ÅSE GORNITZKA, SVEIN KYVIK AND BJØRN STENSAKER

IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Revisiting the Missing Link – Implementation Analysis in Higher Education

In many countries higher education is undergoing fundamental changes concerning its governance, structure, funding and organisation. Often-mentioned forces triggering these changes are effects of the post-industrial society on higher education and the current invasion of 'the market' in higher education (Williams 1995; Slaughter and Leslie 1997). These change processes seem to point in the direction of a future for higher education institutions that is likely to consist of more self-regulated, dynamic and innovative organisations. Consequently, in the attempts to analyse and document the current changes in higher education, there is a tendency not to focus on the analysis of governmental policies. This is understandable, due to the current attention given to other forces affecting change in higher education, for example, the possibilities of new technologies in teaching and learning, corporate-based lifelong learning schemes blurring the boundaries between education and employment, and the effects of globalisation on higher education.

However, governments are far from silent and paralysed by the developments described above. Even though over the last few years the way in which politicians and public authorities have participated in shaping the future of higher education has changed, the involvement as such has not become less (Neave and Van Vught 1991; Neave 1998). Under labels such as 'managerialism' (Henkel 1991), 'new public management' (Pollitt 1993) and 'the evaluative state' (Neave 1988), one can find new policies, ideas and concepts on how politicians and public authorities would like to see higher education develop. Even though many observers seem to agree that the role of the state in higher education is changing (Neave and Van Vught 1991; Dill and Sporn 1995; Neave 1998; Henkel and Little 1999), this fact does not imply that the role and impact of the state on higher education are less relevant than before. A look at the pace and scope of the many public reforms and policy initiatives in higher education throughout the OECD area gives strong indications of a rather proactive state, where new actions are taken continuously as a response to the changing environment for higher education. The increasing role higher education institutions seem to play in the socio-economic and technological development of

our societies is an indication that the public interest in influencing higher education will continue in the years to come. Not surprisingly, this public interest in higher education is often combined with concerns about the efficiency, quality and effectiveness of this sector. In the end, it is exactly these objectives that guide public policy making in higher education. In a situation where tight public budgets, accountability claims due to new social demands, and output of higher education are on the agenda, policy analysis and, in particular, implementation analysis should be squarely at the centre of the research interest of students of the sector.

However, it could be questioned whether this is the case. Even if policy analysis still interests many researchers in higher education, and policy documents, white papers and other policy initiatives often are analysed and commented upon, there are few thorough studies that analyse and 'follow' a given policy through the implementation process. When Pressman and Wildavsky coined the term 'implementation studies' in political science with their seminal book *Implementation,* in 1973, it was argued that well-founded and theoretically based implementation analysis, that is, what happens after decisions have been made and policies are put into action, was a 'missing link' in policy studies conducted at that time (cf. Hargrove 1975). Over 25 years later this still seems to be a valid argument with respect to research in higher education. Implementation studies could, however, be particularly interesting in the present situation for higher education, since it seems evident that public policy, to a great extent, still is shaped during the implementation process.

First, with the amount of resources spent on higher education and with the social expectations now being put on higher education, there is a need for analysis that informs the public on the effectiveness of policy processes that distribute these resources in the sector. To know what those resources are being used on, and their effects, is of great interest to the society in general and stakeholders in higher education in particular. Second, even if the state and public officials are active in policy making and in reform-initiating activities, it is likely that current globalisation, 'technification' and 'marketisation' processes in the sector influence the policy implementation process in new and less known ways. And when the environment for public policy making is changing, it should be more important than ever to analyse how policy is affected by these forces, and to try to identify factors that stimulate or hinder the policy initiatives taken. Third, with new stakeholders entering and influencing higher education, that is, new categories of students, new forms of knowledge producing actors and new types of 'consumers' of higher education, a new territory for policy making is being shaped where little knowledge about cause and effect relationships exists – something that a thorough analysis of the implementation process could help to uncover. The aims of higher education researchers attracted to this field should, thus, perhaps still echo those that initiated this kind of research (O'Toole 1986): to contribute to the development of theories of effective implementation of policy goals, and to aid those involved in policy formulation and implementation processes by developing empirically based recommendations on how the aims of programmes and reforms could be accomplished. Therefore, this chapter will explore the practice and potential of applying implementation analysis for studying change processes in higher education.

The purpose of this chapter is to review the theoretical, empirical and practical advances of the implementation approach in higher education policy studies. In part two, it discusses the development of implementation studies in higher education with references to the general literature in the field. Part three starts by asking why there seems to be so little interest in implementation analysis in current higher education research. We continue the discussion by reviewing some major current policy studies in higher education and their way of handling and exploring changes in higher education policy. However, questions and some comments are made regarding the potential relevance of using some of the basic insights of an implementation perspective in current research efforts. Part four closes the chapter with a discussion of the extent to which a renewed interest in implementation analysis could be of practical relevance to policy makers in higher education. Some suggestions are given on what kind of research is still needed in this area to fill our existing gaps in knowledge.

2. HISTORY, PERSPECTIVES AND CRITIQUE RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

2.1. Introduction

Although there is a long tradition in higher education research, as in other social sciences, for studying the relationship between goals and outcome and explaining what went wrong, it is fair to say that the explicit focus on the implementation process as a distinct field of study in social science first took off in the mid-1970s. The book by Pressman and Wildavsky, *Implementation*, first published in 1973, represents a benchmark in this respect. Based on a study of the Economic Development Administration's employment effort in Oakland, California, two general policy recommendations were put forward in order to facilitate implementation of public programme goals. First of all they showed that an implementation process can include a large number of decision points, and that each required clearance point adds to the probability of stoppage or delay. The number of such points should therefore be minimised wherever possible. Second, the authors recommended that as much attention should be paid to the creation of organisational machinery for executing a programme as for launching one. Another important contribution of this book was its emphasis on an adequate underlying causal theory of the relationship between means and ends in a reform process. This and other case studies, which drew rather pessimistic conclusions about the ability of governments to effectively implement their programmes, were followed by a large number of papers that aimed to investigate the conditions necessary for trying to achieve the objectives of a particular policy. Various attempts were undertaken to build general theories on effective implementation, or how public agencies should proceed to ensure that their policy objectives could be accomplished. Still, empirical evidence on the effectiveness of these models was in general missing. One could, therefore, say that the tendency of trying to identify implementation failure and the related lack of thorough empirical investigations into how implementation processes actually

could succeed was one of the major reasons why a large multi-national research project on policy implementation in higher education in Europe was launched in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Cerych and Sabatier 1986). It is still the most comprehensive and explicit analysis using an implementation approach; it is also a central study in the implementation literature in general. A major question guiding this research project, led by Ladislav Cerych and Paul Sabatier, was: Are contemporary societies really as incapable of planned change in higher education as the pessimists suggest? In their own comment to this question, they concluded that centrally initiated reform initiatives indeed were possible, and that such initiatives also could be characterised as a success under certain conditions (Cerych and Sabatier 1986: 242–254).

However, research efforts, such as the Cerych and Sabatier study, mainly built on a top-down perspective, clearly illustrate the complexity of analysing policy implementation. The latter study could still be criticised for underestimating these problems. Those who argued for developing theoretical models that tried to incorporate the complexity related to implementation processes focused instead on how those who actually worked with putting the policy into action experienced the process. Not surprisingly, this way of analysing implementation soon became known as the bottom-up perspective. A debate by those favouring a top-down or a bottom-up perspective when analysing implementation processes then followed for years. Some attempts at combining these two perspectives were later undertaken, before the theoretical development seemed to come to a halt.

Premfors (1984) has shown that the top-down/bottom-up distinction has been used in three rather different contexts. First, the scholarly debate has concerned the most appropriate way of *describing* implementation processes. Is the top-down perspective more relevant than the bottom-up approach? A second and related question concerns the *methodology* used in implementation research. How should research be undertaken? Finally, much implementation research has a *normative* purpose. How can research help governments to attain the goals of programmes or reforms? The differences in approaches in what became the field of implementation studies, are centred upon the following aspects:

1. What is implementation? Is there a start and a finish to it? And if so, where do you draw the line?
2. What constitutes a 'policy', or what is the object of implementation?
3. What is failed and what is successful implementation?
4. What are the best instruments for implementation?

With these questions in mind, in this section we will give a brief overview of the perspectives, models and critiques of implementation research (for a more extensive overview, see e.g. Sabatier 1986; Lane 1993; Parsons 1995).

2.2. Cerych and Sabatier – The Classic Implementation Study in Higher Education

The major contribution to the field of implementation research in higher education is undoubtedly the book *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance. The*

Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe by Ladislav Cerych and Paul Sabatier. This book was published in 1986 and was the final outcome of a large research project encompassing nine specific reforms initiated during the 1960s.[1] All these reforms sought explicitly to make important changes in the higher education systems of their countries. Three types of objectives predominated in these reforms: a) to widen access to higher education; b) to increase the relevance of higher education to regional development; and c) to develop more vocationally oriented and short-term higher education. The main purpose of the project was to analyse reasons for the success or failure of these reforms by applying policy implementation analysis (see also Cerych and Sabatier 1992). In the conceptual framework that guided the research project, Cerych and Sabatier distinguished between policy formulation, policy implementation and policy reformulation as the three stages major changes in public policy pass through (Cerych and Sabatier 1986: 10):

1. A period of policy formulation involving an awareness of inadequacies in the existing system, followed by the examination of one or more means of redressing the situation, and culminating in a formal (legal) decision by the cabinet or parliament to establish a new program or institution.

2. The program is then assigned to one or more organisations for implementation. In higher education reforms, these will almost always include the Ministry of Education and the affected establishments of higher education. Other institutions such as local governments or private employers may also be included, if the program involves the creation of new universities or efforts to employ graduates. Within the implementation stage one can normally distinguish an initial phase involving the elaboration of regulations and the creation of new structures necessary to translate the cabinet-parliamentary decision into actual practice from a subsequent phase involving day-to-day applications and adjustments of the initial decisions.

3. Based upon various actors' evaluations of the implementation experience and reactions to changing conditions, there will follow what may be termed the reformulation stage, in which efforts are made to revise program goals, to change the implementing institutions or, in extreme cases, to abandon the program altogether. Such reformulation may be based on elaborate studies of the outcomes of the program or simply on perceptions of such effects or on changes in the general political climate. Whereas major revisions will often involve formal decisions by the cabinet or the parliament, they may sometimes proceed solely from the discretionary authority vested in the education ministry or the affected institutions of higher education. Program reformulation may also be the product of a more subtle process involving cumulatively important changes largely imperceptible to people outside the implementing institutions.

Special emphasis was laid on the analysis of goals, their comparisons with outcomes, and the factors affecting policy implementation, particularly the attainment of formal goals. These factors were listed as follows (Cerych and Sabatier 1986: 16):

1. Legal (official) objectives. a) Clarity and consistency b) Degree of system change envisaged;
2. Adequacy of the causal theory underlying the reform;
3. Adequacy of financial resources provided to implementing institutions;
4. The degree of commitment to various program objectives among those charged with its implementation within the education ministry and the affected institutions of higher education;

5. Degree of commitment to various program objectives among legislative and executive officials and affected groups outside the implementing agencies;
6. Changes in social and economic conditions affecting goal priorities or the program's causal assumptions.

This list is fairly similar to those presented in the general implementation literature by Sabatier (1986) and others.

With respect to the goals of the reforms, the authors took as a starting point that their success or failure was dependent upon two aspects of the goals themselves: the amount of system change envisaged and their internal clarity and consistency. The larger the change decided upon, the lower the degree of accomplishment of the reform; and the more clarified and consistent the aims of the change are, the more easily the objectives could be fulfilled. However, Cerych and Sabatier also suggested that vague and somewhat conflicting goals are often the price to be paid for obtaining agreement in the policy formation process, and that ambiguity facilitates adjustments to changing circumstances during the implementation stage.

On the basis of the analyses of the various higher education reforms, the authors came to the conclusion that ambiguity and conflict in goals are in many cases unavoidable, and in addition that a precise goal does not guarantee superior implementation. They therefore suggested that instead of focusing on clear and consistent objectives, implementation analyses ought to identify an "acceptable mix of outcomes" (p. 243).

With respect to the effect of degree of change on the outcome, Cerych and Sabatier stated that a more complex conceptualisation of the scope of change was necessary to capture the processes. They suggested a three-dimensional framework that they called depth of change, functional breadth of change and level of change. *Depth of change* indicates the degree to which a new policy implies a departure from existing values and practices. *Functional breadth of change* refers to the number of functional areas in which a given policy is expected to introduce modifications, while *level of change* indicates the target of the reform: the system as a whole, a particular sector of the system, or a single institution. Lessons learned from the comparative study indicated some interesting conclusions:

- Policies implying far-reaching changes can be successful if they aim at one or only a few functional areas of the system or an institution.
- It is easier to change a single (or to create a new) institution than a whole system.
- Reforms projecting a very low degree of change both in terms of depth and functional breadth are often unsuccessful, essentially because they do not galvanise sufficient energy to overcome inertia in the system.

In the theoretical outline of their project, Cerych and Sabatier also stressed the importance of an adequate causal theory or a set of assumptions about means and ends.

> If goals are to be realized, it is important that causal links be understood and that officials responsible for implementing the program have jurisdiction over sufficient critical linkages to make possible the attainment of objectives. Only when these two

conditions have been met, the basic decision establishing the reform can be said to 'incorporate' a valid causal theory (p. 15).

They concluded that it was startling to observe how many of the reforms examined were based on wrong assumptions. However, they also admit that not everything can be foreseen and advocate that systematic evaluation ought to be an integral part of implementation as a means of correcting errors, reformulating implementation strategies or even goals.

2.3. The Central Debate: Top-Down or Bottom-Up?

The complexity issue raised, *inter alia*, by the Cerych and Sabatier study, serves as a good introduction to the central debate in implementation research: what are the essential factors furthering or hindering the fulfilment of the objectives of a given reform initiative? The effort made by Cerych and Sabatier to create a set of 'critical' variables in understanding implementation success was a procedure followed by many researchers involved in implementation analysis, both inside and outside higher education. The central characteristic for these kinds of studies was the belief that implementation processes could be centrally controlled and steered if just the number of relevant variables and their interconnectedness were disclosed. A study by Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) is an illustrative example of this type of thinking. In their model of how to analyse the implementation process, 'critical' variables were a) *policy standards and objectives*; and b) *policy resources*. In addition, four other factors were included: inter-organisational communication and enforcement activities; the characteristics of the implementing agencies; the economic, social and political environment affecting the jurisdiction or organisation within which implementation takes place; and the disposition of implementers:

- Policy standards and objectives: The objectives of the reform are obviously the starting point for the analysis of implementation processes. As Pressman and Wildavsky (1973: xiv) noted, "implementation cannot succeed or fail without a goal against which to judge it". In general, clear and unambiguous goals are easier to implement than a set of vague, complex and contradictory goals. In addition, if general guidelines are the foundation for a reform, the probability is relatively high that different interpretations will make implementation difficult. In addition, Van Meter and Van Horn assumed that implementation will be most successful where only marginal change is required and where goal consensus is high. Furthermore, of these two variables, goal consensus will have a greater effect on effective implementation than will the level of change. The likelihood of effective implementation will accordingly depend in part on the nature of the policy to be carried out, and the specific factors contributing to the realisation or non-realisation of policy objectives will vary from one policy type to another. Thus, characteristics of the objectives of an initiative may be assumed to be important for the possibilities for implementing an initiative in line with its objectives.

- Policy resources: Policies also make available resources for the implementation of a reform, through funds or other incentives, which facilitate the administration of a programme. It is general wisdom that funds are usually not adequate, making the accomplishment of policy objectives difficult to achieve.
- Inter-organisational communication and enforcement activities: In the context of inter-organisational relations, two types of follow-up activities are most important. First, technical advice and assistance should be provided. Second, superiors should rely on a wide variety of sanctions – both positive and negative.
- Characteristics of the implementing agencies: This factor consists of both the formal structural features of organisations and the informal attributes of their personnel. Van Meter and Van Horn mention the competence and size of an agency's staff, the degree of hierarchical control of processes within the implementing agencies, etc.
- Economic, social and political conditions: General economic, social and political conditions have been shown to be important for the relationship between objectives and results. Political measures are often undertaken without sufficient analysis of financial consequences. Furthermore, economic conditions change continuously, and it is not unusual that it will be difficult to put through a measure in line with its original intentions. Political support for a reform can also change over time, due to new power constellations or to changes in priorities.
- Disposition of implementers: This could concern the motivation and attitudes of those responsible for implementing the reform. Experience has shown that key persons in an organisation, or 'fixers' in Bardach's (1977) terminology, can be very influential for the success or failure of a reform.

A number of papers followed in the wake of the Van Meter and Van Horn contribution, and they were basically aimed at improving the list of factors important for the effective implementation of programme goals. Several of these first attempts at developing theoretical contributions in the field of implementation analysis were to a large extent confined to discussions of which factors were important to study in implementation processes. O'Toole (1986) lists more than 100 studies from the late 1970s and early 1980s that were merely dedicated to identify important variables. In some cases, the authors also linked the variables in more complex theoretical models (e.g. Sabatier and Mazmanian 1980).

The first wave of implementation researchers' attempts at developing conceptual and methodological frameworks for theoretical and practical implementation purposes was soon heavily criticised. One line of criticism was that these approaches mainly identified important variables or a checklist of factors without specifying a model of implementation (see O'Toole 1986). Others argued that the number of variables were too long and that there was a need for research which could identify which variables were most important and under which circumstances (see Lester et al. 1987). The emphasis on clear and consistent policy objectives as a precondition for effective implementation was soon criticised. Several scholars

argued that the lack of clear and consistent programme goals is more the rule than the exception. Instead, "objectives are characteristically multiple (because we want many things, not just one), conflicting (because we want different things), and vague (because that is how we can agree to proceed without having to agree also on exactly what will be done)" (Majone and Wildavsky 1978: 108).

The insistence on 'adequate causal theory' as a policy recommendation to practitioners can also be criticised for lack of realism. In many policy areas the cognitive demands put on policy making are very high. Arriving at the 'adequate causal theory' is not only difficult in view of political controversy, but also when cause and effect relations are disputed in professional or scientific communities. The list of difficulties for those who want to build policy upon an adequate policy theory is rather long. Still, the early implementation researchers were right in trying to unravel the underlying logic of policy decisions, and the attention given to this aspect of policy (but not the conclusions drawn) fits the later 'cognitive turn' in the social sciences (cf. DiMaggio and Powell 1991; Scott 1995). The attention given to underlying 'policy theory' is certainly worth keeping in mind. In essence this point brings up the issue of what constitutes the knowledge basis for policy making. In the present context it gives grounds for higher education researchers to reflect on their own role as information and knowledge providers for decision makers.

The main criticism directed at the first wave of implementation studies was that they represented a 'top-down' approach to implementation analysis, which was not very adequate in explaining real-life implementation processes (Hanf, Hjern and Porter 1978; Barrett and Fudge 1981; Hjern and Hull 1982). Thus, the top-down approach represented an instrumental and rational understanding of organisations. Certain goals are to be realised through particular measures. It is presumed that changes in organisational structure, authority relations, decision-making principles and communication patterns will lead to desired results. The studies applying a bottom-up approach would refer to and distance themselves from the top-downers before presenting an alternative way of addressing the issue of implementation. They represented a break with the earlier implementation approach, theoretically, methodologically and normatively, to the extent that they took great pains to avoid a 'hierarchical' terminology and focus. Clearly, such a critique should be at the heart of the interests of higher education policy researchers who devote their scholarly attention to a sector that traditionally has been viewed as particularly 'bottom-heavy' and where core functions of the institutions are seen as naturally defying hierarchical structures.

One line of criticism aimed at the top-down perspective was attacking the belief in the implementation process as a technical procedure. Sabatier (1986) summarised this as a three-part problem. The first problem is the emphasis on central objectives and decision makers and the tendency to neglect initiatives coming from local implementing officials, from other policy subsystems and from the private sector. Second, top-down models are difficult to use in situations where there is no dominant policy or agency, but rather a multitude of governmental directives and actors. Third, top-down models are likely to underestimate the strategies used by street-level bureaucrats and target groups to divert central policy to their own purposes. In this respect, Dunleavy (1981) stressed the important role of

professionals in the implementation chain. Teachers, doctors, planners, engineers, social workers, etc. all have discretion in how they carry out their work. The relevance of such an observation to the policy and practice in higher education should be obvious to anyone familiar with how colleges and universities work.

In contrast to the top-down approach, the bottom-up researchers start by mapping the network of actors at the bottom of the implementation chain, asking them about their goals, strategies, activities and contacts. The contacts are then used as a means to identifying the network of actors involved in the execution of a public policy at the local level. A key proponent of this approach is Elmore (1980, 1985). He challenges the mythology of the top-down perspective on grounds that it is an inappropriate way of describing real-life policy implementation, and because central control over processes at the local level is not necessarily desirable. In implementation processes bargaining is claimed to be crucial not only to adjust but also to create the goals of social programmes. The disparity between formal policy decision and practice that in the first wave of implementation studies was seen as erring behaviour and 'goal displacement' is now considered as a natural part of implementing policy. It is also put forward as a prescriptive strategy for researchers and decision makers. In a bottom-up perspective the 'intentions in Oakland' are not hierarchically subordinate to the 'goals in Washington'. One further illustration of such an approach is found in the work of Hjern and his colleagues (see Hanf, Hjern and Porter 1978; Hjern and Hull 1982).

The bottom-uppers' research question is rather different from the top-downers'. They ask how actors go about solving societal problems in different areas and see what role government measures play in that. The criterion of successful implementation is then not focused on a degree of match or mismatch between formal intentions and actions of the implementers, or on the possible 'deviant behaviour' of the agencies that are trusted to put policy into practice. Their democratic ideal also comes across as different, in the sense that they see the 'local' flair in handling societal problems as an expression of a well-functioning democracy, and not as undemocratic actions of agencies that run wild or undermine the decisions made by democratically elected bodies. Here we can draw a useful parallel to the discussion on legitimacy in higher education relationship with the state and other stakeholders. The attention given to the traditional concept of institutional and individual academic freedom sets this sector apart from other sectors of society where governments have exerted a stronger steering.

2.4. Adjusting to Complexity – The Development of Combined Models

Partly as a result of the discussion between top-downers and bottom-uppers, and partly as a result of obvious weaknesses in the early top-down approaches, various attempts at building more comprehensive hybrid models took place (see e.g. Lane 1993 or Parsons 1995 for an overview). In a later edition of Pressman and Wildavsky's *Implementation* (1984), Wildavsky and colleagues incorporate some of the criticisms of the top-down approach to present a revised view on implementation. They reject the idea that goals and programmes are reifications:

goals should not be viewed as static. Goals often change over time, partly because of weaknesses in the ideas themselves, partly because of the fact that ideas change, and also because of new circumstances. On the other hand they are not willing to reduce the status of policies to only a collection of words, and they reject the interactionist idea that the function of the implementation process is to satisfy the needs of the participants regardless of the actual policy results. Majone and Wildavsky point to an essential problem when they state that (1978: 114):

> Implementation is evolution. Since it takes place in a world we never made, we are usually in the middle of the process, with events having occurred before and (we hope) continuing afterward. At each point we must cope with new circumstances that allow us to actualise different potentials in whatever policy ideas we are implementing. When we act to implement a policy, we change it.

Implementation thus often implies the carrying out of goals as well as the reformulation and re-design of original intentions and plans. Implementation in this sense has also been conceptualised as *mutual adaptation* (Browne and Wildavsky 1984a) and a *learning process* (Browne and Wildavsky 1984b), and implementation as negotiation and interaction (Barrett and Fudge 1981). The later work of Sabatier (1986) has suggested that implementation studies could be undertaken within 'an advocacy coalition framework'. This approach is based on the premise that the most useful aggregate unit of analysis for understanding policy change is a policy subsystem or policy segment, that is, those actors from a variety of public and private organisations who are actively concerned with a policy problem or issue, such as higher education. Sabatier (1986) proposes to adopt the bottom-uppers' unit of analysis assuming that "actors can be aggregated into a number of advocacy coalitions which share a set of normative and causal beliefs and which dispose of certain resources". Together with a keen focus on the legal instruments and socio-economic conditions that constrain behaviour as the legacy from the top-down perspective, he suggests a synthesised model for the study of implementation processes.

2.5. Some Concluding Comments

The body of scholarly literature on implementation has provided rather disparate answers to the questions we outlined earlier. First, there is a distinction between those who see implementation as a rather narrow process with a start and a finish, versus those who view implementation as a process without a decision to launch it or a goal line that marks the ending of putting policy into practice. And second, there is a distinction to be made between viewing processes in terms of phases or stages gone through, versus seeing policy implementation and formation as intertwined where the defining and negotiating over intentions and objectives are continuous and infinite. For the latter scholars what is to be accomplished is something to be bargained over and not a given attribute of policies/programmes under implementation. That is to say, policy intentions are not fully developed until they are negotiated. Consequently, the criteria for determining policy success or failure differ significantly according to the approach used. Likewise for the issue of

what is 'democratic' or not. The difference between the two approaches becomes most apparent with respect to the policy recommendations that they carry. Where top-downers prescribe an adequate policy theory, more control, goal clearance and fixers to push the policy through, the bottom-uppers would recommend local knowledge and user control and policy outcomes measured against local objectives. Given this state of affairs, implementation research has been criticised for its theoretical pluralism, for its restricted nature and for being non-cumulative (Lester et al. 1987; Lane 1993).

The top-down emphasis on central control as a means to secure successful implementation could be seen as a scholarly anachronism in the sense that such government strategies are both ideologically and in practice increasingly replaced by, or modified by, indirect means of control. Nevertheless, one of the major contributions of the first wave of implementation studies was the emphasis on the importance of inter-organisational arrangements and the characteristics of the formal ties between programme/policy issuers and the implementing institutions. Studying the impact of formal hierarchical arrangements between institutions is important both from a scholarly (echoing the neo-institutional theory development) and a practical perspective. For students of higher education policy it is crucial. Clearly, implementation in times of new relations between agencies/public institutions and central authorities will continue to arouse interest. What are the consequences for implementation when the formal levers of control between government and underlying institutions have been changed? This is a highly pertinent issue that should lead to careful examination of the actual changes in formal arrangements and the consequences of such changes. A focus on decisions and legal resolutions does not represent an obsolete area of interest. Rather, it directs attention to central determinants of political administrative action, also with respect to higher education. Furthermore, national governments continue to formulate policies for higher education with the expectation that such initiatives are translated into practice in the field. Also supranational organisations, such as the EU and NAFTA in North America, have ambitions of effectiveness with the programmes and policies they formulate with respect to higher education. The relationship between policy issuers and the units that policies are directed at in the higher education sector is in many cases undergoing formal alterations. And as such the attention to such arrangements is important to incorporate into a study of implementation of specific policies.

A lasting and important contribution of the bottom-uppers is the highlight they put on the organic aspects of implementation, the informal processes and spontaneous constellations that spring out of processes, the strong element of negotiation and the political aspects of processes also outside the central political apparatus. However, not unlike other behavioural approaches in the study of politics, it tends to overlook the weight carried by institutions as a powerful frame of human action. The bottom-uppers' change of focus from the policy decision fixation to organic processes clearly served to sensitise the student of implementation processes to the danger of reifying policy and adding mythical properties to the power of a policy decision and programme. However, the complete relaxation of a special focus on authoritative policy decisions at a central level is also ill advised. A policy decision then has the same status as other 'environmental factors' that play a role,

with no higher rank order. It is not the trigger of the processes one is studying, as it would for the top-downers. This might be a good approach in areas where government initiatives are many and scattered, but 'ignoring' the importance of formal government decisions and the momentum that such decisions carry both symbolically and as a driving force in implementation processes seems empirically errant.

3. BUILDING ON THE PAST? CURRENT EMPIRICAL POLICY RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1. Introduction

Why has implementation research in higher education not boomed after the seminal work offered by Cerych and Sabatier? Several reasons could be identified, including the complexity of the research task and the lack of a unified perspective in the field due to the debate between bottom-uppers and top-downers. Furthermore, studies of the implementation of higher education reforms have also to a large extent been undertaken in a European context. The relatively few studies of American reforms applying an explicit implementation approach have been explained by system differences. Clark (1986) states that reforms in American higher education, in contrast to Europe, typically are not planned and enacted through the national centre. Because the American system is so large and decentralised, reforms are usually generated at lower levels. In Clark's words: "If authority is extensively decentralized, then opportunities to innovate are decentralized; higher levels find levers of change usually beyond their reach" (1986: 260). Instead, reforms occur incrementally, have small expectations, depend considerably on local initiative and are often market-driven.

In addition, implementation of higher education reforms may be more difficult to accomplish than reforms within other sectors of society. Cerych and Sabatier (1986: 256) have discussed this question. They argue that the special problems posed by higher education reform implementation are set primarily by the many autonomous actors present, and by the diffusion of authority throughout the structure. Even in a centralised state, higher education is more 'bottom-heavy' than other social subsystems and certainly more than lower educational sectors. Policy implementation then becomes very interactive, and implementation analysis becomes a study of the respective interactions. Higher education policy implementation is increasingly complicated by its ambiguous and multiple goals. Although the system is concerned primarily with knowledge, it has been called upon to assume many new functions only indirectly related to its traditional responsibility for producing, extending and transmitting knowledge. It is now supposed to actively promote social equalisation, to provide more vocational training, to assist in regional development, to cater increasingly for the adult student, and so on. Cerych and Sabatier conclude that there is no general consensus regarding these new functions and, if and when they become specific policy objectives, they are immediately questioned and openly contested.

Implementation studies of higher education, as in other sectors, might have been undertaken in other contexts and under other labels, for example, evaluation studies. This is an argument also raised in general by Ham and Hill (1986: 111). They indicate that there are many studies with a policy focus but without the implementation label, that could be of great relevance to the implementation field. The latter explanation brings us to the possibility that policy studies, in which implementation analysis is a central part, also depend very much on the content and type of policy and how it is enacted. The lack of perceived interest in implementation analysis in higher education may be a result of changes in public policy in higher education from the mid-1980s. One major change is, for example, the shift towards new public management doctrines emphasising privatisation, deregulation and evaluation (see e.g. Henkel 1991; Neave 1988). As a consequence, it is possible to identify a change in the way public policy is framed, that is, that only broad frameworks and objectives are specified, leaving much discretion to local organisation and implementing agencies (see Van Vught 1989). Even if it may be difficult to differentiate sharply between internal and external forces in the developments within policy studies, one could argue that changes in public policy have influenced policy and implementation studies. This development has resulted in a change in the way policy and implementation studies are conducted, and not in a declining interest in the implementation 'theme' as such, even if the label has changed.

The development in political ideology and practice sets the focus on rather different aspects of policy making and implementation compared to the analytical focus of the first wave of implementation studies. Rather, one could see the interest in new research questions as related to changes in public policy making. How, for instance, is policy shaped in this new multi-organisational framework in which different stakeholders try to affect policy and policy realisation (Neave 1995)? What are the efficient policy instruments in a situation where the degree of governmental control is loosened (Van Vught 1997)? Undoubtedly this represented a significant shift of the ideology of public policy, and such policy developments impinge on the definition of relevant research issues. However, if we look beyond the rhetoric of 'self-regulation' the transition from one state to the other is not unequivocal. At the level of actual policy in many Western countries the formal structures of the former state control models linger on alongside the ideological and practical decentralised and autonomised structures (Gornitzka and Maassen 2000). Most of these systems are still in a 'hybrid' state where remnants of old systems are blended with the new. The complexity of public policy and political (sub)systems poses serious challenges to the student of implementation, when ideas of self-regulation mix with continued aspirations and practices of central control, and when structures of responsibility and governance are unclear. Consequently, the new policy developments have undoubtedly had an impact on policy studies, yet the 'old' issues are not obsolete and irrelevant within new landscapes of public policy and models of state governance.

Given the changes in higher education policy, the question then becomes: How do current policy studies handle this changing policy landscape? A search through the current higher education literature paying special attention to studies that try to

analyse the relationship between a formally defined or specified policy or reform on the one hand, and institutional responses, adaptation or practice on the other, shows that these questions are at the very core of many studies. On the European scene, it is possible to identify several research projects that are of great interest to the implementation field. However, many studies seem to have a normative purpose when analysing public policy initiatives, without much empirical evidence. Other studies often lack a theoretical framework to structure the analysis, and thus represent empirical descriptions with little contribution in terms of generalisable knowledge. Still, as a result of changes in higher education policy, current empirically oriented 'implementation studies' seem to change according to the development outlined earlier. Some typical examples of recent studies are given below.

3.2. The Organisational Theory Approach

The use of organisation theory for studying change in higher education is hardly a new development. However, one could actually reverse the statement, claiming that several important studies in organisation theory have grown out of studies of higher education (Rhoades 1992: 1884). In recent studies of 'putting policy into practice' that are framed by organisation theory, the investigation has focused not merely on the implementation of higher education policy or reform; rather, implementation is seen as a case of organisational change in higher education institutions.

The most novel element when it comes to applying organisation theory to the study of change is an expansion of the analytical scope of the studies carried out. While organisation theorists traditionally analysed changes *within* organisations, such theoretical frameworks are today often used to study inter-organisational relationships, that is, between organisations and different stakeholders in the organisational environment. The recognition that organisations are dependent on their environment is the main factor behind this development. For organisation theory to be applicable to the study of policy implementation, the latter recognition is essential. An interesting example is that of Goedegebuure (1992), where a resource dependency perspective is applied to understand merging activities in the college sector in Australia and the Netherlands. In both countries, the initiative to amalgamate small institutions into larger ones came as a direct result of governmental policies, with the governments spelling out certain incentives to guide the merging process, that is, increasing institutional size would trigger increased funding (Goedegebuure 1992: 3–6). On the basis of the political objectives, and by outlining theoretical propositions on the basis of the resource dependency framework, these are then tested empirically using a range of data. The results of the analysis show, *inter alia*, that governmental policies relating funding mechanisms to the mergers in the two countries were highly successful (Goedegebuure 1992: 225). However, the study also argues that the merging activity depended on other environmental factors in addition, and that the extent to which a given institution engaged in a merger depended on "the overall environmental situation as perceived by the institutions" (Goedegebuure 1992: 226). This result could be interpreted

positively both by top-downers and bottom-uppers in an implementation perspective. For top-downers, the existence of well-defined policy means, that is, economic incentives that guided the successful implementation of the mergers, must certainly be encouraging. For bottom-uppers, the notion that successful implementation depended on how institutions perceived their general situation could be an argument for analysing potential merger activity by some form of backward mapping. In general, the resource dependency framework proved to be a fruitful perspective for analysing and understanding the institutional behaviour that took place after the policy initiatives in the two countries, accounting for the role of the environment in producing organisational change as well as focusing on the organisational capacity to influence environmental conditions under which they had to operate (Goedegebuure 1992: 223–224).

A project with relevance for students interested in implementation is a large comparative study of governmental policies and programmes for strengthening the relationship between higher education institutions and the national economy (TSER-HEINE project) (see also Gornitzka 1999; Gornitzka and Maassen 2003). The main research question is how higher education organisations change in response to or in interaction with government policies and programmes. The research involves an examination of how government policies and programmes act as impetuses for change in higher education organisations. The approach used is not identical to the set-up of a top-down implementation study. It does not follow a given policy from formation to implementation, to the effects of the policy in question, assuming a linear causal chain of events. The focus of this study is on public policy initiatives as possible inputs to organisational change processes at an institutional level. The conceptual framework applied in this study is built around two theoretical perspectives on organisational change: resource dependence theory and neo-institutional theory. The framework rests on two main assumptions. First, organisational response to environmental expectations is shaped by inter-organisational factors, such as power distributions and institutional values, identities and traditions. Second, organisational actors seek actively to interact with environmental constituents in order to shape and control dependency relations.

The TSER-HEINE project framework echoes the classic implementation studies in the sense that it pays special attention to characteristics of government policies that are directed at institutions in higher education. It assumes that such aspects are of importance in the study of how state action serves as an impetus for organisational change. Policies are more than just 'a collection of words'. Furthermore, their approach does not see the state as 'just another actor'. The research takes as its point of departure that governments are essential in furnishing and maintaining an overall governance system within which the day-to-day relationship between higher education and government takes place. Such system-level characteristics are studied as part of the significant institutional and historical context within which policies and programmes are developed and organisational change processes are positioned. Methodologically, the TSER-HEINE project takes a two-step comparative approach to the study of institutional change. National policies within the selected subject area are studied and compared in an independent analysis (cf. Gornitzka and Maassen 2000). Second, the main empirical basis is

found in a set of case studies at an institutional level in the seven European countries that are part of the project, which in turn are analysed cross-nationally. In these case studies, government policies are analysed as part of the many factors that may affect change processes at an institutional level. This study exemplifies a multi-level comparative approach, with an explicit focus on government decisions and actions as part of a frame of order within which organisational adaptation takes place. The approach used is also compatible with an interest in issues of implementation in the sense that types of policy and systems of state control and steering are seen as important to understanding the responsiveness of universities and colleges. One of the outcomes of the study demonstrates that most of the governmental policies that were studied were not directly linked in a linear causal way to outcomes at the institutional level. Nonetheless, the value of national policies for institutional level change processes is more than 'just' symbolic. The normative and cognitive content of policies certainly affect the sets of values and norms of the institutional actors involved in institutional adaptation and change. Furthermore, a central conclusion refers to the importance of viewing the success or failure of implementing specific policies in relation to the governmental steering approach within which these policies are embedded (Van Heffen, Verhoeven and De Wit 1999: 291).

3.3. The Network Approach

Central to these types of studies are the attempts to couple actor and structure relationships, establishing the 'missing link' between the micro and macro level of analysis. In the words of Lane (1990: 39), these models are high on realism, but have weaknesses when it comes to analytical stringency. One of the projects using a network/field approach to study policy change is a comparative research study, where national policy developments in Swedish, Norwegian and UK higher education are analysed and compared over the last decades, with a special focus on the extent to which public reforms have affected the values and behaviour of academics within higher education institutions (see Kogan and Hanney 2000; Henkel 2000; Bleiklie, Høstaker and Vabø 2000; Bauer et al. 1999; Kogan et al. 2000). The theoretical foundations for these studies can be pinpointed quoting Kogan and Hanney (2000: 20–21), when they state that

> it has proved virtually impossible to make an adequate match between micro analysis, in which the verities of close-grained empirical studies can be demonstrated, and macro analysis, in which more generally applicable propositions can be announced and interrogated. The world of knowledge has increasingly accepted that more than one incommensurate or apparently inconsistent proposition can be advanced simultaneously. In the social domain, in particular, reality does not pile up in well-connected hierarchies of paradigms and theorems.

Thus, it is argued that the problem of traditional implementation studies of both a top-down and a bottom-up character is the question of how the levels are related to one another. Consequently, both the top-down and the bottom-up perspectives are rooted in a hierarchical model limiting the dynamics of policy making and policy shaping (Bleiklie, Høstaker and Vabø 2000: 15). To fully understand the changes higher education has gone through in the three countries, the authors instead develop

theoretical frameworks using metaphors like arenas, frames and space of action (Bauer et al. 1999: 31), or 'fields of social action' (Bleiklie, Høstaker and Vabø 2000: 15). Even if it may be difficult to disagree with the arguments put forward, one could claim that this type of policy analysis is (again) engaging some of the classical problems in the history of implementation analysis, where the number of independent variables is difficult to limit, especially since the dependent variable that the comparative project aims at explaining – change in higher education – is difficult to operationalise. As such, these studies are not restricted to the process where policies are put into practice, but also have an interest in studying how policies come about. The political context is quite different in the three countries studied. The UK policy direction is perhaps the most exceptional, where higher education institutions shifted from state-subsidised independence to increased dependence on, and deference to, state policies (Kogan and Hanney 2000: 234). Nonetheless, political similarities can also be detected. Thus, rather identical conclusions can be identified between the countries when it comes to how policies and reform attempts seem to have been created, being a product of a complex interplay of context, ideologies, ministers and bureaucracies. The findings in the UK illustrate that it is difficult to identify a traditional policy community in this country (Kogan and Hanney 2000: 237). A point Kogan and Hanney make is that in the UK the processes of national policy do not interact directly with the academic system so much as they act as separate systems producing fields of force between them (p. 238). The factor explaining much of the developments seems to be that of historical continuity – in all three countries. Because of the longitudinal character of the studies, the processes of historic continuation may be followed more easily, showing extensive explanatory power (Kogan and Hanney 2000: 238; see also Bleiklie, Høstaker and Vabø 2000: 307; Bauer et al. 1999: 266).

When it comes to identifying the forces of change, quite similar conclusions are also reached. To quote the conclusion from the Norwegian study:

> Changes that have taken place were not the outcome of political reforms alone. They should be considered part of more comprehensive demographic, socio-structural and political-institutional processes of change. Within this context the reforms have been both the driving forces behind and the responses to change (Bleiklie, Høstaker and Vabø 2000: 307).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND CHALLENGES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Policy realisation and political reform are predominantly studied as a part of a comprehensive change process, and not as the sole cause of change. Apparently, policy studies in Europe to an increasing degree take the same path as current studies of organisational change in the US. In the eye of an American scholar, this is a theoretical position where "people (and organisations) are understood to be constructed and to act in the light of socially constructed and defined identities, which are understood to be made up of cultural ideas … Their sovereignty, boundaries, and control systems are similarly embedded in cultural material" (Meyer 1996: 243). These observations are valid also for many of the studies of policy and change in the area of higher education. The empirical studies referred to above point

to the following directions of current and future studies. First, the development is clearly going from a single theoretical framework towards applying a multi-theoretical framework. The direction of change is seen as non-linear rather than linear. Institutional and systemic change are analysed as a result of dynamic interactive processes rather than as the product of a centrally determined design. The theoretical perspectives applied have gone from viewing implementation as a separate process towards seeing policy making and implementation as integrated processes. Similarly, we note a renewed interest in the formal structures that frame action.

While since the mid-1980s a large number of studies on higher education policy issues have been conducted, explicit implementation studies have become rare phenomena in the field. How can this be explained? We have pointed to changes in the relationship between governments and higher education as a key factor that can be regarded as part of the explanation. However, the knowledge that governments keep up their efforts to reform higher education should still trigger interest by researchers in studying the processes that bring about the effects of governmental policies. While the nature of the relationship between government and higher education has changed over the last decade or so, this change was not an expression of the withdrawal of the government from higher education, or the end of public reforms in higher education. Instead, it can be argued that the overall relationship between governments and higher education institutions has changed, leading to different conditions for putting governmental policies into effect. This obviously poses challenges to research on implementation processes. While these challenges are by no means novel in the field of implementation studies in general, specific developments in higher education make it even more urgent to deal with them seriously. Related to the rise of the 'stakeholder society' (Maassen 2000), policy making and reform implementation tend to take place more and more in a network structure that replaces traditional bilateral relationships between the government and higher education institutions. Instead of looking at implementation process in the traditional (causal) way, implementation processes should be perceived as *interactive* processes. Furthermore, 30 years of implementation research has amply demonstrated the lack of realism in assuming that policies and reform initiatives move from government to objects of implementation unaffected by the road they travel. Assumptions of governmental omniscience and omnipotence are not helpful as a point of departure for implementing policies in practice, nor for studying such processes. Also, in many cases, a policy or a given reform is not necessarily the start of change, but a reflection of it; in other words, the government may 'legitimise' changes by developing policies or new laws responding to developments in the higher education system. Understanding implementation in higher education is taking notice of how policies and reforms often are formal political confirmation of developments in the field, and not some kind of alien phenomenon that is thrust upon 'unsuspecting' institutions. Based on these considerations, future research should pay attention to the following topics. Policy and reform studies in higher education should in principle use a multi-level approach. This implies that implementation studies have to be transformed, for example, into studies that examine the relationship between the authority responsible for policy making and

the policy object, that is, from policy implementation to policy interaction. Implementation studies should include a much more careful analysis of the processes of formulating governmental policies, and ask, for example, how the nature of the policy relationship affects the way the policy object is involved in the policy making, feels responsible, and feels committed to the agreed upon policy. Also, one should give special attention to the different interests of institutions in higher education and who the winners and losers are in the process of shaping government policies and reforms. Certainly, the structures of policy making may be seen as a network, but that does not make issues of power, interests and conflicts over policy irrelevant in explaining institutional responses to initiatives from government or supranational bodies.

NOTES

[1] We are grateful to David Dill for constructive comments. This chapter is based on: Gornitzka, Åse, Svein Kyvik and Bjørn Stensaker. "Implementation Analysis in Higher Education." In Smart, John C. (ed.). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, vol. XVII.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002, 381–423, and reprinted with the kind permission of Kluwer Academic Publishers.

[2] Separate case studies were undertaken as part of this project: the British Open University (Woodley 1981), the Swedish 25/5 Admission Scheme (Kim 1982), the University of Umeå in Sweden (Lane 1983), the Polish Preferential Point System, the University of Tromsø in Norway (Bie 1981), the Norwegian Regional Colleges (Kyvik 1981), the French *Instituts Universitaires de Technologie* (Lamoure 1981), the University of Calabria in Italy (Coppola-Pignatelli et al. 1981) and the German *Gesamthochschule* (Cerych et al. 1981).

REFERENCES

Bardach, E. *The Implementation Game.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977.

Barrett, S. and C. Fudge (eds). *Policy and Action: Essays on the Implementation of Public Policy.* London: Methuen, 1981.

Bauer, M., B. Askling, S.G. Marton and F. Marton. *Transforming Universities. Changing Patterns of Governance, Structure and Learning in Swedish Higher Education.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1999.

Bie, K.N. *Creating a New University: The Establishment and Development of the University of Tromsø.* Oslo: Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education, 1981.

Bleiklie, I., R. Høstaker and A. Vabø. *Policy and Practice in Higher Education. Reforming Norwegian Universities.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000.

Browne, A. and A. Wildavsky. "Implementation as Mutual Adaptation." In Pressman, J. and A. Wildavsky (eds). *Implementation.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984a, 206–231.

Browne, A. and A. Wildavsky. "Implementation as Exploration." In Pressman, J. and A. Wildavsky (eds). *Implementation.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984b, 232–256.

Cerych, L., A. Neusel, U. Teichler and H. Winkler. *Gesamthochschule – Erfahrungen, Hemmnisse, Zielwandel.* New York: Campus Verlag, 1981.

Cerych, L. and P. Sabatier. *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance. The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books, 1986.

Cerych, L. and P. Sabatier. "Reforms and Higher Education: Implementation." In Clark, B.R. and G. Neave (eds). *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education, vol. 2, Analytical Perspectives.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1992, 1003–1013.

Clark, B.R. "Implementation in the United States: A Comparison with European Higher Education Reforms." In Cerych, L. and P. Sabatier (eds). *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance. The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books, 1986, 259–267.

Coppola-Pignatelli, P. et al. *Rapporto sull'universita della Calabria*. Roma: Gruppo di Ricerche sull'edilizia per l'Istruzione Superiore (GREIS), 1981.

Dill, D.D. and B. Sporn (eds). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1995.

DiMaggio, P. and W.W. Powell. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Dunleavy, P. "Professions and Policy Change: Notes Toward a Model of Ideological Corporatism." *Public Administration Bulletin* 36 (1981): 3–16.

Elmore, R.F. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." *Political Science Quarterly* 94.4 (1980): 601–616.

Elmore, R.F. "Forward and Backward Mapping: Reversible Logic in the Analysis of Public Policy." In Hanf, K. and T.A.J. Toonen (eds). *Policy Implementation in Federal and Unitary Systems.* Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985, 33–70.

Goedegebuure, L.C.J. *Mergers in Higher Education*. Utrecht: Uitgiverij LEMMA BV, 1992.

Gornitzka, Å. "Governmental Policies and Organisational Change in Higher Education." *Higher Education* 38 (1999): 5–31.

Gornitzka, Å. and P. Maassen. "National Policies Concerning the Economic Role of Higher Education." *Higher Education Policy* 13 (2000): 225–230.

Gornitzka, Å. and P. Maassen. "Europeiske universiteter mellom marked og myndighet." In Larsen, I.M. and B. Stensaker (eds). *Tradisjon og tilpasning. Organisering og styring av universitetene.* Oslo: Akademisk forlag, 2003, 35–58.

Ham, C. and M. Hill. *The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State.* London: Sage Publications, 1986.

Hanf, K., B. Hjern and D. Porter. "Local Networks of Manpower Training in the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden." In Hanf, K. and F.W. Scharpf (eds). *Interorganizational Policy Making. Limits to Coordination and Central Control*. London: Sage Publications, 1978, 303–341.

Hargrove, E.C. *The Missing Link. The Study of the Implementation of Social Policy*. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Henkel, M. *Government, Evaluation and Change*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1991.

Henkel, M. *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000.

Henkel, M. and B. Little (eds). *Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1999.

Hjern, B. and C. Hull. "Implementation Research as Empirical Constitutionalism." *European Journal of Political Research* 10 (1982): 105–115.

Kim, L. *Widened Admission to Higher Education in Sweden – the 25/5 Scheme. A Study of the Implementation Process.* Stockholm: National Board of Universities and Colleges, 1982.

Kogan, M., M. Bauer, I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel. *Transforming Higher Education – A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000.

Kogan, M. and S. Hanney. *Reforming Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000.

Kyvik, S. *The Norwegian Regional Colleges: A Study of the Establishment and Implementation of a Reform in Higher Education*. Oslo: Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education, 1981.

Lamoure, J. *Les Instituts Universitaires de Technologie en France*. Paris: Institute of Education, 1981.

Lane, J.E. *Creating the University of Norrland. Goals, Structures and Outcomes.* Umeå: CWK Gleerup, 1983.

Lane, J.E. *Institutional Reform. A Public Policy Perspective*. Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1990.

Lane, J.E. *The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches*. London: Sage, 1993.

Lester, J.P., A.O'M. Bowman, M.L. Goggin and L.J. O'Toole. "Public Policy Implementation: Evolution of the Field and Agenda for Future Research." *Policy Studies Review* 7 (1987): 200–216.

Maassen, P. "The Changing Roles of Stakeholders in Dutch University Governance." *European Journal of Education* 35 (2000): 449–464.

Majone, G. and A. Wildavsky. "Implementation as Evolution." In Freeman, H. (ed.). *Policy Studies Review Annual 2*. Beverley Hills: Sage, 1978, 103–117.

Meyer, J.W. "Otherhood: The Promulgation and Transmission of Ideas in the Modern Organizational Environment." In Czarniawska, B. and G. Sevón (eds). *Translating Organizational Change*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996, 241–252.

Neave, G. "On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: An Overview of Recent Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe, 1986–88." *European Journal of Education* 23.1/2 (1988): 7–23.

Neave, G. "The Stirring of the Prince and the Silence of the Lambs: The Changing Assumptions Beneath Higher Education Policy, Reform and Society." In Dill, D.D. and B. Sporn (eds). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1995, 54–71.

Neave, G. "The Evaluative State Reconsidered." *European Journal of Education* 33.3 (1998): 265–284.

Neave, G. and F.A. van Vught (eds). *Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1991.

O'Toole, L.J. "Policy Recommendations for Multi-actor Implementation: An Assessment of the Field." *Journal of Public Policy* 6 (1986): 181–210.

Parsons, W. *Public Policy. An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis.* Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1995.

Pollitt, C. *Managerialism and the Public Services: Cuts or Cultural Change in the 1990s?* Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Premfors, R. (ed.). *Higher Education Organization. Conditions for Policy Implementation*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1984.

Pressman, J.L. and A. Wildavsky. *Implementation.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Pressman, J.L. and A. Wildavsky. *Implementation.* 3rd edn. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Rhoades, G. "Governance: Models." In Clark, B.R. and G. Neave (eds). *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education, vol. 2, Analytical Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1992, 1376–1383.

Sabatier, P.A. "Top-down and Bottom-up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis." *Journal of Public Policy* 6 (1986): 21–48.

Sabatier, P.A. and D.A. Mazmanian. "The Implementation of Public Policy: A Framework of Analysis." *Policy Studies Journal* 8.(special issue) (1980): 538–560.

Scott, W.R. *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

Slaughter, S. and L.L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Van Heffen, O., J. Verhoeven and K. de Wit. "Higher education policies and institutional response in Flanders: Instrumental analysis and cultural theory." In Jongbloed, B., P. Maassen and G. Neave (eds) *From the Eye of the Storm – Higher Education's Changing Institution*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999, 263–295.

Van Meter, D.S. and C.E. van Horn. "The Policy Implementation Process. A Conceptual Framework." *Administration and Society* 6 (1975): 445–488.

Van Vught, F.A. (ed.). G*overnmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1989.

Van Vught, F.A. "The Effects of Alternative Governance Structures." In Steunenberg, B. and F.A. van Vught (eds). *Political Institutions and Public Policy. Perspectives on European Decision Making.* London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, 115–137.

Williams, G.L. "The 'Marketization' of Higher Education: Reforms and Potential Reforms in Higher Education Finance." In Dill, D.D. and B. Sporn (eds). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1995, 170–193.

Woodley, A. *The Open University of the United Kingdom.* Paris: European Cultural Foundation, 1981.