



Heusinkveld, S., Gabbioneta, C., Werr, A., & Sturdy, A. (2018). Professions and (new) management occupations as a contested terrain: Redefining jurisdictional claims. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 5(3), 248-261. Article joy015. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joy015>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1093/jpo/joy015](https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joy015)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Oxford University Press at <https://academic.oup.com/jpo/article-abstract/5/3/248/5151287?redirectedFrom=fulltext>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

PROFESSIONS AND (NEW) MANAGEMENT OCCUPATIONS AS A CONTESTED TERRAIN: REDEFINING JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS

Stefan Heusinkveld,^{1,*} Claudia Gabbioneta,² Andreas Werr,³ and Andrew Sturdy⁴

1 School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2 Newcastle University Business School, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK 3 Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden and 4 School of Economics Finance and Management, University of Bristol, UK *Corresponding author. Email: s.heusinkveld@vu.nl Submitted 26 July 2018; Revised 5 September 2018; revised version accepted 8 September 2018

To be published as Journal of Professions and Organization, 2018, 5, 248–261 doi: 10.1093/jpo/joy015 Scholarly Article

Abstract

In this essay, we discuss how research on professions and organizations may benefit from a better understanding of the emergence and prevalence of ‘new’ management occupations or ‘corporate professions’ and their interactions with ‘traditional’ professions. To this end, we explore the theoretical and empirical implications of selected studies, analyzing how professional and occupational jurisdictions, as well as inter-occupational relationships, are *redefined*. This occurs as new areas of management expertise emerge and gain influence in relation to broader organizational, technical and institutional developments.

Key words

Management occupations; corporate professions; traditional professions; expertise; jurisdictional conflict.

Introduction

Occupational jurisdictions have always been subject to challenge and contestation. As a consequence, conflicts between professions have received significant research attention for decades (Abbott, 1988; see Anteby et al., 2016 for an overview). Academic research has focused primarily on how different professions compete for dominance over a particular area of work by making jurisdictional claims. These disputes are of particular theoretical

significance as they are widely considered to be constitutive of the occurrence and evolution of professions as well as of the broader institutions and societies within which they are embedded (Suddaby and Viale, 2011; Suddaby and Muzio, 2015). As such, it is generally accepted that studying occupational competition and conflict should be seen as a cornerstone for research on professions and organizations. Or in the words of Abbott: “an effective historical sociology of professions must begin with case studies of jurisdictions and jurisdictional disputes” (1988, p. 2).

Professional and occupational contests over jurisdictions have traditionally been studied at different levels of analysis (Anteby et al., 2016). Primarily drawing on macro-sociological perspectives, field-level theorists have emphasized how claims and contests around jurisdictions are made in several areas such as in relation to the legal system, public opinion and workplace. This influential line of work has shown how different professions demarcate their jurisdiction and explained how various institutional and technical developments may enhance or limit opportunities for these professions in supporting their jurisdictional claims (e.g. Abbott, 1988; Brint, 1994; MacDonald, 1995). A related stream of research shares a field-level view, but takes a more agentic perspective by studying the micro-level processes of inter-professional interaction (e.g. Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005). Here studies typically focus on how various forms of discursive practices and strategies have impacted field-level boundary establishment and contestations between professions (e.g. Bucher et al., 2011; Timmermans, 2002). Following from the increasing acknowledgement of the role of organizations for professions and processes of professionalization, an emerging literature has concentrated on jurisdictional conflict on an organizational level (e.g. Bechky, 2003). Indeed, an increasing number of studies have shed important light on patterns of workplace contestation between different occupational members (e.g. Allen, 1997). These demonstrated how organizations need to be considered as important spaces that provide opportunities for occupations to influence how tasks are performed and, therefore, define themselves and their jurisdictions (Bechky, 2011). In parallel, theorists have also recognized that beyond jurisdictional disputes, professions and occupations may develop more collaborative relations (Anteby et al., 2016). For instance, it is argued that contests around jurisdictions may ‘end’ in a variety of different ‘settlements’ (Abbott, 1988, p. 69). This entails defining a more or less explicit temporal resolution that may range from full domination to the formal splitting of work, as well as comprising various forms of subordinate or advisory functions (Macdonald, 1995).

Thus, we can see that contests of professional jurisdictions have been understood in relation to different levels of analysis (e.g. field level/intra-organizational level), foci (e.g. structure/agency), and assumptions about how professions and occupations relate to each other (contestation/collaboration). However, the substantial base of research on jurisdictional contests offers little detail about the role and impact of what can be seen as ‘new’ management occupations and spaces that have emerged in the wake of more organizational or corporate forms of professionalism (Muzio et al., 2011; Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011; Reed, 1996). This relative absence is perhaps surprising, particularly in the light of the increased attention to the expansion of management and related ‘knowledge-based’ occupations, albeit outside of the field of occupations (Engwall et al., 2015; Khurana, 2007). Historically, managers have habitually been distinguished from professionals and managerialism from professionalism (Brint, 1994). Although meanings and practices vary according to context, any clear separation is less tenable, especially today (e.g. Abbott, 1988). First, the field of management comprises of various occupational or expert groups, including both traditional and ‘corporate’ professions such as accounting, HR and project management (Muzio et al., 2011). Second, management logics, tools and language increasingly pervade the practice and organization of all occupations, including established professions such as law or medicine and emerging advisory roles (Reed, 1996; Noordegraaf, 2015).

The increasing specialization and professionalization of management may stem, in part, from a broader shift in the dominant organizational paradigm from the corporation and the state to the network and hybrid (Bodrozic and Adler, 2018). Whatever its origin, these changes unavoidably increase the likelihood of struggles for jurisdictional space across occupational boundaries, in the context of management and organization and beyond. New occupational groups, such as CSR managers, project- or change managers may not only compete for power and influence, but may also challenge established occupations, including s line management or be co-opted by them. Furthermore, new domains of colonization and competition are emerging, such as those located in fluid and often weakly regulated transnational spaces (Seabrooke and Tsingou, 2015). The resultant challenging, broadening or blending of occupational domains and their boundaries may likely have important implications for the development and application of management knowledge, as well as the organization of this knowledge in, for example, internal staff functions or internal or external consulting organizations (Christensen et al., 2013).

Thus, while professional groups have long been concerned with establishing and protecting the jurisdiction and boundaries around fields of knowledge (Abbott, 1988), such

issues become complicated when enmeshed within managerial logics and (networked) relations with ‘new’ management occupations. Prior literature provides a crucial basis for understanding inter-occupational conflict over jurisdictions at the field and organizational levels, but is more limited in explaining how this may be redefined in the light of the emergence and increased influence of new expert management groups and of new fluid spaces for occupational activity (Brock et al., 2014; Davis and Williams, 2017; Wedel, 2014). In particular, we know little about how occupational conflict between management and other occupations may be of a different nature than that between traditional or more established occupations and professions. While the latter focus on the control over knowledge domains, one may expect that the former, to a large extent, focus on control over work processes (Evetts, 2011). Also, and relatedly, prior literature provides relatively little detail about the possible implications of the emergence of ‘new’ management occupations. In particular, it is not clear how ‘invading’ actors may redefine extant jurisdictional boundaries and relations between incumbents, not the least because ‘new and competing professions often chose contrasting legitimation values’ (Abbott, 1988, p. 192). As a result, theorizations of jurisdictional conflict remain incomplete, along with those of how organizations, the state and society shape and are shaped by professions and occupations. There is then, an important need to study how contestation over jurisdictional boundaries, both at the field- and at the organization-level, is affected by the emergence of ‘new’ management occupations such as talent, project and CSR managers, as well as the proliferation and transition of existing groups such as accountancy and management consultancy (Sturdy et al., 2015).

This gap in our understanding of both the nature and implications of jurisdictional battles between traditional occupations and management occupations is problematic for various reasons. To start with, the management of organizations is hard to understand without reference to the different professions and occupations who are both conditions and consequences of them (Fligstein, 1990). For instance various expert occupations are key agents in the changing nature of the management of business organizations, both locally and transnationally, and yet are also subject to managerial discourses and practices themselves. In part, shortcomings in our conceptualizations may stem from academic fields of research whereby occupations and professions have been distinguished in some contexts, even within a single discipline, such as sociology (e.g. Brock and Saks, 2016). Also, research has, until recently at least, tended to follow the strict divisions assumed between professionalism and managerialism and the latter has been left to the field of management and organizational studies (cf. Gorman and Sandefur, 2011). The logics of management and organizations have

often been seen as in competition with those of professional and occupational groups working in specialized roles (Ackroyd, 2002). As a result, insights from different fields of study are not always shared and accumulated (cf. Lammers, 1988). For example, and as we have seen, there is a rich field of research on inter-professional jurisdictional conflicts, but this has not been absorbed into studies of organizational structural tensions. Likewise, the established study of organizations and expertise in cross-national perspective, including their functional divisions and associated services (e.g. Guillen, 1994; Hall and Soskice, 2001), is not evident in the study of occupations, where cross-national work is limited and largely restricted to concerns with professionalization and/or state regulation (Macdonald, 1995).

In this essay, we seek to begin to address this gap in the literature by drawing attention to some of the recent work that analyzes organizations and economic systems through the agency of management and management occupations. In particular, we focus on studies which shows how they strive for expert-based authority and jurisdictional control over organizational and field levels, as well as how they relate to other professions. The following sections outline a number of key themes that emerge from this important work. Although illustrative, rather than exhaustive, we believe that this initial selection of empirical and conceptual studies on management occupations as a contested terrain allows us to develop a more advanced understanding of professions and organizations in general. The discussion of the findings supports our argument that the evolution of ‘new’ management and management occupations should be regarded as process of both contestation and collaboration, of which the outcome has important implications for the functioning of (other) professions, organizations and the economic system. As Abbott stated: ‘professions evolve together. Each shapes the others. By understanding where work comes from, who does it, and how they keep it to themselves, we can understand why professions evolve as they do’ (1988, p. 279).

In line with Bechky (2011), we highlight three categories of mechanisms (attitudes, practices, and identification) that are central in these studies, and constitute, in our view, a critical basis on which to develop a more advanced basis for a research agenda on the emergence of ‘new’ management occupations. We group the studies according to the level of analysis they adopted and discuss their characteristics and main contributions.

Studying the dynamics between traditional and management occupations

Research on the dynamics between traditional and management occupations has followed two main approaches. One set of studies has investigated how the emergence of management and management occupations affects intra- and inter-organizational dynamics, in particular in

relation to power and identity issues (e.g. Watson, 1994; O’Mahoney et al., 2013). Another set has instead taken a field-level approach and examined how the emergence of management occupations has impacted traditional or existing occupations and the economic system more in general (e.g. Armstrong, 1986). Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the most important theoretical insights that emerge from each of these areas of work. These, together with some exemplar studies, are discussed and illustrated below.

Organization-level studies

This body of work has examined how the structural and organizational context influences and is influenced by processes of negotiation between traditional and management occupations. It has often challenged a view of the traditional professions and occupations as relatively powerless victims of the increasing influence of management occupations. Indeed, rather than assuming a hierarchical understanding of the relationship between management and other occupations, it has pointed to more dynamic, multidirectional and less predictable ways in which they relate. It has primarily focused on the internal organizational level, and explored ways in which professions and occupations negotiate, through contestation and collaboration, and how they relate to each other in the context of ongoing work (see Table 1 for an overview).

Insert Table 1 about here

Negotiating professions and ‘new’ occupations in relation to ongoing work

Waring and Currie’s (2009) ethnographic study of one hospital’s experience of implementing patient safety systems shows how attempts by hospital risk managers to manage medical knowledge towards organizational learning was perceived by doctors as a significant challenge to clinical freedom and their professional autonomy. As a result, doctors displayed different attitudes towards these efforts, and engaged in a number of practices to try to limit management control over knowledge, including co-opting management techniques into professional activities, adapting these techniques to fit with medical working practices, and in the most extreme cases circumventing them. What we believe is particularly interesting in this study is that it shows that managerial techniques can be strategically drawn into professional practice and identity as professionals try to hold back managerial encroachment. Rather than seeing professionals as being drawn into management roles or bureaucratic ways of working

(that is, being ‘colonized’), the study provides evidence of a form of ‘*reverse colonization*’ in which members of the traditional profession (the ‘colonized’) used the technique developed by members of the management occupation (the ‘colonizers’) to challenge their authority and gain independence.

Research on professionals’ identities at the intersection between management and professionalism, however, indicates that this appropriation of management techniques and skills can create challenges of identity and identification for the individual professional. This may be illustrated by studies by McGivern et al. (2015) and Mueller et al. (2011). In their research on managers in healthcare, McGivern et al. (2015) found that manager-professional hybrids were engaged in active identity work to integrate professionalism and managerialism and position this role as elite in the profession. The study shows that hybrid roles were related to practices aimed at contesting managerialism as well as those which were intended to combine medical and managerial practices. This is in line with Mueller et al. (2011) in their study of how managers make sense of consulting careers in the big four accounting firms. They also showed how blending professional and managerial agendas is challenging at an individual level. For example, the female consultants studied displayed a divided self which, on the one hand, was loyal to the managerial agenda of performance, but on the other hand was reticent towards observed practices of game playing and politics.

Another example of this more fluid and ambivalent relationship between management and other occupations is provided by a study by O’Mahoney et al. (2013) on the role of procurement professionals in sourcing consultancy knowledge. This demonstrates how procurers attempted to commodify management knowledge, thereby limiting the exchange value of that knowledge and, potentially, the status and legitimacy of the management consulting occupation. It also shows how consultants used a number of practices to resist procurement’s attempts to decrease the exchange-value (i.e. price) of their knowledge. These included avoiding the rules that forced work to go through procurement, defining a project as an ‘extension’ to an existing project rather than a new project, and directly collaborating with client managers in different occupational settings to define the requirements of the work at hand. The study highlights not only the tensions and collaborations between occupations, but also their related logics, notably transactional and relational or managerial and professional discourses (see also Perner and Skjolsvik, 2018). It also shows how once emergent and fragile professions, consulting in this instance, become established and a target of competition of other emergent occupational groups.

A further example is provided by Perner et al. (this issue) who study the inter-professional relationships between the management consulting occupation and the classical healthcare professionals (physicians) and examine how the latter construct meanings about management consultants and their expertise. They found that physicians' attitudes towards 'new' occupations may vary significantly by showing how they framed management consultants and their expertise in a polar way - either as irrelevant or as relevant and valuable. These apparently contradictory findings are explained by linking them to the physicians' identification with their own professions, the organizations and the environments in which they operate, and the perceived relationship between managerialism and professionalism. This indicates that inter-professional relations between managerial and other professions are context dependent and rely on the perceived complementarity and value of the managerial expertise (see also Waisberg and Nelson, 2018).

To conclude, the above indicates that the organization is an important arena for the interaction between professions and new management and other occupations. This interaction contains the potential for upsetting the balance between traditional professions and 'new' management occupations within new as well as established organizational forms. Management occupations may both threaten established occupations, and be exploited by them to complement and support their power. In the case of hybrid professionals for example, the potential tension between management and professions is individualized and becomes manifest in identity work and possible role struggles (*cf* Zabusky and Barley, 1997).

Field-level studies

Our second group of studies analyzed the field-level dynamics associated with the emergence of management occupations. These have contributed to our understanding of the impact of broader developments in occupational contexts (Abbott, 1988; Suddaby and Muzio, 2015) and focused on two main themes: (1) the emergence of new management occupations and their positioning in relation to other established occupations and (2) the interplay of established occupations and the emerging management occupations within broader processes of ecological-institutional change (see Table 2 for an overview).

Insert Table 2 about here

Strategic positioning of new occupational projects

An example of the first theme – the emergence of new management occupations – is the study by Muzio et al. (2011) which focuses on the relevant practices that are expected to enhance the establishment of different new management occupations, i.e. management consultancy, project management and executive headhunters. Here, the authors refer to corporate professionalization as these occupations typically identify with the private sector organizations whose power is critical to enhance professionalization projects. The study identifies a number of practices associated with corporate professionalism that are common to the establishment of the three emerging occupations (see also Reed in this issue). The first is organizational membership. As opposed to the classical or more independent professions, membership in these emerging management occupations was both individual and organizational, thus giving organizations an important role in the professionalization project. The second is client engagement, which implies focusing on the (commercial) value of a professional association in the client relationship. Third, the new occupations pursue a closure strategy that is based on a broader set of knowledge than that common in the traditional professions, including generic competencies, skills and experiences. Finally, the jurisdiction of the emerging management professions is typically international rather than national, which has been the focus of the classical or formally regulated professions. Overall, this study illustrates that the proliferation of ‘management’ not only provides a threat to other knowledge-based occupations, but also provides a space for new occupations to emerge, thus adding to the complexity of occupational ecologies.

Another example of fruitfully studying the emergence and establishment of ‘new’ management occupations is provided by Henriksen and Seabrooke (2016). In their work on transnational organizing, they introduce the term ‘issue professionals’ to indicate individuals who cooperate and compete with each other over how specific issues (in their case, transnational sustainability certifications) are treated, and who and what organizations are permitted to work on them. These professionals identify with movements between distinct professional and organizational *networks* and claim particular expertise that is not bound by professional associations, state regulation, formal training, or organizational values. Rather, their assumed expertise is derived from professional experience linked to an extended commitment to the issue that can be traced from their careers. To advance their agenda, issue professionals draw on various practices aimed at exploiting ‘structural holes’ – missing information ties – within professional and organizational networks. In this way, they exemplify a wider development within some *national* as well as transnational contexts, where

expertise, legitimacy, careers and influence of elites are more fluid and hidden (Davis and Williams, 2017; Wedel, 2014). This has some potentially significant implications for education and training, as well as for public perceptions of expertise and professions.

A third example involves the study by Boussard (this issue) which examines the specific boundary work practices performed by global professions to delineate their jurisdictions, defend them against outsiders and legitimate their monopolies. Focusing on those working in the field of Merger and Acquisition (M&A) advice and execution, the study suggests that in contrast to the classical professions, the professionalism these actors claim to embody is not recognized or certified by nation states. Because of this, it is up to them to define their professional jurisdiction and to defend it over time. In order to do that, Boussard argues, M&A professionals engage in three types of boundary work. First, they gain recognition of symbolic and social boundaries through the establishment of sophisticated knowledge certified by impersonal judgement devices (e.g., rankings). Second, they shape and master a professional ethos to strengthen these boundaries. Third, they use this to rely on an exclusionary process which populates the ‘ecology’ of clients with former M&A professionals. By looking at the social closure strategies adopted by these professionals, the study shows that normative boundaries, constructed using rhetorical resources rather than binding national rules, can be as effective as legal boundaries in protecting professional jurisdictions.

New occupations and ecological-institutional change

In relation to our second theme within this group of studies – the interplay between emerging management occupations and the broader context – it has traditionally been argued that the increasing influence of management occupations represents a threat to other occupations (Abbott, 1988). By jeopardizing the claimed autonomy of the established professional, management occupations have been argued to further proletarianization or de-professionalization. However, as argued by Freidson (1984), this is a misleading polarization between management and other occupations, not the least because management techniques of control are often imported and used by classical professionals. This entails leaving control in the hands of professionals, but creating a hierarchy between a professional elite and the rank-and-file (see also Evetts, 2011). This suggests a more complex interplay between professions and management occupations as we shall see from the following two examples.

In his study of the public sector, Noordegraaf (2015) argues that traditional attitudes about the separation between professions and managerial occupations have to be re-

considered. In particular, seemingly “contradictory professional and managerial principles such as autonomy and control, or quality and efficiency, are combined in order to establish contemporary professional actions” (p. 187). Such a combination, it is argued, leads to the emergence of ‘hybrid professional practices’, which have important implications for professional service firms, business organizations, and the economic system. Indeed, this blending of the professional and managerial is linked to the simultaneous development of increased identifications with *organizational* hybridity, evident in neo-bureaucracy where post-bureaucratic rhetoric is adapted into emergent forms where structure and fluidity co-exist such as in multi-functional project teams (Sturdy et al, 2015) and diverse communities of practice (Bodrozic and Adler, 2018).

But the jurisdictional battles involving management are not only played out between management occupations and professions; management also provides an arena and a resource in jurisdictional battles between established professions. In their study of the Danish hospital sector, Kirkpatrick, Dent, and Jespersen (2011) suggest that management is a contested terrain over which both the nursing and doctors struggled to claim jurisdiction. The increasing importance of management in the hospital sector thus provided an opportunity to redraw occupational boundaries and the hierarchy within the system of professions, with an opportunity for nurses to strengthen their position. However, eventually the struggle was won by the doctors, confirming its dominant position in the healthcare system.

Reed’s study (this issue) takes an even broader field view by looking back on the changing nature of public service professions under different forms of neo-liberalism and its related managerialism. He develops an “analytical framework through which we can identify and explore the critical points of intersection and contention between elites, professions, and the neoliberal state structures and regimes in which they are embedded” (p. x). He argues that corporate professionals, exemplifying what we here call management occupations, are instrumental in drawing on practices that enable and support the neoliberal state in relation to three different roles – mediating and distributing, mobilizing and lobbying and sealing-off and protecting. At the same time, the identification of emerging management occupations with the state and transnational corporations limit the professional freedom of occupations. Individuals are turned into “organic intellectuals” that “become dependent technical advisors to the neoliberal state elite rather than independent thinkers or experts who speak to universal problems and dilemmas unconstrained by sectional political interests and values” (p. x). Overall, Reed concludes that “the hybridization and fragmentation of professional services and the expert occupational groups which provide them can now be explained as an outcome

of the new elite power structures and governance regimes through which neo-liberalization has been mobilized and sustained as a long-term political project” (p. x).

Field level studies of the dynamics between management and other occupations thus, confirm the conclusions from organizational-level studies that the relationship is far from straightforward and unidirectional. Management provides a fertile ground for new occupations and jurisdictional domains. The establishment of these domains, however, differs from the traditional way in which many occupations established and protected their jurisdictional domains in earlier times.

Conclusions and avenues for future research

In this essay, we have sought to introduce some of the recent and promising work engaging with the contested terrain of contemporary and emerging management and professional occupations, including recent work in this journal. However, we see this as a starting point in developing a much wider and deeper understanding of these issues and one which both occupation-based and organization studies can benefit from independently and together. In particular, related to the main themes that we have identified, there are a number of key issues we still know little about.

First, with regard to intra-organizational-level negotiations, future work can provide much more detail about how boundaries between different knowledge-based occupations are delineated, contested and repaired and how they connect to different organizational processes and outcomes. With regard to the latter, more research is also needed to uncover how governance structures and management practices are ultimately affected by the proliferation and specialization of management occupations and their struggles for influence. Second, on a more organizational-strategic level, there is scope for further inquiry into the specific challenges and opportunities the increasing specialization of management knowledge and occupations pose to professional service firms and organizations, and how these can be addressed. Third, moving to studies on the emergence and establishment of ‘new’ management occupations, future research may fruitfully focus on exploring the strategies that are available to emerging occupational and professional groups to establish stable jurisdictions, including in transnational spaces and international governance (cf Bres and Gond, 2014). Fourth, with regard to research focusing on the field level interplay between management and traditional professions and occupations, there is important scope for advancing our knowledge about the influence of various field-level conditions. For instance, what do we know about how patterns of regulation and technology diffusion affect national

and sectorial (e.g. public vs. private sector) differences in the emergence of, and competition between, professions and knowledge-based occupations?

In addition to these distinct areas of study, research focusing on the intersections between the above delineated fields may also hold great promise, not the least because it may help in further addressing one of the key underlying issues that constituted a starting point for this essay, that is, research that is restricted by following the established divisions of academic fields. In particular, new studies may focus on cross-level analysis to understand how interpersonal, organizational and field-level processes of competition and collaboration between different management occupations (e.g. Lean and CSR consultants, talent and wealth managers, health and safety officers) shape the establishment of new forms of expertise within organizations and throughout society (cf. Smets et al., 2012). An important but highly challenging research opportunity here, lies in the development of comparative analyses. Such work could shed important light on issues such as how the establishment of expertise and jurisdictions compare in management and other fields (e.g. IT, Accounting and Law) and across national and institutional contexts (cf. Guillén, 1994), an issue that has received only scant attention in studies of occupations, especially in management (cf. Sturdy and O'Mahoney, 2018). Finally, research on the intersections between these areas would also provide possibilities to develop critical analyses of how occupational groups or professions themselves are contested (e.g. Shenhav, 1999). Indeed, better understanding of how new forms of expertise evolve and vary across different relevant social groups could provide a critical insight into the extent to which new occupations are (de)institutionalized (cf. Parker, 2002). These and related concerns can stimulate, enrich and enlarge the study of occupations, expertise and organizations in management-professional contexts rather than maintaining a traditional separation between these domains.

References

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labour*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ackroyd, S. (2002). *The Organization of Business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, D. (1997). The nursing-medical boundary: a negotiated order? *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 19: 498-520.
- Anteby, M., Chan, C. and Dibenigo, J. (2016). Three lenses on occupations and professions in organizations: Becoming, doing, and relating. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 10: 183–244.
- Armstrong, P. (1986). Management control strategies and inter-professional competition: The cases of accountancy and personnel management, in D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds) *Managing the Labour Process*, pp. 19-43. London: Gower.
- Bechky, B. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14: 312-330.
- Bechky, B. (2011). Making organizational theory work: Institutions, occupations, and negotiated orders. *Organization Science*, 22: 1157–1167.
- Bodrozic, Z., and Adler, P. (2018). The evolution of management models. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63: 85-129.
- Bres, L. and Gond, J-P. (2014) ‘The visible hand of consultants in the construction of the markets for virtue: Translating issues, negotiating boundaries and enacting responsive regulations’ *Human Relations*, online first. DOI: 10.1177/0018726713519278.
- Brock, D., and Saks, M. (2016). Professions and organizations: A European perspective. *European Management Journal*, 34: 1-6.
- Brock, D., Leblebici, H., and Muzio, D. (2014). Understanding professionals and their workplaces: The mission of the Journal of Professions and Organization. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 1: 1-15.
- Bucher, S., Chreim, S., Langley, A., and Reay, T. (2016). Contestation about collaboration: discursive boundary work among professions. *Organization Studies*, 37: 497-522.
- Christensen, C., Wang, D., and van Bever, D. (2013). Consulting on the cusp of disruption. *Harvard Business Review* 91: 106-14.
- Davis, A. and Williams, K. (2017). Introduction: Elites and power after financialization. *Theory Culture and Society* 34: 3-26.
- Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology*, 59: 406-422.

- Freidson, E. (1984). The changing nature of professional control. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10: 1-20.
- Gorman, E. and Sandefur, R. (2011). Golden age, quiescence and revival: How the sociology of professions became the study of knowledge-based work. *Work and Occupations* 38: 275-302.
- Guillén, M. (1994). *Models of management*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, P. and Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kipping, M. (2011). Hollow from the start? Image professionalism in management consulting. *Current Sociology*, 59: 530-550.
- Kirkpatrick, I., Dent, M., and Jespersen, P. (2011). The contested terrain of hospital management: Professional projects and healthcare reforms in Denmark. *Current Sociology*, 59: 489-506.
- Lammers, C. (1988). Transience and persistence of ideal types in organization theory. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 6, 203-224.
- Macdonald, K. (1995) *The sociology of the professions*. London: Sage.
- McGivern, G., Currie G., Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., and Waring, J. (2015). Hybrid manager-professional identity work: The maintenance and hybridization of medical professionalism in managerial contexts. *Public Administration*, 93: 412-432.
- Mueller, F., Carter, C. and Ross-Smith, A. (2011). Making sense of career in a Big Four Accounting firm. *Current Sociology*, 59: 551-567.
- Muzio, D. and Kirkpatrick I. (2011). Professions and organizations-A conceptual framework. *Current Sociology*, 59: 389-405.
- Muzio, D., Hodgson, D., Faulconbridge, J., Beaverstock, J., and Hall, S. (2011). Towards corporate professionalization: The case of project management, management consultancy and executive search. *Current Sociology*, 59: 443-64.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against management: Organization in the age of managerialism*. Polity Press, London.
- Pemer, F and Skjolsvik, T. (2018). Adopt or adapt? Unpacking the role of institutional work processes in the implementation of new regulations. *JPART*, forthcoming.
- Reed, M. (1996) Expert power and control in late modernity: An empirical review and theoretical synthesis. *Organization Studies*, 17: 573-97.
- Seabrooke, L. and Tsingou, E. (2015). Professional emergence on transnational issues: Linked ecologies on demographic change. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 2: 1–18.

- Shenhav, Y. (1999). *Manufacturing Rationality: The Engineering Foundations of the Managerial Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smets, M., Morris, T. I. M., and Greenwood, R. (2012). From practice to field: A multilevel model of practice-driven institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 877-904.
- Sturdy, A. and O'Mahoney, J. (2018). Explaining national variation in the use of management consulting knowledge: A framework. *Management Learning*, forthcoming.
- Sturdy, A., Wright, C. and Wilie, N. (2015). *Management as Consultancy: Neo-bureaucracy and the Consultant Manager*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suddaby, R. and Greenwood, R. (2001). Colonizing knowledge – Commodification as a dynamic of jurisdictional expansion in professional service firms. *Human Relations*, 54: 933-953.
- Timmermans, S. (2002). The cause of death vs. the gift of life: Boundary maintenance and the politics of expertise in death investigation. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 24: 550-574.
- Waisberg, I. and Nelson, A. (2018). When the General Meets the Particular: The Practices and Challenges of Interorganizational Knowledge Reuse. *Organization Science* 29(3):432-448.
- Watson, T. (1994). *In Search of Management: Culture, Chaos and Control in Managerial Work*. London: Thompson Business Press.
- Wedel, J. (2014) *Unaccountable - How Elite Power Brokers Corrupt our Finances, Freedom, and Security*. New York: Pegasus.
- Zabusky, S. E. and Barley, S. R. (1997). ““You can’t be a stone if you’re cement””: Reevaluating the Emic Identities of Scientists in Organizations’. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19: 361-404.

Table 1: Studies on the relation between traditional and (new) management occupations: Organizational level approaches

Study	Nature of relation	
	Contestation	Collaboration
	<i>Framing and negotiating 'new' occupations at work</i>	
<i>Waring & Currie (2009)</i> Shows how medical professionals may share a concern about patient safety, but vary significantly in their responses towards the proposed management systems.	<p><i>Attitudes</i> - Medical professionals disagree with the risk managers' efforts primarily because it is seen as an essential element of the doctors' role and the proposed systems is not an adequate means.</p> <p><i>Practices</i> - Medical professionals develop different responses towards risk managers that limit management control and promote professional autonomy including taking the lead over the use of management techniques.</p> <p><i>Identification</i> - Medical professionals may vary in their dis-association with managerial techniques dependent on previous experiences and linkages with professional systems.</p>	<p><i>Attitudes</i> - Medical professionals are generally supportive towards risk managers' general aims to improve patient safety as this in in line with their professional norms.</p> <p><i>Practices</i> - Medical professionals may internalize management practices to some extent given that abandonment is not an option in the light of political pressures.</p>
<i>McGivern et al. (2015)</i> Explains how and why people are driven to take a hybrid management-professional role in healthcare as well as the different ways in which they enact this role.	<p><i>Practices</i> - Professionals use hybrid roles as ways to represent other professionals and protect them from managerialist approaches by promoting professionalism and demonizing managerialism.</p> <p><i>Identification</i> - Healthcare professionals distance from</p>	<p><i>Practices</i> - Professionals draw on hybrid roles to stimulate critical reflections on traditional medical professions, to increase auditing of these professions and promote ways to reconcile professional practices with managerial practices.</p> <p><i>Identification</i> - Healthcare</p>

managerial roles by presenting it as obligatory and a way to promote the interests of professionals.

professionals embrace managerial roles by seeing them as being in line with their interests and career planning.

O'Mahoney et al. (2013)

Analyses how procurement professionals are involved in the purchase of management consultancy services and how these efforts are resisted by both the consultants and the client managers that procurers seek to represent

Practices - Procurement

professionals employ processes of commodification of consultants' knowledge as an important means to limit consultants' exchange value and power while at the same time legitimate their own jurisdictional claims in the field of management knowledge.

Practices - Consultants and client

managers collaborate in resisting commodification by procurement professionals in order to minimize the influence of procurement on their work and preferred approaches on management and organizing.

Pemer et al. (2018 - this issue)

Explains how and why medical professionals may vary in the way they frame themselves in relation to management consultants, thereby shaping receptivity to the expertise of the other, and possibilities for inter-occupational interactions.

Attitudes – One group of medical professionals sees consultants and their expertise as irrelevant and even dangerous in terms of their expected contribution to the quality of healthcare, thereby limiting possibilities for fruitful inter-occupational interactions.

Identification - In the context of public healthcare, medical professionals more likely associate themselves with governmental agencies, construct themselves as working in a professional bureaucracy and frame their occupation as building on only medical expertise, clearly demarcating occupational membership.

Attitudes – another group of medical professionals consider consultants and their knowledge as complementary to medical expertise in achieving high-quality healthcare thereby enhancing the likelihood of inter-occupational collaboration.

Identification - In the context of private hospitals, medical professionals tend to see themselves more as market actors, working in an inclusive organization and seeing their occupation as drawing on both professional and managerial expertise.

Table 2: Studies on the relation between traditional and (new) management occupations: Field level approaches

Study	Nature of relation	
	Contestation	Collaboration
	<i>Strategic positioning of new occupational projects</i>	
<i>Muzio et al. (2011)</i> Explores different patterns of professionalization of new management occupations in comparison with the strategies used by traditional professions.	<i>Practices</i> - Management occupations significantly deviate from traditional professions by using tactics related to corporate patterns of professionalization which, in the context of large corporations, may ultimately limit the power of these traditional professions as well as potentially undermine the established professional structures and institutions.	<i>Practices</i> - By using and legitimating organizational strategies, systems and methods, management occupations help to maintain the influence of large corporations, thereby providing further space for other management occupations. <i>Identification</i> - Management occupations tend to associate themselves with their employing organizations as these provide a key site and locus for corporate professionalization projects.
<i>Henriksen & Seabrooke (2016)</i> Explains how issue professionals move between professional and organizational networks to increase issue control in highly ambiguous (transnational) environments.	<i>Practices</i> - Issue professionals exploit structural holes in professional and organizational networks to succeed in professional battles over how transnational issues are treated and enhance their own agenda. <i>Identification</i> - Issue professionals do not identify with one profession, but claim expertise over others through their mix of skills and career experiences, providing ad basis for a strategic	<i>Practices</i> - Issue professionals' capacity to be 'multiple insiders' in professional and organizational networks allows them to establish relations with relevant others, and act as brokers in facilitating and coordinating transnational issues.

network position for issue control.

Boussard (2018 - this issue)

Practices - Global management professions (e.g. M&A) draw on different forms of boundary work to enlarge and strengthen their specific jurisdiction, and broaden the scope of the profession, thereby avoiding and undermining traditional professional state-based regulation.

Identification - Global professionals strongly associate themselves with elite management remaining at its core, resulting in an internally stratified profession and professionals gradually facing exclusion from the core of the profession into client positions.

Practices - Global professions tend to relate to clients by molding their interests to the profession's own ideas of what ought to be done.

Noordegraaf (2015)

Analyses the main reasons why hybridization of professional work may occur in wider public domains, and shows the variety of different ways in which this may take shape.

New occupations and ecological-institutional change

Attitudes - Professions are expected to independently treat complex cases in the context of their specific jurisdiction (pure professionalism), or are considered to perform their professional work in the context of organizations and related control mechanisms (controlled professionalism).

Attitudes - In the context of economic and social, as well as cultural, technological and demographic shifts, professions are assumed to combine professional logics with managerialism (hybrid professionalism), or are expected to take responsibility for co-organizing sound processes (organized professionalism).

Practices - Organized professionalism involves seeing and systematically dealing with contradictions in collaboration with other professionals, and other stakeholders
Identification - Management and organizing need to be part of professional selection, schooling and socialization to develop organizational affinity and organizational capacity.

Kirkpatrick et al. (2011)

Examines the implications of management reform, and the broader emergence of managerial elites in healthcare, for the position of clinical professionals (doctors and nurses) and the relation between them.

Attitudes - Hospital management is considered as controversial, and at the same time as an important terrain for inter-professional struggles and rivalries.

Practices - Hospital management is used as means for maintaining dominance (medical doctors) and for increasing autonomy in relation to other occupations (nursing professionals).

Attitudes - Hospital management ideology and practices are presented as means to connect economic and medical responsibilities in the context of healthcare.

Practices - Hospital management induced a division of labor that was applied to combine the interest of the medical doctors and nursing professionals with general managers
Identification - Medical doctors and nursing professionals embrace management as relatively small but important element of their professional education and training.

Reed (2018 - this issue)

Analyses and evaluates the impact of the neoliberal state through which corporate

Practices - Liberal, independent professions are subject to various administrative technologies which corporate professionals operate and promote in the context of the neo-liberal

Practices - Corporate professionals facilitate alignment of different occupational groups with the neo-liberal agenda, thereby promoting the interest of the dominant economic,

professional elites impose market-based principles over professional work.

state, thereby increasing the rivalry between occupations, and undermining the coherence and relevance of the established professions.

political and administrative elites.
Identification - Corporate professionals tend to identify with the neo-liberal agenda and the elite actors who hold the capacity to sponsor or block their professionalization project.