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Two things are more important than anything for academic identities (Henkel, 2005):

- **Academic freedom**
- **The discipline**

Academic freedom rest in a continuum between loyalty and autonomy
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A view on knowledge-intensive organisations (Hannah & Lester, 2009)

- Faculty
- Institution
- Leadership (Society)
- (Global networks)

Meso-level: loosely coupled microcultures (Roxå, Mårtensson, & Alveteg, 2011)

- Strong ties internally
- Weak ties in between

And they are and they should be different
If that is true, how can we compare microcultures?

Fallacies:

Bureaucracy: establish the same norms as the best practice
Market: adapt through competition (it limits the variation)

Functioning microcultures are different because they adapt to different environments and tasks
That is: their normative structures should vary considerably

Conclusion:

With the support of Ostrom’s research, microcultures can be compared through the study of the function of norms (design principles)
Allowing for variation and sophistication in relation to local needs.

Four types of microcultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Shared responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low level of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of coexistence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection based on:
- Interviews (23) with leaders (deans, HoDs) and student-union representatives. (Could not point out strong MCs.)
- Course/program-evaluations, Quality audit results
- Local knowledge
- Three faculty contexts; same university

Method:
- Ethnographically inspired
- Interviews with local leaders and academic staff (35)
- Focus-group interviews with (25) students (in the 5 strong MCs)

Microcultures can be described and related to each other through Ostrom’s (1990) design principles – following Roxå & Mårtensson (2014)

1. Clearly defined boundaries and memberships.
2. Rules [norms] in use are well matched to local needs
3. Members can usually participate in modifying the rules.
4. Members right to devise their own rules is respected by external authorities.
5. An established system for self-monitoring members’ behaviour exists.
6. A graduated system of sanctions is available.
7. Access to low-cost conflict-resolution mechanisms
8. Commons are organised in a nested structure with multiple layers of activities
How to develop this environment
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