Collegiality as political work: Professions in today's world of organizations.

Authors:

Jean-Louis Denis

Université de Montréal
jean-louis.denis@umontreal.ca

Gianluca Veronesi

University of Bristol
gianluca.veronesi@bristol.ac.uk

Catherine Régis

Université de Montréal
catherine.regis@umontreal.ca

Sabrina Germain

Law School at City-London
sabrina.germain@city.ac.uk

September 2019

ABSTRACT

(240)

Collegiality is frequently portrayed as an inherent characteristic of professions, associated with normative expectations autonomously determined and regulated among peers. However, in advanced modernity other modes of governance responding to societal expectations and increasing State reliance on professional expertise often appear in tension with conditions of collegiality. This paper argues that collegiality is not an immutable and inherent characteristic of the governance of professional work and organizations; rather, it is the result of the ability of a profession to operationalize the normative, relational and structural requirements of collegiality at work. The paper builds on different streams of scholarship to present a dynamic approach to collegiality based on political work by professionals to protect, maintain and reformulate collegiality as a core set of principles governing work. Productive resistance and co-production are explored for their contribution to collegiality in this context, enabling accommodation between professions and organizations to achieve collective objectives and serving as a vector of change and adaptation of professional work in contemporary organizations. Engagement in co-production influences the ability to materialize collegiality at work, just as the maintenance and transformation of collegiality will operate in a context where professions participate and negotiate compromises with others legitimate modes of governance. Our arguments build on recent studies and hypotheses concerning the interface of professions and organizations to reveal the political work that underlies the affirmation and re-affirmation of collegiality as a mode of governance of work based on resistance and co-production.

Keywords: professions, collegiality, institutional work, resistance, co-production, health care organizations

Collegiality as political work: Professions in today's world of organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Problematizing collegiality

This paper takes inspiration from scholarship on society, organizations and professions and its implications for the work of professions as a singular occupational category. It is conceived and developed in the form of a theoretical essay where we analyse scholarly works relevant to understanding the work of professions in contemporary societies and organizations. Our aim is not to provide an exhaustive review of this literature, but rather to identify and frame a set of problems and ideas into a coherent argument around dynamics that support change and stability in professional work. Our intellectual inquiry focusses on collegiality, a concept that has been mobilized from time to time to delineate a specific approach to coordination and authority at work (Waters, 1989). In the context of this essay, we use collegiality as a revelatory concept of, first, core principles for governing work in contemporary organizations and, second, of practices to promote and propagate these principles. In our analysis, collegiality is therefore seen as an agentic response by professionals (which we will later call political work), to transformative forces within and across organizations and work settings (Ferlie and McGivern, 2013; Bejerot and Hasselbladh, 2011; Martin and Waring, 2018).

Collegiality and professional work

We base our inquiry on the recognition that professional work faces pressures to adapt its essence and existence. Professional work is defined here as a set of organizing principles, rules and practices facing challenging pressures from evolving societal demands and expectations. Thus, our paper looks at collegiality not as an intrinsic attribute of professions, nor predominantly as a relational construct between members of a profession, but as the active manifestation of a singular approach to governing work which can be more salient in professionalized organizations. While collegiality has been conceived as an alternative to formal organizations or bureaucracies (Noble & Pym, 1970), we see collegiality as a mode of governing work within the context of evolving organizations. This view of collegiality does not exclude the manifestation of collegiality within society such as professional associations (Adler & Kwon, 2013), but underlines the growing importance of formal organizations as shapers of professional work and experience. Governance of work is here defined as a broad conceptual category that focuses not only on the regulatory roles

of the State and its institutions, but also on the creation of rules and order in social practices (Bevir, 2013). We argue that collegiality is not an immutable and inherent characteristic of the governance of professional work and organizations; rather, it is the result of the ability of a social group, in this case the profession, to assemble and operationalize the normative, relational and structural requirements of collegiality at work.

Professions have been traditionally defined around specific traits or attributes that are considered critical to fulfill a specific role in society. These attributes consist in the development and maintenance of a formal body of knowledge and expertise as a crucial resource to convey expert power and autonomy (Reed, 1996), the recognition that a given group has acquired this knowledge in dedicated programs or institutions coupled with a capacity to solve a defined and distinctive set of problems, and the recognition by the State of the group's monopolistic control over an occupational niche (Freidson, 2001). In this essentialist and somewhat idealistic definition of a profession, autonomy and self-regulation are considered fundamental as they enable knowledge mobilization to solve practical or important problems in an altruistic and disinterested manner (Friedson, 1984; Klein, 1998; Evetts, 2002). This perspective sees collegiality deriving from or synonymous with professionalism, which limits its analytical utility and conveys the idea of a prescriptive form of power. Norms of collegiality can be used to develop codes of conduct and create certain expectations of behaviour at work among members of a profession. It is argued that such evocation of norms of collegiality can be used to discipline colleagues at work or to exclude them from elite professional groups that control organizations. Consequently, we develop a different standpoint to collegiality, where the value of the concept lies in its potential to understand how individuals and groups govern work within organizations. It encompasses elements of loyalty, solidarity and expertise and amalgamates collaborative and collective forms of control or mutuality among peers within organizations.

Contemporary definitions of collegiality have sought to isolate its inherent attributes. Collegiality is based on a set of normative, relational and structural elements (Sahlin, and Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2016) that constitutes a specific mode of governing professional work (and by extension work in general); it is not exclusively confined to the perceived quality of relations professionals develop among each other in a work context (i.e. 'being collegial with peers'). According to Waters (1989), the characteristics of collegiality, and by extension collegial work and organizations, combine attributes of professionalism and elements of work governance: participants possess (1) a high degree of expertise, (2) a high degree of specialization, (3) a high degree of equality among them, and (4) make decisions by consensus. Despite his recognition that

the concept of collegiality is embedded in broad societal and historical evolution, the definition proposed by Waters (1989) remains anchored in a more essentialist view of professionalism, where collegiality is an inherent and static property of professions. It suggests that collegiality will be more salient in specific work settings such as universities, hospitals and more broadly in professionalized and expertise-based organizations (law and accounting firms, multi-media companies and so forth) than in other types of organizations. Expertise and specialization create a protected space in which collegiality can be developed and nurtured in day-to-day work. Additionally, collegiality implies a set of normative expectations regarding the conduct of peers (professionals) and the relations between them. It is associated with a sense of inclusiveness and a right to voice one's own opinion on collective affairs (Sahlin and Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2016). It represents a way to conceive, coordinate and frame interactions with others at work. This is materialized through various due process mechanisms in organizations, such as transparency of decision criteria (Delbecq and Van de Ven, 1971) and consensual decision-making structures (Sahlin and Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2016).

The partial overlap between this proposed definition of collegiality (Waters, 1989) and the accepted definition of a profession appears self-evident. However, societal demands and expectations may limit the ability of professions to sustain collegiality as a mode of governing work in formal organizations (Blau and Scott, 1962: Gouldner, 1957, 1958). Collegiality gains in specificity and analytical potential when it is viewed as a specific organizing principle that values a unique form of cooperation at work and that can be challenged by evolving institutional or organizational contexts. Consequently, we cannot assume that all professionals organizational settings are able to assemble the conditions of collegiality. In the next sub-section, we argue that a dynamic, as opposed to an essentialist view of collegiality, is needed to support the full analytical potential of this concept as a mode of governing work.

A dynamic or process-based approach to collegiality

Within the context of this essay, our approach to collegiality draws on later sociological and organizational contributions that emphasize the dynamic nature of professions as an achievement (*see Section I*). From this analytical standpoint, collegiality involves both a set of situated practices and a social construction resulting from the enactment of professional agency (and by extension from other groups in non-professionalized organizations) in relation to specific principles for organizing work. Recent literature on professions and organizations provides the raw material on

which we build our main argument and rethink collegiality. More specifically, professionals and professionalized organizations are used here as a revelatory context to understand collegiality as political work.

Looking at the contributions of well-known authors in the field of professions, namely Adler, Muzio and Noordegraaf, we position our inquiry within three identified research or knowledge gaps. First, we note that key studies on the emergence of new professionalized organizational forms such as collaborative communities (Adler) and organized professionalism (Noordegraaf) have mostly focused on changes in the archetype of principles for organizing professional work as a response to mainly external contingencies. However, less attention has been paid to the practices and activities that support these emerging forms and their contestability and contradictions (Bevir, 2013; Martin and Waring, 2018). Our focus on political work to sustain and reformulate collegiality at work specifically aims to fill this gap. Second, growing emphasis on professionals as institutional entrepreneurs (Muzio and Suddaby, 2013) underlines the importance of professional agency in changes in work practices and organizations. Our approach sees in political work a form of institutional work where the agency of professionals or non-professionals is constitutive of mutations in organizations. While external contingencies (e.g. economic, demographic, technological, and fiscal) are crucial to inducing change, in this paper we pay attention to the endogenous aspect of change, where professions, through political work, reshape institutions in order to value, reformulate and maintain collegiality as a core principle in the governance of work. It builds on a representation of governing work that is decentred, where professionals, as individuals or collectively, develop a response to broader contingencies and changes through local reasoning and situated agency (Martin and Waring, 2018). Thirdly, we see Nordegraaf's hypothesis of structural affinity between professions and organizations as the result of effortful and purposive practices and activities by professionals to reconcile organizational imperatives with the pursuit and establishment of work principles that are aligned with a professional ethos.

Overall, these three recent streams of work on professions and organizations generate an intellectual landscape in which to build our argument on collegiality as political work (*Section II*). We recognize that scholarly works on professions (with exceptions – see for example Ashley and Empson, 2013; Empson, Claever and Allen, 2013, Lupu and Empson, 2015; Empson, Muzio, Broschak, and Hinings, 2015) have paid attention to the mechanisms and practices that ensure professional privilege and status in Western societies, and to the discrepancies between professionals' behaviour and motives, and their idealistic depiction. Within this stream of work, professionalism is considered a contestable terrain rather than an inherent quality of certain

occupational groups. While we build on this view of professions as a social construction, we argue that, with regard to the governance of work, there is a compelling need to revisit the value and significance of professional work in society. Using the concept of collegiality and insights from neo-institutional analysis of organizational transformations, we aim to analyse practices and activities that underline stability and change in highly institutionalized forms, namely professional work and organizations (Hallett and Ventresca 2006; Lawrence and Suddaby 2006; Zilber 2008). This approach relies on the generic notion of 'institutional work' defined as 'the purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at creating, maintaining and disrupting institutions' (Lawrence and Suddaby 2006: 215). Professionals are considered embedded agents that engage in effortful practices and activities to deal with and shape evolving tensions and complementarities between professional aspirations and organizational or system imperatives. We focus on a sub-set of institutional work that we characterize as political work, which is activated by professionals to value specific principles of organizing work namely collegiality.

The rest of this paper is developed in two main sections. First, we briefly survey key sources in the sociology of professions and professions and organizations to develop a dynamic and socially informed view of professions. This section aims to situate political work as a fundamental aspect of professional agency in organizations and societies. Second, from this analysis we derive ideas and arguments that underpin the representation of collegiality as political work in organizations. Political work is deployed to affirm collegiality in the context of evolving professionalized work and organizational settings. We see collegiality as a fundamental aspiration of professionals and a contested domain within the definition of work in society. We provide illustrative examples of political work performed by professionals to substantiate our arguments in favour of a process approach to the analysis of collegiality. We then conclude the paper with propositions to expand the theoretical and empirical exploration of collegiality as a response to, and articulation of, alternative modes of governing work. We contend that such analytical perspective is crucial for the development and understanding of the institutional substrates of occupational sectors such as higher education, health and law.

PROFESSIONS, WORK AND ORGANIZATIONS

Sociological work on professions has attempted to define a set of core attributes or traits that distinguish professions from other work roles or occupational categories (Saks, 2010). The quest for such an essentialist definition is closely associated with a functionalist perspective, according

to which professions have developed in order to play an indispensable role in society, fulfilling functional needs and preserving social order (Adams 2015; Drazin 1990). This functional perspective implies that organizations are there to support the materialization of professional aspirations (Scheyner 2013). The essentialist view of professions implies that collegiality is an inevitable aspect of professional work and a derivative of fundamental professional attributes, namely autonomy, independence and self-regulation. Moving away from this essentialist position on professions has implications for the analysis of collegiality in organizations. If professions and their attributes are no longer a given, but a social construction, it would follow that collegiality is not an immutable property of the way professions govern work, but rather an attribute that is performed and achieved. The profession as a unique occupational category and professional work as collegiality are produced through the deployment of agentic capacities (recently labelled political work) within highly institutionalized context.

The idea that professions are necessarily aligned with societal expectations and needs has been challenged by scholars in the sociology of professions with various theoretical affiliations, who have departed from an essentialist and functionalist view of professions. This work, which includes a broad range of sources that focus on the social construction of professions, has contributed to a view of the profession as an achievement. Here, the existence and persistence of professions need to be motivated and cannot be taken for granted. From this perspective, professions consist of specific types of occupational groups that have achieved a distinctive and remarkable control over resources, specialized knowledge and credentials in the labour market (Leicht and Fennell 1997): 'professional groups are directly or indirectly conceptualized in terms of exclusionary social closure in the marketplace, sanctioned by the state' (Saks 2010: 887). Professions are thus considered an anomaly within expanding market economies in so-called liberal democracies. The strength and viability of this singular occupational niche is reinforced by various societal mechanisms such as demonstration of high commitment and a strong sense of identity and solidarity among members of the profession (Brint 1993). Reproducing control over a professional occupational niche and the right and power to self-organize is a very demanding but necessary task considering the forces and prevalence of other modes of governance (Reed 1996). This is well illustrated by work on organized professionalism and the rise of managerialism and commodification (Harrison 1988; Harrison and Pollitt 1994; Nordegraaf 2011), where organizations are seen as embodying the space where bureaucratic demands are at risk of limiting professional autonomy and self-regulation, and consequently of bringing significant changes to the nature of professional work (Sehested 2002). We will now explore three streams of scholarship that have revisited the challenges and mechanisms professionals face in their attempt to secure the

specificies of their work and their positions within organizations and the labour market. We will then identify implications for the analysis of collegiality in organizations.

Emergence of collaborative communities as a response to market and bureaucratic demands

In a set of theoretical and empirical studies, Adler and colleagues (2008, 2015) delineated the emergence of collaborative communities as a fundamental change in professionalized organizations. In their view, collaborative community represents professionals' response to external and internal pressures for change and, more generally, to a situation where their work and status is increasingly dependent on markets and hierarchies (Brint 1993; Freidson 2001). Professional work has been embedded in organizations through the bureaucratization of service delivery and the introduction of systematised process improvements (Scott et al. 2000). Organizations have progressively evolved from solo practices to complex, hierarchical forms. Furthermore, professional organizations have been subjected to market pressures, a logic of efficiency, and the adoption of a business structure (Cooper et al. 1996; Cooper and Robson 2006). Facing these pressures reconfiguring professional work, 'professionals themselves are divided, with some supporting, some acquiescing to, and others resisting these changes' (Adler and Kwon 2013: 930).

The transition from professional community (the traditional organizing principle of professions based on a blend of craft guild and individualistic association features) to collaborative community (relying on greater interdependence and accountability) is a challenging process where a variety of professional interests and values combine and conflate in an attempt to stabilize new organizational forms and work organizations (Adler et al. 2008). Within this process, the principle of community based on trust, underpinned by observing common traditions and rooted in rigid status structures, is reformulated to take into account external contingencies and their implications for relations among professionals and between professional groups (Adler et al. 2015; Kirkpatrick and Noordegraaf 2015). Supporting the view that this is a mutation rather than a displacement, Adler and colleagues highlight Friedson's (1984) argument that the distinctive features of professionalism have not been drastically eroded, but that professional regulation has been further rationalised and formalised, as exemplified by the emergence of these collaborative communities. These communities are driven by exogenous demands for greater accountability and more effective knowledge generation, and are characterised by greater horizontal coordination of interdependent work processes. However, it is also pointed out that the attitude of most professionals today is still of opposition to pressures from external stakeholders and of seeking protection against alienating

market and bureaucratic logics: 'professions often insist that only they can judge the validity of their work, and that they cannot discuss their value-standards with outsiders' (Adler et al. 2015: 7).

The emergence of a new archetype - the collaborative community - is, according to Adler and colleagues, marked by deep underlying difficulties where the ethos and autonomous structures of professionals can act as countervailing forces in response to these changes. This may culminate in sedimented organizational archetypes (Cooper et al. 1996), characterized by active resistance to complex change dynamics that 'many professionals would experience as a stressful distraction of their traditional independence' (Adler et al. 2008: p. 371). While Adler and colleagues have focused mostly on the characterization of archetypes emerging in response to external pressures and internal factors, they also point out that the elaboration of a new way of being a professional at work is a dynamic and controversial process: 'the move toward a form of professionalism based on collaborative community is a difficult one, and the outcome is far from certain' (Adler et al. 2008: 371). We suggest that, in an attempt to shape these changes, professionals will engage in political work, mounting opposition to the forces of change which represent a threat to the quality of professional services in order to frame the principles that guide conduct at work (Adler et al. 2008). Our understanding is that the idea of collaborative community relies on elements of collegiality, insisting more on norms and structures of collaboration among equals than on hierarchical (or market-driven) forms of control of work.

Organized professionalism as an extension of professional ethos

Noordegraaf (2011, 2015, 2016) develops his perspective on modern professionalism by qualifying the traditional view that professionals have 'structural connections' with organizations and the principle of organizing (Larson 1977). However, unlike authors such as Larson (1977: 205) who see professions as ''communities' or as 'companies of equals' which democratically exercise mutual supervision over deeply internalized common standards', Noordegraaf considers that the existence of different realities of professional work and organizing tempers the traditional concept of professionalism characterised by independent practice and collegial partnership based on social closure (Larson 1977; Abbott 1988; Freidson 2001).

The concept of organized professionalism builds on the notion that 'all professions… are bureaucratized to a greater or less extent' (Larson 1977: 179), which implies the existence of 'underlying structural affinities between professions and bureaucracy' (p. 199). Noordegraaf (2011, 2015, 2016) argues that to better respond to external environmental challenges, professionals

actively and purposefully seek engagement and alignment with organizations and organizing work principles. Specifically, he suggests that three types of emerging pressures – wicked cases, changing risk perceptions, and demographic shifts – are leading to a greater openness and hybridisation of professionalism, with professionals actively re-organizing and re-configuring their practices to ensure effectiveness, legitimacy and sustainability. Effectiveness relates to the increasing need to treat problems that cannot be tackled in isolation, for instance the (wicked) problem of patients suffering from multi-morbidity. Legitimacy entails the desire of the profession to respond to public perception of risk and failure in order to maintain adequate standards of safety and quality. Sustainability refers to the need to balance competing demands for cost containment, increasing patient satisfaction and ensuring improvements in the quality of the service provided.

Contrary to the position held by many sociologists of professions (Evetts 2011), Noordegraaf (2011) argues that professionals are absorbing the idea of organizing not solely because of external forces, but also in order to achieve greater legitimacy and sustainability. They are pursuing more 'connective organizational standards for building effective and legitimate services' (p. 1365). In line with our analytical focus on agentic capacities, organized professionalism underlines the idea that professionals play an active and deliberate role in shaping new principles for organizing work to respond to external pressures. However, this analysis does not explicitly address how, at the same time, professionals internalise and reconfigure these pressures for change in order to respond to their own aspirations and deal with tensions and contradictions. In our view, a set of underlying processes and practices supports a situation of structural affinity between professionals and organizations. Our exploration of collegiality as political work aims to define and illustrate strategies used by professionals to reconcile multiple imperatives in professional work.

Professionals as institutional entrepreneurs

Central to Muzio and Suddaby' (2013) theoretical development on agency in the profession is the attempt to better connect insights from institutional theory and the sociology of professions. While earlier work recognized (see for instance Faulconbridge and Muzio 2008) a bridge between bureaucracy and professionalism with the introduction of the notion of organizational professionalism, later work builds on the concept of institutional work to provide an account of the practice of professions. Professionals are seen as agents that generate or open up new spaces for their expertise, colonise existing social spaces with new actors, and shift rules and boundaries that

regulate and govern fields in which they operate. Essentially, professionals are described as institutional entrepreneurs who, through their active agency, redefine existing and create new organizational templates and, in doing so, reshape organizational fields and their practice context: 'professionals are the preeminent crafters of institutions, facilitating and regulating a broad range of human activities' (Muzio and Suddaby 2013: 706).

Institutional agency happens via a stage cycle through which professions (both individually and collectively) create, maintain and disrupt surrounding institutions. For Muzio and colleagues, what professions 'do' impacts strongly on the evolution of organizational settings and more broadly on the organizational field. Because of their attachment to professional values and interests, professionals, as 'entrepreneurs', engage in effortful strategies to shape the development of professionalized organizations and professional practices as a countervailing response to forces of change in the external environment. In their words, 'the unfolding and transformation of professionalization projects will cause systemic repercussions and affect the structure of the broader institutional fields they inhabit' (Muzio and Suddaby 2013: 705). Professionals, as institutional actors, possess a degree of reflexivity in relation to their institutional environment that makes them effective at inducing transformations within the evolving external context.

In our view, it is important to document with granularity the strategies developed and deployed by professionals to shape the broader institutional context in which the institution of professions is embedded. One of the implications of such an institutional approach to professional agency is that it compels us to explicitly recognise the variations in how institutionalised actions are manifested and reproduced, as well as the variety of change dynamics in institutions. This observation is also coherent with a decentred approach to governance, where institutional templates are not synonymous with uniform implications for professional work in varying context. It is therefore reasonable to assume that there is no uniform and encompassing change prototype or set of pressures for change that create convergence among professionalized organizations and professional work. Professional agency brings variations in institutional changes. Collegiality through political work materializes differently in various contexts.

Muzio and colleagues' perspective is broadly in line with our view on the role of political work in collegiality, but it somewhat downplays (though does acknowledge) the existence of environmental pressures as drivers of change and, eventually, of pressures for institutional convergence. Their view draws heavily on Scott's idea that professionals are 'lords of the dance' (2008), indeed it is suggested the aim is to bring: 'the agency of the professions to the theoretical centre stage against a dominant tendency to set these within the context of broader processes of

exogenous change' (p. 700). However, this argument only partially engages with the idea of resistance against work alienation or devaluation or with the fact that professions are deeply influenced by surrounding institutions. Indeed, they highlight the importance of a more attentive analysis to the entanglement of multiple institutional processes and complex dynamics within professions and organizations: 'existing theories have not been able to fully grapple with the evolution, hybridization, and co-penetration of occupational logics and with the transformation of practices as professional jurisdictions are reshaped by exogenous forces' (Muzio and Suddaby 2013: 701). Our inquiry on collegiality focuses on generative practices performed by professionals to interpret and accommodate external pressures while simultaneously shaping the governance of their work.

This summary review of three core hypotheses in recent works on changes in professions and organizations enables a fuller appreciation of the essentially political substrate of principles that govern work. By political substrates we mean the importance of addressing how professionals exert agency to maintain or reshape their positions and status within institutions and how the institution of profession articulates and interacts with other alternate modes of governing work. Embedded within such institutional complexity (Greenwood et al. 2011) is the existence of competing principles in the structuration and regulation of professional work. A view of professions as an achievement implies that we focus the analysis on the agency of professionals in interpreting, dealing with, accommodating and reframing pressures for change in professional work. In Section 2 of the paper, we will interpret professional agency in terms of political work that underlies both stability and change in professional work and organizations. Collegiality is therefore used as a revelatory concept to capture the political substrate of organizing work in and around organizations. Fundamentally, the section deals with political work as a form of institutional work performed by professions to value collegiality as a core set of principles in governing work.

COLLEGIALITY AS POLITICAL WORK

We have argued in the previous section that the notion of profession as an achievement implies that collegiality is related to a broader political agenda and consequently is not an immutable attribute of professional work. Finding inspiration in studies of institutional work and agency (Lawrence and Suddaby 2006), we see professional agents as 'culturally competent actors with strong practical skills and sensibility who creatively navigate within their organizational fields' (Lawrence and Suddaby 2006: 219). Political work incorporates practices that are developed to affirm, in a context

of multiple logics and institutional complexity, a specific approach to the governance of work. Collegiality requires political work by professions. Competing modes of governance require responses from professions and a redefinition of strategies to actualize (and reaffirm) the principles of collegiality at work.

Studies on institutional work have provided a variety of typologies that are more or less encompassing or fragmented (Zietsma and Lawrence; Lawrence and Suddaby 2006). In a previous empirical study on the implementation of health reforms (Cloutier et al. 2015), we found that it was analytically productive (and theoretically meaningful) to create more encompassing categories of institutional work that can serve a variety of purposes, namely analysing dynamics of maintenance, creation and transformation of institutions. For the purpose of our present inquiry and in line with our approach to professional agency in framing the governance of their work, we propose two alternate representations of collegiality as political work: collegiality as resistance and collegiality as co-production. These two types of political work build on insights gained in the analysis of contemporary works on professions and organizations reviewed in the previous section. Resistance and co-production capture both the tensions generated by competing and co-existing modes of governing of work and the forces that favor the involvement of professionals in transforming the governance of work. Moreover, the dynamic interaction of resistance and co-production aims to reaffirm and reformulate collegiality as a predominant mode of governing work. These two types of political work are certainly not exhaustive in terms of capturing the agency of professions in the context of work governance but they are logically derived from recent developments on the interface between organizations and professions. Table I provides illustrations of some empirical studies in the health sector where resistance and co-production co-exist and shape the evolution of professional work and practices.

Table I: Illustrations of situations of resistance and co-production in professionalized organizations: The case of healthcare

Illustrative studies	Collegiality as resistance	Collegiality as co-production
Introduction of Patient Safety regulations within the NHS-England: Ethnographic study of a hospital (Waring, 2007)	Resistance of physicians to perform incident reporting. Contestation of appropriateness and legitimacy of management-led incident reporting.	Participation at the departmental level in local or national initiatives to adapt pre-existing regulations regarding clinical risks.
Introduction of clinical guidelines within the medical profession: Theoretical synthesis based on US and	Cluster of individual professional variables and organizational characteristics (trust for example) can play a	Field level variables such as accountability mechanisms and professional associations can play a key role in the

UK scholarship (Adler and Kwon, 2013)	key role in situations of limited diffusion of clinical guidelines.	diffusion of clinical guidelines and in the participation of the medical profession in this process.
Identity work of managerial-professional hybrids in NHS England: Comparative study of three change initiatives based on the reanalysis of three case studies (McGivern, Currie, Ferlie et al., 2015)	Hybrid roles incidental to professional identities. Passive and defensive performance to buffer professionalism from managerialism and to represent interests and values of peers.	Hybrid roles as legitimate professional roles and career trajectories. Willing hybrids reconstructed professionalism as involving interprofessional teamwork and collective responsibilities for patient care.
Introduction of public reporting in cardiac surgery in NHS England: Case study in one hospital supplemented with interviews with policy-makers (Exworthy, Gabe, Jones and Smith, 2019)	Situations of subtle and passive resistance to maintain professional control and ownership of public reporting.	Signs of assimilation and reformulation of public reporting by surgeons at a more macro or field levels. Professional re-stratification and creation of a professional knowledge elite.

In addition, these two types of political work are structured around a fundamental tension between forces of change in professionalized organizations and the reproduction of expert work in societies (Reed 1996). They are also underlined by the transformation of approaches to governing organizations and institutions in advanced modernity, as argued by governmentalists (Bevir 2013; Dean 2010; Miller and Rose 2008). This work recognizes the significance, expansion and penetration of new political rationalities, and their manifestation in technologies and new forms of power, while leaving space for competing meanings, agency and countervailing forces (Martin and Waring 2018). Political work reflects a rejection of uniform compliance and disciplinary normalization (Flynn 2002, 2004) as a consequence of external pressures or prescriptions and leaves space for a constant dynamic of accommodation, confrontation and reformulation of governmentality regimes. Our approach to collegiality sees in political work a manifestation of agentic capacities, perceived as situated practices that depart from a habitual conception of agency and value a more 'practical' and 'projective interpretive agency' in order to adapt to increased pressure for change (Emirbayer and Mische 1998).

Collegiality as resistance

Resistance has a long history in the sociology of work and organizations (Courpasson, Dany and Clegg 2012; Thomas and Davies 2005; Lawrence, and Robinson 2007). It is generally assumed that organizational resistance permeates organizations, and a growing body of scholarly work has

attempted to delineate various forms of resistance (Courpasson and Vallas 2016). A traditional image of resistance at work is conveyed by explicit adversity and overt conflicts between owners of capital and labour. Organized protest by unions and labour conflicts are emblematic of this more adversarial form of resistance. However, less dramatic forms of resistance have also been identified based on the assumption that fluid forms of opposition may represent a more conventional strategy in contemporary organizations (Thomas and Davies 2005). Resistance in this minor mode consists of activities and discourse that take place in day-to-day work life and may be more or less illicit (Courpasson 2017). These forms of resistance are less formally organized and are activated within the context of the individual experience of work. They often relate to issues of meaning and identity at work and aim to challenge predominant views and discourse. They may culminate in adjustments of organizational elite positions and ultimately generate opportunities for more organized and open forms of contestation.

These more covert forms of resistance resonate with empirical work on strategies of accommodation between professions and organizations. For examples, studies by Waring and colleagues (Waring and Currie 2009; Waring 2007) on the penetration of managerialism in healthcare organizations systematically revealed the significance of professional resistance at work. As shown in Table I, professionals have resisted the introduction of new ways of organizing work that would challenge professional dominance and autonomy (Mintzberg 1998; Reay and Hinings 2009) in various context: namely patient safety regulations, public reporting, the introduction of clinical guidelines and the creation of professional-hybrid managers in health care. Professional groups adopt different strategies of resistance. For example, some professionals have willingly taken on managerial responsibilities to buffer the professional sphere from managerialism, while others have refused or only reluctantly accepted to perform these hybrid roles (McGivern, Currie, Ferlie et al. 2015). The introduction of clinical guidelines has also been resisted or received modest support by a segment of the medical profession. According to Adler and Kwon (2013), individual preferences and experiences condition the propensity to resist the guidelines. However, pressures from the broader organizational and field level context mediate the ability of the profession to resist the propagation of clinical guidelines. Similarly, physicians refuse in some instances to complete incident reporting because it is considered a manager-led initiative (Waring 2007). In their study of public reporting in cardiac surgery, Exworthy and colleagues (2019) also observed the importance of a subtle and passive form of resistance to and contestation of a process that is managerially initiated or led.

As stated, these observations from various studies in health care are coherent with a recent stream of work (Courpasson et al. 2012) that argues in favour of a less adversarial view of resistance in organizational scholarship, namely 'productive resistance'. Productive resistance underlines the importance that agents attach to their work context and to their contribution to the attainment of collective objectives. Productive resistance is enacted in a way that may help organizational elites achieve beneficial changes. It implies that in some circumstances, organizational elites accept to momentarily suspend discipline and authority in order to let resisters develop alternate policies or solutions to perceived problems or contingencies. Along with the studies in healthcare contexts presented in Table 1, work by Zietsma and Lawrence (2010) on innovations in the Canadian forestry industry offer further empirical illustration of the strategies and mechanisms that resisters or promoters of alternate policies can use to transform practices within an organizational field. Essentially, the authors reveal a set of practices that emerged in a highly volatile and conflictual political environment, suggesting that productive resistance can take different forms within the context of tensions between managerial hegemony and the autonomy of professionals or workers.

In our analysis of collegiality, productive resistance is an ambivalent concept that encompasses both resistance and, to certain extent, co-production as a form of political work to support collegiality. Thus, based on these theoretical and empirical works, the meaning of resistance in the context of our inquiry is based on a middle-ground position between assumptions of cooperation between professionals and organizations and assumptions of inherent conflict. It offers a positive view of resistance as a driver of change and adaptation in organizations, but recognizes an underlying tension between forces of reproduction and forces of change (Benson 1977). It sees in pressures to transform professional work a set of forces that carry more or less legitimate forms of control over labour processes and induce resistance (Harrison 2008; Lawrence and Robinson 2004). These forces act as catalysts triggering resistance at work (Prasad and Prasad 2000) in a context where professionals need to maintain their positions and work relationships with organizations. Factors related to the professional labour market may alter the propensity to express resistance (Adler and Kwon 2013). However, in responding to different intrusions on the sphere of professional control and autonomy, we see less adversarial forms of resistance as highly plausible.

Following on this analytical position, the notion of collegiality as resistance builds on the argument that this mode of governing work challenges pressures to develop more rationalized or alienated forms of work in contemporary organizations and society. Collegiality implies a set of expectations regarding the relations among peers at work and between peers and hierarchy within organizations. As underlined in the previous section, studies of professional organizations have

explored and empirically documented these forces of rationalization that may be at odds with a collegial representation of professional work. Crucially, we are not alone in seeing collegiality as an expression of political work against forms of alienation. In his analysis of professions, Friedson (2001) has suggested that professional work carries opposition, more or less explicitly, to more alienated form of labour. Seeman (1976, 1991) has sketched the dimensions of alienation in the following terms: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, social isolation, cultural estrangement, and self-estrangement. For the present analysis, an operational understanding of alienation in work situations is sufficient.

First, alienation carries the idea of separateness between an individual experience and a broader organizational or institutional context. For example, Adler and Kwon (2013) identified the critical role of organizational trust in shaping the reactions of professionals to pressures to rationalize their work. This separation can take multiple forms as expressed by the terms meaninglessness and social isolation. The development of managerial control systems that are less understood by professionals or that orient their work toward the attainment of less meaningful objectives (the tension between volume and quality or appropriateness is an example) may also create situations of alienation at work (Racko 2016). Second, the workplace can amplify separateness by fostering the development of multiple forms of disconnection, including between one's own identity and values and the demands of work settings, and between one's own interests and prevalent discourses and ideologies in organizations (Jenkins and Delbridge 2007; Ashforth 1989, see also Table I study by McGivern and colleagues, 2015). Identity transition in professionals in a context of organizational change can reflect such situations (Croft et al. 2015). Third, organizations may tend to depreciate social relations among workers and a sense of collective identity as a result of a simultaneous process of growing interdependence and fragmentation in the workplace and the experience of hierarchy and inequality (Delbridge and Sallaz 2015). Increased pressure on professionals at work may exacerbate this sense of fragmentation and confinement and favour the development of an elite group of professionals that will carry managerial imperatives (see Table I studies by Exworthy and colleagues 2019 and by Waring 2007).

While, at a first glance, professional work diverges strongly from historical and social conditions of alienated labour, analysis of professionals at work has consistently and in various contexts identified phenomena of resistance. Resistance to the penetration of managerialism and control by organizational or corporate elites has been observed in a variety of sectors (Broom et al. 2008; Barrett 2017; Waring and Currie 2009), such as accounting (Guo 2012; Lawrence 2004), law (Granfield 1996; Felstiner 2005) and universities (Honan and Teferra 2001). According to this

analytical perspective, the ability of professionals to achieve collegiality at work will be based on the enactment of resistance in changing professionalized organizations. Resistance here may be less dramatic than overt industrial conflicts, but it employs strategies or behaviours to reaffirm guiding principles of work that we identify as collegiality.

The concept of alienation also suggests that more attention has to be paid to the socialization process at work (Knights and Willmott 2007), and to how this process does or does not produce and reproduce the conditions for collegiality. A common understanding of collegiality at work emphasises its relational substrate as a surface manifestation of non-alienated labour in organizations. Relations at work that exemplify collegial values and behaviours are conceived here as an achievement that is made possible by the ability of an occupational group to secure the normative, structural and objective conditions of relational quality. Collegiality as resistance aims to protect the nature of work of an occupational group, namely a profession, from undue pressure through alternative modes of governance, as exemplified in the empirical studies presented in Table I. Initiatives in organizations that aim to align professional ways of being and doing with broader organizational imperatives such as performance management will therefore activate a fundamental and latent tension between forces of alienation and forces of emancipation (Courpasson 2017). Professionals as a community, collaborative or not, will develop responses to make sense of new imperatives such as performance expectations and network participation, and resist compliance in contexts where conflicting rationales impact on the meaning of work by proposing or imposing alternate and transformative work modalities.

One of the challenges in the conceptualisation and empirical study of resistance is to delineate the fine line between resistance that reproduces specific interests, status and privilege (the so-called status quo) and resistance that recomposes professional work in challenging environments. Professional responses to pressure for change have culminated in increased differentiation within professions (Waring 2014). These forces of differentiation are associated with multiple loci and pretexts to express resistance. Ideally, resistance simultaneously enables the development of collegiality as a mode of governing professional work, while opposing excessive interference and control (Courpasson et al. 2012, 2016). In summary, work on resistance invites us to look at the dynamic and productive aspect of political acts in organizations where professions maintain their involvement by proposing alternatives, by resisting managerial hierarchy, or by opposing potential undesirable impacts of new rationalities emerging at work. Through this process, professions propose ways to articulate and reconcile alternate modes of governance.

Collegiality as co-production

The notion of productive resistance proposed by Courpasson and colleagues (2012) represents an invitation to explore the potential of co-production as a vector of change and adaptation of professional work in contemporary organizations. If resistance is a manifestation of opposition in the day-to-day operations of an organization, co-production is a manifestation of participation and cooperation between professionals and organizations – an idea partly captured by productive resistance as we argued earlier (Courpasson et al. 2012). Co-production is an institutional response to the challenge of coordinating multiple and varied actors with agentic capacities in contemporary organizations (Meyer 2010), which has been often discussed as an alliance between professionals and clients in order to better adapt and deliver services (Brandsen and Pestoff 2006; Boyle and Harris 2009). However, co-production is also related to the growing interest for a collaborative approach to governance (Ansell and Gash 2017). Professionals are considered key figures in transforming organizational fields (Empson et al. 2015). As underlined by Muzio et al. (2013), they get involved and participate in the reshaping of their work and, more broadly, the institutional context.

Collegiality as co-production is in tension with a more confrontational notion of resistance in organizations as it posits that, despite an inclination towards resistance, professionals are necessarily co-opted in the transformation of their work and work settings. This is manifested at various levels from day-to-day experience of work to more collective participation as exemplified in studies on patient safety (Waring 2007). Here, through a form of adaptive regulation, some doctors were using the new patient safety discourse to legitimise existing internal management risk practices, or to modify and expand them in order to better adhere to the patient safety agenda. Consequently, although doctors were attempting to avoid participating in the new system, to a certain extent they were also internalising principles and procedures of patient safety within medical regulation. Co-production is also observed in situations where professional associations participate in the development and implementation of clinical guidelines (Adler and Kwon 2013) and in public reporting of clinical activities (Exworthy et al. 2019) (see Table I). In the latter, one of the reasons found for cardiac surgeons' openness to publicising their performance in the operating theatre was their desire to ensure professional ownership of public reporting and maintain control of the initiative. This is the notion of co-production that we explore in our analysis. As previously mentioned, the concept of productive resistance somewhat mirrors our idea of political work, where elements of resistance and cooperation blend together in shaping professional work. However, productive resistance is perceived as taking shape or being represented more as a local

phenomenon than as embedded in a broad transformation of the organizational field (Adler and Kwon 2013).

Arguments in favour of professional involvement in broader societal transformation have been put forward by governmentalist scholars in various policy sectors (for example, in health, law, and security, see Dean 2010; Miller and Rose 2008; Ferlie and McGivern 2013). They argue that a fundamental problem faced by advanced modern states is the regulation and co-optation of expertise in a context of heightened awareness of risk (Flynn 2002). This argument also appears in Noordegraaf's (2011) analysis of the development of organized professionalism. Professional expertise becomes part of a system of power that aims to regulate situations that are perceived as being problematic in societies (Ferlie and McGivern 2013). For example, deficiencies with regard to the quality and safety of care, or the inability to protect citizens from security threats, become pretexts to push for a closer alliance between the holders of knowledge and expertise - here the professionals - and the State. Thus, the co-optation of professionals serves three purposes, contributing to: the development of macro-regulations to deal with the proliferation of complex or wicked problems (Ferlie et al. 2013); the enrolment of experts within new regulatory roles; and the development of systems that promote greater professional accountability and closer scrutiny of professional activities (Flynn, 2002), justified by the resources used by professionals and the political sensitivity of their domains for societies and populations. From this perspective, collegiality as a governing principle of professional work will necessarily transform in situations of co-production. Co-production means that professionals exert agency in the formulation of new regulations, but are also transformed in this process, taking on regulatory functions and becoming more accountable.

In situations of co-production, professionals are not simply agents who govern their own work in a given context. The change in emphasis implies that professionals move from a form of internal regulation (as suggested by the essentialist/functionalist view of professions) to a type of regulation that goes beyond the boundaries of the profession itself. In this process, professionals are also shapers of (and are shaped by) a broader policy agenda and set of regulations. Concretely, from a governmentalist approach inspired by the works of Foucault, professionals will participate in the generation of new political rationalities and corresponding technologies of power that constitute new governance regimes (Waring 2007; Martin and Waring 2018; Merligen 2011). Political rationalities are analogous to mentalities and carry the definition of objects of governance (the health of the population, the equity of the financial system, the distributive agenda of the State and so forth). Technologies of power are means developed and used to govern a situation. Metrics

to assess the safety of care and monitoring systems to analyse and attribute responsibility are examples of technologies of power. Professionals, despite their propensity for resistance, will engage in the political task of generating and implementing these new regulatory regimes that will necessarily impact on the nature of their work in organizations. The impact this has on the possibility of collegiality is a question that requires empirical study, but the impact on professional identity and subjectivity and the experience of work has already been suggested in both theoretical and empirical work (Waring 2014; Croft et al. 2015; Denis, Ferlie and Van Gestel 2015).

Empirical studies in health care provide numerous illustrations of co-production as proposed by the governmentalists and help understand the dynamics of professional participation in the governance of work (see studies in Table I). More importantly, professional bodies have recently started to support this change in professionalism, legitimising the shift seen in most health systems to greater professional involvement in management: from 'ward to board' (Exworthy et al. 2019; see also McGivern et al. 2015 on willing professional-manager hybrids within the medical profession). Thus, hybrids have become a professional elite in their own right (Montgomery 2001) and have proven a much more stable phenomena than anticipated (Denis, Ferlie and Van Gestel 2015). Significantly, this change has entailed modifications in professional education, training and socialization, and more broadly in the roles of professional associations in setting the scene for co-production between professionals, organizations and the State (Adler and Kwon 2013). For instance, the American Medical Association agreed with Congress to produce more than 100 standard measures of performance, which would subsequently be reported by doctors to the Federal Government (Pear, 2006). While medical education has historically centred on developing clinical rather than organizational expertise (Noordegraaf, 2011), more recently we see a concerted effort to develop and expand the training provided to doctors in management and organizational skills (Spurgeon, Clark and Ham 2017). As a consequence, the professional education curriculum for medicine, traditionally controlled by professional bodies, has been revamped to formally include leadership and management competencies. In England, this has led to the establishment of high-profile institutions such as the National College for Teaching and Leadership and the National Health Service (NHS) Leadership. In Canada, medical education is based on a model (CanMEDS) comprising seven areas of expertise including management, which is used widely in the western world (Frank 2004). At the macro level, this signals that professional bodies have embraced the blending of professional and managerial logics to the point of incorporating new ways of working in the day-to-day activity of doctors.

Extant analysis of the evolution of control and power in contemporary organizations provides a basis on which to frame the implications of co-production on the structuration of professional work. In this sense, the concept of soft bureaucracy (Courpasson 2000) has been developed to analyse the recomposition of power in contemporary organizations. This work delineates a situation where increased political centralization is coupled with decentralization and flexibility at work. Technologies and new informational capacities provide a basis to restructure work towards objectives that are valued by rulers or organizational elites. For our inquiry, this means that professional work may be collegial only in appearance, i.e. it may incorporate features of cordial lateral relations among colleagues, while at the same time being constrained by and detached from the development and application of new control regimes. This situation can potentially confine collegiality at work to a professional elite that participates in the development of resources and tools that have an impact on the work context of their colleagues or other professionals. This is coherent with the long-standing hypothesis in the sociology of professions that professional differentiation is a response to pressure for change in professionalized organizations (Freidson 1981; Waring 2014). It is logically and empirically plausible that only a minority of professionals will get involved in co-production and that, consequently, collegiality may become difficult to achieve or may be conceived in more restrictive terms. Exworthy and colleagues (2019) conclude that surgeons have been able to control the creation, maintenance and transformation of public reporting in a way that, rather than representing a threat, offers an opportunity for the medical profession to reinforce its position and status: 'surgeons have largely been able to deflect an overt managerial logic through a re-definition of their expertise', (Exworthy et al. 2019: 13). Essentially, this can be seen as an 'assimilation' of the managerial logic with the core prevailing elements of the professional logic, and is also part of what we labelled as co-production.

This representation of the transformation of professional work within the context of co-production is a hypothesis that needs to be balanced with the capacity of professionals to enact resistance. Nonetheless, it conveys the risk inherent in co-production where participation also means transforming professional work and, necessarily, a reformulation of collegiality in concrete work settings. The capture of collegiality by organizational elites was observed by Ashley and Empson (2015) in their study of law firms, where lawyers with high reputation undertook an organizational exclusion of less prestigious lawyers. The growing recognition of affinities between certain segments of a profession and organizational or societal elites (Grandfield 1996; Ashley and Empson 2015) can limit the ability of segments of a profession to participate and influence regulations that are produced through situations of co-production. The idea of collegiality as co-

production thus suggests that resistance co-exists with the participation of professions in the broader agenda of states and governments and, more specifically, in the actualization and articulation of alternate and co-produced hybrid modes of governance. Despite resistance, professions progressively find themselves in situations of increased interdependence and connection with highly organized settings. This view of professions, inspired by a Foucaldian perspective on governmentality (Bevir 2011; Ferlie et al. 2013) in advanced modernity, suggests that professions are increasingly embedded in the regulatory enterprise of contemporary states through the activation and contestation of narratives around changes in governance. States and governments have progressively considered and accepted the limits of instrumental form of authority and coercive policy instruments (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2004; Tyler 2006). In a similar vein, social theorists have investigated other sources of influence on people as they comply with decisions and norms as well as, more broadly, with new demands or expectations (Mueller 1979; Kahneman and Tversky 2000). They recognize that people do not act solely out of self-interest – that is, to maximise gains and minimise losses. Professions can, in the face of new and external demands, respond in a way that departs from immediate interests and values and considers other legitimate logics (Adler et al. 2015).

Thus, the profession is understood here not only as an autonomous entity with its own distinct form of strategic intentions and projects, but as a constitutive part of new governing rationalities. This may be achieved through subjectification or the disciplinary power of the State, but can also manifest through the agentic capacities of professions (Martin and Waring 2018) – what we have labelled political work. As underlined earlier (Section I of the paper), the alignment of professionals within organizational and managerial projects is seen in different streams of work. Professionals' greater acceptance of interdependence, their willingness to contribute to shared goals, participate in teamwork, and balance interests, as well as their openness to modes of control that rely on an alternate rationality, are all empirical signs of involvement in situations of co-production. Engagement in co-production influences the ability to materialize collegiality at work. The protection, maintenance and transformation of collegiality will operate in a context where professions participate and negotiate compromises with others legitimate modes of governance at work.

Summarising, following on a previous review of scholarly work on professions and organizations, we propose that the idea of collegiality as political work is structured around both the act of resistance and participation in co-production. These two types of political work reveal fundamental aspects of professional mobilization in the context of plural modes of governance. The

development, persistence and diffusion of collegiality as a fundamental organizing principle of work in organizations depend on the enactment of political work (resistance and co-production) by individuals and occupational groups. Political work reveals a determination to reaffirm collegiality while aligning it with alternate modes of governance. It also presents some risks in a context where situations of co-production may be associated with the alienation of some professionals by organizational and professional elites that aspire to regulate or control their work.

CONCLUSION

This paper looks at the dynamics of reconciliation and alignment between collegiality and pressures for the development and implementation of other modes of governance in professionalized organizations. Since collegiality is a core principle and aspiration of professional communities, we propose a political reframing of the concept in order to capture and explore the contested terrain in which non-alienated form of labour develops. We also insist on the importance of moving away from an essentialist view of collegiality to a more dynamic appraisal of the concept. Collegiality as political work incarnates this idea that collegiality at work is not a given but an achievement. Our arguments build on recent studies and hypotheses concerning the interface of professions and organizations to reveal the political work that underlies the affirmation and re-affirmation of collegiality as a mode of governance of work based on resistance and co-production. Along the way, we introduce different strands of work to elaborate an approach to understanding the dynamic of collegiality in professionalized settings. This preliminary effort to conceptualize collegiality as a mode of governing work suggests the following lines of inquiry:

1) The identification of specific strategies used in the performance of resistance and co-production that are aligned with the development, maintenance and diffusion of collegiality at work. We underline that the combined effect of engagement in covert forms of resistance and in co-production may support the materialisation of collegiality at work. We also emphasize the risks of co-production when certain segments of the profession may be excluded from decisions that structure new regulatory or governance regimes. We suggest that the ambiguity of the concept of productive resistance may help to further explore this issue.

2) The role of collegiality in creating a safe space to support and govern professional values and interests in organizations and societies. Our critical analysis suggests the centrality of the development of practical and projective forms of agency, where professionals in work

contexts pay systematic attention to forces that drive change and to the potential to transform professional work. Our emphasis on political work as effortful strategy and situated practice aims to explore how professionals at work become agents of institutional change while simultaneously developing the possibilities of collegiality.

3) The creative role of collegiality in the development of a productive articulation of alternate modes of governance. Collegiality as a non-essentialist and non-inherent property of professional work is necessarily and constantly located and articulated with competing forces that structure the experience of work in advanced modernity. We suggest that attention to alienated forms of labour provides an analytical resource that can be used to understand the content and consequences of new work arrangements in professional settings. Again, the realism of productive resistance as a professional project to bring about change in professionalized organizations needs to be further explored.

These lines of inquiry upturn the usual approach to studying professional work, societies and organizations. The idea is to focus less on instances of professional deviance and more on the political conditions associated with the persistence of a specific organizing principle at work, namely collegiality, and the vitality of professions in crucial institutional sectors such as health, law and education.

References:

Abbott, A. (2014). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. University of Chicago Press.

Adams, T. L. (2015). Sociology of professions: International divergences and research directions. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(1), 154-65.

Adler, P. S., Kwon, S. W., and Heckscher, C. (2008). Perspective—professional work: The emergence of collaborative community. *Organization Science*, *19*(2), 359-76.

Adler, P. S., and Kwon, S. W. (2013). The mutation of professionalism as a contested diffusion process: Clinical guidelines as carriers of institutional change in medicine. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(5), 930-62.

Adler, P. S., Heckscher, C., McCarthy, J. E., and Rubinstein, S. A. (2015). The mutations of professional responsibility: Toward collaborative community. In *Professional Responsibility* (pp. 309-26). Springer, Cham.

Ansell, C., and Gash, A. (2017). Collaborative platforms as a governance strategy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *28*(1), 16-32.

Ashforth, B. E. (1989). The experience of powerlessness in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43(2), 207-42.

Ashley, L., and Empson, L. (2013). Differentiation and discrimination: Understanding social class and social exclusion in leading law firms. *Human Relations*, *66*(2), 219-44.

Bejerot, E., and Hasselbladh, H. (2011). Professional autonomy and pastoral power: The transformation of quality registers in Swedish health care. *Public Administration*, 89(4), 1604-21.

Benson, J. K. (1977). Organizations: A dialectical view. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-21.

Bevir, M. (2011). Governance and governmentality after neoliberalism. *Policy & Politics*, 39(4), 457-71.

Bevir, M. (2013), A Theory of Governance, California University Press, Berkeley

Bevir, M., and Waring, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Decentring health policy: learning from British experiences in healthcare governance*. Routledge.

Blau, P. M., and Scott, W. R. (2003). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. Stanford University Press.

Boyle, D., and Harris, M. (2009). The challenge of co-production. *London: New economics foundation*.

Brandsen, T., Pestoff, V. (2006). Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services: An introduction. *Public Management Review*, *8*(4), 493-501.

Brint, S. (1993). Eliot Freidson's contribution to the sociology of professions. *Work and Occupations, 20(3),* 259-78.

Cloutier, C., Denis, J. L., Langley, A., Lamothe, L. (2015). Agency at the managerial interface: Public sector reform as institutional work. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *26*(2), 259-76.

Cooper, D. J., Hinings, B., Greenwood, R., Brown, J. L., Cooper, D. J., Hinings, B. (1996). Sedimentation and transformation in organizational change: The case of Canadian law firms. *Organization Studies*, *17*(4), 623-47.

Cooper, D. J., Robson, K. (2006). Accounting, professions and regulation: Locating the sites of professionalization. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *31*(4-5), 415-44.

Courpasson , D. (2000) 'Managerial strategies of domination: power in soft bureaucracies'. *Organization Studies*, 21 (1), pp. 141-61 .

Courpasson, D. (2017). The politics of everyday. *Organization Studies*, 38(6), 843-859.

Courpasson, D., Dany, F., Clegg, S. (2012). Resisters at work: Generating productive resistance in the workplace. *Organization Science*, 23(3), 801-19.

Courpasson, D., Dany, F., Martí, I. (2016). Organizational entrepreneurship as active resistance: A struggle against outsourcing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *40*(1), 131-60.

Courpasson, D., Vallas, S. (Eds.). (2016). *The SAGE handbook of resistance*. Sage.

Croft, C., Currie, G., Lockett, A. (2015). Broken 'two- way windows'? An exploration of professional hybrids. *Public Administration*, *93*(2), 380-94.

Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage publications.

Denis, J. L., Ferlie, E., Van Gestel, N. (2015). Understanding hybridity in public organizations. *Public Administration*, *93*(2), 273-89.

Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H. (1971). A group process model for problem identification and program planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *7*(4), 466-92.

Drazin, R. (1990). Professionals and innovation: structural- functional versus radical- structural perspectives. *Journal of Management Studies*, *27*(3), 245-63.

Delbridge, R., Sallaz, J. J. (2015). *Work: four worlds and ways of seeing*.

Drazin, R. (1990). Professionals and innovation: structural- functional versus radical- structural perspectives. *Journal of Management Studies*, *27*(3), 245-63.

Emirbayer, M., Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(4), 962-1023.

Empson, L., Cleaver, I., Allen, J. (2013). Managing partners and management professionals: Institutional work dyads in professional partnerships. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(5), 808-44.

Empson, L., Muzio, D., Broschak, J., Hinings, B. (2015). Researching professional service firms: An introduction and overview. *The Oxford handbook of professional service firms*, 1-24.

Evetts, J. (2002). New directions in state and international professional occupations: discretionary decision-making and acquired regulation. *Work, Employment and Society*, *16*(2), 341-53.

Evetts, J. (2011). Sociological analysis of professionalism: Past, present and future. *Comparative Sociology*, *10*(1), 1-37.

Exworthy M, Gabe J, Jones IR, Smith G (2019) Professional autonomy and surveillance: the case of public reporting in cardiac surgery. *Sociology of Health & Illness. 41(6):1040-55.*

Faulconbridge, J., Muzio, D. (2008). Organizational professionalism in globalizing law firms. *Work, Employment and Society*, *22*(1), 7-25.

Felstiner, W. (Ed.). (2005). *Reorganization and resistance: Legal professions confront a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Ferlie, E., McGivern, G. (2013). Bringing Anglo-governmentality into public management scholarship: the case of evidence-based medicine in UK health care. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *24*(1), 59-83.

Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., McGivern, G., Dopson, S., Bennett, C. (2013). *Making Wicked Problems Governable?: the case of managed networks in health care*. OUP Oxford.

Flynn, R. (2002). Clinical governance and governmentality. *Health, Risk & Society*, *4*(2), 155-73.

Flynn, R. (2004) ' "Soft-bureaucracy", governmentality and clinical governance: theoretical approaches to emergent policy '. In A. Gray and S. Harrison (eds), *Governing Medicine.* Maidenhead, UK : Open University Press.

Frank, J. R. (2004). The CanMEDS project: the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada moves medical education into the 21st century. *The evolution of specialty medicine. Ottawa: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada*, 187-211.

Freidson, E. (1984). The changing nature of professional control. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *10*(1), 1-20.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, the third logic: On the practice of knowledge*. University of Chicago press.

Granfield, R. (1996). Lawyers and power: Reproduction and resistance in the legal profession.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 281-306.

Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles. II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 444-80.

Greenwood, R., Empson, L. (2003). The professional partnership: Relic or exemplary form of governance?. *Organization Studies*, *24*(6), 909-33.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*(1), 317-71.

Guo, K. H. (2012). Understanding why and how some chartered accountants object to the proposed merger of the three accounting professions in Canada. *Accounting Perspectives*, *11*(2), 111-30.

Hallett, T. and Marc J. Ventresca. 2006. Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner's patterns of industrial bureaucracy. *Theory and Society* 35:213-36.

Harrison, S. 1988 . *Managing the NHS: shifting the frontier* ? London : Chapman and Hall.

Harrison, S., Pollitt, C. (1994). Controlling Health Professionals. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Honan, J. P., Teferra, D. (2001). The US academic profession: Key policy challenges. *Higher Education*, *41*(1-2), 183-203.

Jenkins, S., Delbridge, R. (2007). Disconnected workplaces: interests and identities in the 'high performance'factory. *Searching for the human in HRM*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kahneman, D. Tversky, A. eds. (2000). *Choices, Values and Frames*, Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, I., Noordegraaf, M. (2015). Organizations and occupations: towards hybrid professionalism in professional service firms. *The Oxford Handbook of Professional Service Firms*, 92-112.

Knights, D., Willmott, H. (2007). Socialization, yes. Skill upgrading, probably. Robust theory of the capitalist labour process, no. *Organization Studies*, *28*(9), 1369-78.

Klein, R. (1998). Competence, professional self regulation, and the public interest. *BMJ*, *316*(7146), 1740-42.

Larson, M. S. (1979). Professionalism: rise and fall. *International Journal of Health Services*, *9*(4), 607-27.

Lascoumes, P., Le Galès, P. (2004). *Gouverner par les instruments* (p. 370). Presses de Sciences po.

Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Rituals and resistance: Membership dynamics in professional fields. *Human Relations*, *57*(2), 115-43.

Lawrence, T. B., Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management*, *33*(3), 378-94.

Lawrence, T. B., and Suddaby, R. 2006. Institutions and institutional work. In *Handbook of organization studies*, eds. Stewart Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, Walter R. Nord, and Thomas B. Lawrence, 215–54. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Leicht, K. T., Fennell, M. L. (1997). The changing organizational context of professional work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*(1), 215-31.

Lupu, I., Empson, L. (2015). Illusio and overwork: playing the game in the accounting field. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *28*(8), 1310-40.

Martin, G. P., Waring, J. (2018). Realising governmentality: Pastoral power, governmental discourse and the (re) constitution of subjectivities. *The Sociological Review*, 0038026118755616.

McGivern, G., Currie, G., Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., Waring, J. (2015). Hybrid manager-professionals' identity work: The maintenance and hybridization of medical professionalism in managerial contexts. *Public Administration.* 93(2):412-32.

Merlingen, M. (2011). From governance to governmentality in CSDP: Towards a Foucauldian research agenda. *JCMS: journal of common market studies*, *49*(1), 149-69.

Meyer, J. W. (2010). World society, institutional theories, and the actor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *36*, 1-20.

Miller , P. and Rose, N. (2008) *Governing the present: Administering economic, social and personal life* . London, UK : Polity Press .

Mintzberg, H. (1998). "Covert Leadership: Notes on Managing Professionals," Harvard Business Review, 76: 140–48.

Montgomery, K. "Physician executives: The evolution and impact of a hybrid profession." *Advances in Health Care Management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2001. 215-41.

Muzio, D., Brock, D. M., & Suddaby, R. (2013). Professions and institutional change: Towards an institutionalist sociology of the professions. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(5), 699-721.

Mueller, D. (1979) *Public Choice*, Cambridge University Press.

Noble, T., & Pym, B. (1970). Collegial authority and the receding locus of power. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 21(4), 431-445.

Noordegraaf, M. (2011). Risky Business: How Professionals and Professional Fields (Must) Deal with Organizational Issues. *Organization Studies*, 32(10): 1349-71.

Noordegraaf, M. (2015). Hybrid professionalism and beyond:(New) Forms of public professionalism in changing organizational and societal contexts. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, *2*(2), 187-206.

Noordegraaf, M. (2016). Reconfiguring professional work: Changing forms of professionalism in public services. *Administration & Society*, *48*(7), 783-810.

Pear, R. (2006). AMA to develop measure of quality of medical care. *The New York Times*, *21*.

Pollitt, C., Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis-into the age of austerity*. Oxford University Press.

Prasad, P., Prasad, A. (2000). Stretching the iron cage: The constitution and implications of routine workplace resistance. *Organization Science*, *11*(4), 387-403.

Racko, G. (2017). Bureaucratization and medical professionals' values: A cross-national analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, *180*, 76-84.

Reay, T., Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, *30*(6), 629-52.

Reed, M. I. (1996). Expert power and control in late modernity: an empirical review and theoretical synthesis. *Organization Studies*, *17*(4), 573-97.

Saks, M. (2010). Analyzing the professions: The case for the neo-Weberian approach. *Comparative Sociology*, *9*(6), 887-915.

Sahlin, K., Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2016): Collegiality in modern universities – the composition of governance ideals and practices. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 2-3.

Schneyer, T. (2013). The Case for Proactive Management-Based Regulation to Improve Professional Self-Regulation for US Lawyers. *Hofstra L. Rev*., 42: 233.

Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. University of Chicago Press.

Scott, W. R. (2008). Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organization studies*, *29*(2), 219-38.

Seeman, M. (2001). Alienation, sociology of. *Regulation*, *58*, 459-71.

Seeman, M. (1976). On the meaning of alienation. In L. A. Coser & B. Rosenberg (Ed.) *Sociological theory* (pp. 401-14). New York: MacMillan.

Seeman, M. (1991). Alienation and anomie. In Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes (pp. 291-371), New York: Academic Press

Sehested, K. (2002). How new public management reforms challenge the roles of professionals. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *25*(12), 1513-37.

Spurgeon, P., Clark, J., Ham, C. (2017). *Medical leadership: from the dark side to centre stage*. CRC Press.

Thomas, R., Davies, A. (2005). Theorizing the micro-politics of resistance: New public management and managerial identities in the UK public services. *Organization Studies*, *26*(5), 683-706.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). Restorative justice and procedural justice: Dealing with rule breaking. *Journal of social issues*, *62*(2), 307-26.

Waring, J. (2007). Adaptive regulation or governmentality: patient safety and the changing regulation of medicine. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *29*(2), 163-79.

Waring, J., Currie, G. (2009). Managing expert knowledge: organizational challenges and managerial futures for the UK medical profession. *Organization Studies*, *30*(7), 755-78.

Waring, J. (2014). Restratification, hybridity and professional elites: questions of power, identity and relational contingency at the points of 'professional–organizational intersection'. *Sociology Compass*, *8*(6), 688-704.

Waters, M. (1989): Collegiality, Bureaucratization, and Professionalization: A Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94 (5), 945-72.

Zietsma, C. and Lawrence, T. B. (2010) 'Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 55 (2), pp. 189-221.

Zilber, T. (2008). The work of meanings in institutional processes and thinking. In *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, eds. Greenwood R., Oliver C., Sahlin K. and Suddaby R., 151-69. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.