, p. 64). According to Maurice Kogan, a long-time observer of higher education, culture often became the umbrella term for all possible intangible factors in organizational life.

At this point, it is tempting to argue that within higher education, the two conceptions have continued to live separate lives. While the conception of culture that *is* organization has continued to inspire academic research, emphasizing pluralism with respect to acknowledging the importance of disciplinary culture, academic cultures, and professional and academic identities (see Välimaa & Ylijoki, 2008; Gordon & Whitchurch, 2010), for some recent contributions, the example from the EUA project suggests that the belief that an organization *has* culture still dominates the political realm and the reform agenda in many countries with its emphasis on the need to change the functioning of higher education. The interest in culture as an instrument for improving organizational performance is still a dominant theme in many policy-statements on the need for reform and change in higher education

(Maassen & Olsen, 2007). In essence, the general message is that values and norms in an organization have a substantial role in securing the interest of shareholders or stakeholders in making a profit or enhancing organizational survival and that such values and norms are 'manageable' (e.g. Stratton, 2006).

Taking one step back, one could easily agree with the argument that those advocating a cultural and more symbolic perspective for understanding social and organizational behaviour are reacting against the functionalist (and political) neglect of how rationalist meaning is constructed in modern societies (Pondy et al., 1983). If our assumption is correct in that different conceptions of culture have different stakeholders, it is perhaps not surprising that culture also is a controversial issue during reform. While those advocating reform tend to see culture as an element preventing the needed change in the sector, those opposing reform tend to see culture as an element promoting inherent values and norms for the sector – which must be nurtured despite any reform attempts. In this politicized environment, culture then becomes the dependent variable for those advocating reform, while it is seen as an independent variable by those opposing it.

### **From culture to identity, and beyond**

Although the previous section almost portrays research on organizational culture as a stalemate between two extreme positions, more recent developments can be seen as a valuable attempt to overcome this dichotomy. Not least, studies in organizational symbolism (Alvesson & Berg, 1992) and organizational identities (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996) have been important and led to the establishment of new arenas for more interdisciplinary and cognitive approaches to the notions of culture where the distinction between the two categories (*having* or *being*) has become increasingly blurred (e.g. see Schultz et al., 2000).

In an attempt to find a concept that incorporates such cognitive changes in higher education, Välimaa (1995; 1998) and Henkel (2000) have suggested that 'identity' may be a promising concept, not least in that it can be used to build a bridge between structure and actor, between the policy context, the institution, the profession, the discipline and the individual academic (Henkel, 2000, p. 22). This integrating capability of the concept of identity is of special interest for our book, which aims to analyse how universities and colleges, units within these institutions and also individuals are all trying to make sense of and cope with external demands at the same time as they are faithful to the values and norms they believe in. In principle, one can distinguish



between two types of identities: those related to the organization or an organizational unit and those related to the individual person.

### *Academic identity*

These two identities are related to each other because they can combine structural elements (higher education institutions) with individual conceptions of self. Academic identities can be described as belonging to post-industrial or post-modern identity construction, which may be described as a process based on dialogue where the development and change of identity is based on continuous dialogue with significant others (Taylor, 1991). Quite naturally these significant others may change during a lifetime even though the questions 'Who am I?', 'Where do I belong?' structure our self-understanding throughout our lifetime whether we like it or not (see also Sennett, 2006). The same is true with academic identities, which may be described as interactive processes between an individual and various significant others. These reference groups can be disciplinary-based communities (national and international colleagues), professional communities (colleagues and/or professional organizations in one's own institution and/or at the national level), institutional-level communities (colleagues from other departments), institutional traditions (like organizational sagas or institutional memories) and national culture (as a reference group: friends, relatives). In addition to these significant others we also would like to emphasize the role of intellectual traditions in the making of academic identities, even though they cannot always be identified as persons or as reference groups. These different epistemic traditions may have strong influence on the ways academics see the world, how they define relationships between human beings and what they see as important things in life. Translated into disciplinary cultures these epistemic traditions have influence on ways of organizing academic work (teaching and research), communicating with other academics (through publications and/or face-to-face communication) and defining principles for practical matters, such as academic leadership. In other words, disciplinary-based cultural assumptions and values often translate into actions and processes in universities. However, a crucial matter in the interplay with different academic significant others is the fact that, depending on the reform or change concerned, these groups may also, and do, change (see Välimaa, 1998). Academic identities, then, can have multiple starting points for either supporting or resisting changes – or both of them simultaneously – in higher education, depending on how the reforms are defined and what their objectives are.

*Organizational identities*

The concept of identity has also been used for the analysis of cultural change at the institutional level. As a starting point, organizational identity can be defined as collectively held perceptions and beliefs about the distinctiveness of a given organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985). As such, organizational identity can be regarded as one of several possible cultural artefacts in an organization (Alvesson & Berg, 1992; Hatch & Schultz, 1997) and has in recent years attracted renewed interest both within organizational studies in general (Weick, 1995; du Gay, 1996; Whetten & Godfrey, 1998; Albert et al., 2000; Gioia et al., 2000) and in higher education studies more particularly (Välilmaa, 1995; Stensaker, 2004).

Indicating that organizational identity is one of several possible cultural artefacts in an organization suggests that it is a narrower concept than, for example, organizational culture. While conventional definitions of the latter often highlight that organizational culture can be managed and manipulated, resulting in changes in the collective behaviour of the members of the organization (Alvesson & Berg, 1992), a provisional definition of organizational identity would emphasize the symbolic, mythological and cognitive sides of the organization. The construction of organizational reality through the use of symbols and myths that blur the distinction between truth and lies is important here (Strati, 1998, p. 1380). In other words, organizational identity should be understood as a socially constructed concept of what the organization is, rather than how it acts. This does not mean that behaviour is unimportant. Symbols and myths may interact in numerous ways with organizational behaviour (Pondy et al., 1983). The point is that a focus on organizational identity is more interested in how organizations are constructed as meaningful entities. The focus is not so much on how people act as on how they try to make sense of their actions (through the use of cognition, symbols, language and emotions).

Henkel (2000, p. 22) has pinpointed the danger of this position by claiming that, as a consequence, analysis may ignore the reality of academic working lives and instead overemphasizes the influence of abstract epistemologies, symbols and language. However, what a focus on organizational identity does is acknowledge that symbols, myths and language exert great social power in that they stimulate fresh ideas, change attitudes and provide new cognitive frames for action (Scott, 1995, p. 129).

Focusing on organizational identity can also be particularly beneficial when studying change processes in general. Organizations are never

'frozen' entities, they move and change constantly. In complex organizations, such as higher education institutions, changes can also occur in contradictory and diffuse ways, where the direction and meaning of the change process can be difficult to identify. By emphasizing organizational identity, pinpointing change can be easier as the identity concept provides a lens where the 'essential' elements in these change processes are distilled.

If organizational identity describes what the organization is, then the consequence is that identity would be understood as something 'real' and 'deep' and as an expression of the true 'self' of a given organization. This tradition can be said to belong to a Durkheimian perspective where individual behaviour aggregates into a holistic and institutionalized organizational entity. As such it links the organizational identity concept to more conventional understandings of organizational culture emphasizing values, norms and behaviour. As already noted, Burton Clark is a consistent representative of this perspective in higher education research (Clark, 1970; 1972; 2004).

Interestingly, it was also a higher education setting that triggered Stuart Albert and David Whetten to develop their interpretations of the organizational identity concept in the 1980s (Albert & Whetten, 1985). As business administration professors involved in a cutback operation at the University of Illinois, they experienced the financial strain in their own university as marginal compared to cutbacks in the industrial sector. The university was not planning to shut down departments, reduce the number of faculty or downsize core academic programmes. Still, the proposed cutbacks triggered internal discussions on whether the university could maintain its profile as a research institution if a few programmes were reduced and heated debates were initiated on whether university legitimacy had been lost. In other words, what seemed to be a marginal budget cut by state legislators, escalated into a full-blown identity crisis for the university.

That event formed the basis for the article 'Organisational Identity' in which Albert and Whetten (1985) proposed that the type of commitment shown by the faculty was rather fundamental. The questions asked at the institutional level were those such as 'Who are we?' and 'What sort of organization is this?' – questions closely related to religious beliefs. At least the observations could not be reduced to factors such as distress, anger or incredulity (Albert, 1998, p. 2). Rather, the factors that seemed to influence the university debate were those of affection, emotions and search for meaning – summed up in what they termed organizational identity – a form of uniqueness related to

the university. In trying to generalize from their case study, Albert and Whetten (1985) suggested that this uniqueness consisted of three aspects: (1) central character, (2) temporal continuity and (3) distinctiveness. The first notion – central character – distinguishes the organization on the basis of something important and essential. Temporal continuity means that the identification includes features that exhibit some degree of sameness or continuity over time and distinctiveness implies a classification that identifies the organization as recognizably different from others.

However, Stensaker (2004) has argued that organizational identity may be a much more fluid concept than usually conceived. The argument is that organizational identity is dependent on the degree of consistency between the image of a given organization (the view from the significant others) and the identity of the organization (traditions and historical values and norms constructing self). If there is too much divergence between the image and the identity of an organization, the organization will try to bridge this gap. The process that enables bridges to be built is based on the fact that organizational identities are expressed as specific labels ('being entrepreneurial', 'modern' and so on) and that change takes place as the meanings of these labels are translated or re-interpreted over time to fit external demands and expectations (Stensaker, 2004, p. 211). Thus, in order to obtain legitimacy from the environment, organizations compose themselves into a whole (Czarniawska, 2000, p. 273). An implication is that the organization then becomes a metaphor – a 'super-person' who 'exposes' an identity (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996). Instead of a conception of identity emerging from deep inside the organization, identity is rather located in the formal structure and becomes a 'chameleon-like imitation of images prevailing in the post-modern marketplace' (Gioia et al., 2000, p. 72). Hence, organizational identity is transformed from a stable, distinct and enduring characteristic to a more fluent and more easily changeable organizational entity.

### *Beyond identity*

While we would argue that the concept of identity is vital in improving our understanding of how higher education is changing, one could still criticize the emphasis on identity as focusing too much on the cultural aspects of organizational life – once again ignoring the structural dimensions. In general the latter focus is well covered in recent contributions on changing governance, funding and quality assurance structures being implemented in the sector (e.g. see Amaral et al., 2003; Teixeira

et al., 2004; Gornitzka et al., 2005). What has received less coverage is how the manifestations of the new structures are culturally interpreted in the sector. In other words, what is the meaning given to new practices and procedures, and how are new rules and routines culturally embedded and translated into universities and colleges? To research such questions we need to dig into the micro-processes of academic life.

### **A culture-as-practice approach to organizational change**

In recent years and much inspired by research in the sociology of science (Knorr Cetina, 2007), one can witness a renewed interest for more anthropological and ethnographic inspired studies within the social sciences. Some examples are the interest in analysing institutional work within neo-institutional theory (Lawrence et al., 2009), the emphasis on studying strategy-as-practice in the field of management (Whittington, 2006) or the use of the concept of epistemic cultures in the sociology of knowledge (Knorr Cetina, 2007). Even in higher education, some empirical studies have been conducted in which strategic processes have been analysed more closely (Jarzabkowski, 2005).

The common denominator for all these contributions is an attempt to identify and investigate the ‘machineries of knowledge construction’ (Knorr Cetina, 2007, p. 363). Such machineries contain not only social structures, but also material structures such as technology, budgetary and evaluation arrangements and requirements, or managerial tools (performance and management information systems). While such material structures are often seen as ‘technical’ arrangements to which culture and identity is attached, we agree with Knorr Cetina (2007) in that culture and identity is an integrated part of how the social and material structure is constituted through practice. In this process, we are in particular focusing on how those working in universities and colleges manage and try to control their lives, and how in doing this they also contribute to change and influence the realities they are facing. As Emirbayer and Mische (1998, p. 962) have pointed out, human agency can be described as a temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past, but also oriented towards the future (as a ‘projective’ capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and towards the present (as a ‘practical-evaluative’ capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment).

We would argue that such an understanding of agency combined with a careful consideration of the surrounding social and material structures at the micro-level is well equipped to analyse how reform is managed in higher education. As such, in this book we are more interested in

addressing and uncovering the dynamic, mediatory and interactive role of culture than in portraying it just as either a preventive or promotional force during reform.

## References

- Albert, S. (1998) 'The Definition and Meta-definition of Identity', in Whetten, D. A. & P. C. Godfrey (eds), *Identity in Organizations. Building Theory Through Conversations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Albert, S., B. E. Ashforth & J. E. Dutton (2000) 'Organizational Identity and Identification: Charting New Waters and Building New Bridges', *Academy of Management Review*, 25, pp. 13–17.
- Albert, S. & D. A. Whetten (1985) 'Organizational Identity', *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, pp. 263–295.
- Alvesson, M. & P. O. Berg (1992) *Corporate Culture and Organizational Symbolism*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Amaral, A., L. Meek & I. M. Larsen (2003) *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Bonaccorsi, A., D. Cinzia & A. Geuna (2010) 'Universities in the New Knowledge Landscape: Tensions, Challenges, Change – An Introduction', *Minerva* 48: 1–4.
- Clark, B. R. (1970) *The Distinctive College*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Clark, B. R. (1972) 'The Organizational Saga in Higher Education', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, pp. 178–184.
- Clark, B. R. (2004) *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Czarniawska, B. (2000) 'Identity Lost or Identity Found? Celebration and Lamentation over the Postmodern View of Identity in Social Science and Fiction', in Schultz, M., M. J. Hatch & M. Holten Larsen (eds), *The Expressive Organization. Linking Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Czarniawska, B. & B. Joerges (1996) 'Travels of Ideas', in Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevón (eds), *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevón (1996) *Translating Organizational Change*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dill, D. D. (1982) 'The Management of Academic Culture: Notes on the Management of Meaning and Social Integration', *Higher Education*, 11, pp. 303–320.
- du Gay, P. (1996) 'Organizing Identity. Entrepreneurial Governance and Public Management', in Hall, S. & P. du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Emirbayer, M. & A. Mische (1998) 'What Is Agency?' *American Journal of Sociology*, 4, pp. 962–1023.
- EUA (2006) *Quality Culture in European Universities: A Bottom-up Approach*. Brussels: European University Association.
- Gioia, D. A., M. Schultz & K. G. Corley (2000) 'Organizational Identity, Image and Adaptive Instability', *Academy of Management Review*, 25, pp. 63–81.
- Gordon, G. & C. Whitchurch (eds) (2010) *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.

- Gornitzka, Å., S. Kyvik & I. M. Larsen (1998) 'The Bureaucratization of Universities', *Minerva*, 36(1), pp. 21–47.
- Gornitzka, Å., S. Kyvik & B. Stensaker (2005) 'Implementation Analysis in Higher Education', in Gornitzka, Å., M. Kogan & A. Amaral (eds), *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Halfman, W. & L. Leydesdorff (2010) 'Is Inequality Among Universities Increasing? Gini Coefficients and the Elusive Rise of Elite Universities', *Minerva*, 48, pp. 55–72.
- Hatch, M. J. & M. Schultz (1997) 'Relations Between Organizational Identity and Image', *European Journal of Marketing*, 31, pp. 356–365.
- Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2005) *Strategy as Practice. An Activity-Based Approach*. Sage: London.
- Kehm, B. & B. Stensaker (eds) (2009) *University Rankings, Diversity, and the New Landscape of Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (2007) 'Culture in Global Knowledge Societies: Knowledge Cultures and Epistemic Cultures', *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 32, pp. 361–375.
- Kogan, M. (1999) 'The Culture of Academe', *Minerva*, 37, pp. 63–74.
- Lawrence, T., R. Suddaby & B. Leca (eds) (2009) *Institutional Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maassen, P. A. M. (1996) *Governmental Steering and the Academic Culture. The Intangibility of the Human Factor in Dutch and German Universities*. Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente.
- Maassen, P. & J. P. Olsen (2007) *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pondy, L. R., P. J. Frost, G. Morgan & R. M. James (1983) *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Sahlin-Andersson, K. (1996) 'Imitating by Editing Success: The Construction of Organizational Fields', in Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevón (eds), *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sarrico, C. S. (2010) 'On Performance in Higher Education: Towards Performance Governance?', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 16, pp. 145–158.
- Sarrico, C. S., M. J. Rosa, P. N. Teixeira & M. F. Cardoso (2010) 'Assessing Quality and Evaluating Performance in Higher Education: Worlds Apart or Complementary Views?', *Minerva*, 48, pp. 35–54.
- Schultz, M., M. J. Hatch & M. Holten Larsen (eds) (2000) *The Expressive Organization. Linking Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, W. R. (1995) *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Selznick, P. (1957) *Leadership in Administration. A Sociological Interpretation*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sennett, R. (2006) *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Stensaker, B. (2003) 'Trance, Transparency and Transformation: The Impact of External Quality Monitoring in Higher Education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 151–159.
- Stensaker, B. (2004) *The Transformation of Organizational Identities*. Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente.

- Strati, A. (1998) 'Organizational Symbolism as a Social Construction: A Perspective from the Sociology of Knowledge', *Human Relations*, 51, pp. 1379–1402.
- Stratton, R. (2006) *The Earned Value Management Maturity Model*. Vienna: Management Concepts.
- Taylor, C. (1991) *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Teixeira, P., B. Jongbloed, D. D. Dill & A. Amaral (2004) *Markets in Higher Education. Rhetoric or Reality?*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tierney, W. (1988) 'Organizational Culture in Higher Education: Defining the Essentials', *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, pp. 2–12.
- Välilä, J. (1995) 'Higher Education Cultural Approach', *Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*, 113, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Välilä, J. (1998) 'Culture and Identity in Higher Education Research', *Higher Education*, 36, pp. 119–138.
- Välilä, J. & O-H. Ylijoki (eds) (2008) *Cultural Perspectives on Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Weick, K. E. (1976) 'Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, pp. 1–19.
- Weick, K. E. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Whetten, D. A. & P. C. Godfrey (eds) (1998) *Identity in Organizations. Building Theory Through Conversations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Whittington, R. (2006) 'Completing the Practice Turn in Strategy', *Organization Studies*, 27, pp. 613–634.
- Witte, J. K. (2006) *Change of Degrees and Degrees of Change: Comparing Adaptations of European Higher Education Systems in the Context of the Bologna Process*. Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente.