HIGHER EDUCATION DYNAMICS

Governing Knowledge

A Study of Continuity and Change in Higher Education - A Festschrift in Honour of Maurice Kogan

Ivar Bleiklie and Mary Henkel (Eds.)

Springer

GOVERNING KNOWLEDGE

HIGHER EDUCATION DYNAMICS

VOLUME 9

SCOPE OF THE SERIES

Higher Education Dynamics is a bookseries intending to study adaptation processes and their outcomes in higher education at all relevant levels. In addition it wants to examine the way interactions between these levels affect adaptation processes. It aims at applying general social science concepts and theories as well as testing theories in the field of higher education research. It wants to do so in a manner that is of relevance to all those professionally involved in higher education, be it as ministers, policy-makers, politicians, institutional leaders or administrators, higher education researchers, members of the academic staff of universities and colleges, or students. It will include both mature and developing systems of higher education, covering public as well as private institutions.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

GOVERNING KNOWLEDGE

A Study of Continuity and Change in Higher Education

A Festschrift in Honour of Maurice Kogan

Edited by

IVAR BLEIKLIE

Department of Administration and Organization Theory,
University of Bergen,
Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, Norway

and

MARY HENKEL

Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy and Practices,
Brunel University, Uxbridge, UK

Springer

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-10 1-4020-3489-X (HB) Springer Dordrecht, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York
ISBN-10 1-4020-3504-7 (e-book) Springer Dordrecht, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-3489-3 (HB) Springer Dordrecht, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-3504-3 (e-book) Springer Dordrecht, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in the Netherlands.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Tony Becher is an Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Sussex and an Adjunct Professor at Southern Cross University in Australia. He has held visiting fellowships and consultancies in a number of countries, including Sweden, Australia and the USA. His most widely quoted work is *Academic Tribes and Territories,* whose first edition was published in 1989 and whose second in 2001. Among his other publications, four are jointly authored with his long-standing friend and colleague, Maurice Kogan: *Systems of Higher Education: United Kingdom* (1977); *Process and Structure in Higher Education*, First Edition (1980); *Process and Structure,* Second Edition (1992); and (also with Mary Henkel) *Graduate Education in Britain* (1994).

Ivar Bleiklie is a Professor of Administration and Organisation Theory at the University of Bergen and the Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, Norway. His publications include: *Comparative Biomedical Policy*, (co-editor, Routledge 2004), *Transforming Higher Education*, (co-editor, Jessica Kingsley 2000), *Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, (co-author, Jessica Kingsley 2000). He heads the national Norwegian research programme on Knowledge, Education and Learning, is a board member of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER), a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the international journal *Higher Education*, and is presently working on a study of reform and change in higher education and health care organisation.

John Brennan is Professor of Higher Education Research at the Open University, UK, where he is Director of the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (CHERI). He has published many books and articles on higher education, especially concerning higher education's relationships to employment and the effects of quality assurance systems. He has directed many national and international research projects on these themes and on related issues concerned with widening participation and social transformation.

Jürgen Enders is Professor of Higher Education Policy Studies and Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Twente, the Netherlands. He is also a member of the management team of the spearhead research programme on 'Institutional Change' of the Institute for Governance Studies at the University of Twente. He was previously Assistant Professor and Executive Director at the Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work at the University of Kas-

sel, Germany, where he received his doctorate in political science in 1995. He is a member of the board and Secretary of CHER; member of the editorial boards of the book series "Higher Education Dynamics" and the journal "Higher Education"; a member of the Advisory Council for Education of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research; and a reviewer to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. His research interests are in the areas of the sociology of education and the professions, organisational studies, governance and management of higher education and research, higher education and the world of work, and the academic profession.

Patricia J. Gumport is Professor of Education at Stanford University and Director of the Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research. Her research addresses key changes in the academic landscape and organisational character of American higher education. A sociologist of higher education, she has studied the institutionalisation of new knowledge, professional socialisation in graduate education, and the tensions between management and governance in organisational restructuring, among other topics. Her forthcoming book on academic restructuring portrays the ascendance of industry logic and its consequences within U.S. public higher education during the last quarter of the 20th century. She received her graduate degrees from Stanford University, two master's degrees and a PhD in 1987. She first worked with Maurice Kogan from 1987–1989 while she was a research associate in comparative higher education at UCLA with Burton R. Clark.

Mary Henkel is Professor Associate at the Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy and Practice at Brunel University, UK. Her consultancy activities have included work with the Swedish Higher Education Agency and the European University Association. She is a board member of CHER. Her main research interests are in evaluation, the academic profession and academic values and conceptions of knowledge. She has published books and articles in the fields of higher education studies and science policy, including *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education* (Jessica Kingsley, 2000); *Transforming Higher Education: a comparative study* (co-editor, Jessica Kingsley, 2000).

Roar Høstaker teaches sociology and political science at Lillehammer University College, Norway and has published books and articles within the fields of higher education studies and social theory, which is his current main research interest. He has a doctoral degree in political science from the University of Bergen, where he was a Research Associate and Researcher in the Norwegian Research Centre in Management and Organization (LOS-senteret) for six years. During that time he worked closely with Maurice Kogan and colleagues on a three-country study of

higher education reforms and was co-author with Ivar Bleiklie and Agnete Vabø of *Policy and Practice in Higher Education* (Jessica Kingsley 2000).

Peter Maassen is the director of *Hedda,* a consortium of European centres on higher education research, at the Faculty of Education, University of Oslo. He specialises in the public governance of higher education. In 1998 he was awarded a fellowship by the Society for Research on Higher Education (SRHE).

Craig McInnis holds the Chair in Higher Education at the University of Melbourne. He was Director of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at Melbourne from 1998-2004. He has conducted more than 20 national policy research projects focused primarily on the work roles and values of the academic profession, the nature of the undergraduate experience, and quality assurance for teaching and learning. His most recent commissioned studies include: a review of organizational structures and resources relating to e-learning **;** a national survey of the first year undergraduate experience; and an analysis of study abroad and student exchange systems in industrialised countries. He is currently working on the research-teaching nexus, and the governance and management of learning and teaching. Professor McInnis has provided consultancy services, workshops and seminars to more than 20 universities in Australia as well as projects in Portugal, Scotland, Ireland, Fiji, Malaysia and New Zealand. He is currently a member of the Australian Government Advisory Group on the Learning and Teaching performance Fund.

Susan Marton is a researcher at the Centre for Public Sector Research (CEFOS) at Göteborg University and an Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science, Karlstad University. In 2000, she received her Ph.D. from the Department of Political Science at Göteborg University with a dissertation entitled, "*The Mind of the State: The Politics of University Autonomy in Sweden, 1968-1998*". While completing her Ph.D., Susan Marton worked closely with Maurice Kogan on a three country study of higher education reform and was co-author of *Transforming Universities: Changing Patterns of Governance, Structure and Learning in Swedish Higher Education*" (1999, Jessica Kingsley). Her recent works focus on research policy and education reform policies in general.

Christine Musselin is senior researcher at the Centre de Sociologie des Organisations, a research unit of the Sciences-Po university and the CNRS (National Centre for Scientific Research). She leads comparative studies on higher education systems and focuses primarily on university governance, public policies on higher education and research, state-university relationships and academic labour markets. Her last book, *La longue marche des universités françaises* was published by the P.U.F in

2001 and recently edited in English (*The Long March of French Universities*) by Routledge (2004). She is finishing a new book on hiring committees and academic labour markets in French, German and American universities.

Sharon Parry is Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Teaching and Learning Centre at Southern Cross University, Lismore, Australia. Her areas of research interest are doctoral study and supervision, and the epistemological bases for the production of knowledge. She has published across a range of areas related to doctoral supervision, academic writing, issues in student assessment, and the evaluation of programs and initiatives in higher education. Her most recent book is *Disciplines and Doctorates* (Kluwer/Springer, 2005).

Gary Rhoades is Professor and Director of the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education. His research concentrates on the restructuring of higher education, with a particular focus on the restructuring of professional labor. His latest books include *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor* (SUNY Press, 1998), and (with Sheila Slaughter) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

Bjørn Stensaker is working at NIFU STEP in Oslo as Head of research on higher education institutions. He holds a doctoral degree from the School of Business Administration, Technology and Public Administration at the University of Twente in the Netherlands, and has a special interest in studies of quality, leadership and organisational change in higher education. Stensaker is the Editor-in-chief of *Tertiary Education and Management (TEAM)*, one of the editors of *Quality in Higher Education*, and a member of the Executive Board of the European Association for Institutional Research (EAIR).

Ulrich Teichler is Professor at the Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work and at the Department for Social Sciences of the University of Kassel (Germany). He was director of the Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work for 16 years, and vice president of the University for two years. He has held visiting professorships and research fellowships in a number of countries, including USA, Belgium, Japan and the Netherlands. Higher education and the world of work, the international comparison of higher education systems, and international cooperation and mobility in higher education are his key research areas. He has published extensively in all of them. He has been a consultant to UNESCO, OECD, World Bank, the Council of Europe, the European Commission and national governments as well as various international and national university organisations. He is a member, and

from 1998-2004 a Board member, of the International Academy of Education, a member of the Academia Europaea, former chairman of CHER and former president of EAIR. He was awarded the UNESCO Comenius Prize in1998.

Agnete Vabø holds a doctoral degree in sociology from the University of Bergen, where she was a Researcher Associate and Researcher at in the Norwegian Research Centre in Management and Organization (LOS-senteret) for five years. She is a senior researcher at NIFU STEP Studies in Innovation, Research and Education in Oslo. She worked closely with Maurice Kogan and colleagues on a three-country study of higher education reforms and was co-author with Ivar Bleiklie and Roar Høstaker of *Policy and Practice in Higher Education* (Jessica Kingsley 2000). Vabø has published a number of articles and reports on higher education in Norway as well as from a comparative perspective and contributed to several evaluations within the field.

FOREWORD

MARY HENKEL AND IVAR BLEIKLIE

This book is offered as a tribute and a token of gratitude to Maurice Kogan on his 75th birthday for the outstanding contribution he has made to higher education research. Over the last three decades, he has brought to our field a special combination of intellectual gifts, breadth of vision and endeavour, analytic creativity and rigour, critical power and a lightning wit. Informing all of these is a set of personal characteristics and beliefs that has won him admiration and affection across the world, above all a passionate concern for the institution of higher education and the academic values it represents, suspicion of dogmatism in any guise and a readiness to challenge in any forum. All of this is combined with a generosity of spirit and action from which so many of us have benefited.

Maurice Kogan's scholarship has many origins but perhaps first mention should go to his undergraduate experience reading history at the University of Cambridge. Drawn particularly to medieval history, he was introduced early to the demands and delights of analytic perfectionism provided by the philosopher-theologians in a context in which the sweep and scope of historical imagination were equally valued.

His college, Christ's, was the home of two of the strongest influences in his early adult years. Jack Plumb, historian of the 18th century, was his tutor and gave Maurice a model of tutorial-based education that his own students and younger scholars, too, will readily recognise. It incorporates recognition of individual intellectual ability, robust and encouraging critique, meticulous attention to written expression, and the creation of learning groups that know how to combine intensive work and conviviality. The second influence was the series of novels by C. P. Snow, which continue to throw a unique light on power and influence in academe and government in mid-20th century England.

Maurice Kogan finished his undergraduate career in Cambridge with a first class honours degree in the History Tripos and first place in the examination for the administrative class of the Civil Service. That gave him a choice between academic research into the world of the medieval Popes and policy making in the world of Lewis Eliot.

The choice he had and the decision he made go some way towards explaining the unique contribution he has made to our field. He spent the next 14 years as a civil servant in the Ministry of Education. There he learnt the difference good ad-

ministration could make and the skills required to achieve it. At the same time, he was a participant observer of power, authority and influence, of how they moved between politicians, bureaucrats, professionals and other interest groups, and of the processes and structures through which they had their effect. On the strength of a Harkness Fellowship, won as a young bureaucrat, he also spent a year in the United States getting an international perspective on a contemporary responsibility of his, the transformation of teacher training, and – incidentally - laying the foundations of some lifelong friendships with American scholars. These he later consolidated and extended in his work for the Ford Foundation and in collaborative writing.

Unusually for a British civil servant marked out for high success, he moved out in mid-career to become an academic, centring his work in the analysis of the phenomena he had encountered in government. His first published book, *The Politics of Education*, already exemplifies his capacity to combine systematic structural analysis with a sensitivity for the subtle interplay between individual human personality and institutions.

One of the reasons for his move at this point was the opportunity to join a group of gifted social scientists, who were in the process of establishing their discipline in Brunel, one of the new technological universities of the 1960s. It was not long before he had created the first department of government in the university. He rapidly built a reputation for himself and the department for research in the public sector that combined help and support for public administrators and policy makers with detached, critical analysis and theoretical development. A second and, for that time, unusual component of the department was a flourishing master's programme in public and social administration for public sector professionals and administrators.

Maurice's work at this time not only responded to government's wish to draw on social science in addressing its own problems but contributed to that belief in social science research. Projects were often large-scale and yet at the same time consistently grounded in close-grained observational and interview data and analysis of primary sources in an array of public sector bodies. The range of the policy fields covered in his work is also important for an understanding of his contribution to higher education research. It encompasses central and local government departments, health services, social services, race relations, community development and the police, as well as education and higher education and science policy. A consideration of his publications on education, in particular, indicates the range of concerns and insights which he has brought from his first field of study into higher education, including educational systems, governance, power, authority, accountability, elites and interest groups.

Maurice Kogan is, then, a political scientist, with particular intellectual and experiential roots. As a historian he has been trained to do justice to and get command of multiple and conflicting strands of evidence to construct robust, ordered and sen-

sitive interpretation. The time frame might be days or months or decades or centuries. As a practitioner and researcher he has confronted multiple patterns of governance, institutions and actions, sometimes at points of crisis or change. As a policy analyst and systems evaluator, he has been called to act on national and international stages, perhaps most memorably for the OECD.

It is against this background that we aim to celebrate some of the hallmarks of Maurice Kogan's approach to institutional and policy analysis in the study of higher education. As Ulrich Teichler points out in chapter 7, his stance is intellectually ambitious, at a personal level but also for the field itself. It is to press for more and better theory as well as to formulate and tackle large and not readily soluble questions, and to encourage others to do the same. This is exemplified in his own work by a preoccupation with questions about the dynamics between power, authority and different forms of knowledge.

It is to tease out the characteristics of higher education systems by developing analyses of different levels and different modes and of their internal dynamics, as he and Tony Becher did in *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* One of his particular talents is to be able repeatedly to analyse on the basis of carefully accumulated evidence the nature of and interconnections between institutions and actors, authority and knowledge, structural forms and relationships and human motivation, policies and practice, norms and operations, external and internal pressures.

There are paradoxes. First, Maurice is an individualist and an original. Yet collaboration and the generation of collective research endeavours have been key features of his academic career and style. It is no accident that so many of the contributors to this book have collaborated with Maurice in a variety of research and writing projects.

Second, Maurice's instinct to create conceptualisations, to formulate new theory and to celebrate theory development is evident. At the same time, he has a distrust of grand theory, vividly captured by Gary Rhoades in chapter 2 of this book. He is sceptical, too, of the capacity of simple, middle range theories and models to accommodate the ambiguities, complexities and contradictions of systems and political actors. "The phenomena of political co-option, alliance making and networking…compel simple models of public authority, bureaucracy and institutionalism to yield to far more subtle forms of interpretation." (Kogan 1984: 60). He has made the concept of multi-modality his own (e.g. Kogan and Henkel 1983).

It is no surprise, therefore, that he is determinedly eclectic as far as theory, methods and discipline are concerned. Political analysis, he maintains, 'though it has a life of its own, cannot explain effectively unless it uses concepts drawn from other disciplines.' (Kogan 1984: 58). As remarked at several points in this book, he himself has drawn on social psychology, social policy, public policy, educational

sociology, sociology of science, as well as normative political theory, political science and history.

Illumination, spark and energy pervade Maurice's work. They are perhaps most strongly demonstrated in his language. The creative metaphor, the probing concept, the subtle nuance and the stringent turn of phrase are among his trademarks. Underlying them are a love and respect for the power of language and the importance of nurturing and using it.

This book aims to honour some of what Maurice Kogan has given us. The major themes of the book are derived directly from his work. The analysis of the interconnections between modes of knowledge, modes of governance and academic values has been central in his studies of education and science policy. The momentous changes that have occurred in the politics and organisation of higher education and the systems of which they are part during the last three decades have provided the focus of much of his work. In examining and seeking to explain those changes, he has nevertheless consistently brought to bear the perspective of the historian and his own sceptical instincts. The dynamics of continuity have held a strong place in his analyses.

We have drawn extensively on his work, consciously and unconsciously. We have, however, taken the view that we can best honour his example by seeking - where we can - to take that work forward.

REFERENCES

Kogan, M. and Henkel, M. (1983). *Government and Research: the Rothschild Experiment in a Government Department*. London: Heinemann.

Kogan, M., Boyle, E. and Crosland, A. (1971). *The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Anthony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

1

INTRODUCTION

IVAR BLEIKLIE AND MARY HENKEL

Higher education systems, institutions and practitioners across the world have been in ferment during the last three decades. Now that we are in an era of decline in the authority of institutions of all kinds and we embrace multiple conceptions of knowledge, ideas about the governance of higher education, about its functions in society and about the values and assumptions that have informed them are being re-appraised.

In this book, an international group of leading higher education researchers come together to analyse contemporary thinking about the governance of higher education and the conceptual and organisational structures through which it is carried out. A central concern of the book is the dynamic between structures and modes of governance, definitions of knowledge and the values that those involved in higher education bring to them. Different contributions focus on different levels of higher education, the system, the institution and the academic practitioner. Underlying them is a commitment to analyses of change that also takes account of the sources of stability and continuity that persist in higher education. How is the interaction between change and continuity to be understood? What does it mean for higher education as it faces growing challenges to established claims to define, create and transmit knowledge?

The inspiration for this work comes from the career and personal influence of an individual scholar, whose contribution to our field has extended over much of the period covered. A central feature of Maurice Kogan's work has been the analysis of interconnections between knowledge, values, authority and power and how these are reflected in institutional structures and relationships and individual practices. At the same time, as a historian as well as a political scientist, he has always insisted on locating contemporary developments in a longer term perspective.

The contributions to this book reflect variation not only in research focus, but also in disciplinary background and empirical focus. Their authors come from eight different countries on three different continents, presenting and analysing material from 15 countries on four continents. Yet despite this variation strong common themes bind the contributions together. In part, this reflects the commonalities of developments affecting higher education systems in various countries, where massi-

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 1-10.

fication, globalisation and managerialism all affect higher education policies, systems, institutions and the individuals within them in some way or another. In part, the common research topics reflect the strengths and shared ambitions of a growing international research community, in which Maurice Kogan has played a crucial part as an architect and entrepreneur. Finally, comparative research strategies play an important part in this volume, as in Maurice Kogan's research, and eight out of thirteen chapters use explicitly comparative approaches.

Recognising the fruitfulness of Maurice Kogan's research agenda, the contributors seek to explore further research topics that have engaged Maurice. Although inspired by these three topics, their approaches diverge. One important source of variation is the entry point that is selected in formulating the research problem. The chapters are organised according to choice of entry point and emphasis, depending on whether the primary focus is on "governance", "knowledge" or "values".

The interconnectedness of the three topics are very nicely demonstrated in chapter 2 in that it focuses on all three entry points – values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance – applying these concerns to the substantive areas of U.S. and Mexican higher education, featuring important neo-liberal developments in each. In the realm of *values*, Gary Rhoades discusses how universities, once seen as nation-building institutions, have increasingly become nation-positioning institutions, and he sketches how this common function is differentially played out in different national contexts. Regarding *conceptions of knowledge*, he discusses how universities that have been seen historically as a source of fundamental, national knowledge, are now being evaluated according to their applied knowledge. He outlines some of the choices that are to be found across countries in the local, national, and global applications to which universities orient their knowledge. Finally, in the realm of *models of governance*, he discusses how, if historically universities have been shaped by senior academics, now they are increasingly being shaped by academic managers and non-academic professionals, in ways that substantially vary cross-nationally. Rhoades closes with some thoughts about the patterns of neoliberalism in higher education that in important respects take us beyond some of the boundaries embedded in Kogan's work.

Then follow four chapters that primarily use changing models of governance as their entry point and main focus.

In chapter 3 Jürgen Enders takes as his point of departure the contention that universities are heavily involved in literally every kind of social and economic activity in increasingly dynamic modern societies. However, this also makes them vulnerable organisations loaded with multiple and growing expectations as to their role and functioning that tend to exceed their capacity to meet them. From this vantage point he discusses how university governance has increasingly been characterised by arrangements that reflect the withdrawal of the traditional trust placed in profession-

als by public authorities. This in turn has given rise to an increasing reliance on formal procedures for performance control affecting not only the academic profession but also the role of the state as protector of governance based on trust in professionals. Furthermore, focusing on the connection between governance and the knowledge content of academic activity, Enders notes a growing tension between various forms of teaching and research. He argues that this has come about not only because of ongoing struggles between the traditional core values in academe and the striving for extra-scientific relevance. A second reason is the growing complexity of the academic endeavour due to the inclusion of non-traditional criteria of 'relevance' into their core business.

John Brennan examines in chapter 4 the changes that have been taking place in higher education systems in central and Eastern Europe since the early 1990s following the collapse of the communist regimes. Drawing on several development projects in the region which formed part of the reform agenda established by the EU and other western organisations, he looks at that agenda and its apparent effects in the light of Maurice Kogan's and his collaborators' comparative studies of higher education reform in England, Norway and Sweden. The chapter discusses findings from a number of case studies carried out in Central and Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Estonia, Russia, Romania and Slovenia) as part of a project entitled "The role of universities in the transformation of societies" directed by the author and supported by the Open Society Institute. The data from these studies are reviewed against the findings of the Kogan studies in order to see whether the findings of the latter might illuminate the former, thereby contributing to a more general understanding of the effects of reforms upon the inner worlds of higher education institutions. Brennan draws the highly interesting conclusion that inability to change with a rapidly changing social environment is a more serious problem than excessive demands for change directed at universities by the environment.

In determining whether or not change prevails over continuity in higher education governance Christine Musselin (chapter 5) draws on social science studies of policy change and organisational change processes. She suggests that instead of trying to study change as an abstract and general issue, it is advisable to specify what type of change one is interested in and on what level (system, institution, individual) one is focusing. Musselin then analyses higher education change processes in European countries to assess what kind of change and how much they experienced in the last decades. She argues that the reforms adopted by European countries within the last two decades indeed reveal strong convergences at the policy-making level, where structural (or paradigmatic) change can be documented. But if one turns to the institutional and individual levels, the impact and the nature of change within the systems appear to be less radical and profound. In particular, continuity prevails when one looks at academic identity. As a result, there is little evidence of the con-

vergence process that could have been expected from the similar orientations and types of solution identified at the policy levels. In fact, national systems and idiosyncrasies remain very resilient. These somewhat paradoxical results are explained in terms of the heterogeneous nature of higher education systems in which three diverse elements, profession, institutions and public authorities, operate semi-independently. This means that although change in one part affects the other parts, there is no automatic causal link from the policy level via institutions to professional practices. In other words the level of the profession shows more continuity than the policy level, even if it now has to adjust to stronger institutions.

In chapter 6 Craig McInnis points out that higher education policy researchers have shown little interest in the governance and management of teaching and learning in universities. In contrast, recent national reforms in the United Kingdom and in Australia appear to have shifted from routine and token acknowledgment of the importance of student learning to according it a central place in the strategic higher education agendas of both governments as well as other national systems. Preceding the recent reforms, and now accelerated by them, there have been significant changes in the organisational structures of universities aimed at the more systematic management of teaching and learning. As a consequence, the old contest between research and teaching has moved to a new arena. The conjunction of a series of changes has created a new set of governance and organisational dynamics. The changes include: the high cost of introducing and maintaining new technologies for teaching and learning; the requirement that institutions have strategic plans for teaching and learning; the almost universal use of student satisfaction measures as a component of performance-based, target-setting and accountabilities; and the establishment of government-sponsored national bodies to provide a focal point for the 'professionalisation' of teaching and learning. What is not clear, however, is how the tensions created by national steering are magnified by the internal dynamics of governance and management. The primary questions explored in the chapter concern the forms and viability of governance that are most effective in managing the changing and complex imperatives for teaching and learning, but at the same time compatible with the core values of universities and academics.

The following four chapters move their focus to knowledge as the entry point for their analyses.

In chapter 7 Ulrich Teichler takes as his point of departure the observation that diversification of higher education tends to be viewed generally as an inevitable and often as a desirable phenomenon. Diversity in higher education can be horizontal, in terms of a plurality of knowledge paradigms, schools of thoughts, mix of disciplines and preferred methods, as well as a broad variety of profiles among the individual higher education institutions and their departments. Diversity can also be vertical, in terms of the “level” and “quality” of teaching and research. The analysis, focusing

on European higher education, seeks to examine the current trends with respect to vertical and horizontal homogenisation versus diversification and to explain their causes. Does the move towards a "competitive" understanding of the steering of higher education systems and of the management within higher education institutions lead to diversification in every respect or rather to steeper stratification alongside horizontal homogenisation? Will research be more vertically stratified while vertical differences lose their importance for teaching and learning? What are the implications of the structural development of higher education for the generation and dissemination of knowledge? Some experts suggest that knowledge generation will be concentrated on a few institutions of higher education, while the rest attempt to take over the knowledge they produce and exploit it as best they can. Others observe a growing decentralisation of the generation and use of knowledge on the road towards the knowledge society. An important aim of Teichler's analysis is to examine in which way developments of knowledge have an impact on the structural development of higher education systems, and conversely how structural conditions determine the ways knowledge unfolds.

In chapter 8 Patricia Gumport contends that the questions of what knowledge matters most, how it should be organised and supported, and who should decide are at the core of higher education reform. Under conditions of resource constraint, however, the imperatives for continuity and for change in the academic structure become competing priorities with unclear operating principles. Such conditions exacerbate divergent views over higher education's primary purposes, including which adaptations are necessary for higher education to maintain its vitality and centrality in society. The extent to which higher education can demonstrate its willingness and ability to restructure trumps the long-held institutional expectations of preserving academic subjects. From extensive case study research on academic restructuring in the United States, Gumport argues that the cumulative effects of these changes have been far-reaching. Her research in the United States also raises the question of whether higher education will lose legitimacy in moving away from its accumulated heritage as an educational institution. At the campus level, the spotlight is on officials to respond strategically, and campus leaders are compelled to serve short-term imperatives as against long-standing mandates to meet society's vital educational and social justice needs. While some adaptation seems necessary in order to survive, a wholesale adaptation could reduce public higher education to a mere sector of the economy. The remainder of the chapter expands upon this thesis. It focuses on the interaction between external pressures and the forces already in play within U.S. higher education institutions: the expansion of administrative authority; the spread of a consumer orientation; and the stratification of academic subjects. She argues that cumulatively these have redefined the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education, which has shifted in the collective conception from a social insti-

tution to an industry, with profound implications for what knowledge is valued and who should decide.

Disciplines have in the past been seen as central elements in the higher education system. Tony Becher and Sharon Parry reflect in chapter 9 on the endurance of academic disciplines and argue that, in recent years, the rapid and widespread development of academic communities of practice – closely related to professional concerns, with problems deriving from social contexts – has encouraged a cataclysmic view of disciplinary teaching and research. The root cause arguably lies in the move towards universal higher education. With governments unable to meet the resulting escalation in costs, universities are constrained to seek the necessary funding mainly from commerce and industry. The latter understandably expect value for money in the form of vocationally-oriented teaching programmes and industrially-relevant research. Disciplines concerned with knowledge which lacks the scope for application have become increasingly starved of resources. Potential students, moreover, faced with paying for their courses, have recognised that the prospects of the high earning jobs needed to redeem their debts rest on professional courses rather than traditional ones. As a result it is common to see a regrouping of academic departments into professional schools, accompanied by a proliferation of first and higher degrees geared to career-related qualifications. Little scope would seem to remain for discipline-based activities. However, a more positive view maintains that traditional disciplines serve usefully to legitimate and give intellectual stimulus to the practical know-how of professional schools; gain a new vitality from their links with the professions and the wider community; are given continuing support through the entrepreneurial skills of many elite universities; and are able to share with communities of practice their rich inheritance of library holdings, journals and the like. Even if an appreciation of the full significance of the disciplines will return only with the passing of the current utilitarian and money-obsessed climate, the chapter contends that the endurance of the disciplines is assured.

According to Mary Henkel (chapter 10) academic identity and academic autonomy have been key driving ideas in the lives of individual academics and in the workings of the academic world. Academic autonomy is variously seen as implicit in the idea of distinctive academic identity. However, both identity and autonomy are contested concepts and their significance for academics and academic institutions is increasingly a matter of debate in an era of change in conceptions of knowledge, in social theories and in political and social institutions, including those of higher education. The chapter is based on comparative research undertaken in England, Norway and Sweden and is grounded in a vision for higher education research that insists on the need for research into systems and structures that enhances understanding of their meaning for individual academic values, forms of knowledge and practices, on which higher education depends. The point of departure is the individ-

ual but the aim is to pursue the inquiry within a perspective informed by empirical and theoretical changes to the political and organisational structures in which individual identities are shaped. The chapter begins by identifying a theoretical framework within which academic identity could be understood, at least until the late 20th century. This framework incorporates individuation and identification within influential, largely self-regulating communities or social institutions, notably disciplines and universities. Then follows an analysis of some conceptual relationships between academic identity understood within this framework, and autonomy, individual and collective, within an ideal model of academic work. This lays the ground for a reappraisal of these values and the relationships between them in the contemporary environment, where the power of the discipline is under challenge and universities are increasingly open to competing goals and conceptions of knowledge.

Susan Marton also takes the concept of academic identity as a starting point in the chapter 11, focusing on the implications for the research related values on which it is based in the face of organisational change. What happens to academic identity in the face of threats to 'academically-anchored knowledge'? To what extent is higher education able to define the 'academic enterprise' on its own terms? Marton points out that empirical studies of academic responses to these issues are few. The chapter sets out to fill the gap with an empirical study of the Swedish case during a period of profound change in the financing system for research. In the following empirical analysis, she discusses the aims of the research foundations in relation to the larger system changes which have taken place in the Swedish research landscape. Then she identifies some assumptions that assist in the analysis of the case material. The empirical data include fifteen large research projects claiming to incorporate a multidisciplinary approach. The case study indicates that the academics interviewed, both in the humanities and social sciences, are more concerned about the threats of various "usages of science" to the "internal core" of science than they are about budget cuts and adopting a competitive, entrepreneurial culture for research funds. How the humanities and social sciences are going to respond today to these new usages is another question, to which the distinction between a 'symbolic approach', an 'instrumental approach' and a 'democratic approach' indicates a possible set of responses. The resolution of which approach dominates is battled out between policy-making interests dealing with research: the academics, the bureaucrats, the economic interests and the civil society. The author concludes that to try to understand change in this system with only a "Mode 2" society model is not a sufficient approach to understanding complexity. The desirability of and possibilities for protecting the "inner-core" of science must also be discussed.

The analysis of academic identity directs our attention towards the intersection between knowledge and the values that sustain the search for and dispersion of

knowledge. The last three chapters shift the focus even more towards values and start their analyses from values as an entry point.

In his contribution on leadership and organisational forms in universities Ivar Bleiklie starts chapter 12 by presenting a theoretical framework for understanding leadership change that focuses on the interconnection between leadership and social values. The chapter discusses leadership ideals and values, and certain characteristics of organisational forms. The discussion focuses on values with an international reach, and how they relate to specific national experiences of which universities are a part. It gives an overview of different types of leadership ideals and their social and historical underpinnings. One reason why it is important to highlight these values is that they nourish fundamentally different notions about the nature of academic work – about the academic production process, the way in which it needs to be organised and to what extent academics can be trusted to organise their own affairs without outside interference. The chapter then focuses on how processes of change play out empirically in different national settings in Western Europe, Australia, USA and Japan. To what extent can we observe a global process of modernisation? To what extent and how do the outcomes, the new organisational forms, vary across nations? To what extent do these forms promote institutional leadership in academia? The chapter ends with a discussion of how different types of knowledge regimes condition different versions of academic leadership.

In chapter 13 Peter Maassen and Bjørn Stensaker make values their main concern by arguing in favour of the relevance of 'cultural theory' in 'theory-driven' research in the field of higher education studies. They argue that one cannot assume a 'one-to-one' causal relationship between environmental and intra-organisational changes in higher education. Although it is generally recognised that changes in the environment are related to the changes in universities and colleges, the question of how they are related and which factors influence the institutionalisation of changes is still something of a 'black box'. The authors contend that it is important to find a middle position when examining organisational change in relationship to shifts in governance. In this chapter they present 'cultural theory' and reflect upon its relevance for furthering our understanding of organisational change in higher education – in theory and practice, and why more theory-based research in higher education is needed. They start their discussion of cultural theory by looking at how organisational change processes in higher education may be conceptualised. They emphasise the embeddedness of individual values, norms, behaviour, motivations and preferences in social institutional contexts, as analysed from the vantage point of cultural theory not only in higher education studies, but also in other fields. 'Cultural theory' represents an attempt to integrate the cultural notion of individual values and beliefs, and the structural organisation of the social and professional relations of individuals. Maassen and Stensaker develop their main argument by way of a discussion of the

applicability of the "grid/group analysis" which is the core conceptual tool within the "cultural theory" framework. They apply the theory to studies of changes in higher education in Germany, the Netherlands and Norway. They argue that it is important to search for and use robust and rich theories in developing the field of higher education studies.

Roar Høstaker and Agnete Vabø offer in chapter 14 an interpretation of the inner structure and developmental logic of higher education systems in the western world in the light of a general transformation of society in the direction of a "knowledge society" or a "cognitive capitalism". They argue that it is a commonplace to observe that many recent organisational changes in the public sector in general and in higher education in particular are inspired by concepts and value systems taken from the private sector, and point out the continuities in the development from the latter to the former. In this connection, studies showing how organisational ideas and concepts travel from different types of organisations and across great distances have come to constitute a particular sub-field within organisation theory. However, the wider social processes leading to organisational changes are often missing from these studies. Høstaker and Vabø are accordingly concerned to put ideas and values in context and develop their topic by sketching changes in how capitalism has been regulated since the 1970s. They also explore some of the consequences these changes have had for the way work is organised. At the same time, they seek to outline the influences of new economic doctrines on the nation state and on how it is organised and seeks legitimacy. This transformation of the state is then seen in relation to similar changes in higher education. Finally, they point out how the relationship between work and education is being reshaped. Higher education institutions seek legitimacy in new "social needs" and at the same time notions of what professional skills are needed have changed. Thus when society changes, universities and colleges change with it, but this does not imply that such changes relate only to what can be bought or sold on a market. The dynamics play themselves out at the empirical level in complex ways that cannot be deduced from these general developments.

What general conclusions may be drawn from the analyses in these chapters of continuity and change in higher education? The first conclusion that may strike the reader is the complexity of continuity and change in this sector of society. Three main sources of variation in the pace and degree of change and the resilience of the forces of stability have been highlighted in the chapters. First, the observation has been made by several authors that changes take place at different levels, that of general ideology, national policy, academic institutions, academic disciplines and the individual academic. From this observation two kinds of ideas may flow. One idea is that profound change may take place at one level, for example in declared policy goals and the ideology underpinning them, without being followed by corresponding changes at the institutional level or at the level of individual academic practice.

Therefore it is necessary to study empirically where and to what extent change does take place rather than deducing that changes observed at one level will also occur at other levels. Another idea is that academic systems and institutions are loosely coupled organisations, according to some a structural necessity for academic organisations to function properly. Many current reform attempts, however, are based on the idea that modern mass higher education systems have developed new functional needs that require them to be much better integrated and more tightly coupled. The struggle between these two views has been a major source of tension in policy debates about higher education reform in the last decades.

The second source of variation is the one we find between national higher education systems. In spite of being affected by common ideological, political and structural trends, national systems tend to preserve their distinctiveness. This suggests that the current higher education changes are not necessarily following one common trajectory, but that a number of different trajectories and future scenarios are possible. The third source of variation runs across disciplines although this is not highlighted very strongly in these chapters. The final source of variation derives from the theoretical assumptions made by the authors themselves. The belief that higher education is undergoing drastic and fundamental changes varies in part systematically, in the sense that the American authors appear to believe more firmly than their European counterparts that higher education is going through a period of fundamental transition. Systematic variation may also be understood in terms of disciplinary difference between authors, depending for example on the extent to which they assume a top-down or bottom up perspective for understanding change processes in higher education. Rather than trying to provide specific policy recommendations one may draw the conclusion that there is much need for systematic empirical and comparative research. Thus the importance of Maurice Kogan's research agenda with its emphasis on theoretically informed and careful empirical analysis, is corroborated by these chapters. We hope that our readers will also find in them some direction as to topics that can sustain that agenda in the future.

2

DISTINCTIVE LOCAL CONTINUITIES AMIDST SIMILAR NEO-LIBERAL CHANGES: THE COMPARATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE PARTICULAR

GARY RHOADES

My first exposure to Maurice Kogan's work came in 1981, when I read a little book of his entitled, *The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Anthony Crosland in Conversation with Maurice Kogan* (1971). Within his interviews and commentary lay three key and enduring features of his scholarship. First, Kogan afforded the reader entrée into the complex interrelations between knowledge, governance, and values. The interviews, after all, were with the Minister of Education and the subsequent Secretary of the Department of Education and Science in the UK, who were prominent national leaders in different political parties. Second, Kogan attended to detail, and to the interesting continuities in government and higher education even in times of significant change. For all the differences in Boyle's and Crosland's values and styles, there were also some remarkable commonalities. Maurice was sensitive to both in his rendering of not just these ministers but the ministries with which they interacted and through which they tried to act. Third, Kogan walked the reader through a body of empirical evidence and inductively built theory on that foundation. Maurice is not one to grand theorise; what is more compelling to him, and comes from him, is an accumulation of solid empirical evidence. The detailed and compelling cases of his interviews with Boyle and Crosland reflect the focus and quality of Kogan's empirical work.

A recent example of Kogan's work also reflects these three features. Nearly a quarter century after I came to Maurice's work as a postdoctoral researcher in Burton Clark's Comparative Higher Education Research Group at UCLA, I continue to draw on it. In *Reforming Higher Education*, Kogan and Hanney (2000) analyse the shifting values and governance structures, and the significant continuities that define 20 years of policy changes in UK higher education. One of the key subheadings in the concluding chapter is "Exceptionalism, continuity, and change"; Kogan and Hanney identify four features of continuity amidst changes in the British higher education landscape. The in-depth understanding of the phenomena at hand is grounded in 300+ interviews. Kogan's comparative work is similarly situated in extensive

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 11-28.

local knowledge: this book is part of a three-country study, with teams of colleagues in Norway and Sweden utilising compatible research frames to develop their own accounts, and later a comparative volume (Kogan et al., 2000). Thus, Kogan provides insights into the particularities of national higher education systems, and the enduring values about knowledge that affect and are enacted in governance across systems. For him, the modus operandi and the goal are inductively derived understandings, which he distinguishes from the approach of Dutch higher education scholars:

> In the social arena, the data emerge in topological rather than progressive arrangements. Whilst we can certainly look for juxtapositions and thematic comparisons, and attempt to find causal explanations, we will be strapping ourselves into an unnecessary bed of nails if we try to direct our research on the basis of prestructured hypotheses. … It is wrong to assume that without hypothesising there is no theorising. (Kogan & Hanney, 2000: 21)

Kogan draws on theory eclectically to inform and clarify the particular patterns that he observes. In doing so, he offers a profoundly important stance in comparative work.

The work that I present for this *festschrift* pays homage to Maurice in several regards. First, as Maurice's work has underscored the importance of the particular and the empirical in providing common comparisons within and across national settings, in this chapter I explore distinctive local continuities amidst similar neo-liberal changes that are unfolding globally. Shifts or translations between neo-liberal changes at the international, national, regional, and local levels are addressed. By neo-liberal changes I mean both formal policies and underlying conceptions that in education involve reducing public sectors, decreasing public subsidies, increasing evaluation, monitoring, and competition, and increasing tuition fees and privatisation. In the neo-liberal model, the private sector market is valorised and promoted. Managerial influence within organisations is enhanced. Students are framed as consumers, and as flows of human capital to be productively processed. Public sector entities are encouraged to more closely intersect with and model themselves on private sector enterprises. A narrow, economic role of revenue generation and contribution to the corporate economy is emphasised for educational institutions. And private models of education are promoted. As a scholar from the U.S., which has a strong private higher education sector, one of the themes I develop relates to conceptualisations and roles of public and private universities.

Second, as with Maurice's analytical focus, in this chapter I focus on values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance, applying these concerns to the substantive areas of U.S. and Mexican higher education, and featuring important neo-liberal developments in each. In the realm of values, I discuss how if histori-

cally universities in some countries were nation-building institutions, now they are increasingly nation-positioning institutions in a globally competitive marketplace. That role necessarily features, in neo-liberal style, the economic functions of universities, and thus of knowledge, although these may be differentially specified in different national contexts. In the realm of conceptions of knowledge, I discuss how, if historically universities in some countries have been seen as a source of significant national knowledge, now they are increasingly being evaluated according to the significance of their knowledge in the global economy. Part of the neo-liberal model is to encourage closer connections between higher education and the economy and to emphasise the value of knowledge that can potentially generate revenue in the private and global marketplace. This has tended to mean a reduced emphasis on basic relative to applied fields (and on the arts, humanities, and social sciences, which often are grounded in the particular cultures of countries, relative to the natural sciences), and an increased investment in fields like biotechnology and information sciences in which the boundaries between fundamental and applied research are relatively blurred. So I outline some of the choices that we find across countries in the local, national, and global applications to which universities orient their knowledge. Finally, in the realm of models of governance, I discuss how, if historically universities have been shaped by senior academics, now they are increasingly being shaped by academic managers and non-academic professionals, in ways that substantially vary cross-nationally. Again, my position as a scholar in the U.S. shapes my discussion. In examining governance issues I concentrate on the department and campus levels of analysis rather than on state and federal boards, systems and ministries. Thus in developing the theme of the contrast between public policy and discourse and private practice, I emphasise the inner lives of departments and contrast that to the public postures of universities.

In short, then, I feature significant commonalities and variations in the neo-liberal directions being pursued in higher education systems and institutions. And I speak to the above analytical foci in the context of three general research projects in which I have been involved. The first is a project supported by the National Science Foundation that focused on entrepreneurial activity at the department level of public research universities in the U.S. (Leslie, Oaxaca & Rhoades, 1999). The second is a set of doctoral dissertations I chaired focusing on neo-liberal policies stemming partly from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in Mexican public universities in three different fields of study – business, engineering, and women's studies (Acosta, 1998; Bracamontes, 2003; Saunders, 2003). The third is a project that is in its initial stages; its aim is to focus on differences between public and private sectors in Mexico versus the U.S. Rather than seeking to provide a comparison of Mexico and the U.S. on key dimensions, my aim is to draw on material from these two national contexts to develop the themes. Notably, all three projects are

joint endeavours, as is so often the case with Maurice's comparative work. And this is a third way that I pay homage to Maurice's work, his emphasis on extensive empirical projects conducted with various colleagues.

I further try to pay homage to Maurice in a fourth way, stylistically. In introducing sections of the paper, I offer a quote from Maurice's writings to convey one of the three key analytical themes – the major features of Kogan's scholarship. In addition, I start each of the sections with a brief vignette to express the principal issues being addressed. Maurice is an excellent raconteur, and satirist, with all the attention to the details and ironies of life that go with that. Though I am unable to adequately replicate and mimic these qualities, I offer, by way of entrée to the cases, a concrete rendering of what Maurice has called the "inner life of institutions" (Kogan, 1984).

Finally, I close with some thoughts about patterns of neo-liberalism in higher education that in important regards take us beyond some of the boundaries that I believe are ingrained within Kogan's work. I do this in part because Maurice himself (Kogan, 1996) has called for the pursuit of new approaches in comparative higher education. I do it also because I know that for Maurice one of the greatest forms of flattery is not imitation but the effort to build on and modify the foundation he has established.

ENTREPRENEURIALISM AND DEPARTMENTS IN U.S. PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

The inner life of institutions becomes more complex as they attempt to reconcile collegiality, managerialism, popularism, and many, often conflicting, forms of participation. (Kogan, 1984: 60)

Much has been written about entrepreneurial universities (Clark, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). But most of what has been written concentrates on research, on patents and technology transfer. Far less has attended to the internal realities of academic departments, probing the concrete realities of research and teaching in the context of a managerial push to connect more extensively with private industry and to generate more revenue. The general policy trends are clear and overwhelming, representing an extraordinary external stimulus. But what is less clear is what is happening internally at the level of the basic "production" unit. In this section I explore what Clark (1998) has referred to as the "academic heartland" of discipline based academic departments.

The narrative story-lines of two department heads capture some significant themes that emerged in an interview based study of 131 heads in science and engineering at public research universities (Leslie, Rhoades & Oaxaca, 1999). The first story-line speaks to a level of uncertainty amidst a broad range of demands that are

raining down on academic departments from within and outside the university. As one head of computer science indicated, he was unable to get any sense of priorities from central administrators. They just want faculty members to do more, with less; to get more federal grant monies and to obtain private sector support for their research; to publish more articles and to patent their work; to teach larger numbers of undergraduates, and to ensure that larger numbers graduate; to address different learning styles of students, and to use instructional technology in the classroom. And to reach out to the community. From his perspective, the inner life of the institution reflected a confusion or just an undifferentiated and, he felt, unrealistic demand for more.

A second department head's story-line offers another perspective. He was clearly angry and upset about a shift in federal and institutional priorities that did not serve his unit well. As he said, the Cold War had ended, and Department of Defense and National Science Foundation support for basic research in mathematics was declining. The institution wanted faculty to pursue private sector contracts, but there was little possibility of that, he felt, in the case of faculty members in his department. The one opportunity structure that existed was in the realm of mathematical education, which infuriated him. He complained vigorously about the "educationists" who, he felt, had at that point taken over the National Science Foundation and were emphasising grants that addressed mathematics and science education at the undergraduate and secondary school level. Although aware that the rules of the game had changed, this head was less interested in strategically moving to address new opportunities than he was in decrying the new directions.

Many department heads that were interviewed for this project had undertaken various entrepreneurial efforts to generate revenues for their unit. But the two that I describe above express key patterns and themes that emerged. First, the responses of heads to the changing fiscal realities of public universities were uneven, and in some sense almost unrelated to the pressures that were being applied by central academic managers (Rhoades, 2000). There was clearly a changed model of governance in these institutions. At the campus level, universities were adopting forms of incentive based budgeting (Leslie et al., 2002) and seeking in managerial style to more strategically focus their resources, leading departments to be more accountable for their productivity, and to compete with each other for institutional resources. These more managerially led resource allocation and strategic planning mechanisms were clearly, in the eyes of department heads, a response to state boards and legislatures that were demanding greater accountability from public enterprises, even as they were becoming less willing to provide public subsidy to universities that were not sufficiently attentive to productivity. Yet it was far from clear that the public discourse and policy of increased managerial pressure from multiple sources in central administration (provost, president, and various vice-presidents) (e.g., for research,

undergraduate affairs, and development) and in state government were generating a consistent, clear, and strategic response in the actual practices of department heads.

In some ways, many heads were involved in seeking to strategically position their units to obtain more resources, externally and from the central administration. The orientation of these efforts was largely one of national competition among similar departments, or competition on campus with related departments. Yet in contrast to what I note later with regard to Mexican universities, there was little sense at the departmental level of being part of an enterprise that had a significant national role.

In terms of conceptions of knowledge, two important themes emerged. First, with regard to research knowledge, although there was evidence of a shift towards research and knowledge that would intersect with and pay off in the private sector, there was little evidence of a significant shift to applied research, or research geared to private sector needs. Departments and their heads were very much connected to their disciplines and to the status structure of those disciplines. There continued to be a marked preference in review processes for federal grant money over support from the private sector, in part because the former was seen as a proxy measure of quality, because it was peer reviewed. However, within fields, there was a clear push not only publicly from the institution but also privately from department heads and professional peers, to generate more grant revenue, partly in order to supplement increasingly insufficient monies allocated from the state. Virtually all departments were being forced to support their basic activities with monies that they had generated on their own. Between fields, there was also clear evidence of a shift in the kinds of scientific knowledge being valued by the institution. With the end of the Cold War, the favoured status of physics and mathematics, with their massive subsidies from various federal agencies, was on the decline. And with the rise of the new economy, fields such as computer science and various biomedical and biotechnology fields, which were seen as having direct payoffs in the commercial sector, were the focus of institutional investment. The humanities, fine arts, and social sciences were not even part of this calculus.

A second theme had to do with education knowledge. In this realm, department heads and faculty seemed much more willing to explicitly orient the curriculum to considerations of the marketplace. That applied particularly to the development of new programmes and degrees to target particular student markets. Most telling here was the development of thesis free "professional masters" programmes, largely as a way of attracting more working students from the business world. In several ways, moving in this direction runs counter to traditional academic norms: the focus is on masters, not doctoral students; this particular graduate curriculum breaks with standard practice by relaxing requirements, such as that students must do a thesis; and the target population is part-time students. In each of these ways, the actual educational practices of discipline based departments were changing in ways that reflected

neo-liberal conceptions of knowledge and of students. Ironically, there were few institutional incentives, and some disincentives, for departments to move in this direction. Nevertheless, we found considerable evidence of educational or instructional entrepreneurialism. Thus, the local translation of entrepreneurial activity varied significantly by the realm of the work, a finding that is consistent with international research on this topic, which points to a diversity of forms of academic capitalism, and various sources of resistance (Ylijoki, 2003; Jansen, 2002).

However, at this point I must introduce another proviso pointing to the significance of local specification of macro patterns. My study of department heads focused on discipline based departments. Yet much of the entrepreneurial action lies outside these realms, in newly created academic and non-academic units. Indeed, the pattern of "academic capitalism and the new economy" (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) is investment in the internal managerial capacity to develop and market various intellectual products. That generally means going outside the traditional academic units and constructing new sorts of units, bypassing traditional structures of academic governance. As Kogan suggests in the quote that opens this section, the complexity of the inner life of academic settings is such that it calls for in-depth specification of these larger patterns. At this point, my findings would not suggest that there has been a shift to, in Gibbons et al.'s words (1994), a "Mode 2" form of organisation. Instead, significant shifts have occurred within existing departments. It remains to be seen how far other organisational units further reflect these patterns, and take on the more stable character of traditional departments or the more flexible form of "Mode 2" knowledge production.

NEO-LIBERAL POLICIES IN MEXICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

There is perhaps no other zone of activity [as higher education] where the foci of concern are so public and the modes of operation so private (Kogan, 1984: 56)

Over the past fifteen years, several countries in Latin America have introduced a range of higher education policies that can be described as neo-liberal (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002). That has meant delimiting public expenditures on higher education, emphasising privatisation in various forms, including an increasingly close connection between universities and industry, demanding greater accountability for performance and quality, and treating higher education increasingly as a private good that should be paid for by the customer. Within the past five years I have worked with three doctoral students whose dissertations have focused on the ways in which such neo-liberal policy changes at the national level have translated into changes within universities, in business, engineering, and women's studies. In part, that work stemmed from my own experience in 1998 in giving an invited address to

the Faculty of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering at the Universidad Autonoma de Nueva Leon (UANL), one of the most important public research universities outside of the top public university in the country, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de México (UNAM), in Mexico City. The topic of the talk, and of the conference, was "International Trends in Higher Education". During the course of my brief visit I was struck by the significant disjuncture between the public discourse about globalisation and the university integrating into and preparing its students for the high tech, global, information economy, and the private realities that surrounded these efforts, as the ensuing vignette suggests.

Two disjunctures were particularly striking. One had to do with language. The other had to do with technology. My presentation at Nueva Leon was simultaneously translated, in a new university library facility that was both aesthetically stunning and extraordinarily high tech. Although part of the engineering faculty's public claim and aim to intersect with the global economy was that students and staff be conversant in English, it was clear in my private conversations with a range of people that most professors and students had very limited English skills. Remarkably, the faculty was proud of having just hired a young European professor, who also presented at the conference; he spoke no Spanish, and his heavily accented English was very difficult even for me to understand as a native speaker. When I asked about how students would understand this professor's lectures and teaching, I was told that it would be fine because they needed to be literate in English, and would follow his lectures in English texts. My sense of the disjuncture between publicly expressed and privately realised linguistic capacities was matched by a sense of technological disjuncture as well. The facility in which I spoke was fabulous. Yet, in working group discussions of engineering faculty members, one of the major topics of discussion and concern was the lack of access to computers and to the Internet. UANL is one of the leading public research universities in Mexico. But many professors in the faculty of mechanical and electrical engineering lacked basic technology.

Some European scholars, including Kogan, have underscored in their work the robustness of the academic community's norms and values, which in some sense buffers it against the interventions and effects of national public policy (Premfors, 1980). The case of neo-liberalism in Mexican higher education policy highlights two other important dimensions of this gap between public policy and private practice. The first is evident in the above vignette. The gap in Mexico between the public policy claims and efforts in regard to neo-liberalism and the on the ground realities of practice have to do in considerable part with the concrete material conditions that delimit various possibilities.

A second dimension contributing to the disjuncture between neo-liberal policy and practice has to do with the historical values and social role of universities in Mexico, and is evidenced in two of the dissertations I have chaired. Each point to

the significance of Mexican universities as national and nationalistic entities. Particularly among public universities, there endures a very real commitment to a role of enhancing Mexico politically and economically, something that is not found in the U.S., and was entirely lacking in the discourse and strategies of department heads there. That commitment colours and underlies (and in some cases undermines) the commitment of Mexican academics to an international orientation in curricular practices, to demonstrate that their students can compete with the best and that their institutions are high quality universities.

Two of the dissertations I have chaired focused on the playing out of neo-liberal policies on particular fields of Mexican higher education – engineering and business. The rationale and issues in the first case were, as engineering, and particularly civil engineering, have historically been the most prestigious fields of study in Mexican universities, how has the curriculum of engineering reflected the effects of globalisation and neo-liberalism (Saunders, 2003)? The rationale and issues in the case of business education were, similarly, how have the curricula of departments in this field, which is explicitly linked to the economy, been affected by globalisation (Acosta, 1998)?

Engineering professors and deans expressed what Saunders (2003) called a "muted nationalism". For them, dependence on U.S. texts and technology was a concrete reality, so taken for granted that it was not really a source of resistance or resentment. At the same time, Mexican academics articulated a commitment to their role in positioning their country in the regional and global economy that expressed a very real sense of nationalism. Universities have long been central cultural institutions in Mexico; indeed, they were a central institution in building the nation, as was true historically of many continental European and Scandinavian countries (Valimaa, 2001). Mexican academics in engineering also articulated their commitment to a broad social role in enhancing educational and economic opportunity within the country, a broad conception of knowledge and the social role of higher education not likely to be found among engineering professors in the U.S. Amidst this continuity with the past, however, was the current reality that Mexican universities were trying to intersect with multinational corporations. Underemployment among graduates was a major problem; the most elite programmes were those that had formed networks with multinationals and were preparing students for such employment. Thus, a much more narrowly economic conception and measure of good education was gaining significance.

A similar pattern was emerging in the case of business education, with the effect of heightened stratification among higher education institutions, particularly between publics and privates. In the process, conceptions of knowledge were changing, though at different rates in different sectors. In comparing four public and private university business departments, Acosta (1998) found that publics were less

aggressive in internationalising their curricula and emphasising the learning and use of English. Their orientation was to relieving financial stress and fostering economic development in the local and regional setting, though of course that economic stress was in part a function of Mexico's position in the global and regional economy. Yet, for faculty in these units the historical social role of Mexican universities continued to define their conceptions of what knowledge and functions were essential, making for considerable continuity amidst changes in the neo-liberal direction. By contrast, the curriculum of private university departments reflected much more the influence of international, and particularly U.S., topics and ideas. And the use of English was much more emphasised in these settings, as was employment in multinational corporations. Nationally, these universities have become increasingly important and powerful, changing the stratification between public and private higher education sectors, particularly in terms of undergraduate education.

In some sense, the ascendance of private universities is forcing publics to respond, and increasingly to emphasise connections with private industry. Historically, publics have been much more linked to the government and to public sector employment. That is beginning to change, slowly, particularly at the level of postgraduate education and research (Leyva, 2001).

Thus, for all the continuities in public universities, neo-liberal policies are having an effect on concrete practices, administratively and academically. A third dissertation that I have recently chaired focused on women's studies departments in Mexican universities (Bracamontes, 2003). One of the key findings of this work was that the so-called New Public Management in Mexican higher education has affected the ways in which faculty are evaluated and rewarded, with implications for the sort of academic work they do. Many of the feminist faculty interviewed for the study contrasted the work they had been able to do in the early years of their departments with what they felt was necessary more recently. With this new model of management had come an increased emphasis on productivity, on publishing in English language journals, and on getting external project funding, which had led them to redirect their energies in terms of academic curriculum and programmes, research, and their service. As a result, their work was increasingly moving away from local problems and populations to address topics that resonated more with international audiences in their field. For them, the private, inner life of the institution was being reshaped by public policy.

A final example here is helpful by way of further illustration and of providing a segue to the next section. Part of the public policy commitment to a more efficient model of management in Mexican higher education is a programme that allocates resources to universities to promote the professional development of their administrative (and professorial) staffs. That can effectively translate into financial support for staff to pursue certificates (diplomados) or advanced degrees, often in the form

of collective agreements with universities in the U.S., Canada, and Europe. Thus, my Center for the Study of Higher Education is forming partnerships with Mexican public universities to provide workshops and certificates, and to facilitate administrators and faculty in Mexican universities getting advanced degrees in Higher Education.

Ironically, the above sorts of arrangement can reflect a neo-liberal emphasis on managerial efficiency and a pattern of private sector, "free market" stratification that advantages the already advantaged. They involve transferring resources from Mexican higher education, which is relatively poor, to foreign universities and systems that are relatively wealthy. Thus, part of the aim of my Center's partnerships is to establish more mutually beneficial relations and exchanges not only between our Center and Mexican universities, but also among Mexican universities themselves. Our aim is to establish a different local pattern and effect of neo-liberalism.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR DISTINCTIONS IN MEXICO VS. THE U.S.

In conclusion, it has been the aim of this paper to demonstrate that the comparative method does not only consist of testing pre-established hypotheses. In addition, the comparative method can be used as "a mode of locating and exploring a phenomenon as yet insufficiently understood" (Castles, 1989: 9). (Kogan, 1996: 401)

In analysing the structure and governance of higher education systems internationally, some scholars have offered comparative case studies of private sectors in higher education (Geiger, 1988; Levy, 1986). Over time, these sectors have become increasingly significant. To a considerable extent, the neo-liberal policies alluded to in the previous section promoted and privileged private higher education sectors in systems that have long been characterised by the dominance of the public sector. Currently I am in the process of undertaking, with a Mexican colleague in the Center, an exploration and analysis of the ways in which the public/private sector distinctions in Mexico are fundamentally different from those in the United States. The work has important connections to the ways in which we understand public policy and private practice in this realm. Yet, even as I begin to outline the contours of some of those differences, I want also to underscore some interesting and ironic similarities. Both emerged at a recent meeting hosted by my Center and attended by ten representatives of public and private Mexican universities. The purpose of the meeting was to establish partnerships among the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education and Mexican universities, towards the end of conducting joint research projects, academic programme cooperation at the graduate level, and professional development workshops and activities.

Two exchanges at the meeting captured essential differences and similarities not only between the public and private higher education sectors in Mexico, but also between the nation's leading public university, UNAM, and state universities throughout the country. The first exchange was over dinner, after a full day of discussions. As the conversation unfolded an interesting pattern emerged. On one topic after another it was clear that there were fundamental divergences between the parties at the table. It was also clear that those divergences were organised largely by institutional affiliation, breaking down by public versus private sector, and by UNAM versus one of the state universities (in Puebla) that has begun to adopt policies that make it increasingly like a private university – capping enrolments and seeking to increase the quality of the student body. For the most part, the topics had little directly to do with education, although one of the most heated exchanges revolved around "the social role and responsibility of higher education". But other topics ranged from foreign policy (specifically, Fidel Castro and the Vicente Fox administration's decision to support the U.S. heightened restrictions on travel to Cuba) to sports to music. Jokingly I suggested a switch of topics to films: one of the representatives from a private university laughed and referred to the recent Mel Gibson movie, The Passion of Christ. The entire table broke out in laughter, realising that "the Church" was yet another topic on which the parties fundamentally disagreed. The representatives from the secular private universities were largely practising Catholics, whereas the public representatives, particularly the one from UNAM, were passionate about the problems of the church as a social institution.

The second exchange was during the presentations of the Mexican universities, in which they briefly described their activities in relation to the field of higher education. In one presentation after another, it was clear that the Mexicans had advanced far beyond U.S. universities in their use of technology in instruction. One representative, Jaime, from a public university discussed how at his institution they were building their own computers and instructional platforms. However, they still had a contract with a U.S. company, BlackBoard, which provided the general instructional platform that was used by most faculty. "Are you planning on marketing the technology you develop to other universities in Mexico?" I asked. When he shrugged "No," I asked, "But why do you remain technologically and economically dependent on a U.S. company for your platform when you have the capacity and sophistication to develop your own technology, and to do so in a language and in a way that is tailored to your particular needs?" A representative from a leading private university interjected, "You don't want to do that. We have developed our own platform, and it is terrible. We are constantly revising and re-engineering it, always looking to improve it. It's a project that is never done." Then I asked him, "Does your institution market this technology in Mexico, or in Latin America?" Like the public university representative, Enrique shook his head, "No. We still rely mostly

on BlackBoard," he said. Although his institution was a very successful private university, and generated its own revenue from tuition, fund raising, and from a nationwide lottery, SorteoTec, the idea of commodifying the instructional technology was not part of their calculus, despite the fact that they had been working on their high tech, instructional model for nearly a decade. Similarities amidst profound differences.

One of the leading scholars of higher education in Latin America is Dan Levy, like Kogan a political scientist. Levy (1986) has written about private sectors in Latin America generally, and in Mexico in particular. As a postdoctoral researcher at the time with Burton Clark, Levy's analysis is based on a set of structures by which he compares various national systems – finance, structure, and governance. In each of these regards he details the extensive differences between the public and private sectors of Mexican higher education. Indeed, he opens his discussion by stating that "There may be no national system of higher education anywhere with more salient private-public distinctiveness" (Levy, 1986:114). He summarises his findings by characterising the gap between the two sectors as "wide and deep." And he counsels against drawing comparisons to the private sector in the U.S., which is fundamentally different. Yet despite Levy's thorough treatment of dramatic differences between the two sectors, there is a distanced, disembodied characterisation of the sectors that does not capture the deep-seated competition and even hostility between them. Instead, Levy analyses them as two separate systems. Put in the context of Kogan's analytical interest in values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance, I offer a different rendering of the two sectors.

Part of the depth of the contest between the public and private sectors in Mexico has to do with what is at stake. The dominant public university in Mexico, UNAM, has played a central role in building and defining the nation, politically and culturally. The interconnection between UNAM and the government in Mexico has historically been very tight (Ordorika, 2002). However, in recent years, UNAM's dominance has been waning. Indeed, with the election of Vicente Fox, private university leaders have gained increased policy influence vis-à-vis the government. The battle between publics and privates in Mexico is not so much a competition over research resources or students, as it is in the U.S. (at least in the elite sector); rather, it is a battle over who defines the orientation and structure and purpose of higher education nationally over the coming years. Leading universities in Mexico have a key national policy role. They are nation-positioning institutions in a way that universities in the U.S. simply are not. And they are nation positioning institutions in terms of a political and cultural role, not just an economic one.

Given the dramatic differences in function between the public and private sectors in Mexico, one might also expect dramatic differences in conceptions of knowledge. Elite privates are largely about undergraduate education, in contrast to U.S.

elite privates, which are deeply invested in graduate education and research. Over 80% of the research nationally is done in publics. And, as Levy has detailed, there is considerable difference between the sectors in terms of the fields of study they offer. Yet there are some interesting ironies here. In contrast to the U.S., where publics are increasingly moving to be more like privates, in Mexico, the largest private university system, Monterrey Tec, is expanding its activities to include the focus of elite public universities on doctoral education and research. And as the vignette with which I opened this section suggests, privates are less focused on the commodification of knowledge than might be expected. Further, although they adopt different approaches to how to handle the goal, institutions in both sectors are oriented to some form of social service for students, with an explicit emphasis on social responsibility that is unusual in a neo-liberal world. So amidst the sharp competition and deep differences, there are some important continuities and commonalities among Mexican higher education institutions.

Public and private universities also differ substantially in terms of models of governance. Private universities are far more managerial at the campus level but less dependent on state ministries, from which they receive little direct support. At the campus level, public universities have elected administrative positions, and the elections can be highly politicised. However, professorial influence is substantially reduced by the fact that over two thirds of teaching staff nationally are part-time. And the institutions are almost entirely dependent on the state ministry for financial support. In both sectors there is a shared trend towards emphasising productivity, accountability/quality assurance and efficiency, and in the public sector that trend is incentivised through the availability of ministry monies for institutions that have programmes for improving the education and efficiency of their administrative staff. Even as the competition between sectors is heightened, there is some common movement towards more managerial models of higher education administration, though these are specified very differently and to greatly varying extents, in different public universities.

CONCLUSION

Which issues should a fully developed political science of higher education tackle? We may group the issues in either of two ways: by themes that emerge at all or at most points in the political system, or by levels of the system. Since the texture of the politics of higher education changes markedly as we move from one level to another, I take the analysis through three levels: the intrainstitutional; the relationship between institutions and the larger polity; and politics at the centre. (Kogan, 1984: 62)

In providing a brief closing discussion of comparative studies of governance, policy, and change in higher education, I look to move beyond some of the boundaries in Kogan's scholarship. The most significant of these is the concept of a political system, which is largely bounded by the nation state. In addition, there is the concept of separate systems within a country – the profession, state, and marketplace – as expressed in Clark's (1983) triangle model of governance, or Becher and Kogan's (1992) modification of it. To fully understand the neo-liberal changes in higher education that have been discussed above, one must look beyond the nation-state to regional and global agencies and agency (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). Moreover, one must look within national systems and recognise the increasing permeation of boundaries between markets, states, and higher education institutions.

At the same time, with a bow to Maurice, I close by stressing the significance of distinctive local continuities amidst neo-liberal changes, the comparative importance of the particular. In his famous essay, "Science as a Vocation", Max Weber indicated that the role of the social scientist is to point out inconvenient facts (Gerth & Mills, 1946: 147). Maurice Kogan is a master of probing for and seeing the differences among the commonalities in comparative higher education. Thus, even as I look to go beyond the boundaries of his work, I also seek to probe the patterns for the locally defined premises and foundations of higher education policy and practice.

As I have suggested elsewhere (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002:285), "Scholars note the prominence of neo-liberal reforms across nations, but there is little theorising about or empirical analysis of the inter-national and/or regional agencies and activities through which these common policy changes are effected…" Various sorts of agencies and collective activity at the regional or global level can come into play in higher education policy and practice. Some connect to various professional groups in the academy. For example, many professional associations have memberships that cut across national boundaries, leading to a circulation of ideas and influence among national systems. Moreover, professionals often move across national boundaries as consultants. Thus, in analysing the percolation of quality assurance mechanisms across national boundaries, Barbara Sporn and I (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002) traced some of the professional mechanisms in Europe, as U.S. ideas about accreditation and quality were "translated" by scholars and policy makers in the UK and the Netherlands, and then further translated into practice from one country to another, according to their particular values and governance structures. These and other professional mechanisms are probably important in developing countries as well; for instance, many professionals in Third World nations have been educated in the West, providing another avenue for ideas to circulate internationally.

Other sorts of agencies and collective activities are also of much importance in shaping higher education policy and practice internationally. In studies of Second

and Third World countries, students of globalisation and critical scholars often focus on the World Bank's dominating influence on policy in education (e.g., see Kempner & Jurema, 2002; Mollis & Marginson, 2002). In tracing such international agencies' influence, it is also important to examine how their activities intersect with and are supported by the collective efforts of various national and local players. Thus, for example, a colleague at the Center has explored the role of key higher education groups and national policy makers in Mexico in locally interpreting, translating, modifying, and specifying the pressures of international agencies such as the World Bank, the Ford Foundation, and the Interamerican Development Bank (Maldonado-Maldonado, 2003; 2004). She has also pointed to the significance of the work of OECD, which norms and thereby influences policies not only in Western Europe but in Mexico as well.

To fully understand the changing governance patterns that Maurice Kogan has so ably detailed, then, it is necessary to go beyond the boundary of the nation state, to the regional and global political economies, and agencies and agents that act and exercise influence within them. Yet it is also necessary to trace the mechanisms by which those regional and global influences are played out at the local level.

So, too, within national systems and institutions. It is necessary to go beyond the boundaries that have defined much of the analysis in comparative higher education scholarship, including that of Kogan. Much of the analysis surrounding entrepreneurial universities (Clark, 1998) has to do with the shifting balance of states, markets, and higher education institutions. For the most part, these are conceptualised as separate institutional realms and systems, as indicated by different points on the triangle heuristic of Clark, and of Becher and Kogan. Yet these boundaries are becoming increasingly permeable and difficult to define. Rather than categorising where systems and institutions lie according to particular boundaries, it might be useful to begin to trace the movement of higher education institutions, units, academics, and academic managers back and forth across these boundaries, nationally and globally (universities are, after all, international agencies and actors). Different parts of the very same university may encompass and express a different range, balance, and mix of entrepreneurial and "traditional" academic behaviours in research, teaching, and service. Indeed, that is an understanding that emerged inductively out of my study of department heads and faculty, and it is a central feature of the thesis and theory that Sheila Slaughter and I have developed in "Academic capitalism and the new economy" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). It is precisely that different balance and mix of elements that makes it so essential to locally specify the concrete manifestations of academic capitalism.

As a comparative higher education scholar, then, I am struck by the global advance of neo-liberal policies in higher education systems. Recognising that general pattern, I want to look beyond some of the boundaries of Maurice Kogan's scholar-

ship to understand what is shaping and promoting that general pattern. At the same time, a major part of what I see as important in this global pattern is what it means by way of values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance in higher education. And sharpened by Maurice's insights with regard to continuities amidst the change, and seeking to emulate his interest in the concrete realities of that pattern, I look to distinctive local continuities at the institutional level, in case studies with thick description. I thereby appreciate and try to express in my work a fundamental feature of Maurice's, the comparative importance of the particular.

REFERENCES

Acosta, J. (1998). NAFTA, *Globalization, and Higher Education Departments of Business Administration: Case Studies From Northwestern Mexico*. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Becher, T.& Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* Second edition. London: Routledge.

Bracamontes, A. (2003). *Feminist Academics in Mexican Universities: Social Origins, Institutional Experiences, and Social Activism*. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* Oxford: IAU Press and Pergamon.

Geiger, R.L. (1988). "Public and private sectors in higher education: A comparison of international patterns." *Higher Education* 17, 699-711.

Gerth, H. H. & Mills, C. W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

Jansen, J. D. (2002). "Mode 2 knowledge and institutional life: Taking Gibbons on a walk through a South African university". *Higher Education,* 43(4), 507-21.

Kempner, K. & Jurema, A. L. (2002). "The global politics of education: Brazil and the World Bank". *Higher Education,* 43(3), 331-54.

Kogan, M. (1996). "Comparing higher education systems". *Higher Education,* 32(4), 395-402.

Kogan, M., with Edward Boyle & Anthony Crosland (1971) *The Politics of Education*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M.. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Leslie, L., Oaxaca, R., & Rhoades, G. (2002). "Revenue Flux and University Behavior". In Priest, D., Becker, W., Hossler, D. & St. John E. (eds.). *Incentive Based Budgeting Systems in Public Universities*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 55-92.

Leslie, L., Rhoades, G. & Oaxaca, R. (1999). *Effects of Changing Revenue Patterns on Public Research Universities*. A report to the National Science Foundation. Grant number 9628325.

Levy, D. (1986). *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leyva, S. L. (2001). *La Vinculación de las Instituciones de Educación Superior con el Sector Productivo en el Noroeste de México*. Culiacán: Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa.

Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2003). "Investigación Sobre Organismos Internacionales a Partir de 1990 en México". In Ducoing, P. (ed.) *La Investigación Educativa en México. "Sujetos, Actores y Procesos de Formación", Formación para la Investigación. Los Académicos en México, Actores y Organizaciones*. México: COMIE-SEP-CESU.

Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2004). The Influence of International Organizations in the Field of Higher Education in Latin America: The Analysis of One Epistemic Community in Mexico. Doctoral dissertation, Boston College.

Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002). "Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic". *Higher Education,* 43(3), 281-309.

Mollis, M. & Marginson, S. (2002). "The assessment of universities in Argentina and Australia: Between autonomy and heteronomy". *Higher Education,* 43(3),311-30.

Ordorika, I. (2002). *Power and Politics in University Governance: Organization and Change at the National Autonomous University of Mexico.* London: Routledge.

Premfors, R. (1980). *The Politics of Higher Education in a Comparative Perspective: France, Sweden, United Kingdom*. Studies in Politics 15. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.

Rhoades, G. (2000). "Who's doing it right?: Strategic activity in public research universities". *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 41-66.

Rhoades, G. & Sporn, B. (2002). "Quality assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and political economic framing of higher education policy". *Higher Education*, 43(3),355-90.

Saunders, T. (2003). Faculty Reactions to Globalization and NAFTA in Selected Engineering Departments in a Northern Mexican Urban Area. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

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

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Torres, C. & Schugurensky, D. (2002). "The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective*". Higher Education,* 43(4), 429-55.

Valimaa, Jussi (ed). (2001). *Finnish Higher Education in Transition: Perspectives on Massification and Globalisation*. Jyvaskyla: Institute for Educational Research.

Ylijoki, O-H. (2003). "Entangled in academic capitalism?: A case study on changing ideals and practices of university research". *Higher Education*¸ 45(3), 307-35.

PART 1: GOVERNANCE

3

HIGHER EDUCATION IN TIMES OF DISCONTENT?

About Trust, Authority, Price and Some Other Unholy Trinities

JÜRGEN ENDERS

INTRODUCTION

Change, it has been said, is part of the pleasure and challenge of social science studies of contemporary society. Of course, change is there – everywhere and at every time. But, from time to time, we experience more far-reaching changes and more dynamic forces within societal development. Traditional structures tend to decline, long-standing boundaries tend to be blurred, and blisters appear on what was once thought of as a stable regulatory order. We cannot know if this means another step in an evolutionary process or if it will turn out to be a quantum leap into another social order. But we can study processes and stages of co-evolutionary developments and transformations even under conditions of what has been called “Die neue Unübersichtlichkeit” (Habermas, 1985). From my point of view, the study of the modern university as we know it is very much about this: a university finding itself in a complicated and sometimes delicate process of societal change. A "wandering university" in search of a new or renewed place in society that is part and parcel of an ongoing transformation. This is so for very good reasons.

Universities are organisations that, in all societies, perform basic functions resulting from the particular combination of educational and scientific, social and economic, cultural and ideological roles assigned to them. They are multi-purpose or multi-product organisations that contribute to the production and application of knowledge, the training of highly skilled labour forces, the social development and educational upgrading of societies, the selection and formation of elites and the generation and transmission of ideology. These are the key functions of higher education systems, albeit with different emphases depending on the national context, the historical period, the specific sector and indeed the organisation concerned. What is clear, though, is that nowadays, universities are heavily involved in literally every kind of social and economic activity in our increasingly dynamic and knowledge-

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 31-48.

driven societies. This is but one of the factors that make the university such an interesting social institution to study. At the same time it makes universities rather vulnerable organisations, loaded with multiple and growing expectations as to their role and functioning. A system theory of functional differentiation gives good reason to argue that the university belongs to the species of modern organisation that is over complex and under differentiated.

It can further be argued that there is no longer a single society to which a university can be expected to respond. Instead, there are now governments and managements, academics and students, labour markets and industries, professions and occupations, status groups and reference groups, communities and localities, and the dis-localities of the "global". In other words, the erosion of the traditional *contrat social* between university, government and society is at stake, as is the revision of the vision of the university. Such revisions have been represented in various ways – as the rise of the "service university" (Tjeldvoll, 1997), the emergence of the university as a "corporate enterprise" (Bleiklie, 1994) or "entrepreneurial university" (Clark, 1998), the concept of the university as a "learning organisation" (Dill, 1999) and the 'network university' (Dill and Sporn, 1995). Interestingly enough these conceptualisations of the modern university borrow their terminology from a growing variety of shorthand labels recently developed to conceptualise the transformation of our modern society. As yet, none can claim a firm or exclusive empirical base.. It remains to be seen whether one of them will survive as a dominant vision of the university and its place in society, or whether the post-Humboldtian university will be characterised by the co-existence of multiple missions and visions. But whatever the short hand title might be, the changing nature and role of knowledge for society seem to be accompanied by changes in universities' relationships with society that are a mixed blessing for their status, function and role (Enders, 2001).

In this light it is clearly of great analytic interest to study the changing relationship between university and society: the old and emerging new modes of coordination in higher education and their underlying rationales, how these are being translated into organisational frameworks and responses, and how they affect the basic functions of universities. Equally, from a normative point of view there is arguably a policy imperative to seek out systems and organisations both solid and dynamic enough to withstand the tensions and dilemmas generated by already evident demands for the simultaneous performance of competing and sometimes contradictory functions (Castells, 2001).

I will attempt to contribute to these debates with two interrelated arguments. First, I want to reflect on the linkages between governance reform in higher education and the issue of public discontent. Large-scale institutional reforms in social service delivery in general and in higher education particularly have frequently been legitimised by statements about the loss of trust in public institutions and their per-

formance. With the problems stated in these terms, management and the market can combine to offer promising solutions: one would centre on the reallocation of authority through strengthening public accountability, the other on strengthening market-type mechanisms of price and competition. Both would help to get "more for less", to raise the quality of services and to restore trust. This well-known argument raises simple, but intriguing questions that have only recently found further attention (Trow 1996; De Boer 2002; Reed 2002): What empirical evidence do we have for a loss of trust in higher education? Who has lost trust? Are institutional reforms in higher education the cure or cause of discontent? And how likely is it that they will help to restore trust?

The second, closely related theme addresses the fact that changes in institutional governance challenge the objectives and goals of the university and its bundle of tasks. Proponents of higher education reform towards management and markets frequently claim that they serve as facilitators of efficiency and effectiveness for higher education's own defined aims and needs. But changes in governance arrangements are not value neutral and reflect attempts to change basic beliefs about the function of higher education and its relationship to society. The circumstances that confront higher education and its relationship to society and the economy certainly suggest that further changes are in the offing that incorporate large portions of the system as well as some of its longstanding basic characteristics. The debate on continuity and change in higher education is certainly not new and can rely on a growing literature on ongoing developments and future directions of the system and its components. The outgrowth of the foregoing analyses may, however, help to shed some new light on the ongoing process of bundling and unbundling in higher education.

TRUST AND DISTRUST IN THE SERVICE STATE

The issue of a lost of trust in higher education is a fascinating one. For one thing, trust is a complex phenomenon that is defined and interpreted in different ways. I want to use trust in probably its broadest sense of confidence in one's expectations (Luhmann, 1979). In this meaning, trust involves a problematic relationship with time. It means behaving as if the future is certain and thus remains in principle a risky undertaking. At the same time, however, it provides an enormously efficient way of dealing with uncertainty and over-complexity (Arrow, 1974). In trusting another party, one treats as certain those aspects of life which would otherwise be clouded by over-complexity. In this sense, trust reduces complex realities far better than authority and price, and can be understood as one of the three major coordinating mechanisms supporting social interaction within uncertain environments. Certainly, trust has to be learned and earned. It may rely on familiarity or social similarity, on past experience and recurrent interactions as well as shared values and norms

(Zucker, 1986). In any case, trust ties the past to present expectations and these to a reliable future. And trust can get lost, which raises the question whether it is possible to find equivalents for the functions it fulfils. "Anyone who merely refuses to confer trust restores the original complexity of the potentialities of the situation . . . Anyone who does not trust must, therefore, turn to functionally equivalent strategies for the reduction of complexity in order to be able to define a practically meaningful situation at all." (Luhmann, 1979: 71).

For another thing, a loss of trust is often spoken or written of as an established fact that has fostered changes in and around higher education. But what exactly does this mean and where is the empirical evidence? Certainly, it suits politicians, faced with fierce fiscal pressures and a greatly expanded higher education system, to claim that there is a groundswell of public opinion demanding change because of a lack of efficiency and effectiveness in the system. But the basis for this claim is unclear, to say the least. We all know about private conversations and public announcements of discontent when it comes to higher education. They sometimes seem to amount to an overall sense of crisis around and within the system. But does that mean that 'system trust', as Luhmann phrased it, the overall public trust in the function and performance of a given societal sub-system, has decreased or even disappeared?

PUBLIC DISCONTENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

One way to try to examine this issue is to have a look at survey data on public confidence in institutions. Major data sources of this kind, like the European Values Survey (see Listhaug & Wilberg, 1995) or OECD data sources, usually do not break down to the level of higher education. They only allow a comparison of public confidence in education with that in other major institutions, like the civil service, major companies or the legal system. It is, however, not possible to demonstrate a simple link between public sector reform in education and citizens' attitudes. In 1981, confidence in the educational system in six Western European countries ranged, for example, from 43 per cent in Germany to 73 per cent in the Netherlands, with Sweden (62 per cent), United Kingdom (60 per cent) and France (57 per cent) somewhere between these countries. It becomes clear that different countries appear in quite different positions.

Ten years later public confidence in the educational system had considerably increased in Germany (+11 per cent), France (+9 per cent) and Sweden (+8 per cent) and declined in countries that were certainly busier with some kind of new public management reform of their educational system, i.e. the Netherlands (-8 per cent) and the United Kingdom (-13 per cent). Further, the respective data sources indicate that in all countries and at both points in time public confidence in the educational system was higher than in the civil service and major companies. In most OECD

countries, public opinion was actually defensive of the major public services – pensions, health care and education – during the last two decades of the twentieth century. In the UK at the height of Mrs. Thatcher's reforms, in New Zealand during the radical changes of the 1980s and early 90s, and even in the US under Reagan, strong popular majorities in favour of these programmes could be found in many opinion polls. Of course, none of this is to deny that individual citizens wanted improvements in particular services. But data indicate that citizens actually have highly sophisticated and differentiated views of public services, and that some of them (e.g. fire services, the police, local hospitals and schools) are often rated more highly than many private sector services (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000). Surveys among students, postgraduates, and academics (see for example Enders & Teichler, 1997; Paul, 2002; Yoshimoto, 2002) tend similarly to show quite differentiated views on the strength and weaknesses of a given higher education system. Obviously, there are critiques and assertions about how it could be improved. But I have not yet seen surveys of that kind that show an overall picture of dissatisfaction amounting to a deep sense of crisis.

Interpretation of broad survey data such as these is, of course, extremely difficult. Macro-level perceptions are not easily reflected at micro-levels. A lot may depend on how questions are phrased, and the broader the questions the more difficult is the interpretation. Moreover, the empirical relevance of such studies for our argument can relatively easily be contested. Confidence or satisfaction is not trust, and subjective measures of that kind are based on expectations that are not usually defined in such surveys. They may be quantitatively and qualitatively different and may well change over time. It is, for example, relatively easy to score high when expectations are already low while a reasonable performance might score low when expectations become inflationary. We cannot ignore the fact that major reforms in public services like higher education influence citizens' and stakeholders' expectations and satisfaction, sometimes in a paradoxical manner. Such reforms share a common problem of major innovations in modern society that are initiated by purposeful political action. They produce high transaction costs in terms of resources and legitimacy. Usually, such reforms search for support via two strategies: an unfair attack on the performance of the 'old' system that systematically over-emphasises its points of weakness, and the promise of a brighter future that systematically over-emphasises what can realistically be achieved through particular reforms. They create a missionary phase that may undermine trust not only in the "old" system but in reforms as well, when their success and failure come to be assessed in the light of their earlier missionary goal statement. There is no easy answer to the question whether loss of trust is the cause of the ongoing re-engineering of higher education or, at least partly, the effect of a public attack by those who are proposing the need for such a re-engineering.

Finally, there may well be changes in what can be called the meta-trust in higher education's benefits for society at large that we do not observe via such surveys at all. This argument concerns changing expectations within society about the contribution of higher education and research to societal welfare and economic well-being. It is not so much about "more of the same" but about qualitatively different expectations, about changing qualification needs and requests for research production and knowledge dissemination. And ultimately, it is about the construction of a different innovation strategy that is no longer based on the traditions of the industrial age. As yet, we lack large-scale international studies that would allow for a differentiated empirical analysis of what has already happened and what might be in the making when it comes to public expectations of the role of higher education in society. Such studies should – among other things – make it possible to control for cohort, age and periodic effects and so to disentangle long-term changes from the short- term impact of certain events and developments over the life-course. We cannot, however, disregard the influence that the discourse of changing expectations of the role of higher education in society and economy has had. That would undermine trust even if higher education scored well according to the traditional expectations.

Procedural distrust or the decline of the professional state

From another point of view, a good case can be made that the trust of political actors in the steering capacities of the "professional state" has suffered and stimulated a search for a new mix of procedural arrangements to run public service sectors like higher education. Two abstract dichotomies that have oriented analytical thinking about governance for quite a long time come into play here: the state versus the market and the profession versus the organisation. It is now commonplace to conclude that the traditional governance arrangements in Western Europe were premised around three assumptions about the university as a professional state institution: (1) the regulatory environment is a national one dominated by the state or the various agencies of governmental or intermediate steering and control; (2) the self-organisation of science and the academic self-administration of universities assure a high degree of legitimate professional autonomy and performance; and (3) these relationships are more or less exclusive in terms of protecting the university from further direct interference from 'society' or interest groups. Yet, as a consequence of various processes, these assumptions have all been challenged.

During the last decades we have been able to observe a remarkable shift in governmental beliefs and attitudes in Western European countries concerning the role of the state in modern societies and the modes of governmental problem-solving in public sectors like higher education. By and large, the implementation of the various reforms is profoundly modifying the relationship between government and universi-

ties, as well as between the organisation and the profession, and rests, at the same time, upon a significant reinforcement of the external ties of universities with their environment (Goedegebuure et al., 1994; Neave, 2002). While there are significant differences between countries, there is now a substantive body of (comparative) literature offering detailed analyses of the respective reforms. The common observation is that the traditional professional state model of higher education is under increasing pressure. New approaches are in the making that stimulate increased organisational autonomy combined with managerial authority, a withdrawal of the government from detailed procedural regulation and control and a market rhetoric that favours responsiveness to the economic needs of the nation and its international competitiveness.

"New public management matters" (Braun & Merrien, 1999; Amaral, Jones & Karseth, 2002) is one of the prime conclusions of recent comparative studies on new models of governance for universities in Western Europe. But they also show that countries have taken the implementation of reforms to different lengths and along different paths in their bid to overcome the well-known problems of universities as expert organisations. In this context, we might distinguish three different, sometimes interrelated types of thinking that stimulate the revision of universities' internal structures and procedures (De Boer & Huisman, 1999). They are: a more efficiency-oriented model stressing productivity and managerial control under conditions of austerity, where decisions have to be made between competing goods; a more service or client oriented model stressing service orientation, consumerism, and responsiveness to external environments; a more market oriented model stressing competition, privatisation, and a utilitarian belief system. Precisely which kind of new model or models of governance for universities might emerge, and to what extent they might be institutionalised is as yet undetermined. But all models share to a certain extent a withdrawal of trust in the procedural arrangements that traditionally governed the professional state and a withdrawal of trust from the university as a matter of government policy.

Contesting the third logic: distrust in professional self-control

The withdrawal of trust has the most obvious consequences for the academic profession as one of the cornerstones of the professional state model in higher education. As for all professions, trust in the self-steering capacity of the academic profession provides an important legitimisation for the right of expert autonomy and discretion. Unlike other occupations which are mainly controlled by bureaucratic rules, market competition, or democratic procedures, the professions control themselves to a considerable extent as collectives, and each professional is supposed to control himself or herself within this collective. Their status vis-a-vis their clients as well as the pub-

lic rests on the latter's trust; if it erodes the profession comes into trouble. But who were the clients of higher education in Western European countries? Higher education has certainly served many masters, but traditionally the state was not only the patron but also the most important addressee for the professionalisation of the academic estate. And what has been given can be taken away. Again, the approaches may differ but the overall picture is one of a profession under strain. In some countries public debate tends to caricature the *homo academicus* as the "lazy professor" who has to be kept at work by a management of short-term incentives and visible sanctions. In another variation the academic tends to be seen as a *homo oeconomicus* who can easily be steered by a cost centered management that shapes rules, regulations and instruments for efficient work and output locally. A more sophisticated version emphasises the internal differentiation of academic staff and the role of institutional leadership as soft supervisors aiming to design the status and tasks of academics according to their strengths and weaknesses. In any case, overall trust in the self-steering capacities of academics as long-standing and deeply socialised professionals that are best left alone and only symbolically represented by institutional leadership is diminishing.

Further, it has been argued that the appearance of "accountability" in higher education is intertwined with the loss of trust in the self-steering capacities of the academic profession. In Western Europe governments have tried and still try to link measures of "outputs" more closely to funding, and this linkage seems to require assessments of the amount and quality of what is achieved by their higher education organisations and their professionals. This points in the direction of greater management of work processes and outputs. At the same time, most European governments have recognised that the growth of higher education systems, both in size and complexity, means that it is necessary to grant greater autonomy to their universities and other higher education providers. Trow (1996) has argued that accountability can be viewed as an alternative to trust that takes root especially in situations and places where markets are weak as well. "Accountability" serves as an instrument of co-ordination that supplements trust and price. I would therefore argue that "accountability" could and should be interpreted as an instrument of authoritative interaction in the framework of social coordination in hierarchies. This implies being accountable both to someone who is "above" me and to someone who is "below" me.

More important to my argument is the ambiguous relationship between 'trust' and "accountability". "Accountability" means that trust is no longer given but has to be earned, again and again. This in itself is a substantial change. It makes a huge difference whether someone who attacks you has to come up with evidence that you are untrustworthy or whether you have to come up with evidence that there is no need to attack you because you are trustworthy. As traditional authority is weakened

and trust in traditional elites undermined, more formal and open accounts and justifications have to be made to the variety of bodies which claim the right to judge the performance of institutions and professionals. Professionalism as the "third logic" (Freidson, 2001) of modern society is thus contested by hierarchy and market. This means that there is a certain correlation between "accountability" and "power" as well: those who define the processes and criteria for accountability measurements will have pre-defined performance and success to a certain extent. The struggle around the setting for evaluations and quality assessments, and their external and internal use, has thus developed into one of the major power games within and around higher education. Certainly, evaluation exercises have been successfully sold to the academic community by incorporating traditional norms and criteria of the peer review system. But analysts of the traditional academic peer review tended to emphasise the discrete character of the various formal and informal mechanisms that have evolved as part of the evaluative traditions of academic life. In this view, highly ritualised and structured procedures for the assessment of academic performance among peers and the semi-public and fluid medium of reputation serve as mechanisms to limit and control ruinous competition and centrifugal tendencies of status-striving. One of the consequences of evaluation exercises and rankings on the basis of achievement is that they foster intense competitiveness, status striving and conflict among academic organisations, sub-units and faculty. In consequence, there is no uni-directional relationship between cause and effect when it comes to the loss of trust and the rise of accountability. As Trow (1996: 311) has put it, accountability does not appear only when trust gets lost but "efforts to strengthen it usually involve parallel efforts to weaken trust."

FROM INPUT- TO OUTPUT-LEGITIMACY: THE STATE IN ADVANCED CAPITALIST DEMOCRACIES

The foregoing argument has already made it clear that the withdrawal of trust in the procedural arrangements that traditionally governed the professional state affects not only the academic profession but also the role of the state as the other corner stone of this model. The loss of "process trust" and the withdrawal of trust from the university as a matter of government policy deserve some further attention; among other things because they raise again the issue of "output trust". There are at least three different interpretations of the withdrawal of trust that at first sight may seem to stand in competition. I want to propose that they are compatible and follow an argument made by Kogan and Hanney (2000: 237):

We can offer no clearly schematic picture of how policies emerged and ideologies were sponsored. Intentions were forged partly by belief systems, partly by the power

of circumstances, and partly by opportunistic reactions to what might not have been planned or even rationally contemplated.

First, the attack on higher education is the outgrowth of neo-conservative politics and an ideology that favours the private over the public, management over professions, and economic growth over cultural identity. This argument lays emphasis on the "trust crisis" and sees it as the outcome of purposeful political action. In fact, a good argument can be made that certain governments have made very clear that they have withdrawn from whatever trust they previously placed in the traditional norms, standards and practices of their public service institutions, among them the university. "The United Kingdom under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher provides a classical example of the withdrawal of trust from the university as a matter of government policy rather than of changes of attitudes in the broader society." (Amaral et al., 2002: 291). The loss of trust is thus "made" by political actors who formed an ideologically motivated attack against the "old" system. As I have tried to show earlier, such an attack is usually accompanied by strategies of "blaming" and "promising" in order to gain legitimacy for a major shift in policy-making. There is, however, a problem when we try to generalise this argument because such political changes in Anglo-Saxon countries took place or continued rather independently of the political party involved. Furthermore, continental European countries are undergoing a re-engineering of their higher education systems accompanied by certain strategies of "blaming" and a search for new forms of coordination and structure as well, even though the changes are qualitatively different and less sharp compared to the developments in the United Kingdom and some other Anglo-Saxon countries.

A second interpretation of reform in higher education is that it is the unavoidable outgrowth of systemic problems inherent in the massification of higher education and the changing role of knowledge in society, to which there has not been an adequate response either within the system itself or by traditional means of political intervention. This argument suggests that impersonal forces and structural trends have generated a "system crisis" that calls for new forms of purposeful political action. The changing attitudes of public authorities against higher education are the outgrowth of a search for new procedural arrangements to stimulate systemic changes. It can convincingly be argued that the loss of trust is inherent in the growth of higher education since the 1950s and the increasingly varied forms taken by higher education, many of which can not claim the authority of the traditional elite forms. The lack of internal systemic differentiation and the persistence of traditional privileges in terms of resources and authority have created growing tensions between expectations and outputs that raise questions about quality and standards in public authorities. Massification has meant that a growing number of citizens have become familiar with the private life of higher education. Growing familiarity with the "realities" of higher education may have harmed public images formed in the

period of elite higher education. This has in turn raised growing interest in accountability, managerialism and market forces as means of maintaining both the funding and quality of higher education, even in countries that have long mistrusted the role of such forces in "cultural affairs". It has also weakened the defence of higher education and the academic profession against these forces. It has led to both a decline in public support for them and a growing gap between the political interests of institutional leadership and management on the one hand and the academic profession on the other. The problem with this argument is, however, that the search for new forms of public intervention and new modes of coordination has become a more or less ubiquitous phenomenon in public services. It can easily be generalised to the systems of social security, public health and education in general and can not only be ascribed to specific characteristics and problems of the higher education system.

This leads us to a third argument about overall changes in the role of the state in society. In Western Europe, globalisation of economies and individualisation of societies create inherent tensions for political democracies in capitalist economies that foster government by output-oriented efficiency (Scharpf, 1999). This argument centres on the idea of a "political crisis" generated by impersonal forces and structural trends that call for new forms of legitimacy in state-society interaction. The dual and interrelated processes of, first, economic globalisation that transcends the given boundaries of any given political system and, second, societal individualisation that breaks up traditional collective identities, undermine the problem-solving capacities of governments as well as trust in the efficacy of the democratic process of government by the people. In turn, output-oriented legitimacy that emphasises government for the people as regards the effectiveness and efficiency of public services and welfare spending gains in importance. This argument seems to resemble debates in political economy in the late 1970s about the precarious symbiosis of the democratic state and the capitalist economy. Theories of "late capitalism" discussed an imminent legitimacy crisis of the state (see e.g. Offe, 1972; Habermas, 1976), which had to instrumentalise its power in order to fulfil the growing requisites of capitalist economy and consumerism. By contrast, theories of the 'overloaded state' (e.g. Crozier et al., 1975; Hennis et al., 1977) predicted an inflation of political demands for taxation and economic regulation that would harm the problem-solving capacities of capitalist economies. Against these predictions of inevitable collapse, theories that we have become used to working with in the field of higher education, such as the off-load state, the rise of the evaluative state, and the governmental shift from procedural regulation to output control, simply talk of another stage of development in the precarious relationship built into capitalist democracies. The problem with the argument is, however, that it does not take into account purposeful political action generated by certain belief systems and the inherent systemic tensions of public service sectors addressed above. And the explanation that shifts in governance

are due to the search by nation states for new sources of legitimacy does not necessarily imply that the problem-solving capacities in public sector services like higher education have been enhanced.

Pressures and tensions: through a glass darkly

In any case, the decline of central support is relevant to the university-society relationships in Western Europe. In place of a single institutional centre of financial and political support, systems of higher education depend more and more upon a plurality of stakeholders and potential supporters. The dependency of the system upon its capacity to influence (and to convince) a growing number of relevant communities is increasing. Resources, in terms of money and legitimacy, rely on its connectedness to a plurality of communities and solidarities within a pluralised society. This social phenomenon referred to as "higher education in the stakeholder society" (CHEPS, 2000) is certainly not entirely new. Three decades ago, Parsons and Platt (1973) analysed the importance of the nexus of the American university to an extended economic market and influence market as one of its sources of strength and sustainability. They argued that the complex bundle of functions incorporated into the university "means a differentiated influence market for all potentially interested parties drawing from a broad spectrum of intellectual and practical interests at various levels of sophistication and at all levels of society" (358). This may have been a somewhat broad and optimistic statement on the openness of the American university. But such options for operative and shifting relationships between university and society have been incorporated much more strongly into the US system of the university in the service of society than in the continental European traditions. As Neave (2000) has shown in his stimulating historical study of universities' responsibility to society, we could delve deeper into the traditional role of the university within the nation-state to understand the challenges that Western European higher education is facing. We could then observe contrasting assumptions and significant differences "beneath the political and social priorities which different referential systems of higher education assigned to the place of higher education in the social fabric" (15). Indeed, a very good case can be made for arguing that the *leitmotif* of the development of systems of higher education in mainland Europe is characterised by assumptions about their national status and role. They were manifested in nationally standardised arrangements designed to stress their unity and homogeneity, uniformity in the services provided, and the role of detailed law in establishing universities as public institutions. In this context, higher education policy was, among other things, designed to emphasise its role as a national entity shielded from external interests by the state. In contrast, the relationship between government and university in the Anglo-American world was one of separation of power, a minimal

rather than a comprehensive legislative framework, a substantial degree of corporate self-governance, and a local version of community service and responsibility. Thus, rules and regulations tended to shield academia from the State.

Obviously, this is a very rough and dichotomous summary of a more complex and varied picture (see Kogan et al., 2000). Yet such traditional roots have visible impacts on the most recent developments and patterns in higher education. Western European systems of higher education are challenged by an astounding shift from "cultural institutions" to "service organisations" that "redefine the place of the university in society from being an instrument for political integration within the nation to becoming part of the 'productive' process, an agent for economic integration between nations" (Neave, 2000: 17). What has evolved over time in the US as a specific *contrat social* between higher education and society can certainly not be established overnight under different historical and structural circumstances. And we may expect that the further development of new forms of stakeholder interaction, internal and external to higher education, will become a composite mix of the old and the new. Our pathway might be very different even though it might be that we all seek the same Holy Grail. But we may predict that Western European higher education will increasingly rely on stakeholder interactions as multiple sources of finance and trust.

Equally important, fundamental changes are under way in the substantial and structural composition of public higher education in Western Europe. A contemporary issue regarding higher education in society is that of its purpose and functions and of good ways to organise or reorganise the structural bundle. Here, statements about missions and structural changes are correlated. Every suggested change in mission has consequences for structural changes, and structural changes have consequences for the mission of higher education. The historical model for its Humboldtian universities has been one of a generalist coverage of disciplines, a close connection between teaching and research, large public support, and the absence of a quality-based hierarchy at the national level. This model is under pressure in several ways that call for horizontal and vertical institutional differentiation, an unbundling of teaching and research, and a bundling of the basic and the applied.

One of the possible outcomes is a loss of generalist coverage and the emergence of a process of differentiation and specialisation of universities. We are perhaps starting to see a shift from "comprehensive universities" to specialised universities that have to make choices between competing goods and to establish fields of "excellence and relevance" in selected areas. Such division of work via horizontal differentiation may go along with processes of vertical differentiation in terms of reputation and resources available. Public evaluations and national and European rankings foster vertical differentiation among higher education establishments. The recent re-invention of the European university – a term of previously rather historical

relevance – and policies aimed at the concentration of resources and capacities at centres and alliances of excellence has a potential to create European universities of two very different kinds. Those which are truly European universities are expected to become global competitors, and those which are universities in Europe will serve the needs of a massified higher education system.

Over the coming years, we may see a growing tension between teaching and research missions and growing diversity in the way to mix them, even more so if account is taken of the rise of the so-called third mission of universities, making "relevant" contributions to economy and society. The basic research functions of universities have benefited considerably from their link with the teaching function, irrespective of the lasting question whether the mutual benefits of the research-teaching nexus for the two basic functions of higher education have been "real" or "ideological". Public money for higher education has rested to a considerable extent on an investment rationale that was more concerned with the function of higher education in education and training than with blue skies research. The research function was often "tolerated" by the public because of the role of higher education in facilitating productive employment and inter-generational mobility in the social stratification system. It thus seems likely that the inclusion of non-traditional criteria of "relevance" gains in importance while the mutual "piggy-back" legitimacy between teaching and research gets weakened.

In teaching, universities are nowadays not only expected to continue considering fair access according to socio-biographic background and to strengthen the overall supply of a highly trained workforce in the sense of the old regime. They are also expected to further diversify structurally and, in terms of educational provision, devote greater attention to generic competencies and social skills, reshape their function for a society of lifelong learning, prepare students for a growing internationalisation, and serve practical learning beyond the class room teaching (Teichler, 1998). In other words, universities are expected to move from a "front end" model to a "life-span" model of education and training, to move from curricula to learning pathways (Jongbloed, 2002).

In research, we observe a strong political appeal to "strategic science" as a new role model. While the term was used already in the 1970s, to denote applied research with a long-term perspective, it has now become a new "piggy-back" legitimisation for basic research. Strategic research combines relevance (to specific contexts, possibly local) and excellence (the advancement of science as such), and may therefore bridge the eternal tension between the basic and the applied. But it is supposed to do so in a specific way: "Strategic research [is] basic research carried out with the expectation that it will produce a broad base of knowledge likely to form the background to the solution of recognized current or future practical problems" (Irvine & Martin, 1984: 11). Part of the regime of strategic science is a modified version of the

division of labor between research and uptake of research (in innovation, in health care, in policy making). This applies to innovation-oriented research, but just as well to expertise and decision-oriented strategic research. And it applies all the more for a new regime of knowledge production and dissemination in which borders are becoming fuzzy not only between disciplines but between universities and other knowledge producers and users in society.

Criteria for "excellence and relevance" in teaching and research may thus stand next to each other while partly also in tension with each other. Such tensions do not only appear because of ongoing struggles between the traditional core values in academe and the striving for extra-scientific relevance. They appear as well because of the growing complexity of the academic endeavour due to the inclusion of non-traditional criteria of "relevance" into their core business.

CONCLUSION

As the 20th century has come to a close, the pace of change in our societies and their major institutions has accelerated. When we analyse social change, it is good to specify in which of its two major meanings the concept of social change is employed. First, social change appears as the outgrowth of impersonal forces or structural trends to which human agents are exposed as objects. In this meaning, social change is something that "happens" and has not been initiated by "someone" nor can it be stopped by "anybody". Second, social change appears as the outgrowth of deliberate and intentional action of human agents. In this meaning, social change is something that is "made" and has been purposefully enacted by "someone" while it can be influenced by "others". The foregoing argument exemplifies how these two seemingly incompatible understandings of social change can be combined: the forces of change that happen to human agents are themselves set in motion by human agency and its aggregate and sometimes unintended consequences.

I have discussed the issue of public discontent and lack of trust in higher education that seems to me intimately tied to the theme of "trust in the service state" in both of its meanings: trust placed in the service state and trust placed by the service state. We have seen that we lack empirical evidence to clearly identify the relationship between cause and effect when it comes to the relationship between a lack of public confidence in higher education and purposeful political interventions to transform the university. It seems quite likely that what was offered as a cure to the system was at the same time, at least partly, a cause of distrust. What has most clearly suffered is the trust that public authorities place in higher education and the traditional modes of governance of higher education in the professional state model of the nation-state. Three causes for this "trust crisis" were discussed: the ideologically motivated attack on the university; the tensions and problems built into the devel-

opment of higher education systems that are themselves partly the aggregate outcome of unintended social action; and the legitimacy problems of the state in capitalist democracies. It was suggested that they form complementary rather than alternative explanations. In other words, it has been argued that when this kind of "trust crisis" occurs, there is a self-vindicating effect, whether or not the institution in question has experienced an "over-investment" of confidence or an "under-output" of performance in the past. And the dynamics of long-term investment of resources and expectations, the dynamics of crisis, and the reaction to and management of crisis call our attention in explaining the causes and effects of change and stability in higher education.

From a European perspective, there is little doubt that the modern university as we know it – the university as a project of the nation-state and its cultural identity – is in a delicate and complicated process of transformation. The question of whether the current passage means the inevitability of the radical reformulation of the social mission and the tasks of the university is to me still an open one. I have, however, offered some hypotheses about pressures on the Humboldtian university that call for horizontal and vertical institutional differentiation, an unbundling of teaching and research, and a bundling of the basic and the applied. There are signs for the things to come – whether they deserve trust needs to be seen.

REFERENCES

Amaral, A., Jones, A.J. & Karseth, B. (eds.) (2002). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer.

Axelrod, K.J. (1984). *The Limits of Organizations*. New York: Norton.

Bleiklie, I. (1994). *The New Public Management and the Pursuit of Knowledge.* Notat 9411. Bergen: LOS.

Boer, H.F. de & Huisman, J. (1999). "The new public management in Dutch universities". In Braun, D. & Merrien, F.-X. (eds.). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View.* London/Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley, 100-118.

Boer, H.F. de (2002); "Trust, the Essence of Governance?". In Amaral, A., Jones, A.J. & Karseth, B. (eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht/ Boston/London: Kluwer, 43-62.

Braun, D. (1999). "New managerialism and the governance of universities in a comparative perspective". In Braun, D. & Merrien, F.-X. (eds.). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View.* London/Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley, 239-261.

Braun, D. & Merrien, F.-X. (eds.) (1999). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View.* London/Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Castells, M. (2001). "Universities as Dynamic Systems of Contradictory Functions". In Muller, J., Cloete, N. & Badat, S. (eds.). *Challenges of Globalisation. South African Debates with Manuel Castells*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman, 206-223.

Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (2000). *Higher Education in the Stakeholder Society*. Enschede: CHEPS.

Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Crozier, M., Huntington, S.P. & Watanuki, J. (1975). *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies in the Trilateral Commission.* New York: New York University Press.

Dill, D.D. (1999). "Academic accountability and university adaptation: The architecture of an academic learning organisation". *Higher Education*, 38(2), 127-154.

Dill, D.D. & Sporn, B. (1995). "The Implications of a Postindustrial Environment". In Dill, D.D. and Sporn, B. (eds.) *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1-19.

Enders, J. (ed.) (2001). *Academic Staff in Europe. Changing Contexts and Conditions.* Westport, Con.: Greenwood.

Enders, J. & Teichler, U. (1997). "A Victim of their Own Success? Employment and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Comparative Conditions". *Higher Education Policy* 34(1), 347-372.

Enders, J. & Fulton, O. (eds.) (2002): *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goedegebuure, L.C.J., Kaiser, F., Maassen, P.A.M., Meek, V.L., van Vught, F.A. & de Weert, E. (eds.) (1994). *Higher education policy: An international comparative perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Habermas, J. (1973). *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1985). *Die neue Unübersichtlichkeit*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Hennis, W. (1977). *Regierbarkeit: Studien zu ihrer Problematisierung.* Stuttgart: Klett.

Irvine, J. & Martin, B. R. (1984). *Foresight in Science. Picking the Winners*, Frances Pinter: London.

Jongbloed, B. (2002). "Lifelong Learning: Implications for institutions". *Higher Education*, 44, 413-431.

Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*. London/Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.) (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Listhaug, O. & Wiberg, M. (1995). "Confidence in public and private institutions". In Klingemann, H.D. & Fuchs, D. (eds.). *Citizens and the state: beliefs in government*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 298-322.

Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Chichester/New York/Brisbane/Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Neave, G. (2000). "Introduction. Universities' Responsibility to Society: An Historical Exploration of an Enduring Issue". In Neave, G. (ed.) *The Universities' Responsibilities to Society. International Perspectives.* Oxford: Pergamon,1-28.

Neave, G. (2002). "On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seers: Changing visions of the University". University of Twente: Inaugural Lecture.

Offe, C. (1972). *Strukturprobleme des kapitalistischen Staates*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Parsons, T. & Platt, G. (1973). *The American University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Reed, M.R. (2002). "New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities: A Review and Assessment". In Amaral, A., Jones, A.J. & Karseth, B. (eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer, 163-186.

Scharpf, F.W. (1999). *Governing in Europe – Effective and Democratic*? Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Teichler, U. (1998). "Higher Education and the World of Work: Changing Conditions and Challenges". Kassel: Paper for the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education.

Tjeldvoll, A. (1997). "The service university in the global marketplace". *European Education*, 30(4), 5-19.

Trow, M. (1996). "On the Accountability of Higher Education in the United States". In Maassen, P.A.M. & van Vught, F.A. (eds.): *Inside Academia. New challenges for the academic profession*. Utrecht: De Tijdstroom, 227-268.

Yoshimoto, K. (2002). "Higher Education and the Transition to Work in Japan Compared to Europe". In Enders, J. & Fulton, O. (eds.): H*igher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 221-239.

Zucker, L.G. (1986). "Production of trust: institutional sources of economic structures, 1840-1920". In Staw, B.M. & Cummings, L.L. (eds.) *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 8, Greenwich: JAI Press, 53-111.

4

REFORM AND TRANSFORMATION FOLLOWING REGIME CHANGE

JOHN BRENNAN

INTRODUCTION: HIGHER EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD

What are the principal drivers of change in higher education? And what is the relationship between changes in higher education and changes in wider society? What part is played by governments through the "top down" policy process and how far, and in what ways, does higher education respond more directly to wider processes of social, economic and political change?

Much has been written about the changes occurring in higher education over the last twenty years – massification, diversification, marketisation, managerialism and the like. These are frequently regarded as global phenomena and can be related to political trends and the "triumph" of neo-liberalism, to the emergence of so-called knowledge economies and to continuing concerns about equity issues and social justice.

Surveying this scene from a United Kingdom perspective, Kogan and Hanney have contended that

> Perhaps no area of public policy has been subjected to such radical changes over the last 20 years as higher education (Kogan and Hanney: 2000: 11).

Maurice Kogan and his associates have explored these changes in **a** comparative perspective, particularly with regard to higher education change and development in the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries of Sweden and Norway (Kogan et al., 2000). All are developed western countries, subject most certainly to global political and economic forces but rather stable in terms of their internal political and social structures. This chapter attempts to explore the relationship between higher education change and wider social and political change in more unstable social settings, notably those of the former communist states of central and eastern Europe. Change here has generally been regarded as revolutionary or "transformative" and has involved institution building on a large scale as well as fundamental change to the legitimising ideologies of society. To what extent and in what ways has higher education itself been affected by these changes?

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 49-63.

The chapter will draw on a larger study, *The role of universities in the transformation of societies*[1], part of which comprised a series of case studies of higher education and social and political change in Eastern Europe and Central Asia supported by the Open Society Institute. Some of the case studies took a broadly national look at higher education change whereas others adopted an institutional approach. Still others explored particular themes across countries. Although the cases do not provide a systematic base for formal comparisons – methodological guidelines were set for the case studies but local concerns and contexts drove particular studies in different directions – they do provide a rich source of information and commentary on how higher education affects and is affected by radical and "transformative" social changes.

The project took the concept of social transformation to imply at the very least some fundamental changes to society's core institutions, the polity and the economy, with major implications for relationships between social groups and classes, and for the means of the creation and distribution of wealth, power and status. Transformation would generally imply the existence of a discernible moment of regime change and would have both structural and ideational elements. While the main focus of the project was on the extent to which higher education contributed to such wider processes of social transformation, it was hardly possible to ask such questions without being equally interested in how such wider social changes were themselves impacting upon higher education. Indeed, this proved to be the preferred focus of several of the case studies and it is the main area of interest here.

In their United Kingdom study, Kogan and Hanney are interested in four theoretical issues: (i) changes in the role of the state and of the place of the universities within it; (ii) the extent to which contexts or individual actors cause change; (iii) higher education policy making: dual processes, elites and interest groups; (iv) continuity and discontinuity in policy. It is hoped that all four theoretical concerns will be discernible in this chapter. However, the chapter adopts a somewhat different and slightly simpler structure in attempting to take account of the rather different social contexts in which higher education changes were being worked out. Thus, the next section will look at macro issues concerned with *higher education, state and society.* The following section will take a more *institutional* look at higher education change and the final section will examine what change has meant for *individual academics*

[1] The project**, *The role of universities in the transformation of societies,*** was co-ordinated by the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information of the Open University and the Association of Commonwealth Universities. Grants from the Open Society Institute and the Rockefeller, Ford and STINT foundations supported a series of national and institutional case studies in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. The case study reports and details of the overall project can be found on the project website at http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/TRhome.htm.

and "intellectuals" – the latter an important concept within the countries with which we are concerned. Moreover, in these countries we find the very concept of "policy" to be somewhat problematic and need to adopt broader notions of the 'social' in which to set the changes that have occurred within higher education.

This was not a project in which any notion of hypothesis testing could sensibly be applied. The limitations of the data and the complexities of the contexts in which they were collected prevent any pretensions to "hard science" in what follows. Nevertheless, it may be useful at the outset to indicate three possibilities in the relationship between change in higher education and wider social changes. These are that (i) change in higher education has essentially been evolutionary and driven largely from within higher education; (ii) change in higher education has been imposed upon it through various policy mechanisms driven by the political process; and (iii) change in higher education has been largely driven by changing social demand, itself a reflection of the transformed contexts in which higher education finds itself. The first two possibilities reflect Kogan and Hanney's distinction between "organic evolution" and "imposed change" (Kogan and Hanney: 2000: 243). The addition of the third perhaps highlights some important features of the contexts to be found in almost all central and eastern European countries, namely the existence of only weakly developed civil institutions and the relatively low levels of political legitimacy enjoyed by the existing regimes.

Of course, in exploring the relationship between changes in higher education and larger social and political changes, it should not be assumed that the relationships between the two are necessarily strong. Universities have often been defined in terms of their autonomy from immediate social and political agendas and a degree of independence and "distance" seen as a pre-requisite for successful academic work.

HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE AND SOCIETY IN EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

Developed principally in the context of Bulgaria, Gocheva's notions of a society "travelling" are probably more widely applicable to the region (Gocheva: 2003). In answer to the question of "from where to where?" she produces six quite definite answers:

- From planned economy to state economy
- From "one party" state to pluralistic society
- From a state where human rights were violated to one where they are respected (in theory)
- From a state where, despite declarations of social equity, social strata were related to political (party) affiliations to one where they are principally economic related

– From the "socialist undemocratic state" to a more democratic social settlement
– From belonging to the Soviet empire to belonging to "the constellation of the economically developed Western countries with stabilised democratic systems". (Gocheva: 2003: 10)

The interesting question arises, therefore, about the extent to which higher education was travelling in parallel with these larger social changes. Gocheva herself is rather pessimistic on the point as far as Bulgaria is concerned, finding that "Bulgarian university intellectuals continue to live with the memories of the past, rather than the problems of the present" (17). This past is both a communist and a pre-communist past. As far as the former is concerned, university intellectuals had a respected role in the leadership of society. They might lack some of the freedoms enjoyed by their peers elsewhere but they possessed a status and could exert an influence that was significant and respected (Konrad and Szelenyi 1979). As far as the latter is concerned, the historical memory of the "Humboldtian university" is alive and a reference point for a "paradise lost" to which one day "we dearly hope to return" (Baumun quoted in Gocheva: 18).

This essentially conservative view of the role of higher education is picked up by Kroos, writing about Estonia but with implications for the former Soviet Union more generally. While dismissing any ideas that higher education institutions had contributed to the fall of communism through "questioning the essence of the Soviet regime", he finds their contribution to lie much more in their inadequacies, i.e. their failure to play their assigned part in ensuring the success of the Soviet system:

Rather than performing heroically, institutions of higher learning were set to contribute towards the success of the soviet model. Ironically it was the failure of the soviet higher education system to legitimate the soviet regime through economic progress that most apparently led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The most important contribution of the Estonian institutions of higher learning towards the regaining of independence was the reproduction of an Estonian elite and the conservation of a national culture (Kroos 2003: 15).

This "failure" of Soviet universities is at least partly explained by the following features described by Kroos: (i) members of university teaching staff were under political control (ensuring the transmission of Marxist-Leninist ideology and values); (ii) publishing was (self-) censored to a large extent; (iii) behaviour and loyalty were controlled and careers dependent on membership of the Party (iv) the Soviet penal code contained sentences to discipline, reinforce loyalty and if necessary punish for activities deemed to be "anti-Soviet". Thus, writes Kroos,

it is unlikely that an academic, who did not make a secret out of the understanding that the soviet economic system was (fundamentally) wrong or that the soviet political regime was either (essentially) illegitimate, unchangeable or unreformable, could

have got a teaching position in any Estonian institution of higher learning. (Kroos 2003: 23)

Yet controls by the state in some respects still left space for an independent role in others. Possibly most important in countries such as Estonia was the maintenance of the national language of instruction in the universities and the reproduction of a national elite bound together through possession of common language and culture.

Higher education policy in the soviet period is described by Fedatova as

facilitating transition from world-outlook knowledge to scientific one, in forming professionals, in educating, in creation of a modern educational system in the country, in combining both elitist and egalitarian functions (Fedatova 2003: 3).

This process of modernisation, or "catching up", is not unique to the communist system but the conditions of isolation in which it took place are. However crude and imperfect, national policies and control mechanisms may be more effective when alternative sources of information and ideas are absent. It is ironic therefore – but perhaps unsurprising – that the post-communist period should have been characterised by apparent enthusiasm for supposedly western ways of doing things. Whole successions of "experts" supported by the initiatives of bodies such as the World Bank and the European Union, as well as national western governments, have passed through universities in the region over the last ten years, extolling the virtues of western-style management, quality assurance systems, curriculum development and so on. And universities in eastern Europe have been among the most enthusiastic participants in exchange schemes, for both staff and students. (The fact that such exchanges have frequently had the function of providing exit strategies for individuals rather than stimulating reform at home is another matter.)

Higher education policy in many central and eastern European countries in the post-communist period appears to have been a mixture of the replacement of one set of detailed regulations with a new set and the "letting rip" of market forces and entrepreneurialism. The balance between the two has differed between countries. At an institutional level, it has generally been the new private universities that have been market orientated while the traditional state universities have remained under quite tight state direction.

However, in considering the relationship between the state and higher education in eastern Europe, a certain blurring of boundaries between the two must be acknowledged. Thus, Gocheva notes that Bulgaria had "witnessed eight different governments and nine different ministers of education (plus at least thirty different deputy ministers of education)" in the twelve years since the ending of the communist regime. Most of these ministers were in fact academics and many were from Sofia University. In many cases, they continued with some of their teaching and much of their research during their brief periods in office. This "colonisation" of state offices

by members of a university elite was a feature of the soviet period but has continued in several places. It is one of the reasons why the interests of the traditional state universities have been maintained although this has not protected them from massive drops in funding.

In some respects, of course, the failure of higher education policy in these countries reflects a much more general weakening of state powers and controls. Fedatova draws our attention to the fact that "capitalism in Russia was not built on a rational ethos (as Weber described in the west) but on adventurism, looking for immediate profit which does not require higher education" (Fedatova 2003: 19). She might also have referred to the part played by corruption in this process. The point is taken up by Tomusk who describes how "through privatisation, positions in the bureaucracy and communist power hierarchy have been translated into wealth" (2003: 278). He goes on to quote Frydman et al (1998) on the post-communist privatisation of State assets:

According to a former leading politician in Rumania, 80% of new Rumanian millionaires were part of the Ceausescu-era nomenklatura; many had been in the arms industry and have since built their fortunes on arms trading….A Polish economist who traced the careers of several hundred nomenklatura from 1988 to 1993 found that over half of them turned up as private sector executives. The numbers in Hungary are reported to be even higher than in Poland (Frydman et al quoted in Tomusk 2003: 278).

It is these contextual realities of contemporary society rather than the policies of national governments that frame higher education life in eastern Europe and central Asia. While to some extent universities have regained some autonomy, the settings in which this autonomy is to be exercised are generally harsh. Status and funds have been lost. Corruption and nepotism remain, both inside and outside the universities. At the same time, higher education in these regions has developed well-honed survival skills. Traditions of management from the ministry rather than from within the institution produced accountability processes that gave established professors considerable freedoms. To a degree, the anarchic market conditions of society at large are mirrored by similar conditions within higher education. In both higher education and society, however, these markets are characterised by powerful hierarchies and increasing inequalities of both power and wealth.

CHANGING INSTITUTIONS

As has already been noted, institutional levels of authority in universities during the communist period were mainly weak. In terms of Becher and Kogan's four levels of authority in higher education (central authorities, institutions, basic units, individual academics) (1980; 1992), institutions were the weakest link in a context where all-

powerful and controlling states "did deals" more or less directly with basic units, a process frequently mediated by influence from party officials. For example, Mencinger has described how the University of Ljubljana

…was a loose association, the components of which were legal entities. The latter were financed directly by the state for their activities in education and basic research and were completely independent in regard to their market activities. The central University had no control over the budgets of these units, and the Office of the Rector (the university administration) existed to perform only those functions that were transferred to it by these units, this giving it a mere representative role. (Mencinger 2000: 326)

Within this situation, and reflecting Humboldtian legacies, individual professors – providing they were senior and well-connected enough – could enjoy considerable freedoms and privileges.

Although all the formal changes in legislation and funding arrangements had been implemented at Ljubljana to empower the University's central authorities (for example, now only the University centre is allowed to have a bank account and has legal status), Mencinger goes on to describe how the dispersed reality of institutional authority had continued:

The new arrangement has not been fully implemented for four major reasons: (i) resistance by the constituent units, especially those with a large proportion of market-oriented activities; (ii) the existing weak university level management that is unfit to undertake new tasks; (iii) absence of an appropriate management model; and (iv) the general belief shared by the present rector in the advantages of decentralised compared to centralised decision-making in management which can coincide with the integration of education and research. (Mencinger 2000: 326/7)

It is perhaps worth noting that Mencinger is himself the "present rector" of the University of Ljubljana.

If authority at the institutional level is weak, we must look elsewhere for the drivers of change within universities in periods following regime change. In so doing, we may need to elaborate the Becher and Kogan model to include an additional "authority" level of the "international community". Partly in reflection of the legitimacy problems of the state and the effects of long periods of relative isolation, international reference points for institutional change have become increasingly important. In concrete form, through bodies such as the World Bank and international foundations, they could be a source of much-needed financial support in a situation where state funding was in "free-fall" in many countries. But the international influence has been as much about models and values as it has been about money.

One manifestation of this has been the introduction of western-style quality assurance systems in most countries of the region. Several multinational projects have supported this process funded by bodies such as the World Bank, the European Union and the Council of Europe. They have led to the establishment of national quality agencies and the implementation of quality assessment regimes involving both self-evaluation and peer review that would be familiar, superficially at least, to many western academics. Differences exist, however, and these reflect both the legacies of the communist period and the problems inherent in the transitional situation in which higher education now finds itself. In some countries, for example, quality assurance regimes have not replaced direct controls by the state; rather they have become the mechanisms by which such controls have been enforced. Thus, state requirements in respect of university curricula in Bulgaria have effectively been policed by the new national accreditation agency (Brennan and Williams 1997). This situation reinforces a further legacy of the communist period: the survival of a robust "compliance culture" within higher education. External requirements may be complied with, even to the point of subversion. The notion of a self-critical academic institutional community sits uneasily with such a culture. Indeed, in her case study for the project, Gocheva noted that Bulgarian universities were lagging behind other institutions in their introduction of openness and democracy to their internal decision-making.

Tomusk has pointed out that quality assurance mechanisms in eastern European higher education systems have multiple functions to perform and that these can only be understood against the social and political contexts facing these societies.

> Newly established east European quality assurance mechanisms are driven by many concerns including internal and external politics, interests of particular universities and academic groups as well as by the need to secure social stability. However, its connection to education remains relatively weak. In the long term this may become a serious problem. (Tomusk 2000: 185)

International perspectives have also been a strong feature underlying the growth of private higher education institutions. Here, too, quality assurance appears to play an important part as witnessed by this extract from a case study report from the New Bulgarian University (NBU):

> The opportunity to receive a British diploma from the Effective Manager Program allowed NBU to attract trainees from business and banking, and therefore to mediate the transfer of British educational methodology to Bulgarian society. An additional benefit is the mastering of business English in which this program is taught. (Georgiev 2003: 19)

Private institutions of higher education have been established in most countries of the region, frequently with external funding and support. While some of these appear mainly to address a growing demand for business and IT related vocational courses, many have been established in order to achieve a much broader set of modernising purposes. Many institutions have been established with support from bodies such as the Soros Foundation with the objective of contributing to the construction of open democratic societies. The curriculum of such institutions may emphasise the social sciences and the humanities as much as more vocational subjects. In some cases, private institutions appear to be playing a role of national "innovators" and have developed quite close connections with national governments. The claims of one of the new**,** "liberal" universities – itself with good links to national authorities – are exemplified in this further quotation from the New Bulgarian University case study:

When entering the specific NBU liberal environment, students start spreading the university's philosophy and value system they have adopted, which involve independent and critical thinking based on evidence, action as opposed to passive intellectualisation, argumentation of free human choice, as well as opportunities for team-working in an environment of fully-developed and protected individuality. (Georgiev 2003: 20)

As with private higher education elsewhere in the world, these institutions may be of variable quality and reputation. They are frequently viewed with suspicion by academics in the much larger and longer established state universities. For these universities, curriculum reform has been a major priority with the institutionalisation of "new" disciplines such as political science, sociology, cultural anthropology, management, marketing, public administration and so on. There has also been a need to "overcome suspicion" of social science courses as traditionally overloaded with material on such topics as scientific communism and Marxist-Leninist philosophy, something to which, according to Tomusk (1998), international recognition initiatives have given special attention.

The attempts to initiate curriculum reforms have confronted significant institutional problems, however, and these are ably summarised by Kroos in his case study on the Estonian situation:

On the one hand, the increased academic freedom, contacts with the western institutions as well as the information technology revolution (expansion of internet) have allowed the university administrators to learn, and in some cases also to copy, the curriculum from the West. On the other hand, the change is intangible as the very same academic freedom that allowed these new subjects to be introduced, allows them to be taught as lecturers see appropriate… The fact that many subjects were not taught during the soviet era is still affecting the content (ideas, theories, method-

ology and authors introduced) and method of instruction in these science areas. Since program directors do not have academics that would have got (proper) training in sociology, economics, political science, international relations, these subjects are taught by people who have got their training in neighbouring subjects (for example, philosophy, psychology, history). (Kroos 2003: 48-9)

Curriculum innovation frequently confronts "human resource" problems of this sort. In the east European case, however, these are exacerbated by the limitations of institutional managements in addressing these and other problems.

Traditional dependence on the state and weak decision-making at the institutional centre have already been referred to. To them needs to be added the oppositional culture that has developed in societies where formal sources of authority are viewed with deep suspicion. This affects not only decision-making within the university but also relationships between universities and public authorities. Ralph Dahrendorf described the situation thus in 2000:

> The memory of all authorities as the enemy is still fresh. In some cases it is also very close; universities or other institutions of higher education were themselves the enemy. In such circumstances, autonomy means not only getting as far away from "public" authorities as possible, but also confronting, indeed more often than not attacking them. For those who had this experience, accepting the fact that autonomous academic institutions can actually work with the grain of those who hold public power, requires almost too much of a leap of the imagination. (Dahrendorf 2000: 113)

The notion of "autonomy" has been central to discussions about university developments in central and Eastern Europe in recent years and yet, to an outside observer, the autonomy seems rather limited. Quoting Dahrendorf again: "It shows an endearing if essentially continental European belief in the goodness of the state to expect university autonomy to be granted by governments through laws and, if at all possible, through articles of the constitution." (Dahrendorf 2000: 105). Yet, in practice, this is what has happened. "Autonomy" is in the legislation, therefore it exists – despite the co-existence of lengthy lists of other laws that attempt to prescribe the curriculum, staffing, promotions, student admissions, assessments etc. A further difficulty with the notion of autonomy in practice is its interpretation on the ground as 'do your own thing if you can get away with it'. Set within a cultural legacy of opposition, suspicion and privacy, autonomy proves to be a barrier to change rather than its facilitator.

The importance of the cultural dimension to understanding the barriers to change in universities in central and eastern Europe is underlined in the case study by Gocheva. Adapting the work of the Serbian author Silvano Bolcic on indicators of "social" changes of the socialist into the "entrepreneurial" society (Bolcic, 1995), she ap-

plies five of the indicators to Bulgarian state universities and finds the universities firmly rooted in the "socialist" society. Thus,

– "The decision making is centralised not only on the national level, but also inside the separate higher education institutions"
– "The model of the 'good member of the university community': he or she is the one who is loyal and disciplined subject, who does only what is assigned to do and never dares to do something individually determined and creative"
– "The attitude of the academic community towards innovation: they have to be introduced by the persons 'in charge' – when other groups attempt to innovate, their initiatives are indefinitely postponed or marginalized"
– "The culture of academic behaviour: encourages conformity and obedience, collectivism and paternalism"
– "The desirable way of thinking and perceiving academic reality: perceiving academic life with the charisma of tradition and the past, and correspondingly, demonising the ones who tend to be pragmatic and critical of the present situation."

(Gocheva 2003: 13/14)

However, this picture does not accord with some of the features of the University of Ljubljana described by Mencinger and there is certainly much variety in the institutional cultures of universities in central and eastern Europe, as elsewhere. But a common thread seems to be an underdeveloped institutional capacity for leadership, management and innovation from the centre. Insofar as universities are changing in reaction to the changing circumstances around them, they are therefore doing so in relatively uncoordinated and possibly idiosyncratic ways. The agents of change – and sometimes the blockages to change – are individual academics responding to interests and agendas not necessarily set by those in authority over them, whether in the rector's office or at the ministry.

INDIVIDUAL ACADEMICS AND UNIVERSITY INTELLECTUALS

Writing about an earlier set of case studies of eastern European universities, Peter Scott highlighted a number of particular problems in the staffing of these institutions. He notes the following points:

– "a (comparatively) small number of staff, generally at senior levels, owed their positions to their support for the previous communist regimes, rather than to merit or competence"
– "the balance of academic subjects has shifted substantially since 1989. Some subjects have declined in popularity (for obvious reasons, as in the case of Russian language, but also for less obvious reasons, as in the case of engineering),

while new or almost new subjects, such as management or information technology, have emerged"
- "the restoration of institutional autonomy and the development of more centralised systems of governance and management have exposed a substantial deficit in administrative skills"
- "the failure of budgets to keep pace with the expansion of student numbers has increased the pressure on both academic and administrative staff" (Scott 2000: 383/4).

These have been harsh years for academics in central and Eastern Europe. Neither wages nor status have been maintained in the post-communist world. Many younger academics have moved west and those who remain must typically attempt to balance a whole portfolio of jobs in order to earn a living wage. And the more senior staff were socialised to perform in a world that no longer exists.

Writing mainly about Estonia, Tomusk suggests that remaining in an academic career constituted the "last choice" for well-educated people and he divides those who did remain into "highly privileged senior staff, and those who could not find jobs elsewhere" (Tomusk 2003: 83). On the one hand were the "aristoscientists" – the former academic elite with its privileges intact – and on the other the "lumpen academics" – often senior academics holding junior positions with high teaching loads and on less than a living wage (Tomusk: 85). Neither group could be relied upon to provide the energy and inventiveness required by higher education institutions facing a period of radical change.

The pauperisation of university teachers is a recurring theme in the case studies, which describe how teachers need to hold down several jobs simultaneously, "often combining lecturing with employment in the commercial sector, or offering private tuition to school-leavers keen to pass the university entrance exams" (Reeves 2003: 11). The relatively high status and privileges enjoyed by academics within the communist regimes make the contrast with the current situation all the more striking. While universities were extremely hierarchical and academic autonomy very weak in the former regimes, they offered a degree of security and comfort largely lacking subsequently. In consequence, several authors describe what Fedotova calls "crisis tendencies" in higher education, comprising "decrease in quality of education" and an "acute deficit of qualified personnel" (Fedotova 2003: 9).

All of this is in some contrast with the noble role often assigned to university intellectuals in writings during the communist period (for example, Konrad and Szelenyi 1979). The position of the "intelligentsia" in socialism is open to much debate but it has provided a means for distinguishing the role of "people" from the role of "institutions". Thus, Gocheva refers to the "decisive" role played by intellectuals "in the persuasion of society" to follow new directions:

at least one hundred of our intellectuals-compatriots took active position in the public discussion in the media of the transformational process in the past dozen years. They have written at least one thousand books, articles and studies….in Bulgarian and other languages on the essence of the transition. Another hundred university intellectuals became politicians in the executive and the legislative power, diplomats, editors and publishers. Thousands of Bulgarian intellectuals, artists and public persons have published at least once in our dailies and weeklies what they think about the transition and the various ramifications of the road of the 'movement to be different (Gocheva 2003: 15).

In contrast, the "Bulgarian universities played no societal role at all in the transition period itself, either as institutions or as communities" (14). She goes on to point to the irony that, despite their contribution to social transformation, the concerns of university intellectuals with university transformation were virtually non-existent: "if we sort these thousands of papers, we will find that the problems of the academic community *qua* academic and *qua* community were not discussed at all" (15).

Slightly different emphases are given in other case studies but the general picture emerges of conservative institutions providing space for radical individuals to engage with social and political issues. It must also be said that this "protected space" also allowed conservative individuals to engage politically. But neither, it seems, has been much concerned with change within the university itself.

CONCLUSION

If the momentum for change in eastern European universities has been neither "top-down" nor "bottom up", there seems to be some justification for the charge levelled by Dahrendorf that

stagnant universities are expensive and ineffectual monuments to a *status quo* which is more likely to be a *status quo ante,* yesterday's world preserved in aspic (Dahrendorf 2000: 107).

This situation may itself be a product of the context in which universities find themselves. As Fedotova writes about the Russian situation

It is a dramatic period: anomie accompanies all transitions from a society with one type of social order to a society with the other order, especially when characteristics of both orders contrast… It is a time when social orientations, values and norms are lost: what is good and bad, legal and illegal, proper and improper is unclear… Russian mentality during the last decade has become unprecedentedly fragmented and heterogeneous. The implication for society is clear: there is no integration, society is broken up and as a result there is no society. Hence, it follows that it

would be inadequate to consider universities as something not affected by the larger societal processes, not having anomie themselves. (Fedotova 2003: 26)

We thus find in central and Eastern Europe universities struggling with momentous changes arising out of the wider social transformations of which they were a part. To an extent, the pace of social change in these countries has been much greater than the pace of change in universities, at least in the large traditional state institutions. Again, we might follow Fedotova in her references to anomie and note how "illegitimate means" become more significant when legitimate ones fail. Becoming a gangster may be a wiser career move than becoming an academic in these circumstances!

In looking at changes in higher education, we may need to look neither to politicians nor to academics but to other social actors, not least those who are or who wish to become students. Their wishes and choices ultimately become factors that even the most conservative institutions cannot ignore. In many universities, it was pressure –even open rebellion – from students that removed the obligatory Marxism-Leninism from the curriculum well before either university or political authorities got round to it. It may be, therefore, that fundamental changes to universities – as to these societies more generally – will need to await generational changes in those filling positions of institutional or societal authority.

At the end of their comparative study of university changes in the United Kingdom, Norway and Sweden, Maurice Kogan and his associates set out a series of conclusions that, taken together, point to the complexities of both generating and understanding processes of change within universities (Kogan et al 2000). The cases of universities in central and eastern Europe support such conclusions and perhaps point to even greater complexities. We might note, however, that versions of institutional and academic autonomy that allow higher education substantially to ignore larger processes of social change may be in the long term interests of neither the universities nor their societies.

REFERENCES

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1980/1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education,* London: Heinemann and London: Routledge.

Bolcic, S. (1995) "The meaning of the social system and the initial achievement of the 'post-socialist transition". *Balkan Forum*, 3 (3)

Brennan, J. & Williams, R. (1997). Feasibility Study: Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions in Bulgaria – Final Report. London: Quality Support Centre/Open University.

Dahrendorf R. (2000). *Universities after Communism.* Hamburg: Korber-Stiftung.

Fedotova N. (2003). *The Role of Universities in Social Transformations (case study of Russia).* http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/TRfedotovafinal.pdf.

Georgiev L. (2003). *An Institutional Case Study of the New Bulgarian University.* http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/TRnbu.pdf.

Gocheva, D. (2003). *Transition and transformation (in the eyes of a sceptic Bulgarian academician-cai*http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/TRdimkafinal.pdf.

Kogan, M. &Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education.,* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M, Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M**.** (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: a comparative study* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Konrad, G. & Szelenyi, I. (1979). *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power. A Sociological Study of the Role of the Intelligentsia in Socialism.* Brighton: Harvester Press.

Kroos, K. (2003). *The Role of Universities in Social Transformation: the case of Estonia.* http://www.policy.hu/kroos/research_paper.pdf.

Mencinger, J. (2000). "The University of Ljubljana" In Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: a review of the transformations of higher education in central and eastern Europe. Bucharest: UNESCO/CEPES.

Reeves, M. (2003). *Case Study of the American University – Central Asia.* http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/TRaucafinal.pdf.

Scott, P. (2000). "Higher education in central and eastern Europe: an analytic report". In *Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: a review of the transformations of higher education in central and eastern Europe*, Bucharest: UNESCO/CEPES

Tomusk, V. (1998). "Development in Russian Higher Education: Legislative and Policy Reform Within a Central and East European Context" *Minerva*, 36: 125-146.

Tomusk, V**.** (2000). "Reproduction of the 'State Nobility' in Eastern Europe: past patterns and new practices" *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 21(2), 269-282.

Tomusk, V. (2003). "Aristoscientists, Academic Proletariat and Reassembling the Mega-machine: 21st century survival strategies of the Estonian academia" *International Studies of Education,* 13(1),77-99.

5

CHANGE OR CONTINUITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE?

Lessons Drawn from Twenty Years of National Reforms in European Countries

CHRISTINE MUSSELIN

INTRODUCTION

Determining whether change does or does not prevail over continuity is a classical question in sociology and political science. Higher education studies do not escape this recurrent questioning. In particular one can wonder how much change should be documented, what factors or dimensions should have been affected by change, which characteristics should change processes bear, for an analyst to be allowed to state that change indeed occurred. No simple answer can be given to these questions. Furthermore, depending on the focus chosen by the researcher – actors *versus* structures, micro *versus* meso or macro levels, local *versus* national perspectives, long term *versus* short term perspectives, individual *versus* institutional settings, norms *versus* practices, etc. – the balance between change and continuity may be differently assessed. A further difficulty results from the fact that change is not always radical and provoked by identified reforms but may also be incremental (Lindblom, 1959) when successive limited moves produce fairly profound change in the long run.

Among the contributions which may help to cope with the "change or continuity' issue, two are especially useful.

The first is common to two authors, each of whom developed it for his own field and independently of the other: Jean-Jacques Silvestre (1986 and 1998) as a labour economist and Peter A. Hall (1993) as a political scientist. Both went beyond the traditional and simplistic distinction generally made between radical and limited

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 65-79.

changes. Silvestre differentiated structural change, i.e. change that[2] "[facilitates] new behaviours and new social relations" from change as a "mechanical response superimposed on the existing structure" or change as "an organic response, through which the structure [changes] but in a way compatible with the basic principles governing its operations." This typology is very close to the distinctions introduced by Hall (1993) to analyse change in public policies. He differentiates between, first, modifications in the settings of the basic existing instruments that do not affect the goals or the instruments, those modifying the tools but not the objectives and finally what he calls paradigmatic change. Paradigmatic change occurs, according to Hall, when the three constitutive elements of a public policy (the settings of the instruments, the instruments themselves and the hierarchy among the goals) are transformed.

A second helpful contribution is to be found in the book published by Tony Becher and Maurice Kogan (1980 and 1992) where they distinguished four levels of change. In Chapter 8 (Initiating and adapting to change) they first explored "changes to the system as a whole", then looked at "changes at the institutional level" and at "changes affecting the basic unit", and finally came to "Innovation and the individual". They thus clearly defend the idea that change may refer to different processes at each level and that transformation at one level does not automatically imply transformation at another.

In this chapter, I intend to combine those two analytical frameworks to assess what kind of change and how much change higher education systems experienced in the last decades.

In the introduction to their book, Becher and Kogan recognised that some general characteristics (openness and loose coupling) can be attributed to any contemporary higher education systems, but that "there are also important distinctions to be noted between existing systems in one country and another. (…) The first dimension relates to access. (…) The second dimension is that of governance and control" (1992: 3). It is in particular this last dimension and its evolution that I would like to discuss here. It is frequently observed that recent developments in European higher education systems constituted a shift from academic to institutional governance or, in terms of Clark's (1983) modes of coordination, from the oligarchy and state corners of the triangle towards that of the market. Such conclusions entail two implicit statements: first, change did occur and second, it followed the same direction in the different countries and can therefore be understood as a vector for convergences within Europe.

In the first part of the chapter, it will be argued that the reforms instituted by European countries within the last two decades indeed reveal strong convergences.

[2] The quotations are from the foreword written by M.J. Piore to a book in memory of Jean.-Jacques Silvestre (Gazier, Marsden and Silvestre, 1998).

These are to be found, first, in the kind of governance model they aim to realise. But they are also evident in a number of important transformations: in the role expected of public authorities at the national level, in the steering instruments mobilised and in the definition of the actors involved in higher education systems. In other words, at the policy-making level, structural (or paradigmatic) change can be documented.

But if, following Becher and Kogan's approach, we turn to the institutional and individual levels, the impact and the nature of change within the systems appear to be less radical and profound. In particular, continuity prevails when one looks at academic identity (Henkel, 2000).

As a result, the convergence process that could have been expected from the similar orientations and types of solution identified at the policy levels is not carried into other levels. As a matter of fact, national systems and idiosyncrasies remain very resilient. Explanations for these somewhat paradoxical results will be discussed in the second part of the chapter.

FROM ACADEMIC AND/OR STATE GOVERNANCE TO INSTITUTIONAL AND/OR MARKET ORIENTED GOVERNANCE?

Within the last two decades, European higher education systems experienced two main processes of change. They were, first, the national reforms launched since the 1980s by almost every European Union country; and second, the two policies developed at the European level, the construction of the European Research Area[3] (ERA) on the one hand, and the construction of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA), or "Bologna process"[4], on the other.

[3] This policy is pushed and managed by the Brussels European commission and more specifically by the General Direction for Research under the leadership of the Commissar Busquin: it maintains the former orientations aiming at building European research networks and programs and accelerated this process through the 6th FPRD.

[4] This process is quite clearly different from the previous European policies for higher education, which essentially focused on mobility (Corbett, 2002). In fact it started in Paris in 1998 with the Sorbonne conference which was organised by the French Minister of Education, Claude Allègre. A first declaration was signed by four countries: France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. Some other countries joined this first group rather quickly but an important step was reached when a second meeting was organised in Bologna in 1999 with a second declaration and 29 countries involved. Further declarations were signed: in Prague in 2001 and in Berlin in September 2003. This policy follows an intergovernmental dynamic and, at least at the beginning, excluded the European commission (Ravinet, 2003): its first impacts are to be observed in the harmonisation of the structure of study programmes in the involved countries with the introduction of the Bachelor / Master / Doctorate structure.

If the latter policies potentially affect the governance of higher education systems (and in particular accentuate the europeanisation of national higher education policies), it is still too early to discuss comparatively the nature and effects of the change involved. Too few research-based qualitative studies are at hand to produce more than some impressionist conclusions on this issue. Much more material exists, however, on the impacts of the national reforms. Therefore this chapter will concentrate on these change processes and their impact on higher education governance.

Converging national reforms on different higher education systems

It is quite often stated (see., for instance, Braun & Merrien, 1999) that in the past European universities were "cultural institutions" or ivory towers, steered by nation states whose principal role was to produce rules and then to control whether they were respected, and that now they are becoming corporate organisations, opened up to stakeholders, and in interaction with an evaluative and regulative state (Neave, 1988; Neave and Van Vught, 1991 and 1994; Van Vught, 1989 and 1995). Such a view clearly overestimates the similarity of European universities in the past and tends to ignore the diverging models that were to be found in Humboldtian, Anglo-Saxon and south-European systems respectively. Let me take three quick examples. As described by Kogan and Hanney (2000), but also by other observers, until the 1970s, the British university system was governed by the community of academics. "Government assumed that what the academy thought to be good research and teaching was likely to be good for the economy and society" (2000: 55). Self-regulation prevailed and was in the hands of academics who were responsible for the allocation of money among institutions (through the UGC) and for its use. As is evident from the plan of the Becher and Kogan book (1980 and 1992) and its focus on basic units rather than on institutions, universities had a limited role to play: "the norms are assumed to be determined either by single teachers or researchers, or by academics collectively within their basic units, or nationally, in response to social and economic desiderata, by central authorities. (…) This has seemed to leave the institution somewhat short of functions as a value-setter" (1992: 67).

The comparative study I led in the 1980s on France and Germany reveals two other models of higher education governance. In France, but for different reasons, higher education institutions were also very weak (Friedberg & Musselin, 1989 and 1993) but, in contrast with the distance between central authorities and British academics and their respective independence, co-management between academics and ministerial staff was the dominant feature of the French scene. As a result, French higher education governance primarily reflected the preferences and goals of the academic profession, even if the ministry frequently used financial incentives to try to orient the teaching offered and the research programmes. It was the other way

round in Germany. Institutions were stronger and therefore were the direct and relevant partners for the Land ministries. But the absence of co-management between the academics and the ministerial staff as well as the institutional significance of the universities for the academics (even if it was not very constraining) gave more leeway to the Land governments to set priorities, redistribute resources, cut positions, merge redundant programmes than in France. While higher education policies in France were very much defined and controlled by the academic profession, in Germany they depended far more on what the political and ministerial staff defined as the requisite policy for the Land and for the country.

Nevertheless, despite this variety of models, despite the national characteristics and the specificities of each European higher education system that prevailed twenty years ago, the reforms that they all experienced in the 1980s and/ or 1990s certainly expressed the same concerns, pointed to the same orientations and mobilised the same range of solutions[5]. As already mentioned by previous observers, such evolutions slightly varied (cf. Goedegebuure *et al.,* 1993) from one country to another. They did not happen at the same time or with the same intensity. (Some countries – like the United Kingdom- began very early in the 1980s while others started later, the second part of the 1990s being a peak time almost everywhere (Eurydice report, 2000). In some countries rupture was preferred to incremental change). Nor did they follow the same kind of process. Decentralization was most frequently the mechanism of choice but not in the UK (Kogan and Hanney, 2000). However, it is surprising to see how the orientations of these policies and the nature of the solutions mobilised in their name converged.

Converging orientations

First of all, reforms all insisted on the central role of universities in developed societies. But they were no longer or not only to be the sources of welfare benefits and redistribution (as was the case in the 60s) but rather tools and resources in economic

[5] The reason for this common set of orientations is an open question, which should be more thoroughly studied than has generally been the case. Some authors have used functionalist explanations and argued that facing the same problems European countries developed the same solutions. Others have mobilised the dissemination of ideas as an explanation. They admit that new public management spread all over Europe and was applied in a range of public sector bodies, including universities. It is also frequently admitted that international organisations such as the OECD played a role in this diffusion. But no serious study is at hand to analyse how and if this really did happen. Furthermore, in a country like France, new public management ideology infiltrated later than in other countries (Bezes, 2003). Reforms on similar lines to those introduced in the other countries were launched but before new public management came on the agenda (Musselin, 2003).

international competition (Kogan *et al.,* 2000). This general perspective strengthened over the years and became even more explicit as the notion of "knowledge society" became a *leitmotiv* within Europe.

While the academic community and/or the state were previously the two cornerstones of the European higher education systems, the changes introduced in the 80s and 90s favoured a shift in power towards higher education institutions in order to avoid two risks. One was that posed by too independent, too autonomous and too loosely regulated professionals. Even if anti-professionalism has not been as explicit everywhere as in the policies and discourses of the British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, it is often presented as one of the sources of the development of "new managerialism" and of the support of institutions better able to control and manage professionals, in higher education as well as in other parts of European societies (Cave et al. 1988; Reeds, 2003). On the other hand, institutions were expected to counterbalance, if not replace, some of the state prerogatives. There was suspicion as to the capacity of public authorities to set the relevant preferences or priorities and develop effective policies, as well as criticisms of the bureaucratic character of their activities. Institutions, and the more competitive relationships they were expected to adopt with one another, were seen as a way to escape such dysfunctions.

This rhetoric based on suspicion towards the individual academics as well as towards the state informed most of the national reforms and produced rather similar policy orientations and instruments for their realisation.

Strengthening university autonomy and leadership

First, increasing university autonomy became a slogan and decisions were made to strengthen leadership within higher education institutions. This went along with the devolution of new tasks an responsibilities to the universities and expectations for increased accountability.

In some countries (Netherlands, Austria, and Norway, for example) the status of institutional leaders was redefined and new legislation on university governance was created (de Boer, 2002). In other countries such changes were brought about through less direct and less mediatised processes[6]. The intention was to develop executive leadership and to weaken the deliberative bodies and collegial decision making. Academic leaders (often appointed rather than elected) were now expected to behave like managers and were recognised as such. This went along with a general professionalisation of the university leadership, thanks to the introduction of management methods and tools and to the recruitment of more administrative staff and/or staff with new competencies (Rhoades and Sporn, 2002; see also Bleiklie in this volume).

[6] For instance, the transfer of tasks to the university president.

The emergence of universities as more organised and structured collective actors also affected university-academic relationships and the conceptions underlying academic activities. In many countries (for instance the Netherlands, Italy, Sweden, and Austria), staff management was decentralised to higher education institutions, which became responsible for the posts they established and for the persons they recruited to them. As a result the increase in temporary academic staff (Enders, 2000 and 2001; Altbach, 2000) is not the only change experienced by the European academic profession. The relationships between tenured academics and their institutions also evolved: more incentive mechanisms were introduced and the university level (and leaders) became responsible for decisions in which they were not previously involved. The relationships between the universities and their academic staff increasingly resemble employer / wage-earner relationships and academic activities are increasingly conceived as academic work (Musselin, 2005). The orientations followed by the recent German reforms[7] clearly reflect such an evolution: the introduction of merit-related salaries for university professors gives university leaders the opportunity to reward or sanction their permanent faculty members, whereas they had almost no possibilities of that kind before.

Furthermore, universities are expected to act as policy makers. In the past, their development resulted either from the individual decisions made by the faculty members and/or from the preferences and objectives set by the public authorities. They now have to define their strategies, to implement their own policies, to decide on their own development within a general framework designed by the state[8]. This reveals how state – university relationships have been transformed.

Transforming State-University relationships

The national reforms clearly also aimed at modifying the role of public authorities, especially in countries where they were rather interventionist and centralised. In most cases, [9] they were expected to abandon their traditional role of rules producers and controllers for new competencies. These included setting a general framework within which institutions may choose their own directions, providing the support needed to facilitate new developments rather than dictating to them how to proceed,

[7] Introduced in 2001 by the Fünftes Gesetz zur Änderung des Hochschulrahmengesetzes.

[8] Such a framework and the instruments associated with it may be much more constraining than the previous more bureaucratic steering mode. It therefore should not be understood as a withdrawal by public authorities.

[9] In the UK, the exceptional case, public authorities were also expected to develop this kind of role but, because it was previously very non-interventionist this evolution resulted in strengthened public interventions in higher education.

intervening ex-post if problems arose rather than setting rules ex ante, and evaluating ex post rather than controlling.

The transformation of state-university relationships further included the development of other interactions and the diversification of the universities' interlocutors in order to introduce competition into a state-university relationship described as too exclusive, bilateral and monopolistic. Most reforms therefore were intended to favour the participation of more actors, or even of new ones into the higher education systems. This orientation was supported by two arguments.

On the one hand, university systems were suspected of being guided by their own interests rather than those of society. This criticism in fact called into question the hitherto prevailing belief that what was good for universities was good for society. It also questioned the idea that public authorities were the best and only actors able to collect the needs and demands of society and to mediate and reformulate them for the academic community. It was argued that the latter should develop direct relationships with society and that universities should themselves listen to and incorporate the needs and demands of external stakeholders.

New or more actors were recruited to engage in higher education issues and challenge state steering. In some countries this occurred through the introduction of external personalities in university councils (as in Norway and Sweden) or (as in the Netherlands and in Germany) through the creation of new bodies, called university boards and composed of university stakeholders (and sometimes of university representatives, too). They would be involved in the management of a higher education institution, in the definition of its main orientations and in the approval of its budget (Mayntz, 2002).

On the other hand, the difficult budget situation confronting European countries also spoke in favour of breaking the monopolistic relationship linking the universities to the state. The diversification of university funding mechanisms became a maxim. Universities were asked to find financial support from local authorities, economic partners, European programmes, etc.

Finally, the transformation of state – university relationships included the introduction of new tools and a more frequent recourse to existing but hitherto rarely used instruments. Very often, but not always, this was linked to the influence of the proponents of the New Public Management (for instance Ferlie *et al,* 1996, Reed and Deem, 2002). As Bleiklie *et al.* (2000) observed, symbolic tools, learning tools and contractual procedures were brought in alongside the traditional production of rules and control activities. Also, an important emphasis was put on the introduction of new budget allocation principles, paying more attention to outputs (the number of students finishing with a diploma, for instance) than to the inputs (number of students), or directly linked to the realisation of specific projects. Furthermore many

countries introduced global budgets rather than strictly defined items (in Germany and Italy for instance).

At first glance there thus seems to be substantial convergence between the reform orientations and the solutions adopted for higher education in most European countries. Moreover, most of the reforms that have been implemented can be defined as "structural" or "paradigmatic" change: they affect the instruments, the contexts in which instruments are applied , the goals and the conceptions of higher education. If these two observations are taken together, it is plausible to conclude that European higher education systems have experienced profound transformations and are less divergent than before. At the policy level, this is true but when one looks at the institutional and individual levels, the image of change gradually becomes an image of continuity. As a result, convergences among the different systems also vanish.

PERSISTENT NATIONAL SYSTEMS AND RESILIENT INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES AND BELIEFS

I shall now examine the two observations more closely. Because the question of convergence is in part linked with the question of what change has actually occurred and where, I shall begin by discussing change.

Various levels of change

Political scientists have very nicely and convincingly shown that many obstacles may stand in the way of successful reform and that ambitious change may be poorly implemented (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973; Bardach, 1977**;** Cerych and Sabatier, 1986). They provide many explanations for this phenomenon stressing amongst other things the complexity of implementation processes, the re-appearance of actors excluded during the decision-making processes, the shift in objectives, and the construction of new problems. But in the case under study we are not confronted with a reform which did not succeed (unlike, for example, the French law for the mergers of towns in 1971: France had 36000 cities and towns then and still has as many today, Dupuy and Thoenig, 1983). Neither are we talking about reforms that met with subversion and distortion or strong resistance.

In fact, one can hardly say that the reforms put in place failed: even if they were not all strictly implemented[10], all analysts recognise that the characteristics of today's higher education systems do not look like those of yesterday. Conceptions of

[10] The mergers fostered by the Norwegian (Bleiklie et al., 2000) government, for instance, did not succeed.

higher education have evolved. Nowadays, governments are steadily pursuing such policies and many of the recent public decisions can easily be understood as continuing the line of the previous reforms, rather than drawing back from them.

But a more careful look at the institutional and individual level reveals both change and continuity: some groups, bodies or structures are influenced, affected by or mediate change, while others remain the same. There is indeed a strange pace of reform as confirmed by the comparative study led in Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom by Maurice Kogan and his colleagues[11] (Kogan *et al.,* 2000). The design for this comparative research (Henkel, 1996), made it possible to observe change at the national public policy level, the institutional level (universities) and the individual levels (academics). The study showed that the public policy level evolved considerably and the institutional level (universities) was also affected by change (but less than the macro level), while at the level of the basic units academics' values, identities, research agenda and educational practices remained quite stable. The case of the United Kingdom illustrates this point particularly well because the discrepancies to be observed are the larger. While the reforms put in place by the British government (Kogan and Hanney, 2000) were radical and rather brutal, the transformations discerned at the institution level were less profound and the modifications detected in the practices, norms and values of the lay academics appeared to be rather marginal and superficial. One can thus speak of a kind of surface transformation where the deeper layers of the system are rather untouched (Henkel, 2000, Henkel, 2005).

The same observation holds for France where the last decade has been marked by an increase in institutional autonomy and in managerial practices (Musselin, 2001). University presidents mostly adopted this evolution. A quantitative study undertaken in 1999 (Mignot-Gérard and Musselin, 2000) shows that they conceive themselves and behave more and more as managers. They are pro-active, develop strategic plans and generally are in favour of more organisational and financial autonomy. By contrast, the deans have very different discourses: they value collegial style and for the most part present themselves as *primus inter pares* rather than as leaders. This creates some conflicts linked to the fact that the presidents are lacking transmitters within their universities to diffuse change and implement different institutional policies.

At the individual level, the recent study on academic work in France (Becquet and Musselin, 2004) comes to conclusions close to Mary Henkel's research: it first reveals that the practices of lay academics are weakly affected and that their core

[11] B. Askling, M. Bauer,. I. Bleiklie, S. Hanney, M. Henkel. R. Høstaker, F. Marton, S. Marton, A. Vabø. Five books were published Bauer et al., 1999; Kogan and Hanney, 2000; Bleiklie et al., 2000; Henkel, 2000; Kogan et al., 2000.

values and norms remain stable, even when their concrete situation has changed. Physicists, for instance, are all obliged to find resources by submitting proposals to funding bodies or firms but at the same time they remain very attached to what they consider to be the model for fundamental research in physics.

One explanation for this mix between change and continuity relies on a top-down conception of change, where diffusion proceeds through successive disseminations from the policy level to the individual practitioners and where time is the decisive variable: just wait and change will progressively overtake the whole system. Supporters of change take this view, as well as the critics of the evolution set in motion who fear that in the long run the new conceptions will completely absorb the old (Reed, 2001). But such an interpretation strongly relies on a zero-sum game conception of change, where what is lost by some (the professionals) is gained by others (mainly the institution).

But other explanations or scenarios may be mobilised and among them a non-zero-sum game where the new higher education governance is characterised by the empowerment of some actors without a corresponding decrease in the influence of others. The interplay between profession and organisation should not be conceived as a duel (with the death of one of the protagonists at the end) but much more as a construction of new arrangements (which can be rather different from one country to another). Strong institutions are not inherently incompatible with a strong academia as testified by the elite American universities.

Persistent national systems

This interpretation of on-going change as an aggregation rather than as a substitution process can also help us to understand why the overall convergences stressed in the policy orientations did not lead to a discernible reduction in the divergences among countries. In each place, change had to combine with the existing situation and different configurations and agreements emerge from this specific encounter. This is precisely why it is so important not to understate the previous existing divergences: they help us to understand why different implementation of the same ideas occurred. Evaluation, for instance, developed everywhere but has given rise to different outcomes. In some places (France) evaluation is mostly institutional, while it is discipline based in others (the Netherlands). In some cases, it relies mostly on self-evaluation (Sweden, at least initially), but in some other countries external evaluation by peers prevails (for the Research Assessment Exercise in the United Kingdom). The point at which evaluation occurs and the weight of its impact also varies. In France for instance, evaluation is almost always a priori, i.e. based on the assessment of projects and very rarely on outcomes [outputs?], while in other countries it is either exactly the contrary, or at least both kinds of assessment exist but the latter

(evaluation of outputs) is the most important. Finally the link between the results of evaluation and the allocation of resources can be very tight or completely loose. For instance the reports of the French National Evaluation Council (CNE) have no impact on the budget allocation. But, in the United Kingdom, the results of the RAE (Research Assessment Exercise) have had a deep impact on the public funding which is directly linked to the RAE performance and to the private resources too: as the RAE results are published, firms looking for collaboration with research units develop relationships with the best ranked. Consequently, differentiation has increased between the top research universities and the others (Shattock, 2002; Dill, 2002). The same term thus hides very different meanings and practices from one country to another.

The maintenance of the national character of the different higher education systems despite the convergent orientations, comes from the fact that everywhere reforms had to cohere with the former national system. As a matter of fact, no country experienced a "revolution" and went from a situation "A" to a "situation "B". Indeed each country went from "A" to "A+", where "A+" results from an aggregation process between what existed before and the new solutions (Musselin, 2000 and 2001).

CONCLUSION

As outlined in the preceding sections, the national reforms in higher education governance in European countries provide a nice case to reflect on change and continuity.

It first of all stresses the limits of the transfer of the Kuhnian conception of change in science to the sphere of social systems (Kuhn, 1962). The shift from one paradigm to another in science is much more radical and revolutionary than the shift from one policy paradigm to another. The main reason for that is linked to the last point discussed above: policy change does not occur on sand and has to cope with the resilience of former institutions, structures, actors and logics. The new combination resulting from this transformation may be very different from the previously existing one but nevertheless it always bears characteristics of the latter.

Second, change is not uniformly spread within a system. Some aspects or levels may be more affected than others; structural change may impact on some parts and not on others (or not as much). This is precisely what the comparative study led by Kogan and his colleagues so clearly documents and outlines in their comparative work on Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

More generally this confirms the heterogeneous nature of higher education systems. Instead of seeing them as a hierarchical nesting of levels (academics, within units, within institutions steered by the state, the market or an oligarchy of professionals) as in Clark's terms, it is more plausible to view them in terms of a complex

and nationally different interplay between three heterogeneous elements, which in Europe are a profession, institutions and public authorities (Musselin, 2001 and 2004, chapter 7). If one of these changes, the others will of course be affected and in turn impact on the on-going transformation. But because each element has its own characteristics, practices, norms, values, identities, change in one element will not automatically mean change in the same way or with the same intensity for the other two. Thus, while the national reforms deeply affected the governance of higher education systems within European countries, this in turn obliged academics to develop new practices but it barely impacted upon their identities and beliefs[12]. In other words the profession shows more continuity than the policy level, even if it more than before has to adapt to with stronger institutions.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. (ed..) (2000). *The Changing Academic Workplace. Comparative Perspectives.* Boston, Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

Bardach, E. (1977). *The Implementation Game. What happens after a bill becomes a law*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

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

Becher, T. et Kogan, M. (1980 and 1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*, London: Routledge, First and second editions.

Becquet, V. et Musselin, C. (2004). *Variations autour du travail des universitaires*, Convention MENRT 20022007, ACI : « Travail », rapport CSO, Paris.

Bezes, P. (2003). "Du management public au new public management: fabrique, diffusion et appropriation des idées néo-managériales dans les réformes administratives en France. Une comparison entre les années 1980 et les années 1990". Contribution for the 13rd *international conference of the Politiques et management public*, Strasbourg, nov. 2003.

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

Braun, D. and Merrien, F.-X. (eds.) (1999). *Towards a Model of Governance for Universities ? A Comparative View*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Boer de H. (2002): "On Nails, Coffins and Councils". *European Journal of Education*, 37 (1), 7-20.

Cave M., Hanney S., Kogan M. et Trevett G. (1988). *The Use of Performance Indicators in Higher Education : A critical Analysis of Developing Practice.* London: Jessica Kingsley. First edition.

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

Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-national Perspectives*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

[12] This means that there is no perfect connection here between practices and ideas or representations. Or to put it differently, actors may change their practices (as a result of the introduction of new instruments, rules, settings) but nevertheless still adhere to the same norms, values and identities.

Corbett A. (2002). Ideas, Institutions, Entrepreneurship in European Community Higher Education Policy 1955-95. PhD thesis, Department of Government, London School of Economics.

Dill, D. (2002). "Regulatory Success Regulatory Failure: A Review of the Regulation of Academic Quality in the United Kingdom". *CHER Annual Research Conference*, Vienna, Austria.

Dupuy, F. and Thoenig, J.C. (1983). *Sociologie de l'administration française*. Paris : Armand Colin.

Enders, J. (ed.) (2000). *Employment and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe*. Materialen und Dokumente, Hochschule und Forschung, Frankfurt am Main.

Enders, J. (ed) (2001). *Academic Staff in Europe. Changing Contexts and Conditions*. Westport, Conn, Greenwood Press.

Eurydice (2000). *Two decades of reform in Higher Education in Europe: 1980 onwards*. Eurydice Studies, Education and Culture, Brussels, European Commission.

Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., FitzGerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996). '*The New Public Management in Action'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Friedberg, E. and Musselin, C. (1989). *En quête d'universités*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Friedberg, E. and Musselin, C. (1993). *L'Etat face aux universities*. Paris : Economica.

Goedegebuure L., Kaiser F., Maassen P., Meek L. et de Weert E. (Eds) (1993): *Hochschulpolitik im internationalen Vergleic*h, Güterloh, Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung

Hall, P.A. (1993). « Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State », *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275-296.

Henkel, M. (1996). « Frameworks for the research », Seminar on *International Study of Higher Education Reforms*, Stockholm, April 1996.

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

Henkel, M. (2005). « Academic Identities in a changing policy environment », *Higher Education, 46, forthcoming.*

Kogan, M. and Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*, London and Philadelphia. Jessica Kingsley.

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

Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lindblom, C.E. (1959). « The Science of Muddling through », *Public Administration Review*, 19(1), 79-88.

Mayntz, R. (2002). "University Councils: an Institutional Innovation in German Universities". *European Journal of Education*, 37 (1), 21-28.

Mignot-Gérard S. and Musselin, C. (2000). *Enquête quantitative des modes de gouvernement de 37 établissements*. CAFI-CSO et Agence de Modernisation des universités, Paris.

Musselin, C. (2000). « The Role of ideas in the Emergence of Convergent Higher Education Policies in Europe : The Case of France ». *Working Paper Series #73* , Center for European Studies, Harvard University

Musselin, C. (2001). *La longue marche des universités françaises.* Paris : P.U.F.

Musselin, C. (2003). "French Universities and the Construction of the European Higher Education Area". UACES Study Group on *The EU as an Opportunity or a Threat? French Higher Education Policy and Europe*, London November.

Musselin, C. (2005). « European academic labour markets in transition »,. *Higher Education, 46, forthcoming.*

Neave, G. et Van Vught, F. (1991). *Promotheus Bound : the Changing Relationship between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe.* Oxford, New-York, Pergamon Press.

Neave, G. et Van Vught, F. (eds.) (1994). *Government and Higher Education relationships across three continents : the Winds of Change.* Oxford, New-York: Pergamon Press.

Neave, G. (1988). « On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise : an Overview of Recent Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe, 1986-1988 ». *European Journal of Education*, 23 (1 et 2), 7-23.

Piore, M. (1998). « Le message de J.-J. Silvestre : une conversation interrompue », in Gazier, B., Marsden, D. and Silvestre, J.-J (eds) : *Repenser l'économie du travail : de l'effet d'entreprise à l'effet sociétal*, Toulouse, Octarès Editions : pp. 3-26.

Pressman, J.L. and Wildavsky, A. (1993). *Implementation : how great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland or why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the economic development administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Ravinet, P. (2003). "Research Strategies to Study the Bologna Process", contribution presented at the 4th meeting organized by the R.A.P.P.E., London, Institute of Education, February.

Reed M. (2001). "New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities : A Review and Assessment", presented at the *Hedda – Cipès*, conference Pinhao, Portugal, October.

Reed, M. (2003). "New Managerialism and Changing Forms of Organizational Governance: Governance without Government". Presentation at the *CONDOR (CONtradictions et Dynamiques des Organisations) seminar*, Paris, May.

Reed, M. and Deem, R. (2002). "New Managerialism – The Manager-academic and Technologies of Management in Universities – Looking Forward to Virtuality". In Robins, K. and Webster, F. (eds.) *'The Virtual University'.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 126-147.

Rhoades, G. & Sporn, B., "New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States". *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(1), 3-28.

Shattock, M. (2002). "Evaluating University Success", in Dewatripont, M. Thys-Clément, F. et Wilkin, L. : *European Universties : Change and Convergence*, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 163-174.

Silvestre, J.-J. (1986). « De la mobilité à la flexibilité » *Formation emploi* ,n°14 (04/86), 54-61, partially reproduced in Silvestre J.-J. (1998). « Marché du travail et crise économique : de la mobilité à la flexibilité ». In Gazier, B., Marsden, D. et Silvestre, J.-J (eds) : *Repenser l'économie du travail : de l'effet d'entreprise à l'effet sociétal*, Toulouse, Octarès Editions, 147-160.

Van Vught, F. (1995). Policy Models and Policy Instruments in Higher Education : the Effects of Governmental Policy-making on the Innovative Behaviour of Higher Education Institutions, Vienne, Institut für Hohere Studien, Series n°26.

Van Vught, F. (ed.) (1989). *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*. Higher Education Policy Series n°7, London: Jessica Kingsley.

6

THE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING IN UNIVERSITIES

CRAIG MCINNIS

The recent prominence given to student learning and changing expectations about the nature and quality of the student experience more broadly have created a new set of governance and organisational dynamics within universities and a more intense interest of government in the core business of teaching and learning. These developments are having substantial consequences with respect to power relationships, as well as management structures, budget allocations, forms of reward and recognition for academics, and the recruitment and deployment of academics. The power relationship under pressure is between government and institutions, as well as within institutions.

The power shifts and structural changes generated and legitimised by the new student learning experience agenda are the subject of this chapter. It is hardly surprising that Maurice Kogan's work provides the foundation for the perspectives taken here. Kogan has chronicled the shift of power away from the basic units to faculty or institutional leadership, across national systems. In an analysis of lifelong learning and power relations and structure he observed that:

Institutions have increasingly taken power from the collegium, and internal structures have emerged to administer initiatives sponsored by central government.(2001: 351)

The classic notion of the university as self-regulating with its own self-sustaining values and ways of working remains a useful ideal-type. It accepts external influences but "only on its own terms" (Kogan 1996: 239). The contrast is, of course, with the dependent institution where the locus of control is typically external, with government. However, Kogan (2001: 351) also noted the evidence of increased permeability to external influences rather than power shifts. Why permeability does not involve a change in power relationships is an interesting question. The incrementalism involved in policy moves to improve the quality of university teaching over the last decade can be seen on one level as a continuation of attempts by government to intervene in the affairs of universities. However, permeability could also be interpreted as an openness, rather than compliance, to the idea that teaching and learning need to be improved, often but not always from altruism, and

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 81-94.

learning need to be improved, often but not always from altruism, and certainly from institutional self-interest.

Higher education policy researchers have generally shown little interest in the governance and management of teaching and learning in universities. Policy conversations about teaching and learning have been focused largely on quality assurance and issues of efficiency. In part this is because the study of teaching and learning in universities has been dominated by a focus on the individual practitioner and change in the classroom. Much of the intervention of government with respect to teaching quality and innovations assumed that the individual academic was the prime target to effect change. Moreover, the research on teaching and learning in higher education has been guided by theories and perspectives that have had little obvious or sustained impact on national or institutional policy. The small world of higher education learning theorists has been generally ineffective in exciting the imagination of ministers in charge of higher education. The curriculum has featured in policy analysis insofar as it has been contested ground for vocational – work related – training and broader educational experiences.

However, recent national reforms in the United Kingdom and in Australia have shifted the acknowledgement of the importance of student learning from the routine, and often token, to a central place in higher education policy. For the most part, politicians and public alike had little interest in university teaching and learning, other than reinforcing the faintly endearing stereotypes of the bumbling and incompetent university researcher turned teacher. The personal and political interest has been heightened as more offspring, and constituents, worry about the cost-benefits of university education.

Most policy makers, university executives and administrators have first-hand experience of what they consider to be good teaching and learning. Where once in small elite systems academics could get away with very ordinary teaching, and desultory performance could be ignored or even concealed, their teaching is now a very public act. Large classes, web-based instruction, student satisfaction ratings, the range of course choices and the market competition for students, to name just a few developments, have pushed teaching into the policy spotlight. In contrast, until recently, the research roles of academics have been less exposed to everyday scrutiny of management than teaching. In the UK for example the Research Assessment Exercise has had a huge impact on senior management in university and the quality of research in the university is now regarded as a matter for management at various levels. While measures of research productivity are moderately clear, and assessment of research performance of individuals, departments and institutions makes for sharp comparisons, what academics actually do in their research time continues to be a relatively private aspect of their work and often inaccessible to the lay mind.

Alongside the national policy reforms, and now accelerated by them, are significant changes in the organisational structures of universities aimed at the management of teaching and learning. The urgency and immediacy of these policy reforms are having an impact on decision-making processes of a different order from earlier phases of reform. Governments and universities are struggling to find the appropriate mix of regulation and incentives to enhance the quality of teaching. The changes in emphasis given to teaching and learning may be interpreted as an extension of the general trend towards universities becoming increasingly subject to interventionist central policies, and are certainly part of a broader reconceptualisation of the roles of universities in the student marketplace.

The change in power relations and organisational structures that Kogan observed have been sharpened quite dramatically with respect to the organisation and management of teaching and learning. In many instances the initial response of universities to the rapidly changing context has been to produce excessive and suffocating bureaucratic processes to manage teaching and learning. They often mimic the forms of government intervention about which they complain so much. *Ad hoc* institutional survival mechanisms include the use of short-cycle decision-making bodies, the stamp of senior executive authority and the expansion of discretionary and incentive funding mechanisms. Close on the heels of these modes of adaptation to external pressures has been the development of formal specialist management positions devoted to the enhancement of the student experience.

KEY CHANGES IN THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The immediately recognisable changes in the student learning experience that are driving the shifts in government and institutional power relationships include: the high cost of introducing and maintaining new technologies for teaching and learning; enormous growth in choice and diversity in the curriculum; the introduction of sophisticated, institution-wide commercial (and open access) learning management systems; the rapid emergence of institution-based formal programmes of teacher-training for academics; the expectation that institutions should have strategic management plans for teaching and learning (including clearly articulated targets for graduate attributes); the almost universal use of student satisfaction measures as a component of performance-based funding, target-setting and accountabilities; and the establishment of government-sponsored national bodies to provide a focal point for the "professionalisation" of teaching and learning.

Addressing the concept of lifelong learning, Askling, Henkel and Kehm (2001) focus on the structuring and organisation of knowledge. The widely observed shift from teaching to learning suggests a demand-led client driven approach with significant consequences. What they describe as a shift in responsibility for learning to-

wards individual learners (2001: 345) is, however, not as benign as it might appear, as far as the power relations and the permeability of institutions is concerned. While no institution of any worth would ignore the needs of the learners, universities are increasingly finding themselves in the position of being judged on their capacity to respond to the market rather than their integrity with respect to asserting core values such as academic excellence. The two are not, of course, mutually exclusive.

As long as they are mobile, and have sufficient financial resources, undergraduate students increasingly have many more choices about when, where and what they will study, and how much commitment they need to make to university life (McInnis 2004). They have been encouraged in their expectations by the choice and flexibility offered by universities, partly as a consequence of market competition, partly because new learning technologies make it possible. The reality is that the quality of the student experience in the current context is a crucial factor in establishing the legitimacy of university claims to at least a partial monopoly on shaping the knowledge future. Any discussion of "public good and market commodity" or the "academic enterprise" that does not give priority to the overall quality of the learning experience of students is surely hollow:

How and with what success universities are able to advance their status and relevance in knowledge-based economies will depend to a significant extent on the way they interpret and respond to the changing needs and expectations of undergraduate students. (McInnis, 2003)

Three broad developments are emerging in most leading knowledge economies and, with the appropriate policy instruments, they are likely to have an impact on student learning experiences (McInnis, 2004). First, the notion of understanding and valuing the total student experience has recently been revived – partly to counter the fragmented patterns of learning sometimes generated by flexible delivery as an end in itself. Since the initial surge in the adoption of new technologies, universities have become aware of the significance of the social context of student learning.

Engagement with learning occurs where students feel they are part of a group of students and academics committed to learning, where learning outside the classroom is considered as important as the timetabled and structured experience, and where students actively connect to the subject matter. Where once it was assumed that students would naturally form support groups, it is now clear that the mix of part-time work, idiosyncratic timetables and the accessibility of web-based resources requires lecturers and course designers to design learning experiences that encourage students to develop informal networks. As a direct outcome, the management of learning, and the management of academic teaching roles, has a new edge: witness the increase in specialist professional roles expanding student learning support.

Second, and obviously related, is the growth in student-centred and active learning approaches. This has been led largely by medical schools where problem-based learning is now widely incorporated or indeed totally embraced in the leading schools. There is also now an emerging effort, especially in research-intensive universities, to connect research to undergraduate teaching, and the integration of practical experience in professional courses is more systematic. Notwithstanding the deeply embedded and justifiable cynicism about the likelihood of teaching usurping the primacy of research, it is clear that teaching issues are generating changes to organisational structures and processes beyond the perennial rhetoric about the importance of teaching. As a consequence, the old contest between research and teaching has moved to a new arena. The renewal of interest in the teaching-research nexus, in the absence of conclusive empirical support, has excited interest in reconceptualising the relationship (Boyer Commission, 1999).

Third, there is a growing awareness of the importance of evidence-based approaches to the organisation of learning experiences. That means universities and academics routinely collecting evidence about how much their students have learned and modifying approaches accordingly. This has partly reinvigorated the demand to stick with first principles in guiding the improvement of teaching and learning. Without evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning, the improvement of teaching becomes a hit-and-miss exercise; and without systematic monitoring of student performance and progress there is little chance of institutional learning. Creating an institutional evidence-base generates significant rolechanges for academics. As with almost every aspect of society, the digital revolution has permeated universities, especially the development and adoption of flexible delivery with web-based resources and on-line learning. The clearest indication of change is the commonplace use of technologies in lecture theatres and laboratories, and the routine design of courses on the assumption that students will have ready access to the internet.

Students are now more likely to study in multiple settings: in large lecture theatres, in groups on collaborative exercises, in computer laboratories with two or three others in an on-line tutorial, or simply working at home alone. They are less likely to spend significant time in small group tutorials, or to have one-to-one consultation with their lecturers. On the other hand, they often have access to the personal home pages of their lecturers and easy access to comprehensive learning support services. While students are increasingly using information and computer-based technologies, it is not necessarily in ways that enhance their engagement with the learning experience. The extent to which the management of these flexible learning experiences and the use of these resources is directed by changing conceptions of the way students learn is not clear. Likewise, our knowledge of the nature and extent of student use of technologies and its impact on their learning outcomes is still sketchy. Academics have on the whole embraced the opportunities that new technologies provide. How-

ever, their biggest challenge has been the increasing range of differences in student preparation, experiences and abilities in any given classroom. Meeting the needs of the students is almost impossible without an informed understanding of their approaches to learning.

THE IMPACT ON RELATIONSHIPS AND STRUCTURES

The changes outlined in the previous section are having multiple effects on internal power relations and role definitions as universities become strategic in the ways they manage the student experience. Whole-of-institution approaches have become the norm. Some universities have created senior positions for academics and administrators focused on a portfolio of activities such as school to university transition, assessment, housing, employment and "student life". Support structures are increasingly claiming to be central to the academic performance of students, and with some justification. With increasing numbers of students arriving at university from diverse backgrounds and levels of preparation, institutions have little choice but to address their needs. Retention and progress rates are central to emerging performance indicator reward schemes, and as more sophisticated student tracking processes are developed, the institutions, departments and academics will be more obviously accountable.

Until recently, there had been an incremental growth in the professionalisation of roles in support of student learning. Academics had not been reluctant to let go of some of the time-consuming tasks that they considered distracted them from their core work.

While it is now commonplace for activities such as student admissions and course advice to be the province of senior administrators, new technologies have opened up opportunities for specialists to claim a central role in the academic life of students. The growth of interest in information literacy, for example, arose from a shift in focus and status of university librarians, who now argue for a place in the core curriculum. This, while symbolic of a series of tensions emerging over control of the curriculum, is relatively minor when considered against the impact of learning management systems. Institution-wide platforms for student learning via technology require substantial financial commitments, which in themselves increase the influence of central university administration. Equally significant is the way in which the choice of university learning systems establishes authority over key aspects of the student learning experience. It is not uncommon for academics to find their professional judgement and preferences overridden in the search for a university-wide solution to technical incompatibilities.

The demand for evidence-based strategies to improve student learning and overall experience has spawned increasing numbers of administrators responsible for

mapping and monitoring the student experience. Combine this with the use of performance indicators for budget allocations, and it is not surprising that the rank-and-file of academics find themselves distanced from the evidence informing change. What is particularly interesting here is the extent to which academics have been forced to articulate their contribution to the student experience. The inevitable tendency of senior executive to reduce teaching quality to a series of readily comparable numbers has generated renewed interest in learning beyond the process of instruction. In both the UK and Australia new measures of the total student experience are being explored. This is welcomed by the professional administrators and support staff as confirmation of their contribution outside the classroom.

Overall, these patterns of changes in internal structures represent a considerable and growing shift in the relationship between academics and administrators. When professional managers were surveyed in Australia in 1996:

> The most obvious source of tension and potential for everyday conflict in the workplace derived from the lack of acknowledgement administrators felt they received for their increasingly specialist skills and knowledge. (McInnis, 1998: 170)

At that time Dill was arguing that unless academic planning was integrated and promoted collaboration between academics and administrators, then university processes 'cannot hope to effectively promote strategic choice' (Dill, 1996: 40). Observation suggests that the level of collaboration has improved markedly and that the professional skills of specialist administrative staff are more universally acknowledged.

THE PROGRESS OF REFORMS

Gibbs (2003) highlights trends in reforms in the UK that ultimately led to the current whole-of-institution approaches. Recent policy and programmes there were preceded by almost two decades of institution-based activity such as professional development workshops to improve university teaching. As in Australia, these typically focused on individual academics. Government and institutional teaching innovations programmes provided funds to encourage and support experimentation. As class sizes grew and government resources declined in the 1990s, multi-media and distance-mode technologies aimed at managing large classes were particularly popular and well-funded activities. Gibbs paints a convincingly gloomy picture of what was essentially a period of “make-do” policy from governments and universities to improve the quality of teaching. The “small scale change within an unchanged (1970s) infrastructure”" presented academics with an impossible task. Rising to the challenge of performing in the face of adversity, with longer hours of work and less support, obviously began to wear thin with academics. The systemic obstacles could not simply be circumvented. Even large-scale, well-funded innovations such as the “Teach-

ing and Learning Technology Programme" failed to make a sustainable impact. These were, as Gibbs describes them, essentially government-led "bottom-up" exercises. Much the same can be said of the impact of three government bodies set up for this purpose in Australia from the mid-1990s. To be fair, the efforts of the innovators created a new and increasingly recognised space for academics committed to teaching, and promotion processes were adjusted to accommodate their profiles.

The two developments in the English system that followed this period of innovation projects, and the review that concluded they had basically failed to shift mainstream practice, are noteworthy since they represent the first steps in the new and continuing agenda of central government. A two-strand approach aimed at academic disciplines and at institutions established teaching and learning development centres for each discipline and, at the same time, all universities were rewarded for developing formal learning and teaching strategies.

In May 2003, following a period of national consultations, the Australian government produced the current government reform agenda set out in a package of reforms, "Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future". The major priorities – sustainability, quality, equity, diversity – are driven by the view that unless Australian higher education continues to be at the forefront of international developments, then "Australian universities are on a long-term collision course with mediocrity" (Nelson, 2003). The reforms have been driven most obviously by the recognition that universities make a crucial contribution to the international competitiveness of the economy and to maintaining and enhancing the world standing of Australia's research-led universities.

"Backing Australia's Future" includes a new emphasis on promoting excellence in teaching and learning in higher education. Despite the tensions created by the increase in class sizes, the pervasiveness of reward systems that favour research over teaching, and the overall decline in resources, the universities appear to have maintained Australia's international reputation for innovation and quality in university teaching, not least as measured by the numbers of international fee-paying enrolments.

ACADEMIES AND INSTITUTES

The "Academy for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching" in the UK now styles itself simply the "Higher Education Academy". It is relevant to note the comment of the incoming Chair, Lesley Wagner, that: "The student experience is the main function of higher education...We have to take that experience seriously." The institute will merge three existing bodies that had created competing expectations for policy makers and universities. A persistent theme running through the debates about the structure and function of the Institute is the long-standing tension between

disciplinary alliances and institutional obligations. The forms of overlapping collaboration are not readily managed once disciplinary and professional association networks are invoked.

In Australia, one of the major outcomes of the 2004 reforms is the establishment of the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (named after a former minister of education). The Carrick Institute will provide a national focus for raising the status of teaching to match that of research:

> Excellence in learning and teaching will be placed alongside the delivery of research excellence as a valued contribution to Australia's knowledge systems.(Nelson, 2003: 28)

This flagship organisation mirrors in many respects the UK Academy. From the power and relationships perspective, the debate over its functions and structure illustrates the dilemma for universities: not to appear too responsive or permeable and at the same time not to be perceived as perverse and self-defeating. The core functions in the initial outline of responsibilities of the proposed Institute included the promotion of competition between institutions for funds (a grants scheme for innovation in learning and teaching), tempered somewhat by the promotion of collaboration between institutions in fund-seeking. The broad agenda included the monitoring of national standards, international benchmarking, dissemination of good practice and the improvement of assessment practices.

The point at which permeability can be observed is in the consultation processes typically undertaken by Australian governments to gauge the likelihood of consensus and compliance ("stakeholder buy-in"). As the national round of consultations developed, it emerged, predictably enough, that the sector had major concerns about the detail (AUTC, 2004). The tensions reported include: the distance (both geographical and administrative) from the government centre; promoting substantial strategic engagement of the Institute with the senior executive of universities while seeking to maintain widespread participation amongst academics across the system; and, the remoteness of a centralised institute and the risk of it losing touch with the everyday realities of academic work.

Most of these tensions centre around the growing issues of the formal governance and management of learning and teaching in universities. It emerged during the Carrick Institute consultations, for example, that university academic and professional development centres were not considered by their own institutional leaders as the logical homes for the reform of teaching and learning. The credibility of the development units has long been problematic but is even more so now that they report, in most cases, to newly created deputy and pro vice chancellors "academic", "teaching and learning", "education", or "student experience".

Complementing the Carrick Institute , but at a conceptual and administrative distance from it , is the government proposal to establish a "Learning and Teaching Performance Fund". This will reward institutions that demonstrate a strong strategic commitment to learning and teaching. The Fund is the most contentious of the initiatives to come out of the Commonwealth Government's response to its Higher Education Review. The rationale for the fund is essentially driven by the view of government that the imbalance between teaching and research, in terms of status and rewards for both institutions and individuals, ought to be rectified. This is not simply out of fairness or an altruistic concern for the health of the sector. Maintaining the quality of the student learning experience is genuinely considered central to the national capacity to participate in the global knowledge-based economy. The more immediate imperative is to ensure that the national standing of Australian higher education in the international fee-paying market, on which so many universities now depend, is not put at risk by negative student experiences. The significant policy emphasis here is on rewarding excellence for learning and teaching rather than providing resources for performance improvement.

FINDING SYNERGY IN ACADEMIC AND MANAGEMENT VALUES TO ADVANCE LEARNING AND TEACHING

The emerging changes that are most striking concern the governance and management of teaching and learning. Considering models of governance, Kogan, El Khawas and Moses observed that "Collegial values are most often realised in research universities where research and scholarship provide meaning to individuals, status and access to intra-institutional decision making."(1994: 20) The growth of teaching-oriented universities over the last decade in both Australia and the UK has given governments broad-based support for giving priority to teaching, and, by definition, the notion of collegial values as embodied in the research universities has been weakened across the sector. In the knowledge-based economy the more explicit shift of higher education to a nation-positioning role has given governments a new set of justifications for steering and regulating the teaching performance of universities.

A decade ago, Kogan, Moses and El Khawas analysed the staffing of higher education. They identified "serious gaps in policy and practice in academic staffing." (1994: 116) They noted the shift in leadership from the "hands of senior academics, usually professors, working within small clusters of other academics." (1994: 116) and from a tradition where "institutions were able to work well without any very obvious and systematic management."(1994: 116) At that time, the authors recognised that more sophisticated and careful management of human resources was needed. New thinking about management and governance was required especially with respect to work roles within the universities.

They should lead to the creation of structures which combine the vertical management and the horizontal collegial modes of governance and for the release of synergy between academic and management values. (1994: 117)

Their list of national tasks gives an account of what was considered possible for government in stimulating changes to the staffing issues faced by the universities. The list includes the need to decrease the level of regulation of academic work, then prevalent in many systems, to allow greater flexibility for institutions and academic departments to decide how their time should be spent. A key proposal was that the process of developing institutional plans as the basis for negotiating funds should enable national policies to be asserted while giving universities the maximum possible freedom to manage staffing (1994: 118). The proposal is instructive since it illustrates just how much the context has changed since 1994, especially with the current focus on the teaching roles of academics and the tensions that creates with government and management imperatives. What is particularly striking in the list produced by Kogan et al. is the relative absence of specific reference to the task of teaching. At the same time it does remind us that talk of improving teaching without considering the total work roles of academics is rather pointless.

The reforms to improve teaching, in Australia at least, are flying in the face of a significant shift in the work preferences of academics towards research (McInnis 2000). Turning the pro-research tide will take some time, and little significant change can be expected until the rewards system is adjusted. Gibbs (2003: 16) notes that the introduction of promotion mechanisms at the University of Manchester to ensure that research achievements do not automatically outweigh teaching has resulted in more excellent teachers being promoted than excellent researchers.

CONCLUSIONS

Taken together, the two elements of the Australian policy package – the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching, and the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund – illustrate the way in which government-university power relations are being played out under the broad imperative of improving the quality of the student learning experience. It would be easy for many commentators to slip into cynicism at this point. It might be inferred that the learning and teaching agenda provided the government with a convenient and morally unassailable means of maintaining its level of control over the sector at a time when government influence by virtue of its financial contribution was declining. As one Vice-Chancellor, a supporter of the reform package in principle, said, referring to the increasing opportunity for the use of ministerial discretion:

…we have reason to believe that all of those powers…are going to be subject to wide discretion and represent, I think, an interventionist regime of the kind we have not seen before in Australian higher education. (Senate, 2003: 18)

What has the Australian government done to cause such disquiet and resistance across the system, even from those who strongly support the need for reform? Basically, the reforms have been accompanied by detailed bureaucratic requirements and guidelines to closely define the ways in which the deregulation of fee structures will occur. Moreover, these demands have been combined with the opportunity for the minister to exercise discretion and to intervene in the affairs of universities where there was formerly no provision at all. Perhaps the most significant indication of change in Australia towards government intervention has come from an attempt by the government to give ministers some discretion over which courses are funded. This is not just about which courses can attract funds; it opens the way for the minister of the day to decide on other grounds, ideological for instance, that some subjects and courses are unsuitable. For Australian universities and academics this strikes at the heart of their autonomy. Despite some legislative obstacles developed by the opposition parties it has left an uneasiness in the sector.

What was clearly underestimated by most observers less than five years ago was the extent to which the process of teaching, including the "interpretation on both the fashioning of content and the modes of its delivery" (Kogan, 1996: 241), would become the subject of intense public scrutiny.

The addition of the Carrick Institute and the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund to the national higher education agenda is likely to be an interesting challenge in managing university responses. The government discussion paper sees the two exercises as substantially separate and that "While some synergies may develop between the Fund and the Institute in the future, these are expected to be incidental rather than integral to the Fund's operations." (DEST, 2004: 5) However, if nothing else, these initiatives, combined with the public reporting of the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA), will provide some interesting possibilities for triangulating institutional accounts of their learning environments.

The importance of publicly available information for the Australian Government has been emphasised for some time. In England, the development of a national Teaching Quality Information (TQI) website follows the same line of thinking, that is, students ought to have available as much information as possible about the courses and universities they plan to attend. Amongst other things, the higher education institutions will be required to make available their learning and teaching strategies. In addition, a national survey of graduate satisfaction, modelled on the Australian Course Experience Questionnaire, will be implemented and published with the TQI data. Finally, the UK reforms mark an innovative approach to accommodating the perennial problem of assessing institutional and disciplinary contributions with

the establishment of the Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning whereby individual departments at single institutions are designated with substantial funding to maximise their impact across the system.

Perhaps the most obvious but nevertheless salient point to make about the innovations in both countries, is that the level of cross-pollination of agendas and processes is likely to be high. So too is the increasing permeability in the borders between government and universities, between senior executive and the teaching departments, and between academics and administrators and specialist support staff.

Policy research on the many and complex issues surrounding national efforts to shape and enhance learning and teaching is sorely needed. Kogan's foundational frameworks provide the basis for such work but the temptation is to overlook the core assumptions about process and structure given the rapidity of change in just the last five years or so. The impact of the UK and the Australian government initiatives on the values and outlooks of universities and academics is far from clear. The boundary shifts are not just between government and institutions. Within the institutions there are many more participants in the strategic management of the student learning experience and the new players have considerable weight on their side. The market imperatives, and the change in student expectations about what the university should do for them, are forcing academics to rethink their roles beyond instruction. So far there is little in the way of theories or modes of analysis to provide the basis for rethinking the fundamentals of the governance and management of student learning.

REFERENCES

Askling, B., Henkel, M. & Kehm, B. (2001). "Concepts of Knowledge and their Organisation in Universities." *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 341-350.

Australian Senate Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee (2003). *Hacking Australia's Future: Threats to institutional autonomy, academic freedom and student choice in Australian higher education.* Parliament House, Canberra.

Australian Universities Teaching Committee (2004). Paper presented for the Forum on the Establishment of the National Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education 12 February.

Boyer Commission (1999). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

DEST (2004). Learning and Teaching Performance Fund Issues Paper (April) Canberra.

Dill, D. (1996). "Academic planning and organizational design: Lessons from leading American universities". *Higher Education Quarterly*, 50(1), 35-53.

Gibbs, G. (2003). "Improving university teaching and learning through institution-wide strategies". Paper presented at the conference 'Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: New Trends and Innovations." University of Aveiro, Portugal 13-17 April.

Kogan, M., Moses, I. & El-Khawas, E. (1994) *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*. London: Jessica Kingsley .

Kogan, M. (1996). "The Institutional Aspects." In Brennan , J., Kogan, M., and Teichler, U. (eds.) *Higher Education and Work*. London: Jessica Kingsley .

Kogan, M. (2001). "Lifelong Learning and Power Relations and Structure." *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 351-360.

McInnis, C. (1998). “Academics and professional administrators in Australian Universities: dissolving boundaries and new tensions”. *Higher Education Policy and Management*, 20 (2), 161-173.

McInnis, C. (2000). "Changing perspectives and work practices of academics in Australian universities." In Tight, M. (ed) *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research. Vol 1. Academic work and life: what is to be an academic and how this is changing.* New York: JAI Elsevier, 117-145.

McInnis, C. (2002). "Signs of disengagement: Responding to the changing work patterns of full-time undergraduates in Australian universities." In Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (eds). *Higher Education in a Globalising World*. Elsevier: London.

McInnis, C. (2003). "Emerging issues for teaching and learning in Australian universities." In Markwell, D. (ed) *Improving Teaching and Learning in Universities*. Business/Higher Education Round Table Issue 18 (November).

McInnis, C. (2004). "Challenges and tensions in Australian and Asian national higher education reforms." The 8th Shizuoka Forum Japan, *A future prospect of higher education in Asia*.

Nelson, B. (2002). *Higher Education at the Crossroads.* Canberra, Department of Education , Science and Training.

PART 2: KNOWLEDGE

7

NEW PATTERNS OF DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: TOWARDS A CONVERGENT KNOWLEDGE

ULRICH TEICHLER

INTRODUCTION

Maurice Kogan is one of the most influential higher education researchers. He has taught us that societal demands put on higher education are inevitable and substantial but one should be aware of the line between academic professionalism and epistemic freedom on the one hand and quality-endangering intrusion on the other. Much of his research raises the question whether changing higher education policies have led academics to be responsive or made academic professionalism vulnerable. Maurice Kogan is among the key experts on governance in higher education, but, in contrast to many others, he focuses on the links between "structures" and substance. Moreover, his academic work extends far beyond these areas of emphasis. Thus, he provides food for thought for my own research activities on the shape and the size of the higher education system and on the relationships between higher education and the world of work. Cooperation with Maurice Kogan (see Brennan, Kogan and Teichler, 1995; OECD, 1995) is thought-provoking; not free from tensions but rewarded at the end by in-depth mutual understanding and lasting friendship. Maurice Kogan constantly calls us to improve the theoretical quality of higher education research without adhering dogmatically to individual heroic theories or, indeed, heroes in our field. He might criticise us, but never with the intention of discouragement or even the end of a friendship, as long as he sees others as seeking to improve higher education research. Some thoughts in his honour, therefore, must not be confined within certain thematic areas but must raise conceptually guided questions that have not been asked before.

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 97-112.

REVISITING THE PATTERNS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Higher education institutions are generally assumed to be characterised by two core activities: by research in terms of generating, disseminating and preserving systematic knowledge, and by teaching in terms of educating people to become capable of acting competently in occupations and other life spheres. We note that there are different ways of understanding the idea of service in different concepts of higher education: as a distinct, third activity or as a function of most higher education activities. Some definitions of higher education state continuing education as a separate activity. Finally some concepts of higher education focus not on major activities, but rather on its possible social impacts. For example, higher education might be viewed as having a "status-distributive function" for the occupational system and the social structure or a "custodial function" for students facing employment problems (cf. Teichler, 2001).

As regards research activities, most experts agree that higher education has by no means a monopoly in them. Statistics on research and development claim that less than a quarter of research in the rich countries of the world is undertaken within higher education institutions. It is also conventional wisdom that not all institutions of higher education are active in research. "University" is upheld in Europe as the term characterising institutions responsible for both teaching and research, in contrast to institutions of higher education with a more limited research role or none at all. Universities differ from other institutions undertaking research by providing opportunities for research driven by the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, by having a large proportion of academics responsible for both research and teaching and by awarding degrees certifying the capability of conducting research, notably the doctorate.

As regards teaching activities, it is generally assumed that higher education, first, is a stage of learning based on substantial prior knowledge; in most countries, between 11 and 13 years of prior schooling is customary before entry to higher education. Second, it is generally assumed that advanced cognitive achievements have to be reached prior to entry to higher education; rules are set for entry qualifications and possibly for selection procedures of those meeting the formal qualification requirements. Third, teaching in higher education aims not only to transmit the available knowledge, but also to foster the competence of students to challenge the conventional wisdom and seek for new knowledge.

If we want to go beyond this general wisdom and to define the boundaries of higher education more precisely, we tend to accept pragmatically the official definitions laid down by institutions with the authority to recognise higher education institutions, in most cases governments, or the prevailing expert views in individual countries. Academics may conduct their search for knowledge all over the world,

often harbour cosmopolitan values, like to cooperate on a world-wide basis and consider international reputation as the most desirable. However, the regulatory system, the funding, the character of institutions and programmes as well as the qualifications tend to be determined within countries – through centralized or de-centralised systems (cf. Kerr, 1990). In all rich countries of the world, it is still the case today that between 80 and 98 percent of the students are citizens of that country, and in most of them, more than 95 percent of those graduating in the country of their citizenship eventually get employed there. Therefore, a "higher education system" is a national higher education system, and the definition of what is included and excluded in higher education is undertaken nationally.

It is often forgotten that the term "higher education" only became popular in many countries in the 1960s and 1970s, i.e. at a time when a need was felt to put a relatively broad range of institutions under a single conceptual and possibly administrative umbrella. Before that, we talked about universities or a university system without considering other colleges that had much in common with them. The term "higher education" became popular when efforts were made by political actors to underscore the characteristics common to both universities and other colleges. Similarly, the term "tertiary education" (or "third-level education" or "post-secondary education") got momentum in the subsequent decades when efforts were made to emphasise that institutions claiming an advanced cognitive entry level have much in common with other institutions teaching students beyond the typical secondary education period.

When the term "higher education" became popular internationally, it was taken for granted that a higher education system is and should be characterised by "diversity". The term suggests that a system has some common denominator, but that there are substantial differences between the institutions, sub-units and programmes that comprise it. The key debates on diversity of higher education do not address issues such as the fields of the study, mono-disciplinary versus multi-disciplinary institutions, campus universities versus city universities or even modes of administration (see Birnbaum, 1983), but rather focus, as will be discussed below, on

– "vertical" diversity in terms of "quality" of teaching and research, selectivity at entry, achievement levels of students, professional success of graduates, reputation of researchers and the like;
– horizontal diversity in terms of substantive profiles of research and curricula.

We know that national higher education systems vary substantially from each other in the extent to which they are vertically and horizontally diverse. In some countries, for example in the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan, we note steep hierarchies and in others, for example Australia, Germany and the Netherlands, flat hierarchies of vertical diversity. In some countries, we note marked differences between profiles of study programmes and, to some extent, research approaches as

well; others are relatively homogeneous as far as the substance of their work is concerned. In some countries, the diversity is strongly in tune with formal elements of the system, such as types of higher education institutions and programmes or levels of programmes; in other countries, we note a high degree of "informal" diversity among institutions or programmes of the same type (cf. Teichler, 1998).

Analyses of higher education policies show that the quantitative and structural development of higher education, i.e. the size and shape of the system of higher education, have been constantly among the key policy issues. We might argue that this topic comes second in higher education after those of power distribution, regulation, steering and governance. However, the topic of the structural development of the higher education system is more important than merely the shape and the figures, because it is crucial for the distribution and composition of knowledge in the labour force and the citizens of a country, and substantially influences how the production of systematic knowledge is organised in any country. And this is the area in which society puts it strategic stamp on higher education and the knowledge system. While the direct regulation of knowledge is to a large extent left to the "academic freedom" and thus to the competence of the systems' professionals, the shape and size of the systems constitute the domain in which society, through governments or other "stakeholders", claims visibly what it expects from higher education.

To illustrate this with one example: countries considered similarly rich and similarly successful in fostering systematic knowledge varied consistently over the last 50 years or so in the percentage of the age group entering higher education in the range from one to three. In the early 1950s, we noted enrolment rates varying between about 3 percent to 10 percent. For some time in the 1960s, we observed ranges from 10 percent to 30 percent. And in the 1990s, ranges from about 20 percent to about 60 percent became the norm. But an international comparative study showed that even the university professors of most countries, i.e. those who often claim that they have different views about quality and the functions of higher education from the politicians and external stakeholders, believe on average that the number of those capable of higher education study is about equal to the number actually undertaking it in their own country (Teichler, 1996). Their perception does not seem to be shaped by a general concept of academic knowledge; rather the various demands of society are viewed as the yardstick for the numbers higher education has to absorb and to educate successfully.

ON THE SEARCH FOR EXPLANATIONS

In some respects, we take this variety of higher education systems among countries for granted. We know, for example, that there are varied traditions of higher education concepts, of the relationships between study and career and of higher education

policies. In other respects, we believe that certain elements such as academic quality, academic communication within and between institutions, links and tensions between quality and equity, contributions of higher education to the economy or trends towards a knowledge society are more or less common phenomena for advanced societies.

In the search for explanations why the various national higher education systems take the shape and possibly the size they do, the majority of scholars pay attention to the causes of variety. Frans van Vught (1996), for example, argued that the structure of the higher education system is very much a political affair. If frameworks are set, rules are defined and incentives are provided to support them, the higher education system will have the politically desired structure, for example a two-type structure of higher education institutions or a unitary structure. This is not a decisionistic argument, because the politicians choose between different potentially feasible models, but the argument suggests that there is nothing inherent in higher education to make one common model an imperative.

The majority of scholars aiming to explain the shape and size of the system are searching for rationales which apply, in principle, to all countries. For example, the most widely quoted conceptualisation of the structure of higher education systems, Martin Trow's (1974) "Elite, mass, universal" higher education, undoubtedly achieved its popularity because we tend to subscribe to several related beliefs. They are that there are basic common elements of higher education in different countries, that we have to find the cross-nationally best structural solution and that the shape and size of the system have substantial implications for the character and the social function of higher education. Trow argued that higher education had to diversify in the process of expansion, in order to protect the function of the elite sector while enabling a larger proportion of the population to benefit from higher education and also to develop competences shaped by the critical questioning approach that is one of its hallmarks. In a similar way, Burton Clark (1976), the other leading American higher education researcher interested in international comparison of higher education systems, considered a high degree of diversity within an expanded higher education system as best suited to serve the varied purposes and the broad clientele of higher education institutions. Both Trow and Clark were very much aware of the fact that the varied national systems of higher education did not converge, but they were convinced that a highly diversified system was the best solution in the context of a near universal international trend towards expansion.

In the debates about types of higher education institutions, it was frequently argued that different types were the best means of ensuring varied programme profiles. Varied types could reinforce each specific ideal in the best possible way. This was preferable, it was said, to regarding the institutions at the apex of the academic reputation hierarchy as providing a single optimal model. In contrast, when the Eng-

lish polytechnics were upgraded to universities in 1992, some experts argued that a single-type would ensure the greatest flexibility. This would make it possible for each institution to opt freely for any meaningful and feasible solution (see for example Scott, 1997).

Not all the major concepts used to explain the causes of structural developments were based on the assumption that one particular model was the most successful and others would either become similar or would be less successful. Other major concepts identify developments without claiming that these trends lead to successful or disastrous results. For example, the view put forward by Burgess and Pratt (1974) that "academic drift" prevails in higher education became a classic argument. Many scholars contended subsequently that higher education institutions are not faithful to their espoused institutional goals if other goals rank higher in academic reputation. Instead they try to become closer in substance to those goals. Gareth Williams' (1985) argument, that the depressed labour market for university graduates in the 1980s triggered off phenomena of "vocational drift", just extends this line of thought: there is widespread imitation behaviour in the direction of what is presumed to be the most successful model. Similarly, various historians have observed (without drawing normative conclusions) cyclical movements in the quantitative and structural developments of higher education systems, for example in response to cycles of shortage and oversupply of graduates (e.g. Windolf, 1997).

I argued that we can identify three different types of view among experts and actors as regards the causes of the development of higher education systems and the possible policy options. According to the idiosyncratic view, historically grown system characteristics in a given country are likely to be viewed as beneficial and so to persist. According to the functional view, higher education systems in all modern societies are influenced by common societal, economic, technological and possibly even common cultural factors which call for a search for the internationally most appropriate solution. Finally, political views point out that options can be taken and structural models are more likely to serve particular goals (see Teichler, 1988). This suggests that there are different and competing rationales for a variety of national systems and for a convergence between them.

There are periods in which the belief is widespread that an international variety of structures of higher education systems is the normal state of affairs. From time to time, however, we note an inclination to seek for the internationally best possible solution. The 1960s and 1970s obviously constituted a good example of the latter, as far as the market-oriented highly industrialised countries were concerned. Politically this was the period between the "Sputnik Shock" in the late 1950s and the "Oil Shock" in the early 1970s.

The OECD was a major driving force of this debate. It was a period in which higher education was expected to serve more directly certain societal goals than in

the past: economic growth and reduction of inequality of educational and professional opportunities (see Papadopoulos, 1994). This search for the internationally best option did not lead to a consensus regarding the specifics of a structure of higher education systems, for example how much vertical diversification or how many types of higher education institution or programme. Nor did it remain at the level of a debate without consequences. Rather, as I had argued earlier, the OECD eventually advocated some structural principles – I called it a "soft model of education" which can be embedded into varied structural models. Accordingly, late selection in pre-career education, permeability of educational careers, compensatory measures for the disadvantaged, soft, diversified higher education structures , and the establishment of a life-long education system contribute to a soft system in three respects: no decision in the educational career would be considered as definitive, the model could satisfy both the advocates and the critics of educational expansion, and, finally, it would facilitate rapid adaptations, if major problems occurred (see Teichler, 1988).

In the course of the 1970s, however, we noted a loss of the belief that a certain model of the higher education system would be optimal. This was a period when a loss of faith in grandiose concepts of higher education reform was obvious. The notion faded that there is a definite international trend as far as the shape and size of the higher education system are concerned. Certain patterns of higher education systems ceased to dominate the debates. Aims and tasks of higher education policies became unclear. And the power and influence of planning bodies faded in the countries where they had flourished in the preceding period (see OECD, 1983, Cerych and Sabatier, 1986).

In the late 1990s, a new period of search for the best model of higher education emerged. For example, the OECD (1998) noted that since the late 1980s enrolment quotas in tertiary education had again started to increase substantially in most economically advanced countries and enrolment figures of more than half of the age group seemed to have become the norm. Terms such as "massification stage" or "post-massification stage" aimed to characterise a convergent quantitative trend which obviously had structural implications (see, for example, Research Institute for Education, Hiroshima University, 1997).

The new spirit of search for convergent solutions is most directly visible in the so-called "Bologna Process". The education ministers of most European countries agreed in the late 1990s to establish a stage system of study programmes and degrees similar to Anglo-Saxon bachelor-master structures. The new system, the "European Higher Education Area", is expected to be realised by 2010.

Finally, we have to take into account in this context the call of the European Council, i.e. the assembly of the heads of governments of the European Union, in the year 2000 to establish a "European Research Area" by 2010. The concept of the

"European Research Area" is viewed by many experts and actors as having substantial implications as well for the shape of the higher education systems in Europe.

A first glance suggests that an unprecedently high degree of consensus among key actors has now emerged that certain formal patterns of the higher education system are the best possible option for all countries, i.e. a stage structure of programmes and degrees. Also, views seem to converge more strongly than in the past as far as the acceptance of almost universal tertiary education is concerned. Finally, those experts and actors who advocate a steep vertical stratification of the higher education system feel more convinced than ever that their view is the only rational one.

The aim of the following considerations is to shed some light on the current efforts in Europe to shape national higher education systems in Europe in a similar way. What are the shape and size of the systems envisaged? What degree of "convergence" is sought ? What purpose are the convergent structures expected to serve? What are the underlying ideas about the composition of knowledge and the composition of knowledge production? For example, what proportions of the adult population should be highly qualified, highly specialised technical experts? And what proportion of young people should either undertake no advanced study or study only up to first degree level? Are there reasons why we might believe more today than in the past that a certain shape of the higher education system is the optimum? Does the current pursuit of convergent structures even suggest that we can agree across countries about the best composition of knowledge in the population and the best composition of knowledge production? The analysis will focus on the "Bologna Process" without, however, completely neglecting the expansion of student enrolment and the implications of research policies for the shape of the higher systems in Europe.

Structural reforms for increased world-wide attractiveness and intra-European mobility

In 1998, the ministers in charge of higher education in France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom declared on the occasion of an anniversary of the Sorbonne University in Paris their aim to establish a "harmonised" structure of programmes and degrees. In 1999, the ministers of 29 countries signed in Bologna a declaration, according to which a stage structure of programmes and degrees should be established and eventually a "European Higher Education Area" implemented by the year 2010. Subsequent ministerial conferences for monitoring, specifying and stimulating this process were held in Prague in 2001, in Berlin in 2003 and will be held in Bergen in 2005. The main objective of the proposed reforms is the introduction of a stage structure of programmes and degrees similar to Anglo-Saxon Bachelor-Master structures. In the meantime, about 40 countries participate in the "Bologna Process".

It should be noted that similar discussions and implementation activities had started even earlier. In Germany, for example, the relevant legislative change was already realised in 1998.

Two aims for establishing a structurally "convergent" – this term replaced "harmonised" in the subsequent debate - higher education system were most frequently named in the Sorbonne, Bologna and subsequent declarations and communiqués:

– to make European higher education more attractive for persons from outside Europe, notably for students;
– to facilitate intra-European student mobility.

The Bologna Process was triggered off by concern on the part of continental European countries that a rising proportion of internationally mobile students were opting for study in English-speaking countries with a Bachelor-Master structure and that the continental European universities would increasingly lose the "world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions" (Bologna Declaration; cf. this and other documents in http.//www.bologna-berlin.de). The introduction of a Bachelor-Master structure all over Europe should be the key measure to enhance the attractiveness of its higher education.

In fact, the argument that continental European countries lose attractiveness was not well founded. The proportion of students all over the world studying abroad (i.e. in a country different from that of their citizenship) going to the major Anglo-Saxon countries (the United States, United Kingdom, Australia and Canada) remained about 45 percent from the mid-1960s to the mid-1990s, while the proportion of students studying abroad in other European countries slightly increased (see Teichler, 1999). Moreover, it was by no means certain whether measures in favour of structural convergence were those most likely to increase the attractiveness of European higher education for students from other parts of the world. For example, in Germany, the language issue, the scarcity of highly organised doctoral programmes and the deficiencies in academic and administrative support for individual students were at least as often named as possible barriers and deterrents for foreign students (ibid.). But certainly, for many students from various parts of the world, a Bachelor-Master structure might be viewed as more transparent. It avoids the problem that a degree from a long university programme considered equivalent to master could be interpreted in the home country as equivalent to a bachelor. And it makes a master study in Europe a real option for those awarded a bachelor degree in their home country.

The Bologna Process would hardly have been started , if the key aim had been to facilitate intra-European student mobility; yet this appears to be the central aim in the debate. This can be inferred from the fact that the accompanying measures suggested, notably the Europe-wide introduction of credit systems and the Diploma Supplement, derived from the intra-European debates about means of facilitating student and professional mobility.

In fact, considerable efforts had been made before the Bologna process to facilitate student mobility in Europe. The Council of Europe since the 1950s and UNESCO since the 1970s promulgated Conventions for the Recognition of entry qualifications, study periods and degrees in Europe. According to the Lisbon Convention of 1997, eventually all institutions of higher education in Europe are expected to recognise prior study at other European institutions "unless a substantial difference can be shown" (Council of Europe, 1997).

Also, the ERASMUS programme, inaugurated in 1987, now supports more than 100,000 European students annually for a period of study up to one year in another European country, on condition that the home and host institutions ensure through educational and administrative means that recognition of prior study will be granted as a rule. The European Credit Transfer System was started in 1989 in this framework in order to make a high degree of recognition most likely. In fact, surveys suggest that about 80 percent of the study achievements reached during the ERASMUS-supported study period are recognised upon return by the home higher education institution. This can be viewed as a very high proportion if one takes into account that a substantial number of mobile students are not well prepared to study in the host country language at the beginning of their study period abroad and that many students take fewer classes abroad than during a corresponding period at home (see Teichler, 2002). We noted that, in the framework of intra-European student mobility, the number of years of study had worked relatively well as an "exchange rate", irrespective of the diversity of lengths of study programmes. The evaluation of ERASMUS student mobility, however, shows that recognition might effectively be much lower than these data suggest; for students expect their overall study period to be prolonged by an average of half the length of their study abroad. This notwithstanding, the evaluation does not lend support to the view that a convergent structure for programmes in terms of length of study would be a key measure for the facilitation of intra-European student mobility.

"Convergence" does not mean identity of programmes and degrees; the Bologna Declaration explicitly calls for "greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education". In the meantime, an agreement has been reached that all participating countries should establish a stage structure, whereby

- the duration of study up to the first degree is three to four years;
- the duration of the second stage is between one and two years, and
- the overall duration of the two stages of study programmes and degrees is no longer than five years.

According to reports on the implementation of the Bologna Process (see Reichert and Tauch, 2003), three-year Bachelor programmes and two-year Master's programmes are the most frequent choices, but there is a considerable number of other options. We do not know yet whether the stages will become the key criteria instead

of the length of study. If this is the case, a four-year bachelor would be conceived as similar to a three-year bachelor. If it is not the case, a four-year bachelor is more likely to be conceived as a three-year bachelor plus one year of master's level study.

Moreover, the key documents of the Bologna process do not address many other issues which could be considered crucial for the "comparability and compatibility" of study programmes and degrees. Substantial variation might prevail regarding years of prior schooling, desirable entry quotas of the age group, unitary or multi-type systems of programmes and institutions, or selectivity at entry to the master stage. Last but not least the European countries agreed to cooperate in matters of quality assurance, but not to establish Europe-wide systems of evaluation or accreditation.

One might ask how a "convergence" of structural and formal elements of study programmes and related measures can be expected to have a facilitating effect on student mobility, if such a large range of differences is viewed as acceptable. It would not be surprising if, in the process of implementing the Bologna aims, efforts were made in the future to reduce this range and to emphasise a higher degree of structural "identity" instead of a soft "convergence".

Towards smaller or increasing quality differences?

A great deal of energy is being invested in the Bologna Process and in associated reforms of higher education in Europe. The purpose is certainly not to achieve only token change. Rather, the Bologna Process addresses one of the key formal mechanisms for affecting the extent to which higher education systems are homogeneous, "diverse" or heterogeneous. One of the major problems of this reform, however, is the fact that the degree of diversity aspired to in the Bologna Process is open to ambiguous or even contradictory interpretation.

This holds true not only for stages of programmes and degrees but also for other formal dimensions of diversity. The same point has already been made with respect to the duration of study. It is even more true in the case of types of programmes and degrees. On the one hand, it might be argued that an increasing emphasis on stages of programmes and degrees more or less automatically reduces the relevance of different types of higher education institutions or programmes. On the other hand, we note intensive debates in some countries as regards how differences between the types of programmes or institutions can be preserved or even strengthened in the framework of a stage system.

The Bologna Process is characterized by a still more ambivalent or even contradictory relationship to the informal dimension of "vertical" diversity. On the one hand,

- it is widely assumed that the vertical range of talents, motivation and job prospects will grow in the process of increase of enrolment quotas;
- many activities are being undertaken in Europe to reinforce the competitive mechanisms of system steering and institutional governance, and claims are made that the European Higher Education Area ought to be "more competitive";
- in the framework of efforts to establish a "European Research Area" by 2010 as well, many actors and experts claim that a steeper stratification of the higher education systems should be promoted in order to strengthen an elite research sector in higher education (see Weber, 2003).

On the other hand,

- the Bologna Process is expected to facilitate mobility of students within Europe. Mobility, however, can only be substantially facilitated through similar levels and programmes , if the formal level of a programme and a degree or the number of years of study indicate similarity in the quality level as well as similarity or equivalence in the substantive profiles of the programmes.

If the purpose of introducing a Bachelor-Master structure is to attract students from other parts of the world , one would not expect the common labels "Bachelor" and "Master" in Europe to signal a certain level of quality, but rather a certain duration of study or formal level, which implies substantial diversity as far as quality is concerned. The new structure, thus, would only increase "transparency" with respect to formal dimensions. In contrast, in order to facilitate student mobility within Europe with the help of structural "compatibility and comparability", attempts are being made within the Bologna Process and the 1997 Lisbon convention on recognition to keep differences in the quality of the study programmes in Europe at each level relatively small.

In order to avoid misunderstandings: the Lisbon Convention obviously did not assume that there are no substantial quality differences between higher education programmes and degrees in Europe. However, it seemed to be based on the "creative assumption" that the existing differences are often smaller and less relevant than is often thought and that it would be advisable to avoid emphasising differences.

Experts have frequently pointed out that there is a tension or possibly a contradiction between the global view and the intra-European view in the Bologna Process (see van der Wende, 2001; Neave, 2002). Not surprisingly, some suggest that the quality differences are bound to grow in the process of globalisation. It would also be an illusion to expect the Bologna Process to be a strong instrument of facilitating student mobility in Europe (see, for example, van Vught, van der Wende and Westerheijden, 2002). There are contrasting arguments as well:that societies that act to ensure the diffusion of advanced knowledge rather than concentrating their resources on a few institutions might be better prepared for a knowledge society in

which widespread critical and innovative thought and decentralised decision-making prevail (see Teichler, 2003).

Obviously, there is enormous support for the introduction of a convergent structure, but much less agreement as to what this implies for the composition of quality levels and programme profiles. This suggests that, altogether in the Bologna Process, even under the umbrella of more or less common structures, ample room remains for structural variation between the countries and that the link between structural innovation and substantive shaping of knowledge is relatively vague. Or, in the words of the Bologna Declaration, a common structural concept is pursued while "taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of university autonomy".

"Employability": a structurally neutral debate

The Sorbonne and Bologna declarations as well as the major subsequent documents focus on structures of the higher education system, as well as on formal accompanying measures, such as credit systems. What this means for the substance of curricula and knowledge acquisition, remains largely open. It is not that structures of the higher education system and formal elements such as credit systems are viewed as irrelevant for the substance of teaching and learning. It is obvious that efforts to introduce a Bachelor-Master structure have triggered a more lively debate on aims of study programmes, curricular thrusts, competencies to be fostered by higher education, relationships between the supply by higher education and the work tasks of graduates, than was observable in the preceding decades. But the prevailing view seems to be that the new structures as such pre-determine the curricular approaches only to a limited extent.

In fact, the Bologna Declaration refers explicitly to the substance of study programmes only once: "The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification." As universities in many European countries were accustomed to providing only longer programmes than bachelor programmes, they are called on by the Bologna Declaration not to be tempted to design bachelor programmes simply as a first stage towards a master degree, but to regard them also as an entry qualification for the labour market.

We note that the Bologna Process is accompanied by major debates on "employability" (cf. Teichler, 2004). The term as such is misleading, because it usually refers in debates on labour market issues to problems of young people at risk of not getting a job at all. Graduates from institutions of higher education in Europe have a much lower risk of unemployment than young people without a degree. The debate on "employability", however, suggests that the current restructuration of study pro-

grammes in many European countries is taking place at a time when universities are more strongly expected than in the past to have the labour market relevance of study in mind when they design study programmes. The following questions are frequently raised. Should three years of study at university become more specialised and more professionally oriented than in the past, when specialisation and professional emphasis often started at a late stage within long programmes? Should bachelor programmes at vocationally oriented higher education institutions become more general and turn the professional preparation, which has been their traditional trade mark, over to the master stage? Should all higher education programmes emphasise more strongly than in the past the acquisition of socio-communicative competences, the socialisation of employment-related values or the training of the transfer of academic knowledge to practical problem solving? Should programmes be divided according to types of academic or professional emphasis, generality or specialisation, disciplinarity or interdisciplinarity?

Whatever the answers are, we do not perceive any common views in the debate about the labour market relevance of the new programmes and degrees with respect to the overall composition of levels of competences. Rather, this seems to be left to the "full respect of the diversity...". However, there seems to be one fairly widespread common element. In countries where most universities have had long study programmes in the past, the introduction of a bachelor degree that is both genuinely labour market relevant as well as preparatory for advanced study, is frequently expected to increase the overall proportion of graduates entering the labour market after a relatively short period of study. This is often applauded by those employers, politicians and academics who have complained in the past that higher education tends to produce "too many chiefs and too few Indians". In fact, in some countries the widespread support for the Bologna Process might be partly explained by the fact that it is expected to produce an increase in the proportion of short-cycle graduates entering the labour market.

Growing structural consensus amidst declining structural relevance?

In conclusion, it can be contended that the shape and size of the higher education system has been one of the major issues of higher educational policies in the last few decades. Determining the shape and size of the system is viewed as a legitimate way for society to influence the actual activities and output of the higher education system, i.e. the composition of knowledge in the labour force and population as well as the composition of knowledge production through higher education. There were periods in the past during which a substantial variation in the shapes and sizes of national higher education systems was taken for granted. There were periods, too, in

which the aim was to find the best international model, but a variety of national higher education systems persisted.

Currently, we note in Europe for the first time a high degree of consensus that a particular structural model should be implemented by all European countries. We might assume that consensus has grown as well as regards the composition of knowledge of the graduates in terms of levels of quality or the degree of homogeneity of substantive profiles. A close look, however, reveals that divergent and contradictory expectations accompany the so-called Bologna Process as regards the composition of knowledge that should emerge in the commonly agreed stage structure of study programmes and degrees. The more consensus has grown as to the structure, the less the structure seems to be guiding the substance in higher education.

But this conclusion might be premature. We frequently observe that common policies are pursued by actors harbouring diverse aims and that the goals stated are contradictory. This does not preclude the possibility that the actual reforms implemented lead to relatively consistent results, as hoped for by some advocates but feared by others. It might well be that clear decisions have to be taken in the Bologna Process or will emerge with respect to the extent of diversity. The European Higher Education Area is expected to be implemented by the year 2010. We might have to wait a few years before we know.

REFERENCES

Birnbaum, R. (1983). *Maintaining Diversity in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bologna Declaration: Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education Convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999

Brennan, J., Kogan, M. & Teichler, U. (eds.) (1995). *Higher Education and Work*. London and Bristol, PA, Jessica Kingsley.

Burgess, T.& Pratt, J. (1974). *Polytechnics*. London: Pitman.

Cerych, L. & Sabatier, P. (1986). *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Clark, B. R. (1976). "The benefits of disorder". *Change*, 8(10), 31-37.

Council of Europe (1997). *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region*., Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Kerr, C. (1990). "The internationalization of learning and the nationalization of the purposes of higher education: Two 'laws in motion' in conflict?". *European Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5-22.

Neave, G. (1997). „Nachäffen der Nachbarn oder überzeugt sein von der eigenen Weisheit". *Das Hochschulwesen*, 45(3), 135-145.

Neave, G. (2002). "Anything goes: Or, how the accommodation of Europe's universities to European integration integrates an inspiring number of contradictions". *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(2), 181-197.

OECD (1983). *Policies for Higher Education in the 1980s*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (1995). *Review of National Policies for Education: Finland.* Paris: OECD.

Papadopoulos, G.S. (1994). *Education 1960-1990: The OECD Perspective*. Paris: OECD.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University (1997). *Academic Reforms in the World: Situation and Perspectives in the Massification Stage of Higher Education.* Hiroshima: RIHE.

Reichert, S. and Tauch, C. (2003). *Trends in Learning Structures in European Higher Education III*. Brussels: European University Association

Scott, P. (1997). "Structural developments in higher education: The experience of unified systems". *Das Hochschulwesen*, 45(3), 133-139.

Teichler, U. (1988). *Changing Pattern of the Higher Education System*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Teichler, U. (1996). "The conditions of the academic profession". In Maassen, P.A.M. and van Vught, F.A. (eds.) *Inside Academia*. Utrecht: Uitgeverij De Tijdstroom, 15-65.

Teichler, U. (1998). "The changing role of the university and the non-university sectors of higher education in Europe". *European Review*, 6(4),475-487.

Teichler, U. (1999).Gestufte Studiengänge und –abschlüsse in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften. In DAAD & HRK (eds). *Bachelor und Master in den Geistes-, Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaften*. Bonn: DAAD, 37-141.

Teichler, U. (2001). "Higher education". In Smelser, N. & Baltes, P.B.(eds.). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 6700-6705.

Teichler, U. (ed.) (2002). *ERASMUS in the SOCRATES Programme*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Teichler, U. (2003). "Changing concepts of excellence in Europe in the wake of globalization". In De Corte, E. (ed.). *Excellence in Higher Education*. London: Portland, 33-51.

Teichler, U. (2004). "Employability". Keynote speech at the EUA Conference "University and Society: Engaging Stakeholders", Marseille, 1-3 April 2004.

Trow, M. (1974). "Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education" In OECD (ed.) *Policies for Higher Education*. Paris: OECD, 51-101.

Van der Wende, M. (2001). "Internationalisation policies: About new trends and changing paradigms" *Higher Education Policy*, 14(3), 249-259.

Van Vught, F. (1996). "Isomorphism in higher education?" In Meek, V.L. et al.(eds.) *The Mockers and Mocked*. Oxford: Pergamon/IAU Press, 42-58.

Van Vught, F., Van der Wende, M. & Westerheijden, D. (2002). "Globalisation and internationalisation: Policy agendas compared" In Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (eds.) *Higher Education in a Globalising World*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 103-120.

Weber, L. (2003). "Main issues in European higher education and research". *Higher Education Forum (Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University)*, 1, 13-32.

Williams, G. (1985). "Graduate employment and vocationalism in higher education". *European Journal of Education*, 20 (2-3), 181-192.

Windolf, P. (1997). *Expansion and Structural Change.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

8

THE ORGANISATION OF KNOWLEDGE: IMPERATIVES FOR CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION[13]

PATRICIA J. GUMPORT

The questions of what knowledge matters most, how should it be organised and supported, and who should decide are at the core of higher education reform. In teaching and research activities, higher education has served society by preserving, transmitting, and advancing knowledge. These diverse knowledge functions have been the raison d'être and foremost justification for a myriad of public and private funding, even prior to higher education's worldwide expansion during the 20th century. In practice, the pursuit of these knowledge functions is imbued with ambiguity for those who are responsible for determining the appropriate academic structures and practices to realise these purposes.

In shaping the academic landscape, a perennial challenge for academic organisations is to sustain their commitments to enduring fields, while keeping pace with – perhaps even leading the way to – knowledge advancements. In a context of abundant resources, additive solutions have been commonplace. Rather than choose between subjects that align with one of these two sets of priorities, one has the option of investing in both. Under conditions of resource constraint, however, the imperatives for continuity and for change in the academic structure become competing priorities, with unclear operating principles. Such conditions exacerbate divergent views over higher education's primary purposes, including which adaptations are necessary for higher education to maintain its vitality and centrality in society.

The difficulties for higher education leaders in responding to conditions of resource constraint became readily apparent during the last quarter of the 20th century in the United States. Public higher education, in particular, faced waves of constrained funding symptomatic of broader political economic pressures. An unprecedented mix of external forces turned the spotlight on higher education institutions, amplified accountability demands, and raised the stakes for the very legitimacy of the enterprise in the eyes of society. Declining public confidence along with policy-

[13] Adapted from Gumport (2000 and 2001).

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 113-132.

makers' scrutiny of higher education's costs, quality, and governance practices – all conveyed to higher education leaders that sufficient public funding was no longer assured. The mandate for change was clear: higher education needed to adapt its academic practices, both to become more efficient and to meet the short-term utilitarian interests of students, employers, and various state actors. The dominant ideology favoured the pragmatic over the idealistic. The extent to which higher education could demonstrate its willingness and ability to restructure trumped the long-held institutional expectations of preserving academic subjects.

From extensive case study research on academic restructuring in the U.S., I argue that the cumulative effects of these changes are far-reaching. Before elaborating on this thesis, I locate my research within key themes developed in Maurice Kogan's work on higher education reform.

A COMPLEX INTERDEPENDENCE

My approach to studying these changes focuses on the intersection of knowledge, organisations, and environments. Kogan's work has been generative in this regard, particularly in identifying a complex interdependence between environmental pressures and changing conceptions of higher education's purposes and knowledge agendas.

Kogan's theoretical work is distinctive in spanning political theory, public policy, and organisational theory. Kogan uses empirical evidence to scrutinise widely accepted conceptualisations and then elaborate upon those most fruitful. His substantive contributions illuminate structural and normative changes in higher education systems during the last several decades of the 20th century. Refuting a model of simple causation, such as top-down public policy, Kogan has depicted how actors at several levels – with the institutions themselves – have exerted agency amid state forces and specific reform policies. Therein he locates an ongoing interdependence between governance, values, and knowledge (Kogan et al., 2000). A prominent theme in Kogan's work is how expanding student enrolments in higher education constituted both a context and a consequence of policy change. He states:

> Whilst expansion, fuelled by increased student demand, was a dominant factor in causing change, it pulled into more rigorous public policies a domain that had hitherto been trusted to do good by doing what it thought to be good. The demystifying of academic work, and reduced confidence in professional groups in society as a whole, went along with increased numbers and severely cut units of resource (Kogan and Hanney, 2000: 15).

The expansion of higher education rendered it more vulnerable to a powerful mix of ideological orientations that were already gaining momentum. Institutional auton-

omy was effectively displaced by prescriptions driven by a faith in market forces that prized competition and privatisation, tightening governmental accountability mechanisms, and extending economic instrumentalism into the content of teaching and research activities. The increased size, complexity, and costs of higher education intensified state and public scrutiny, which in turn dramatically affected the inner workings of higher education systems.

What I find particularly valuable in Kogan's analyses is the way he casts the cumulative consequences as, among other things, redefining the parameters for higher education's knowledge functions to align more closely with the needs of the economy. I pursue this theme in my study of academic restructuring in the United States to show how the wider forces that constrained institutional autonomy simultaneously changed the prospects both for existing academic subjects and for new knowledge (Gumport, 1997; 2000; and forthcoming. Kogan's major analytical accomplishment in this regard is twofold: he characterises how the external pressures on higher education to change teaching (curriculum) and research (R & D) emphases threatened to undermine the authority and legitimacy of "academically-anchored knowledge" (Kogan and Hanney, 2000: e.g.58); and he links this process to the decline in the status of academics, underway since the 1970s as part of a broader anti-professional ideology.

My case study research on academic restructuring during the last quarter of the 20th century in the United States has borne out Kogan's views on these political and economic exigencies: higher education's responses have been varied but profound. For the most part, administrators and faculty no longer have the option of widespread additive solutions such as their predecessors enjoyed. Even though there is talk about a knowledge explosion, and the prevailing image of knowledge change on many campuses is still one of expansion, academic fields are differentially valued and resourced. Organisations selectively invest in new areas to align with projected student demand, employer needs, and currency in today's marketplace; and conversely, consolidate academic programs and departments deemed to have insufficient centrality, quality, or cost-effectiveness (Gumport, 1993). In the corresponding governance dynamic, centralised strategic initiatives tend to bypass representative forums of faculty governance. Moreover, the faculty workforce itself has been reconstituted: as faculty vacancies arise, those full-time tenure-line positions may be replaced with fixed-term or part-time appointments, or simply eliminated. The tenure-line academic workforce becomes smaller, eroding institutional memory and weakening the faculty voice in deliberations over alternative responses to political and economic exigencies.

I concur with Kogan that the implications of such shifts are far-reaching. The tensions in intermingling long-held academic commitments with wider economic and political pressures signify that deliberations over reorganising academic units

will likely be ongoing. My research in the United States also raises the question of whether higher education will lose legitimacy in moving away from its accumulated heritage as an educational institution. At the campus level, the spotlight is on officials to respond strategically. In an era when market forces and a competitive ethos have reached an unprecedented level of legitimacy, campus leaders are compelled to set related short-term imperatives above longstanding mandates to serve society's vital educational and social justice needs. Higher education's adaptation to unrelenting pressures from policymakers, employers, and prospective students has prompted discussion of whether higher education has lost the ability to define the terms of the academic enterprise. While some adaptation seems necessary in order to survive, a wholesale adaptation could reduce public higher education to a mere sector of the economy, thereby subsuming the discourse about higher education's future within a logic of economic rationality, to the detriment of the educational legacies and democratic interests that have long characterised American education.

The remainder of this chapter expands upon my thesis. I focus on the interplay between external pressures and the forces already in play within U.S. higher education institutions: the expansion of administrative authority; the spread of a consumer orientation; and the stratification of academic subjects. I argue that, cumulatively, these have redefined the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education, which has shifted in the collective conception from a social institution to an industry, with profound implications for what knowledge is valued and who should decide.

THE LEGITIMATING IDEA OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Over the past 25 years, academic knowledge in U.S. public colleges and universities has been reorganised along a utilitarian trajectory such that historically, at the macro level, the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education has shifted away from higher education as a social institution, to higher education as an industry.

At the macro societal level, a legitimating idea is constituted by taken-for-granted understandings of the parameters for what is legitimate; that is, what is expected, appropriate, and sacred, as well as the converse. In higher education, both legitimating ideas of higher education – as a social institution, and as an industry – have distinct premises regarding what is valued, what is problematic, and what is in need of improvement in public higher education. Simply stated, from the perspective of higher education as an industry, public colleges and universities are seen principally as a sector of the economy. As with firms or businesses, the root metaphor then becomes a corporate model of production that includes producing and selling goods and services, training the workforce, advancing economic development, and performing research. Harsh economic challenges and competitive market pressures

warrant better management, including swift programmatic adjustment, maximum flexibility, and improved efficiency in the direction of greater accountability and thus customer satisfaction. Emphasis is placed on maximising one's competitive position and seeking opportunities to be out in front. In contrast, from the perspective of higher education as a social institution, public colleges and universities by definition must serve a broader range of societal needs; these include workforce training and economic development, but also foreground such essential educational commitments as preserving knowledge (and its pursuit) as a public good, cultivating citizenship, transmitting cultural heritage(s), and forming individual character and habits of mind. The value of such educational aims and practices does not lend itself to cost-benefit analyses. Fostering imagination and creativity as well as character and public responsibility – these are long-term pursuits irreducible to tangible or parsimonious outcome measures.

The tension between these two legitimating ideas is profound. It is not simply that the social institution idea connotes a multiplicity of purposes while the industry idea is a narrower set of priorities to be pursued in a more focused manner. The tension is captured in what is at stake for higher education if it fails to respond appropriately. The industry perspective is dominated by a concern that higher education's inability or unwillingness to adapt to contemporary demands will result in a loss of centrality to society and perhaps ultimately a loss of viability. In fact, there are widely cited proclamations that higher education – in the United States – has already lost the ability to judge itself (Zemsky and Massy, 1990; Neave and van Vught, 1991; Dill and Sporn, 1995; Gumport and Pusser, 1999). In contrast, the social institution perspective is dominated by a concern that adaptation to market forces and to a competitive ethos gives primacy to short-term demands to the detriment of a wider range of educational responsibilities and knowledge pursuits, thereby jeopardising the long-term public interest.

Higher education as an industry

The conception of higher education as an industry primarily sees public colleges and universities as quasi-corporate entities producing a wide range of goods and services in a competitive marketplace. A research university may be thought of as offering a widely diverse product line, as in the post–World War II "multiversity," the term coined by Clark Kerr (1963). An entire state's public system of higher education may be seen as offering an even more diverse range of goods and services with segments differentiated by mission. Community colleges offer degrees, or one course at a time in many fields, to people of all ages. The universities offer many courses and levels of degrees across hundreds of fields of study; profess to serve

national, state, and local economic needs; and sell entertainment in sporting and cultural events to the local community.

According to microeconomic theory, organisations are ideally managed based upon values of economic rationality. The main services of teaching and research are variously supplied and priced to correspond to laws of supply and demand. Students, parents, state legislatures, employers, and research funders are seen as customers who conceive of themselves as purchasing a product or procuring services. Particular customers have different tastes and preferences. Other people, such as faculty employed by the organisation, are presumed to participate out of calculative involvement. As such, they can be motivated to greater productivity through incentives and sanctions. Major obstacles to maintaining the organisation's viability include: fixed costs and inefficiencies; competition and oversupply; uncertainty and imperfect information. Guiding principles for the organisation's managers are to know its liabilities and assets, to anticipate costs and benefits, to enhance efficiency and flexibility, and – as realised in the contemporary quality movement – to increase customer satisfaction. To be successful entails a willingness to take risks and an ambition to be out in front by envisioning what is just beyond the horizon.

The insights of this "industry" perspective focus on the harsh realities of market forces and the urgency of doing what is required to stay competitive, be it planning strategically, scanning environments, attempting to contain or cut costs, correcting inefficiencies, or whatever it takes to maximise flexibility. Adjustments include changing product lines, substituting technology for labour, and reducing fixed costs through such means as outsourcing and privatising, as well as increasing the proportion of part-time and temporary personnel. Doing nothing is not an option. Such imperatives were popularised in the reengineering movement during the 1990s, catapulted by variations on Hammer and Champy (1993), whose work – along with other writings on reengineering in private companies – was adapted by U.S. higher education discourse as a rationale for moving beyond retrenchment to organisational restructuring.

Within this conceptualisation, higher education can be viewed as having not just one major marketplace, as determined by type of student served, geographic location, or degrees granted. Instead, we can see several markets at work – not only for obtaining students, but for placing graduates, hiring and retaining faculty, obtaining research funding, establishing collaboration with industry and other organisations, maintaining endowments, sustaining and extending alumni giving and other fundraising sources, and so on.

Managers read each market for constraints and opportunities relevant to the viability of their niche; if this is done well, a higher education organisation can position itself competitively, capitalise on untapped demand, and supply the educational product at a higher price. Adding an academic program can position the college or

university to attract new and higher paying customers, thereby increasing revenue. In this sense, programmatic changes can be seen as prudent market corrections.

All of this should sound quite familiar to observers of contemporary higher education management, where corporate metaphors of production and a competitive ethos in multiple marketplaces are omnipresent. Knowing one's resources, comparative advantage, and strategic alternatives has become standard in the U.S. and increasingly in Europe.[14] Of course, public higher education diverges from the corporate model in that the market is regulated through public subsidies, restrictions in pricing, approved degree offerings, and prescribed admissions standards. Yet the industry perspective and its dominant corporate metaphor have pervasive resilience, due in part to their parsimony, to today's uncritical acceptance of business and economic rhetoric, to the declining proportion of public funding in total revenue, and to the very real complexity of today's campus operations.[15]

This conception of higher education has consequences. In the industry formulation, attention is not focused on the educational, normative, and societal costs incurred from short-sighted adaptation to market forces. Nor are provisions made for preserving public goods that exceed the market's reach.

Higher education as a social institution

The rising dominance of the above conception, its implicit metaphors and attendant discourses, has been so powerful that in some academic settings, the legitimating idea of higher education as a social institution has been gradually displaced.[16]

A social institution may be seen as an organised activity that maintains, reproduces, or adapts itself to implement values that have been widely held and firmly structured by the society. According to Turner (1997), human history is characterised by the evolution of social institutions, relatively stable and conservative in norms, structures, and general standards of good/bad, appropriate/inappropriate, worthy/unworthy, and other evaluative criteria for behaviour. Over time, as institutions change, they do so in relation to one another. For example, key functions such

[14] Over the past two decades there has been a steady stream of publications in higher education that either diagnose or prescribe the utility of business concepts, such as strategy. (See, for example, Keller, 1983; Chaffee, 1985; Hearn, 1988; Hardy, 1990; Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992; Massy, 1996; Clark, 1998).

[15] See Duderstadt's (1995) characterization of "the University of Michigan, Inc.," which with an annual budget of over $2.5 billion would rank roughly 200th on the list of Fortune 500 companies.

[16] In other academic settings, the two conceptions may coexist side by side, to varying degrees of harmony and conflict. The circumstances of each I elaborate on in my case study research (Gumport, forthcoming).

as childcare have moved out of the family into workplace and educational settings. Turner is among those who argue that social institutions, while inherently interdependent, have been in a process of ongoing differentiation, with far-reaching consequences – including the further challenges to organic solidarity that Durkheim so powerfully depicted.

Thus through the lens of "social institution" we see educational organisations devoted to a wide array of social functions that have expanded over time: developing individual learning and human capital, socialising citizens and cultivating political sensibilities, preserving knowledge and cultural heritage(s), and fostering other legitimate pursuits for the nation-state. In the U.S. in the decades following World War II, higher education not only expanded in student enrolments and the number and size of institutions, but as a social institution, higher education dramatically diversified in activities regarded as its legitimate province. In addition to traditional functions, higher education became a venue for: educating the masses in less selective settings, providing remedial education and English as a Second Language for immigrants, advancing knowledge through applied and commercially viable research, contributing to economic development by employing and retraining workers for a changing economy, and unabashedly collaborating with industry. These shifts in societal imperatives reshaped expectations for higher education and redefined what activities are or are not recognised as "higher education." Such expectations continue to be reconstituted over time, tantamount to reinterpreting higher education's social charter.

An additional dimension of the historical proposition warrants consideration. As an enduring social institution, public higher education is interdependent with other social institutions – not only with other levels of education, but also with the family, government, industry, religion, and popular culture. Turner argues that society has expected education to take on human capital, political legitimation, and socialisation functions (1997: 258-59). His thesis lends great insight to understanding the proliferation of expectations for higher education as a social institution during this historical period. In one sense, these expanded purposes can be seen as aligning with higher education's expanded enrolments, and we might deduce that higher education became more functionally embedded in society.

While the expanded mandate to serve more of society may seem promising initially, the weight of these additional expectations may also have increased the likelihood that higher education could not do all of them well, especially under conditions of resource constraint. Looked at from a political economic rather than a functionalist perspective, such expanded expectations may subject higher education to unprecedented levels of scrutiny and ideological pressures in the policy context, as Kogan has proposed in his analyses. From either angle, the fate of higher education is not assured: for just as higher education is asked to do more for society, its re-

sources are threatened and its autonomy is undermined. The result is a *de facto* narrowing of the institutional and individual academic commitments that count as most worthwhile. For example, within corporate metaphors of production, no rationale provides for higher education as a place for dissent and unpopular ideas, for creativity and the life of the mind, for the irrelevant or unvalued, except as inefficiencies likely to be deemed wasteful or unaffordable.

Just as the legitimating idea of higher education as an industry carries powerful connotative metaphors, so the formulation "social institution" wields potent associations.[17] As Bellah et al (1991:11) explain, in our thinking we often neglect "the power of institutions as well as their great possibilities for good and evil"; for the process of creating and recreating institutions "is never neutral, but always ethical and political." For example, speaking of alternatives in a language of trade-offs (such as trade-offs between health care, prisons, higher education, or other public goods) "…is inadequate for it suggests that the problems are merely technical, when we need a richer moral discourse with which to conduct public discussion..." (26). Heeding Bellah et al's admonishment, conceptualising higher education as fundamentally a social institution invokes the moral context and consequences.

For, as the above should make clear, not only are contemporary public universities and colleges being reshaped by their environments, but the very discourse about those changes and challenges itself plays a significant role in the reshaping. The framework of higher education as a social institution focuses on societal needs – construed broadly, short-term, and long-term. Its conceptual anchor is to interpret the changing nature of the social charter between higher education and society, which is not only dynamic but reflects a multiplicity of rights and responsibilities. Through the lens of the social charter, one must ask how well higher education is fulfilling its responsibilities and meeting societal expectations for educating citizens and workers, among its other functions. The question must also be raised from the other side: to what extent society is fulfilling *its* responsibilities – in continuing public investment to sustain higher education's institutional capacity, in trusting professional authority, and in protecting campuses for their unique societal functions as places that foster critical thinking, creativity, and even social dissent. As participants and observers of the higher education enterprise wrestle with these questions as to

[17] It is essential to note that the terms "institution" and "organization" do not have the same meaning, even though they are often used interchangeably in higher education. While colleges and universities are frequently referred to as organizations, the use of the term "institution" is commonly intended as a synonym, often used casually to refer to organization-wide constructs such as institutional leadership, decisions, or policies. When used in a theoretical context, the term "institution" sends a clear signal to those familiar with sociology and institutional theory that the referent both includes the organization and extends to the larger arena of institutional dynamics transcending the organization.

how well public interests are being served, it becomes clear that, often, actors position themselves as speaking on behalf of those public interests, when other interests may be at work. When policymakers speak, it is not clear whether they are speaking for national, state or local interests; or for their political or individual interests. When employers speak, it is not clear whether they are speaking for their company, their industry, their employees, or for their own professional interests. When college presidents speak, it is not clear whether they are speaking on behalf of the public interest, their sector's interest, their organisation's interest, or their own managerial interests. So, in this arena, we see that the public interest is neither clearly defined nor unified. Further, an array of public and private interests is increasingly represented not only as compatible but as convergent, with little to no inspection of the veracity of that claim. And again, the framework of higher education as a social institution, as a partner in the social charter, is itself transformed by such discourse.

CONVERGING MECHANISMS

Higher education as an industry became a dominant legitimating idea during the last quarter of the 20th century through an unprecedented mix of external pressures, propelling three major forces already underway within U.S. higher education institutions: expanding administrative authority; a spreading consumer orientation; and increasing stratification of academic subjects.

a) Academic management

Since the 1970s, universities and colleges of all types have shown signs of expanded administrative structures and – as information systems became more elaborate – more centralised administrative authority embedded in those positions.

The momentum for expansion in the number, authority, and professionalism of academic managers was galvanised by the ideology inherent in management science and organisational adaptation. The core premises of these literatures position campus leaders and key administrators as managers who diagnose and prescribe organisational well being. The rationale is simple: organisations can and do adapt, and organisational survival is dependent upon the ability of the organisation to respond to its environment, which is characterised as dynamic and thus uncertain and potentially threatening. Among other responsibilities, managers monitor the organisation-environment interface, determine appropriate strategies, and develop effective bridging and buffering mechanisms.

Applying this rationale to the academic enterprise, campus leaders attend to both resources and resource relationships. Managing resources – their acquisition, maintenance, and internal allocation – and managing resource relationships between the

organisation and its environment become key organisational practices to position their organisations for survival (Gumport and Sporn, 1999). Prominent examples include: monitoring vulnerabilities of resource dependence, trying to reduce existing dependencies, and meeting expectations for compliance. To monitor vulnerabilities from environmental turbulence, campus managers attend to forecasting enrolment changes, to shifts in state appropriations, and to how such changes are handled by their peer institutions. To cultivate new resources to reduce existing dependencies, public universities and colleges devise strategies to generate revenue for the organisation – whether to improve public relations with the state legislature, seek out new student markets, find new sources for research funding, step up efforts for alumni giving, or cultivate new sources of private revenue. These managerial prerogatives have gained currency in the contemporary era as dependence on state appropriations has created serious challenges.

Managers also ensure compliance with demands from a number of sources, some of which are expensive for the organisation. Health and safety regulations abound, for example, as both public and private universities well know. With the most recent wave of accountability required in operations and in educational functions, mandates are often tied to essential state and national funding. Initiatives monitor faculty productivity as well as student learning outcomes. One study documented that approximately half the states in the U.S. have already instituted some type of performance-based funding, with twenty additional states anticipating doing so in the near future (Burke and Serban, 1998).

Managing these challenges positions higher education administrators in the central mediating role of determining the potential costs and benefits of any course of action (or non-action). They function as interpreters for the rest of the organisation, addressing such key concerns as: Who are the constituencies from whom the organisation is seeking legitimacy, and what do they want? What are successful peer institutions doing? Can some demands be responded to symbolically or minimally? Managers can have powerful effect in securing a sense of stability as the organisation navigates through uncertain and turbulent times.

In positioning higher education managers in an expanded role, with such broad authority, a key premise warrants careful scrutiny – that they are appropriately and effectively positioned to act for the organisation. This premise is questionable. The need to manage resources and resource relationships and to reduce resource dependence provides a compelling post-hoc rationale for an expanded managerial domain to select among academic priorities, make the case to eliminate or downsize academic programs, and determine the academic workforce and its characteristics (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, courseloads, etc.). Critics of expanding managerial authority have suggested that environmental conditions should not pre-determine such academic restructuring. Rhoades and Slaughter (1997:33) argue: “The structural pat-

terns we describe are not just inexorable external developments to which colleges and universities are subject and doomed…. The academy itself daily enacts and expresses social relations of capitalism and heightened managerial control grounded in a neo-conservative discourse." This makes explicit a mechanism that has helped an industry discourse to displace an institutional discourse that had previously justified a full range of knowledge areas supported for reasons other than their anticipated human capital or market value.

b) Academic consumerism

A second mechanism contributing to the legitimating idea of public higher education as an industry is the rise of academic consumerism, which emerged after the post–World War II decades of massification and its attendant democratic gains. The conceptual shift elevates consumer interests to paramount consideration in restructuring academic programs and reengineering academic services – over the more diffuse mandate to serve society by providing education, cultivating citizenship, and other liberal education ideals.

When considering whom public universities and colleges serve, several types of consumers come to mind: taxpayers, employers, research funders, and students. However, we most commonly think of the student-as-consumer in public higher education, and particularly the student as potential or current employee seeking workforce training or economic security. The rise of academic consumerism in the contemporary era has been accelerated by four essential presumptions, each in its own way problematic.

First, the student-consumer is presumed to be capable of informed choice, with the ability to pay (Readings 1996). To view prospective students as prospective buyers conjures up images of the smartest shoppers among them perusing *Consumer Reports*, as when considering the purchase of an automobile or major household appliance. The premise is that the intelligent consumer will select that which has the best value for the money. In practice, the U. S. higher education system has no such institutional performance data available. Institutions themselves vociferously resist such attempts, even as they pay close attention to their standings in the widely cited *US News and World Report* rankings.

A second, related presumption is that the enrolled student-consumer has chosen to attend that particular college or university. Thus, a student chooses to enrol at a community college to maximise his or her utility, rather than as a result of socialisation, truncated aspirations, socio-economic barriers, or a discriminatory culture.

Third, enrolled students-consumers are "...encouraged to think of themselves as consumers of services rather than as members of a community," as Readings (1996: 11) insightfully observes. The basis for exchange is the delivery of an academic ser-

vice (e.g., lecture, course, piece of advice). This conception of students drastically reduces the potential richness of teaching and learning relationships, mentoring and sponsorship, and students forging meaningful bonds with their peers.

Fourth, consumer taste and satisfaction become elevated to new heights in the minds of those responsible for designing academic services and programs. The translation of this presumption into practice can be seen in vocationalising academic programs with as little consideration as changing the time that courses are offered, or rushing to establish them on-line. The academic quality movement also places a premium on customer satisfaction. While attention to student needs and preferences is by no means inherently misguided, *reducing* students to consumers in this way, and prioritising consumer interests in academic restructuring, may make consumer taste rather than professional expertise the basis for legitimate change in public higher education.

The consumer orientation is also evident in the perspective of some states, as they come to view their relationship to public higher education as procurement of services rather than as a long-term investment. Academic consumerism may increasingly dictate the character of the academic enterprise, as public colleges and universities cater to the desires of the state or the individual (shortsighted though they may be). While such interests should arguably play a role in determining some academic offerings, the concern is over what happens if they become the dominant determinant, thereby further displacing faculty authority and educational legacies.

c) Academic stratification

Academic subjects and academic personnel have been re-stratified based upon the increased use-value of particular knowledge in the wider society and its exchange-value in certain markets. The increased use-value of knowledge is evident in both the culture of ideas and the commerce of ideas, defining features at the heart of post-industrial society (Bartley, 1990; Drucker, 1993; Gibbons et al., 1994; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). The culture of ideas acknowledges an accumulated heritage of knowledge accepted by society, sometimes seen as a storehouse or stock of knowledge with shared understandings and values. From this perspective, public colleges and universities may be seen as social organizations of knowledge that contribute to society in the Durkheimian sense of integration. However, the commerce of ideas spotlights the creation and distribution of ideas in what is now referred to as "the knowledge economy," and the growing exchange-value of knowledge in specific markets. From this perspective, public colleges and universities – particularly research universities – may also be seen as competitors in the commercial activities of publications and copyrights, patents and licenses, positioning themselves and the nation for global competitiveness. Such knowledge activities have, on some campuses, come

to be seen as essential – even as core – pursuits of public colleges and universities. (Moreover, this is quite compatible with the revenue-generating aspirations of academic managers, as discussed above.) This idea arises from understanding higher education primarily as a knowledge-processing system. This contrasts with the conventional view characterising higher education as a people-processing system in which goals, structures, and outcomes support students' undergoing personality development, learning skills, and acquiring credentials that may enable upward mobility.

An instrumental orientation toward academic knowledge also seems widespread in the contemporary era – what Kogan refers to as "economic instrumentalism." The notions of knowledge as a public good seem increasingly unsustainable in a context where academic subjects and knowledge workers are not buffered from market forces. Given the realities of complex organisations, where resource acquisition and status considerations abound, these developments also have consequences for the stratified social order on campuses. Academic knowledge areas require capital for fuel and the promise of future resources for sustained legitimacy. The salience of these requirements cannot be overstated, such that today's knowledge creation and management may be interpreted as increasingly dominated by a proprietary ethic in the spirit of advanced capitalism. This characterisation may be problematic insofar as it uses the corporate metaphor to talk about higher education in terms of entrepreneurial dynamics that help a campus sustain its inventory and pursue its core competencies. Nevertheless, in the present era, the resource requirements of creating, sustaining, and extending knowledge activities figure prominently in campus deliberations over what academically is worthy of support.

As an illustration, consider the ways in which state governments conceptualise public higher education as services to procure. Particularly in the past fifteen years, we see evidence of a willingness to support (i.e. allocate financial resources to) public universities to procure teaching (and where applicable, research) services. This procurement orientation suggests an underlying production function approach, where higher education is valued for its instrumental contributions vis-à-vis preparing and retraining individuals for work and applying useful knowledge to social and economic needs, rather than an approach where all fields of study have inherent worth. In this sense, the context quite directly shapes what knowledge is considered to have value for instruction, research, or service. Conversely, the context neglects – or perhaps actively dismantles – those areas not valued. In this way, the context alters the academic landscape and its knowledge areas.[18]

[18] Public universities themselves come to internalize this conception (e.g., see NASULGC 1997).

Selection processes are also at work as higher education managers reshape the academic landscape according to demands. Thus, what has come to count as knowledge has not simply unfolded or evolved out of existing areas, but has resulted in part from the differential valuing and resourcing of academic units competing for epistemological, organisational, and physical space. Priorities are identified; particular units are constructed as failing to pull their weight, obsolete, or unaffordable, and are targeted for downsizing and elimination. Small humanities programs, for example, have been consolidated and, on some campuses, have lost resources and status. The role of countervailing forces bears consideration in this challenging question: what if student demand becomes too small to support those subjects still considered to be core by those with vested interests, whether internal or external to higher education? The fate of the foreign languages in the United States, for instance, suggests an even more complex mix of forces at work and thus an unclear trajectory: on some campuses foreign languages are being consolidated, despite widespread recognition of their economic instrumentalism and salience given global interdependence.

Similarly, the discourse of restructuring for selective reinvestment on campuses is a marked departure from comprehensive field coverage, and directly parallels the discussion about maximising one's comparative advantage that dominates corporate approaches. In contrast, the histories of many U.S. public colleges and universities suggest that they were established with the ideal of openness to all knowledge, regardless of immediate applications and relevance. It was assumed that access to the full range of knowledge is desirable, and that higher education is the appropriate gateway to that reservoir. However, now that comprehensiveness is not considered a widespread option, academic reorganisation is cast as a set of budget issues and a management problem, albeit with educational implications. Such restructuring limits the scope of academic knowledge that students are offered on any given campus – and longer-range, risks further stratifying who learns what (Bastedo and Gumport, 2003, Gumport, forthcoming).

It remains to be seen whether campuses will become increasingly divided by initiatives such as responsibility-centred budgeting and the pursuit of selective excellence, where a paramount consideration is the revenue-generating capability of discrete academic units and their proximity to thriving industries, such as software and microelectronics. The longer-range consequences, of course, are not just organisational but institutional – that is, for higher education as a social institution. As knowledge is seen as a source of wealth, it is increasingly constructed as a private good rather than a public good. The commodification of knowledge proceeds alongside negotiations over the ownership of knowledge, and is refined in policies for intellectual property rights. Market-consciousness of knowledge outputs and property rights is bound to constrain teaching and research, and perhaps even thinking, in public higher education.

CONCLUSION: MANAGING FOR LEGITIMACY

The cumulative effect of these changes has thus been to displace the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education as a social institution and to lend momentum to the notion of higher education as an industry, with profound implications for what knowledge is valued and who should decide. One consequence of these converging forces is that the managers of public higher education institutions face formidable legitimacy challenges, where it is exceedingly difficult to achieve both strategic and institutional legitimacy. The tensions are evident in academic restructuring dynamics on different types of campuses.

The central balancing act in contemporary academic restructuring is to respond adequately to seemingly irreconcilable expectations, where gain in one dimension means loss in another. For example, achieving strategic positioning in new knowledge markets may yield immediate gains for a campus in generating resources, but at the cost of its institutional legitimacy, core purposes, and values, such that it is no longer recognisable and identified as the entity that it wanted to be. Alternatively, a campus could have all the legitimacy it can muster and no revenue, and thereby go out of business. Particularly for public colleges and universities, repositioning with respect to contemporary environmental demands is difficult – not only in terms of reconciling conflicting demands, but also in the extent to which the organisation can respond to demands that threaten its survival.

The question of whether or not the organisation *can* respond should be preceded by the question of whether or not it *should* respond to short-term demands linked to the resources on which it depends, for – again – an entirely different kind of organisation may result. For example, a local community college and a liberal arts college may face demands to offer more vocationally oriented programs, including electronic access through expanded distance learning programs. It is prudent for the community college to do so given that nationwide, community colleges perceived to be cutting-edge are offering such programs, advertising through relevant media that they can enthusiastically and swiftly accommodate these demands. For the liberal arts college, however, the path is not clear. While some liberal arts colleges may come to add professional or vocationally oriented programs, the bulk of the academic program cannot shift too far afield from its institutional charter to provide liberal education. In fact, the institutional unwillingness to offer such programs may earn it greater legitimacy within a smaller elite niche, for holding steadfast to its commitment to distinctive core values. In this situation, it would be prudent to see what its peer institutions are doing, in particular its most successful peers.

However, managing legitimacy challenges cannot be reduced to a simple calculation or weighing of discrete trade-offs. Acknowledging public higher education's institutional legacies, the full range of expectations must be considered, along with their moral import. Consider, for example, the commonly cited array of demands on

public higher education: to reduce or contain costs, to improve teaching and learning, to remain technologically cutting-edge, and to expand access. The demand to reduce or cut costs can be achieved in several ways – by streamlining, disciplining budgets, eliminating programs that are not cost-effective, divesting of expensive ventures, or by economies of scale. Improvement of teaching and learning may be achieved by reducing class size, providing more faculty attention to individual students, obtaining more state-of-the-art equipment, or enhancing learning environments. Similarly, upgrading technology may entail major overhauls of the institutional infrastructure and of access to information systems, in addition to providing students and faculty with the training to use it. Finally, expanding access may involve admitting students who are academically underprepared and in need of expanded and extensive remedial programs across subject matters. Accomplishing any one of these four would be an outstanding feat, while achieving any two in a resource-constrained environment is unlikely. The demands in themselves are not at cross-purposes, but the strategies for responding to them may be in conflict under conditions of resource constraint.

Thus, the challenge for public higher education's leaders in the U.S. is to invite collective deliberation over appropriate responses – not only at the campus level, but at state and national levels as well. And the challenge for the rest of us is to participate actively and critically in these determinations. Given the decentralised structure of U.S. higher education, few forums exist for such purposeful discussion of the cumulative impact of local academic restructuring. Considering the nature and direction of change in higher education, consensus holds that the locus of academic reform, if not control, has moved beyond local campus settings.

Not only have economic and political demands proliferated, but satisfying them all is ultimately elusive – due either to the prohibitive cost or to the irreconcilability of conflicting mandates. Besides cutting costs, improving access, and enhancing quality, campuses are expected to embrace new information and communications technologies that are in themselves costly and unproven. Moreover, the accountability climate has in effect squeezed public higher education into a vice, even as various legislative and state actors have taken it upon themselves to dissect the enterprise, inspecting slices of academic life/work/teaching/learning under a microscope. The assessment paradigm has an apparently unlimited reach, imposing an institutional and individual performance metric on every aspect of higher education, with profound consequences for the academic workplace (Gumport, 1997; Rhoades and Slaughter, 1997). (This trend is also evident in Europe (Neave and van Vught, 1991; Dill and Sporn, 1995)).

What Kerr (1987: 184) calls the “confrontation” between the past and the future is characterised by a profound tension, a simultaneous call for protection and for redefinition. How can higher education protect its legacy, including decades of pub-

lic investment in an enterprise whose strengths must not be diluted or deteriorated for short-term market demands? On the other hand: how can higher education redefine itself to attend to the signals of those it is supposed to serve? Several observers of contemporary calls for change share Kerr's observation that this historical moment is a defining one for higher education, perhaps as significant as the late 19th century transformations (Clark, 1998; Marchese, 1998; Readings, 1996).

In the process of rapidly assimilating concepts from corporate approaches, bolstered by concepts from management science, contemporary public colleges and universities risk losing sight of the historical reality that they are more than organisations *per se,* and that prescriptions for their management must not be reduced to general organisational imperatives. Unfettered organisational imperatives have the potential to run wild in public colleges and universities – free of content, history, and values, disregarding their accumulated heritage as particular types of social institutions, traditionally within yet not entirely *of* society, with educational legacies grounded in the centrality of knowledge and democratic values. To guard against this, I suggest that contemporary academic restructuring be viewed not only as organisational change but also as institutional change. And as such, we need to pause and reflect on the cumulative record of the recent past.

We are witnessing a reshaping of the institutional purposes of public higher education: in its people-processing activities as well as its knowledge processing. The change entails not only what knowledge is deemed worthy, but also who has access to it and ownership of it. In deviating from accumulated heritage, questions of moral import arise. For example, should public colleges and universities primarily serve the needs of the economy? If so, will core educational and socialisation functions be redistributed among other social institutions – such as the family, religion, or the media – that already serve in part to fulfil some of these functions? Can public universities sustain knowledge creation, production, and transmission as compatible activities? Or will each set of activities become privatised in their respective ways? Who will judge the academic worth of specific subjects – faculty, students, state legislators, employers? I raise these issues in the spirit of considering unintended consequences in a Mertonian sense, and for the purpose of reflecting upon the cumulative impact of the ways we talk and the ways we think about the settings where we study and work.

REFERENCES

Bartley, W. W. (1990). *Unfathomed Knowledge, Unmeasured Wealth: On Universities and the Wealth of Nations*. La Salle, IL: Open Court Press.

Bastedo, M. and Gumport, P. (2003). "Access to What?: Mission Differentiation and Academic Stratification in U. S. Public Higher Education". *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* 46, 341-359.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A. & Tipton, S. M. (1991). *The Good Society*. New York, NY: Random House Books.

Burke, J. C. & Serban, A. (eds.). (1998). "Performance Funding for Public Higher Education". *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 97 (Spring). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cameron, K. S. & Tschirhart, M. (1992). "Postindustrial Environments and Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities". *Journal of Higher Education* 63, 87-108.

Chaffee, E. E. (1985). "The Concept of Strategy: From Business to Higher Education". In Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Volume I. New York: Agathon.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* Surrey, Great Britain: Pergamon Press.

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

Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Books.

Duderstadt, J. (1995). " Academic Renewal at Michigan". In Meyerson, J. & Massy, W. (eds.) *Revitalizing Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamic of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gumport, P. J. (1993). "The Contested Terrain of Academic Program Reduction". *The Journal of Higher Education* 64: 283-311.

Gumport, P. J. (1997). "Public Universities as Academic Workplaces". *Daedalus*. 126(4), 113-136.

Gumport, P. J. (2000). "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives". *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* 39, 67-91.

Gumport, P. J. (2001). "Built to Serve: The Enduring Legacy of Public Higher Education". In Altbach, P., Gumport, P.J. & Bruce Johnstone, D. (eds.) *In Defense of American Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gumport, P. J. (Forthcoming). *Academic Restructuring: The Ascendance of Industry Logic in Public Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gumport, P. J. & Pusser, B. (1999). "University Restructuring: The Role of Economic and Political Contexts". In Smart, J. (ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Volume XIV, 146-200. Bronx, New York: Agathon Press.

Gumport, P. J. & Sporn, B. (1999). "Institutional Adaptation: Demands for Management Reform and University Administration". In Smart, J. (ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research.* Volume XIV, 103-145. Bronx, New York: Agathon Press.

Hammer, M. & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution.* New York: Harper Collins.

Hardy, C. (1990). "'Hard' Decisions and 'Tough' Choices: The Business Approach to University Decline.". Higher Education 20, 301-321.Hearn, J. C. (1988). "Strategy and Resources: Economic Issues in Strategic Planning and Management in Higher Education". In Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research.* Volume IV. New York: Agathon.

Hearn, J. C. (1988). "Strategy and Resources: Economic Issues in Strategic Planning and Management in Higher Education". In Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research.* Volume IV. New York: Agathon.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kerr, C. (1987). "A Critical Age in the University World: Accumulated Heritage Versus Modern Imperatives". *European Journal of Education* 22(2), 183-193.

Kerr, C. (1963). *The Uses of the University*. Fourth Edition (1995). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Kogan, M and Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education.* London: Jessica KingsleyPublishers.

Kogan, M and Gerard Marton, S. (2000) "State and Higher Education". In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. and Henkel, M. (eds) *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Marchese, T. (1998). "Not-So-Distant Competitors: How New Providers are Remaking the Postsecondary Marketplace". *AAHE Bulletin* 50(9)

Massy, W.F. (1996). "Productivity in Higher Education". In Massy, W. (ed.), *Resource Allocation in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

NASULGC. (1997). *Value Added - The Economic Impact of Public Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (December).

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

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rhoades, G. L. & Slaughter, S. (1997). "Academic Capitalism, Managed Professionals, and Supply-side Higher Education". *Social Text* 15(2), 11-38.

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

Turner, J. H. (1997). *The Institutional Order: Economy, Kinship, Religion, Polity, Law, and Education in Evolutionary and Comparative Perspective.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Zemsky, R. & Massy, W. (1990). "Cost Containment: Committing to a New Economic Reality". *Change* 22(6), 16-22.

9

THE ENDURANCE OF THE DISCIPLINES

TONY BECHER AND SHARON PARRY

EPIGRAPH

The importance and fascination of the [characterisation of academic disciplines and their distinctive disciplinary cultures] lay in its depiction of a passing world, of tribes already on the verge of extinction, except perhaps in places like Oxford, or Harvard. ... Knowledge communities are simply too diverse, and too separated from their previous location within a place called "a university" to develop a culture. (Ryan, 2002)

THE NOTION OF A DISCIPLINE

There was a time when membership of a recognised discipline was a significant part of the identity of a practising academic (Henkel, 2000). It is a measure of recent changes in higher education that such a claim is no longer valid. Its clientele has widened and its landscape has substantially changed: values and traditions have – if sometimes reluctantly – evolved to meet new imperatives (Brennan and Shah, 2000). Practising academics today are not necessarily members of disciplines, and for some, the very notion of them is lacking in relevance. To understand the place of the disciplines in academic life, it is first necessary to review what is understood by a discipline and to examine the new ways in which knowledge is used, including the contrasting notion of a community of practice.

Disciplines have two distinguishable but interconnected aspects, which may be denoted as the cognitive and the social (Becher, 1989; Becher and Kogan, 1992). As far as the cognitive characteristics of a discipline are concerned, there has to be some recognisable – even if disputed – boundary marking off its particular area of academic territory. Related to this, the basic knowledge domain falling within that boundary has to be clearly identifiable, usually providing the material for the associated undergraduate degree programme. Most disciplines will also have their particular techniques of enquiry, their established research methods and their own set of

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 133-144.

required resources (Clark, 1983). And crucially, a discipline must be able to sustain an active and reasonably well-organised research frontier or pattern of conceptual development, without which it will face stagnation and atrophy.

The social features include, firstly, incorporation within a typical academic organisation. To be rated as a discipline, it is necessary to become part of the working structure of a reasonable number of universities, in the sense of undertaking relevant scholarly activities, including the provision of courses at undergraduate or advanced level. Such courses serve among other things as a formal induction to membership of a disciplinary community. There is also a need, at least at a basic level, for a shared set of cultural values. However much doctrinal controversy might arise within a disciplinary group, there has to be some sense of common concern (Becher, 1989). But the most significant feature of all is recognition by the Academy at large: only when a scholarly community is deemed intellectually acceptable by its peers, is it qualified to achieve disciplinary status.

These various considerations, it should be noted, do not imply that disciplines once established are stable and unchanging entities: indeed, they resemble living organisms in being in a constant state of flux. It is also easy to identify the emergence of new subdisciplines and the changing interactions between existing ones (Becher, 1990). On the cognitive side, one can observe their steady growth by accretion as new findings are made or new interpretations established. Major conceptual revolutions, such as that famously explored by Kuhn (1962) are a rarer occurrence, though when they occur they are liable to bring about a seismic shift in the configuration of the discipline concerned. In addition to these cognitive forms of change, disciplines may undergo social upheavals, such as the attempted take-over by one grouping of another – exemplified by the bid in the 1960s by physics to incorporate aspects of biology – or a steady decline in intellectual prestige – as in the case of the classics in the post-war period.

Thus, taking a traditional stance, one may see disciplines as reasonably well-organised and well-defined elements at the core of the higher education system, giving shape to its communal and epistemological structure, while remaining adaptable to circumstances. In one of the dominant views of higher education in the past, as comprising the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, the less applicability to everyday life the purer the claim to disciplinarity. Even the relatively long-established fields of applied knowledge, such as medicine, engineering, law and education, were until recently seen as outsiders, not deserving admission to the heartlands of academia. The shift from this perspective (see, for example, Delanty, 2001) has had more dramatic consequences than any of the changes mentioned above.

Gibbons et al (1994) described the shift as one from the traditionalist, discipline-based mode of knowledge production (Mode 1) to a broader conception in which application and negotiation with users of knowledge are predominant (Mode 2). In

this shift, the legitimisation of knowledge is seen as taking place in new ways, fuelling the debate about whether the power of science lies in its internalist, self-regulatory authority, or whether – as Latour (1998) argues - it is a construct more deeply rooted in its social context. Kogan (2005) accommodates both these perspectives, pointing to the power-knowledge nexus through which the authority of knowledge is generated from within a group of experts such as a discipline, while at the same time, different forms of knowledge reinforce different philosophies of state and professional control in society. Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons (2001), however, remark on the decoupling of science's useful outcomes from its cognitive authority, and assert that the epistemological core of contemporary knowledge is empty. At the same time, though, they allow that the "agora" – and therefore the boundaries – of reliable knowledge are greatly extended in the current context.

COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

A rival view of the academic endeavour - its organisation and spheres of influence - has emerged over the past decades. Lave and Wenger (1991) offer the notion of situated learning in which individuals learn from their social environments, forming social identities, taking on community values and accommodating their social structures. They argue that communities of practice, such as midwives, tailors, quartermasters and butchers, are made up of experts. When novices engage with an expert in the social setting of the community of practice, they do so to a limited degree and with less responsibility for the outcome. In this way, the novice learns from the experts. Lave and Wenger (1991) describe this socially based learning as legitimate peripheral participation in the practice of the community, arguing that it is different from traditional notions of apprenticeship where the structures are more rigid and the rules of engagement more systematic.

The features of socially-based learning and knowing, Wenger (1998) argues, are readily observable in the professions and have four characteristic elements – community (learning as belonging), identity (learning as becoming), meaning (learning as experience) and practice (learning as doing). Together, these features shape learning, knowing and the development of perspective among community members.

Wenger (1998) points out that organisations, such as hospitals and universities, which house communities of practice typically do not acknowledge the social – and often tacit – nature of the learning they embody. The kinds of systems and structures needed to support communities of practice have recently been explored by examining areas of professional activity. Wenger, McDermott and Snyder (2002) argue that as a key requirement the community needs to focus on values because communities of practice vary; they may be distributed across sites, for example, or they may be

relatively new. These variations have implications for maintaining communities of practice, and in particular for supporting their host institutions.

The idea of communities of practice has a particular resonance in the context of higher education, and there is widespread acceptance that situated learning, or learning in a socio-semiotic setting, best describes how adults learn in universities. This description also fits well with the increasing professionalisation of awards and the vocationalisation of the curriculum. Although Usher, Bryant and Johnston (1997) question whether disciplines can be differentiated epistemologically or ontologically from socially-related forms of enquiry, well- established professional fields such as law, medicine and allied health fields have in fact long exhibited the characteristics of communities of practice, given that they have close proximity to their professional communities and that many of their research issues derive from practical concerns.

The emphasis upon the social rather than the cognitive aspects of communities of practice is reflected in the higher education literature, in well- established terms such as authentic assessment (Newmann and Archibald, 1992; Cumming and Maxwell, 1999); situated learning (Anderson et al, 1996); communities of learners (Parry and Dunn, 2000) and core skills (Fallows and Stephen, 2000; Gallagher, 2001). In addition, newer fields of study such as ecotourism, gambling studies, complementary medicine, sports management and journalism all reflect highly differentiated communities which draw upon knowledge from a variety of sources. They have in common a shared conception of community, identity, meaning and experience as practitioners. Since research problems in these new fields are derived from practice, knowledge must be gleaned from whatever source is appropriate to advance the field: thus they are usually transdisciplinary. The concern with values is less about the unity of the cognitive base and more about united conceptions of practice.

EXPANSION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The source of the interaction between disciplines and communities of practice can be traced back for more than three decades. As in the case of many other developments in higher education – see for example the demand for quality assurance - any significant policy initiative in one country is soon imitated in another, and then in another, until a large part of the academic enterprise is suffused with the change in question. In the present case, the policy was a highly significant one, supported both by governments and many of the universities themselves: namely the decision - against a background of relative stasis in student numbers – to opt for expansion. It was Martin Trow who first gave the phenomenon a vocabulary and a definition (Trow, 1970; 1974). National systems, he proposed, should be designated as elite if their age participation rate (the proportion of enrolled students out of the total num-

bers of a given age range eligible to be enrolled) fell below 15%; those lying between 15% and 40% could be described as mass; and those over 40% as universal.

There were few systems, in the developed world at least, which failed to take up the copycat policy to attain mass status. The pattern was not uniform (Kogan and Hanney, 2000): as Henkel (2000: 36) points out in the case of the UK, "government attitudes towards growth fluctuated considerably from the mid-1970s and the surge in numbers that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s could not be ascribed to planned and consistent government policies." In a number of systems, the exercise was in part a statistical one, involving the promotion of second tier institutions – polytechnics, technical institutes, community colleges – to first tier status, thus creating overnight a new tranche of undergraduate students. But whether by redefinition, political edict or changes in social climate favouring graduate status, student numbers have increased in country after country, sometimes to mass level.

Before the expansion began, it was the practice in a number of systems to offer the students accepted onto degree courses heavily subsidised – or even free – tuition, and in some cases maintenance grants as well. Alongside this, academics wishing to undertake research were able to do so with relatively generous state support. With comparatively small numbers, the costs involved amounted to only a small fraction of the national budget. But as the student population grew, it became increasingly obvious that the government would not continue to provide funding on anything like the earlier scale (Marginson, 2002). The larger student numbers brought with them increased – though not commensurately – intakes of academic staff, whose research costs could again not be maintained on the previous basis, with teaching and "other distracting duties" becoming increasingly pressing (Halsey, 1992).

Faced with considerably reduced funding for both students and staff, the universities have had to meet the deficit from other sources. The most accessible have proved to be industry and commerce and the students themselves. Understandably enough, the new industrial sponsors have been concerned to ensure value for money. Accordingly, they tend to favour industrially-related research and vocationally-oriented training programmes. Those disciplines concerned with knowledge which lacks direct application, or the potential for exploitation in the longer term, have found themselves increasingly starved of resources (Macintyre, 2002; Marginson, 2002).

From the student perspective, Kogan and Bauer (2000: 43) argue that the combination of economic stringency and a growing demand for higher education has given rise to greater accountability for available funds, and therefore to "questions as to whether the basic qualities and values of higher education were under threat and whether available resources were used efficiently". Henkel (2000) in turn observes that the common assumptions about what constitutes a university education began to change as the student body expanded. The first signs were the decline of the hu-

manities and the paucity of interest in studying classics, followed by the recession in "foundation" disciplinary areas such as physics and history.

Alongside this, many students came to see higher education as a credentialling exercise rather than as an educational process (Henkel, 2000:214). As the corporate aspects of higher education have become more emphatic, the needs of students as "customers" have become increasingly dominant, resulting in an explosion of undergraduate programmes in applied and vocational fields, from acupuncture and homeopathy to event management. This explosion has been fuelled by the incorporation of the college and polytechnic sectors with their inherently vocational emphasis, and by government policies that have encouraged links between industry, the professions and the world of work (see, for example, OECD, 1997).

At the same time, students in developed countries have found themselves increasingly responsible for the costs of their higher education. In England and Australia in particular, schemes for requiring students to meet a significant part of their tuition expenses have reached a high level of artistry. The result is that, by the time they have completed their studies, graduates may be confronted by debts equivalent to approximately half their first year's salary, albeit repayable over an extended period. The official justification for this practice is that those with degrees earn on average more than non-graduates, and may therefore legitimately be taxed on some of the value added.

It is not surprising that in consequence courses oriented towards the world of work – either in industry or in professional fields – are increasingly attractive (Bourner et al, 2001). So too are courses with fieldwork or work experience components. In their concern to accommodate the growing proportion of mature age learners who dip in and out of higher education while managing work and family responsibilities (Long and Hayden, 2001), many universities have created more flexible opportunities for study, based on such notions as "lifelong learning" (Candy, Crebert & O'Leary, 1994) and "recognition of prior learning". This development in effect presents higher education as a commodity, and has enhanced the market for professional courses (Symes, 1999).

THE NEW REFERENCE GROUPS

At the institutional level – particularly in England and Australia, the two main reference points of this discussion - the interaction of higher education with the working world (Kogan, 2000) has been modified to accommodate a diversity of organisational profiles. The tension between market-oriented course offerings and those based on a core discipline has moved markedly in the direction of professional awards – a development seen by some (for example, Evans, 2002) as "creeping credentialism".

One consequence of the tension between meeting consumer demand and building a disciplinary base, or "market and mission", is that – as Marginson (2000) notes – academics have become more "other-referenced" than "self-referenced". They are more closely associated with, and accountable to, vocational and professional reference groups, and there are wider accountabilities too. Not only must universities develop closer associations with external agencies in order to finance research as well as teaching: they must also shore up the opportunities for graduates in the workforce in accordance with market requirements.

The result has been a reshaping of the organisational landscape within institutions to accommodate the external reference groups at the expense of the knowledge areas which support them. Whereas in the past the configuration of disciplinary areas dictated organisational systems, newer reference points have come to take managerial precedence (see, for example, Knight and Trowler, 2001). Lomas (1997) presents this trend as an ideological struggle between those who are concerned to protect the traditional liberal ideal and those who have embraced corporate enterprise. However, this view fails to take account of the extent to which universities have freely chosen to become closer to their external reference groups.

The new reference groups in which knowledge is generated and becomes legitimated by universities include the professions, vocations, industry and community groups – Wenger's (1998) communities of practice. That legitimation is no longer, however, the special prerogative of academia. Whereas knowledge was in the past solely the universities' domain and privilege, where it was valued for its own sake, it now exists recognisably outside the Academy, where its justification lies in its being purposeful and pragmatic. The emphasis on academic communities of practice is reflected in the proliferation of professional and vocational awards – including masters and doctoral as well as undergraduate degrees – and in the organisational structures of institutions which in many cases have come to be built up around values and practice – for example Business and Management or Health and Applied Sciences rather than core disciplines in the arts, social sciences or science. Gibbons et al (1994) characterised the shift in emphasis as a new mode of knowledge production: a proliferation of many kinds of knowledge producers working in applied ways to solve practical problems**. A** recent Australian government report (McWilliam et al, 2002) goes so far as to describe research training as providing skills, and credentials as proxies for those skills, thus blatantly limiting the value of disciplinary knowledge to its practical application. While the value of the knowledge base becomes blurred in this way, the need grows for academic communities of practice to draw upon knowledge sources outside the academy. These new sources of knowledge are reflected in the changing nature of the research enterprise, which has itself become more interdisciplinary, and which also exists outside universities -for example in commercial and industrial settings (Symes 1999). There is a growing acceptance of

the need to draw upon knowledge from whatever source may be appropriate to the purpose, rather than from a single disciplinary corpus. As Kogan (2000:211) observes, "the sources of academic power and honour… including the professorial title, seem now more able to draw on other sources and reference points than that of core subject areas."

THE CONSERVATION OF ACADEMIC KNOWLEDGE

Our contention so far is that until the onset of mass higher education the pure disciplines enjoyed pride of status and the capacity to confer legitimacy upon professional fields. As the numbers increased, it became impractical for governments to continue to provide adequate levels of funding for both teaching and research. The new paymasters – mainly industry and commerce – helped to fill the gap, but their support was directed at entrepreneurial, applied activities at the expense of enquiry for its own sake. The result has been a reversal in prestige, with market oriented academic communities of practice, dealing in utilitarian pursuits, in the ascendancy. Pure research and non-vocational teaching programmes find themselves in decline, especially in non-elite institutions whose endowments and reputational standing do not allow scope for a range of such activities. Barnett (1997) calls this reversal of fortune a dispute about "what is to count as knowledge" in which the fundamental criteria for knowledge are arguable.

External perceptions have changed to reflect this change. Fewer students now feel confident of their subsequent careers when armed with a degree in a pure knowledge area: employers too are reluctant to recruit graduates without relevant practical experience. For many of these stakeholders, knowledge needs to be contextualised into appropriate professional, industrial and community settings, because its principal value is in its applicability. Some - for example, Usher, Bryant and Johnston (1997) - see this as a move away from "privileging theory"; others may see it as privileging practice.

However, there lies a danger in an over-extensive reliance on the knowledge generated by the academic communities of practice and a corresponding dismissal of that stemming from the pure disciplines. By its very nature, practice-oriented knowledge draws its strength from its ability to develop protocols and procedures. But although it provides the "know-how" necessary for professional tasks, and offers guidance designed to improve performance, it is weak in articulating the relevant "know-why" on which such guidance is founded. In consequence, it is unable to provide a base from which to explore the underlying structure of ideas, to make significant connections, or to generate innovative developments. If practically-oriented knowledge is not to prove sterile in the long term, it needs to have recourse to the contributions of pure academic disciplines, a need already identified by some

observers (see, for example, McInnis, 2002). Disciplinary groups can also be of value in offering related communities of practice a strong source of intellectual legitimation.

As noted above, the relationship tends to be a promiscuous one, with any given applied knowledge area drawing for enlightenment on more than one pure disciplinary base. Arguably, taken as a whole, practice needs to be enhanced by theory and practice-oriented knowledge by the products of pure academic enquiry. This gives rise to a symbiotic relationship in which professional groupings need academic knowledge while disciplines need the subsidies such groupings can provide, a notion not inconsistent with Barnett's (1997) three forms of critical being: critical reason, critical self-reflection and critical action.

A related but different interconnection between disciplines and academic communities of practice involves the recruitment into the latter of individuals with the relevant skills in an established disciplinary area, so ensuring the direct availability of the required intellectual expertise. While this arrangement is appropriate for pragmatic purposes in exploiting academic knowledge, it does not in itself secure the legitimation offered by the links with disciplinary groups noted above. It does however provide a new source of vitality for such groups, significantly widening their scope. Academic knowledge is no longer the sole prerogative of the scholarly profession, concentrated in universities: it has now become the domain of industry, the professions and elements of the community at large. From the point of view of the disciplines themselves, this strategy of survival by dispersion offers a useful counterpart to that of survival by concentration in the elite institutions which occupy the pinnacles of scholarly prestige.

The claim to elite status of certain universities is underpinned mainly by the high standing of their pure academic components, but the more entrepreneurial among them have also seized the opportunity to achieve excellence in applied fields. Their strong reputations enable them to raise substantial funds from commerce and industry, and to use the resulting wealth to preserve and enhance their academic core (Clark, 1998). As Marginson and Considine (2000:193) remark, "their academic cultures are more robust than elsewhere …[They] reproduce themselves despite reductions in public funding and despite managerialism". They are accordingly able to select highly capable and academically motivated students and staff to work in pure academic fields of enquiry, so maintaining the related standards of intellectual excellence.

This source of life support is reinforced by the historical legacy accumulated by the pure disciplines in their heyday. When the going was favourable, many departments in the arts, pure science and social science were able to build up key resources to stand them in good stead in leaner times. Some of these – printed materials, apparatus and the like – have inevitably become dated as the subject areas in question

have developed and changed: but others have remained stable, helping the departments concerned to maintain an adequate, if limited, existence. Collective resources are no less important. Journals and other publications keep open the traffic in ideas, enabling academic departments to stay in touch with ongoing developments. All established disciplines also have a range of associations which defend their interests in general and their standing and reputations in particular. Most of these associations also provide a kind of club to bring together the related individuals and groups and to offer them a source of mutual support which is not based on the interactions of communities of practice.

Taken together, these considerations suggest that the traditional disciplines will continue to survive, even if only as unacknowledged partners to academic communities of practice. As the foregoing discussion has implied, one of the factors in their relative downgrading has been the strongly utilitarian and money-obsessed current ethos (Griffin, 1997). For them to resume a significant place in the fabric of higher education would accordingly call for a significant change in the contemporary *zeitgeist*. Given the roller-coaster pattern of social values, in which one set of principles and practices is succeeded by its polar opposites, such a change - embodying a greater appreciation of the intellectual heritage of the academic disciplines - is clearly not impossible to contemplate.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M. & Simon, H. A. (1996) "Situated learning and education". *Educational Researcher,* 25(4), 5-11.

Barnett, R. (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Becher, T. (1990) "The counter-culture of specialization". *European Journal of Education* 25(3), 333-346.

Becher,T. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* Second Edition. London: Routledge.

Bourner, T., Bowden, R.& Laing, S. (2001). "Professional doctorates in England". *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1), 65-83.

Brennan, J. & Shah, T. (2000). *Managing Quality in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Candy, P. C., Crebert, G. & O'Leary, J. (1994). *Developing lifelong learners through undergraduate education*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System.* Berkeley, CA : University of California Press.

Clark, B.R. (1998). C*reating Entrepreneurial Universities.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Cumming, J.J. & Maxwell, G. S. (1999). "Contextualising authentic assessment" *Assessment in Education* 6(2), 177-193.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Dunn, L., Morgan, C., O'Reilly, M. & Parry, S. (2004) *The Student Assessment Handbook: New Directions in Traditional and Online Assessment.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Evans, T. (2002). "Part-time research students: are they producing knowledge where it counts?" *Higher Education Research and Development,* 21(2), 155-165.

Fallows, S. and Stephen, C. (eds.) (2000). *Integrating Key Skills in Higher Education.* London: Kogan Page.

Gallagher, M. (2001). "Lifelong learning: demand and supply issues – some questions for research". Business/Higher Education Roundtable Conference on Lifelong Learning, Sydney, July.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge*. London: Sage.

Griffin, A. (1997) "Knowledge under attack: consumption, diversity and the need for values".In Barnett, R. & Griffin, A. (eds.) *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education.* London: Cassell.

Halsey, A H. (1992). Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

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

Knight, P.T. & Trowler, P.R. (2001). *Departmental Leadership in Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Kogan, M (2000) "Higher Education Communities and Academic Identity" *Higher Education Quarterly*, 54, (3), 207-216.

Kogan, M. (2005) "Modes of knowledge and patterns of power", *Higher Education,*44(1).

Kogan, M. & Bauer, M. (2000). "Higher education communities and academic identity". *Higher Education Quarterly* 54(3),207-216.

Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. (1998) "From the world of science to the world of research?" *Science*, 280, 208-209.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lomas, L. (1997) "Does the development of mass higher education necessarily mean the end of quality?" *Quality in Higher Education* 8(1), 71-79.

Long, M. & Hayden, M. (2001). *Paying their way: a survey of undergraduate student finances in 2000*. Published report of the Australian Vice Chancellors Association,Canberra.

Macintyre, S. (2001). "Funny you should ask for that: higher education as a market". Paper presented at the Australia Institute Conference on The Idea of a University: Enterprise or Academy? Canberra: Australian National University, July.

Marginson, S. (2000). "Rethinking academic work in the global era". *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 22(1), 23-36.

Marginson, S. (2002). "What's wrong with the universities?" *Arena Magazine,* 61, BB3-BB16.

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McInnis, C. (2002). "The place of foundational knowledge in the Australian undergraduate curriculum". *Higher Education Policy,* 15, 33-43.

McWilliam, E., Taylor, P.G., Thomson, P., Green, B., Maxwell, T., Wildy, H. & Simons, D. (2002) *Research training in doctoral programmes. Evaluations and Investigations Programme*, Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Meister, J.C. (1998) "'Forging partnerships with institutions of higher education'". *THE Journal*, 26(3), 20-29.

Newmann, F. M. and Archibald, D. A. (1992). "The nature of authentic academic achievement"'.In Berlak H., Newmann F.M., Adams, E., Archibald, A., Burgess, T., Raven, J. & Romberg T. A., *Toward a New Science of Educational Testing and Assessment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P. & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Rethinking Science: Knowledge and the Public.* Oxford: Polity Press.

OECD (1997) *Thematic review of the first years of tertiary education.* Australia. DETYA, Canberra.

Parry, S. & Dunn, L. (2000). "Benchmarking as a meaning approach to learning in online settings". *Studies in Continuing Education*, 22(2),219-234.

Ryan, Y. (2002). Book Review of Becher, T. & Trowler,P., (2001) *qv. HERDSA News*, 23-24.

Symes, C. (1999). "Working for your future: the rise of the vocationalised university". *Australian Journal of Education,* 43(3),241-253.

Trow, M.(1970). "Reflections on the transition from mass to universal higher education". *Daedalus,* 90, 1- 42.

Trow, M. (1974). "Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education".In OECD: *Policies for Higher Education.* Paris: OECD.

Usher, R., Bryant, I & Johnston, R. (1997). *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge.* London: Routledge.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W.M. (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

10

ACADEMIC IDENTITY AND AUTONOMY REVISITED

MARY HENKEL

INTRODUCTION

Academic identity and academic autonomy have been key driving ideas in the lives of individual academics and in the workings of the academic world. Academic reward systems are based on the assumption that knowledge is advanced by individuals striving for the achievement of a distinctive identity in their chosen fields. Academic autonomy is variously seen as implicit in the idea of distinctive academic identity, as a "socio-technical condition of good academic work" (Becher and Kogan, 1992: 100), as a central academic value and as a right.

However, both identity and autonomy are contested concepts and their significance for academics and academic institutions is increasingly a matter of debate in an era of change in conceptions of knowledge, in social theories and in political and social institutions, including those of higher education. This chapter will explore how fundamental a challenge current changes pose to the ideas of academic identity and academic autonomy and to the connections between them.

The research and reflection on which the chapter is based are grounded in a vision for higher education research generated by Maurice Kogan and in opportunities for empirical investigation that he created. The idea that "higher education's main activities – research, scholarship and teaching – are essentially individualistic and depend on the expertise and commitment of creative individuals" (Kogan and Hanney, 2000: 26) has been a cornerstone of his own thinking. He has consistently insisted upon the need for research into systems and structures that enhance understanding of their meaning for individual academic values, forms of knowledge and practices.

Maurice has converted his vision into research projects within which it is possible to undertake the kind of close-grained inquiry and analysis at the macro and micro levels that are required to offer realistic chances of achieving this ambition. The main empirical source on which this chapter draws is one such inquiry: the English component of a three country study of higher education reforms undertaken between

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 145-165.

1994 and 2000 by teams from the University of Bergen, Norway, Brunel University, England and the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The second source is a linked project on academic responses to the UK Foresight Programme undertaken in 1997 and 1998. The point of departure is the individual but the aim is to pursue the inquiry within a perspective informed by empirical and theoretical changes to the political and organisational structures in which individual identities are shaped. It should be said that, while the two inquiries referred to, embraced a wide range of universities in England at the end of the 20th century, the majority of academics included in these studies were employed full time and working in well-established disciplines.[19]

The chapter begins by identifying a theoretical framework within which academic identity could be understood, at least until the late 20th century. This framework incorporates individuation and identification within influential, largely self-regulating communities or social institutions. There follows an analysis of some conceptual relationships between academic identity understood within this framework and autonomy, freedom and independence, individual and collective, within an ideal model of academic work. This lays the ground for a reappraisal of these values and the relationships between them in the contemporary environment.

THEORIES OF IDENTITY

Liberal and essentialist theories of identity and autonomy, representing the unified individual as the source of free, rational choices and possessor of a given "core" identity or essence, were increasingly strongly challenged by a range of social and political theories in the 19th and 20th centuries. While theories of physical, social or economic determinism had their day, the 20th century saw growing interest in the interaction between the individual and society and the emergence of theories seeking to encompass the ideas of individual and society and actors and structure in "a single analytic space" (Jenkins, 1996). The specific examples that inform much of the argument of this chapter are symbolic interactionism, communitarian moral philosophy and sociological versions of institutionalism. It is contended that they can enhance understanding of individual and collective academic identities in the conditions prevailing for much of the 20th century but that they themselves came increasingly under question in the last two decades.

In such theories, identity is understood as a deeply ambiguous concept, incorporating ideas of difference and sameness, individuation and identification, and distinctiveness and embeddedness, although there are differences of emphasis. Mead

[19] Predominant among these disciplines were physics, chemistry, biochemistry and other biological sciences, economics, sociology, history and English.

(1934) argues that the self is developed most fully when the individual most completely integrates community attitudes and values: individuals achieve a sense of identity through internalising significant others' images of themselves. Jenkins, whose thinking about social identity is strongly influenced by Mead and Cooley, envisages a more open-ended and cognitive process. He suggests that all identities, individual and collective, are constituted in a process of "internal-external dialectic of identification", of self-definition and definitions offered by [significant] others (Jenkins, 1996: 20). Identity is a continuing and reflexive activity.

Amongst communitarian moral philosophers, MacIntyre (1981) underlines the idea of the individual as bearer of community tradition. Taylor (1989) also speaks of the importance of "a defining community" for the construction of identity, although he gives more emphasis to individual choice in the process.

Taylor argues that it is through the language of the community that individuals understand themselves and become acquainted with their world. Being initiated into a language entails "entering into ongoing conversations between ... people with a particular role or status in the web of relationships that make up [the] community" (Mulhall and Swift, 1992: 111; Taylor, 1989). Through such conversations individuals may be introduced to the myths through which deeply held values and beliefs of the community are expressed (Bailey, 1977; Becher, 1989; Vabø, 2002). More fundamentally still, in learning a language they also learn a way of understanding the world, through the concepts, cognitive structures and experience expressed in that language.

Taylor also places values at the centre of identity. "To know who you are is to be oriented in moral space, a space in which questions arise about what is good or bad ... what has meaning and importance to you and what is trivial and secondary" (1989: 28). He suggests that the moral framework within which they are worked out has three dimensions, which reflect the interconnections of the self and others: obligation to others, fulfilment or meaningfulness and a range of notions concerned with dignity, respect and self-esteem.

Some theorists emphasise the importance of boundaries and defining spaces or horizons (Taylor) in the building of identities. Defining spaces are internal and external. The transactions between individual and community take place inside the boundary. Bernstein, however, in his theories of identity and socialisation highlights the key function of external space. Strong classification makes for strong identities (Bernstein, 1996). It marks out the space between one category, group or discourse from another: it demonstrates difference between the members of each. Jenkins (1996) follows Barth and Cohen in suggesting that group identity is characteristically constructed in transactions which occur at and across the boundaries.

ACADEMIC IDENTITIES

Academic identities have been seen as formed and sustained predominantly in two forms of self-regulating, knowledge-centred organisation, namely the discipline and the higher education institution, that together constitute a notional bounded "space of action" (Bauer et al., 1999) within the nation state. The discipline has been regarded as the dominant collective influence. Its defining nature is, however, difficult to capture: unified and diverse (Geertz, 1983), visible and invisible, intellectual and social. *Prima facie*, it is an epistemological construct. However, as Becher has tellingly shown, it is more complex than that. The main cognitive principles, objects of study, methodologies and theories, round which disciplines might be thought to coalesce not only shift over time but are found in various combinations simultaneously (Becher, 1989; Becher and Trowler, 2001). While some disciplines, like physics and economics, may be strongly framed, others may have highly permeable and fluid epistemic boundaries. Important integrative forces are often social (learned societies, conferences and editorial boards) and cultural (histories, traditions, symbolic materials, myths and prestige) (Becher, 1989; Clark, 1983; Geertz, 1983). However, the more powerful are the institutions for appointments, evaluation, rewards and the organisation of work.

Clark argues that higher education must be seen in terms of a strong basic framework: a matrix structure formed by the cross cutting imperatives of discipline and enterprise (the university or higher education institution). Discipline and enterprise are perceived as coming together in the basic units. "The discipline and the enterprise modes of linkage converge in the basic operating units - the department ... or the institute is simultaneously a part of the discipline and a part of the enterprise, melding the two and drawing strength from the combination" (1983: 32).

In this conceptualisation, the context or space of action in which academic identities are shaped and developed is both cosmopolitan and local, concrete and abstract.

The process of academic identity construction in this context tends to be described in terms either of *internalisation*, of values, aspirations, sense of meaning and worth, language, theories and knowledge, or of "internal-external *dialectic* of identification" and individuation. Analysts employ different metaphors for this process, derived from different conceptions of epistemic communities: acquiring "tacit knowledge" (Polanyi, 1958; Becher, 1989; Gerholm, 1985), "positioning" or locating oneself in the territory (Hall, 1990; Moore, 2003), "finding a voice" (Bernstein, 1996; Di Napoli, 2003), "conducting a dialogue" (Becher et al., 1994).

These different metaphors or conceptualisations can be understood as reflecting, respectively, "old" and "new" institutionalist theories and therefore an earlier and a more recent interpretation of the process of identity construction. In this interpretation, there is a shift in time from the idea that identities are formed by historic, nor-

mative influences to one entailing more deliberate, cognitive choice and the pursuit of future goals through the use of articulated rules or scripts. An alternative approach combines these two perspectives in a more interactive framework[20] and might take more account of the differences between disciplines. Different individuals, too, in different contexts are likely to find a different balance between the active and the passive, struggle and immersion, the explicit and the implicit in identity development.

The processes have a dual purpose: to acquire a clearer private sense of academic identity, together with a recognised public image or reputation. For there is a requirement that the realisation of academic identity is public as well as private. There is also an interaction between these two: one is reinforced, if also sometimes questioned, by the other. For some people the process may be linear; for others it may entail points of redirection, reformulation, even relocation in a different epistemic community, particularly in periods of paradigm transition in a discipline. For all it is a continuous process of both individuation and identification, although establishing a public identity is likely to be more self conscious and explicitly articulated.

IDENTITY AND AUTONOMY

Identity and autonomy are linked conceptually and empirically, for example through the institutionalisation of individualism in academic systems and the profound and continuing influence upon them of enlightenment thought. The academic reward system has been based on the assumption that academic career development, beginning in most cases with the doctoral thesis, is in part dependent on the establishment of an individual epistemic identity through making an individual contribution to knowledge. Demonstration of the capacity to pursue and bring to fruition a recognisable or distinctive line of inquiry or interpretation within the framework of the intellectual traditions and accumulated knowledge of an epistemic community constitutes a normative mode of advancement.

The underlying assumptions are that academic work is ideally advanced through the disciplined creativity and originality of individuals, given the freedom to "pursue truth wherever it seems to lead" (Berdahl, 1999) by the exercise of their own reason. Individuals need not only to immerse themselves within the cognitive and cultural traditions of their discipline but also to have the courage and capacity to distance themselves from, or at least engage in critical dialogue with, their colleagues.

Individual academic freedom has been institutionalised in tenure, which effectively gives academics the right to determine their own academic agenda. This may,

[20] See Stensaker (2004) for the development of such a framework in the context of organisational identities.

as in Britain until recently, be further reinforced by institutional autonomy. British universities, as chartered institutions (Kogan and Hanney, 2000), had a remarkable degree of both "substantive" and "procedural" autonomy: "power to determine [their] own goals and programs… and the means by which [they] will be pursued" (Berdahl, 1999: 60.) The state, in granting academics a high degree of autonomy, also provides them with a legitimising identity.

The degrees of freedom and self-regulation accorded the academic profession in this model have been attributed in Britain to the trust accorded by an elite to a profession regarded both as part of that elite and serving its interest. They are similarly regarded as components of an exchange relationship or "'corporatist bargain' through which the state will give freedom and funds and legitimacy in return for discernible contributions to the public good by way of advanced education and new knowledge" (Kogan and Hanney, 2000: 39). It can also be argued that that knowledge was seen as primarily of a particular kind, "high culture", "pure", "fundamental", "theoretical", a resource for technological development or for a particular kind of citizen, and not directly concerned with utility or application. Clear conceptual and normative demarcations have been made in Britain as between universities as locations of pure research and industries as sites of applied research (Mulkay, 1977; Henkel, 2004). This was another aspect of the bounded world of academe. It was to some extent sustained, in the face of demand for advanced technological and vocational education, by the creation in the 1960s of a binary system of higher education.

The ideal model was, of course, subject to attack in advance of the major shifts in the relationship between higher education and the state at the end of the 20th century, mainly from within academe itself (Kogan and Hanney, 2000). The concept of knowledge as discovery was superseded by alternatives such as production, practices and construction. The concept of truth was another casualty of the sociology of knowledge and the view that academic motivation should be seen in terms of a competitive struggle for power and authority (Bourdieu, 1975) or domination and control (Latour, 1983) gained ground. Indeed, it was argued that the distinctions between epistemological and political conflicts should be abandoned (Bourdieu, ibid.). Analyses of the organisation of science suggested that it could promote dependency and conformity rather than the opposite, particularly in the context of resource constraints (Mulkay, 1977). Achievement of a public identity might also be based as much on identification with as independence of those carrying authority in the academic community. Particularly in fields where paradigms are strong, problems well-defined and the routes to new knowledge well marked, the establishment of identity may be a matter of making a recognisable rather than an independent contribution.

In other words, the advance of sociological theories suggests a high degree of ambiguity in academe between individuation and identification and between independence and dependence in academic cultures and systems. However, recent em-

pirical studies suggest that liberal epistemologies die hard. Belief in the importance of academic freedom as a source of motivation and as a necessary condition of the advancement of knowledge remains a powerful force in academic cultures (Henkel, 2000; Kogan et al., 2000)

THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW ERA

The closing decades of the 20th century have seen major change in conceptions of the state and society, in the nature and function of knowledge and knowledge-centred institutions in them and in theories of identity. These will now be briefly discussed before we move onto the implications for individual and collective academic identities and autonomy.

A major impetus for reconceptualising higher education institutions and their functions is to be found in theories of "the knowledge society". There are several dimensions to these theories. First, knowledge and, more specifically, science and its exploitation in technological innovation are seen as key drivers of national and regional prosperity and, indeed, survival in a globalised economy (Bell, 1973). Second, it is argued that the knowledge society is "a society which is to an unprecedented degree the product of its own action" (Bohm and Stehr, 1986: 19). The increasingly varied forms of knowledge produced (for example operational research, systems analysis, cybernetics, computer sciences) enable us to interpret, elaborate, manage and change our own social constructs.

At the same time, knowledge has been democratised (Delanty, 2001). It is extensively distributed in different kinds of organisations, eroding distinctions between expert and non-expert actors and organisations and, with them, the authority of experts and professionals. The revolution in communication technologies means a massive increase in the speed and extent to which knowledge is acquired, exchanged and recontextualised by individuals and organisations. Moreover, in the words of Nowotny et al. (2001), contemporary society "speaks back" to science (the paradigm case of authoritative knowledge) now understood as operating in the "*agora*". Science is no longer mediated and regulated through a limited number of bureaucratic or professional institutions, although some of these persist, but is involved in collaborations, negotiations, debates and conflicts with all sorts of actors.

All forms of knowledge are said to have become contested and increasingly reflexive with the impacts upon epistemology of developments in the sociology of knowledge, poststructuralism and postmodernism, grounded in the rejection of "meta-narratives" and "grand theories" (Lyotard,1984). Reflexive engagement with knowledge is increasingly characteristic of contemporary behaviour, although it can be argued to have roots in enlightenment values of critical rationality and in theorisation or the location of ideas in certified traditions of thought. Meanwhile, the entry

of cultural politics and the politics of difference into the epistemologies of the humanities and the social sciences, in particular, have meant that the concept of culture itself has been revolutionised (Delanty, 2001) within relativist assumptions. Curricula have become battlegrounds and the roles of the university as guardian and transmitter of foundational knowledge or unified, high cultures have been weakened.

These developments have profound, if contradictory, implications for universities. Advanced knowledge has become both more and less valued and its historic purveyors have more and less power. Universities have become "pivotal" institutions not only in but also of society (Barnett, 1988: 88). They are no longer simply the providers of elite education but also the location of near universal training and lifelong learning for the populations of knowledge societies. Moreover, following the attacks on Keynesianism and the post second world war welfare states, those policies are framed by political ideologies in which the boundaries and distinctions between the state and the market are blurred and new modes of public management are being developed. Policies advocate greater interdependence of universities and industry, the exploitation of advanced knowledge in a range of markets, and the redistribution of the financial burden of higher education from government to the private sector and knowledge "users" or "consumers" of all kinds.

Universities and academics are encouraged to become "academic capitalists". In doing so they find that they have both competitors and collaborators outside academe, in the form of consultants, independent analysts and think tanks, as well as industry-based researchers. Their work is more in demand but also more open to challenge from media, interest groups and potential users or customers. Humanities and arts subjects have to compete for institutional support with subjects that more evidently contribute to national and business agendas of wealth creation. They may be doing so in a context where their own intrinsic rationale is being redefined. Meanwhile, as Gumport (in this volume), Becher and Parry (in this volume) and Marton (in this volume) point out, the consequences are that definitions of the university itself are themselves being re-appraised.

Meanwhile social, institutional and cultural changes have generated new questions about and theories of identity. Giddens' concept of identity is formulated within assumptions that the bond between local social institutions or communities and individuals is becoming weaker. Institutions have become disembedded in the context of globalisation, new communication technologies and the collapse of time and space; individuals are less constrained in the construction of identity. He defines identity as "a reflexively organised endeavour" or "a project" orchestrated primarily by the individual and individual choices. "The reflexive project of the self, which consists in the sustaining of coherent, yet continuously revised, biographical narratives, takes place in the context of multiple choice as filtered through abstract systems" (Giddens, 1991: 5).

For Giddens identity has continuity, if not stability. However, within a postmodern context, according to Hall (1992), "the subject previously experienced as having a unified and stable identity is becoming fragmented" (276). This is partly explained by breakdown and change in social institutions, including significant communities. The "postmodern subject" has no fixed identity but is formed and transformed continually "in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us" (ibid.). Identities are continually shifting over time and individuals may be pulled in different directions by contradictory identities at one and the same time. The stable and coherent identity is an illusion, constructed out of individuals' "narrative of the self" (Hall, 1990). Foucault and others speak of the "death of the human subject": it is wholly externally constructed through discourses of power.

The postmodern position is put more positively by Bauman: "the postmodern problem of identity is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open" (Bauman, 1996: 18).

In the context of such fluidity, the capacity of traditional institutions, such as universities and the professions, to provide their members with dominant or legitimising identities may be less secure. Individuals, for their part, may decide they have other choices in how they define themselves. For example, identities generated in the emergence of cultural politics in the name of resistance to or transformation of entrenched power (Castells, 1997) and centred in gender, race, ethnicity and religion may become more important in the lives of individuals, their definitions of themselves and their epistemologies.

ACADEMIC IDENTITIES AND ACADEMIC AUTONOMY IN THE NEW ERA

Manifestations of change

We now first consider the implications of these changes for the institutional spaces of action in which academic identities are constructed and what they mean for academic identity and academic autonomy.

The relatively simple institutional framework of academic identity development set out at the beginning of this chapter seems to have been undermined. The mutually reinforcing discipline- enterprise dyad has given way to a world of multiple interconnections, fluid structures and unstable relationships. Organisational restructuring and departmental mergers and reformulations are increasingly common, as universities rationalise their research and educational activities so as to maximise their financial as well as their reputational returns.

The idea that there is a relatively uniform and stable basic unit such as the department, in which university and discipline are melded together, is under threat.

The thesis put forward by Gibbons et al. (1994) has been widely accepted: that a new mode of knowledge production, mode 2, has emerged and is supplanting the discipline-based mode 1. Knowledge is said to be increasingly produced in the context of application by "hybrid communities" working on multiple sites, by no means all of which are academic institutions.

As Becher and Parry (in this volume) vividly show, demands for forms of inquiry and teaching that cut across disciplines generate new organisational forms that also cut across both departmental and institutional boundaries. Some may be relatively transitory: inter-disciplinary centres or groups, inter-institutional consortia, networks for research and technological development. The focus and dynamics of research and teaching may become less compatible, putting pressure on another source of strength for the disciplines and their influence as stable and self-renewing socialising communities. Investment in research geared to external goals, technology transfer or commodification may result in the employment of contract researchers that have little or no connection with the teaching responsibilities of departments or institutions. In many institutions there has been a profound change in the balance between contract researchers and tenured academics promoted on the back of discipline-based reward systems.

Increasing numbers of academics, researchers and teachers, are working in an environment of complex, differentiated social groups and influences. The proliferation of contexts and frameworks for research education means that individuals are open earlier to extra-academic professional influences and identity possibilities, more varied evaluative criteria and conceptions of "the good" than those centred on the discipline. Other developments, such as the entry of cultural politics into academic organisations, might bring into question the idea of epistemic identity development as grounded in autonomous academic communities. Class, gender or ethnic identification might be more explicitly acknowledged as informing or moulding epistemic or professional identity, as distinct from Clark's contention that disciplinary identity can be the most powerful shaper of personal as well as professional lives (Clark, 1983).

As the scope of university ambitions and responsibilities widens and universities develop structures and processes to manage them, an increasing number of academics might choose to move away from defining themselves in terms of research and teaching and to assume academic managerial roles instead. A further alternative is the individual entrepreneurial route through the commodification of scientific expertise.

All these trends could mean a clear shift from relatively stable and embedded identities to more fluid, varied and distinctive identities and to the idea of identity development as a more individual project.

Manifestations of continuity: the discipline

However, there are counter forces. There are strong institutional and functional continuities, as well as discontinuities: in reward systems, for example, and the forms of evaluation on which they are based. In Britain the national research assessment exercise (RAE) has been probably the most evident. It is organised round disciplines and the most influential criteria are those of the disciplinary community, as represented by the panels. Attempts to give the utility criteria of the Foresight programme have met with substantial resistance amongst panels. It is true that minority subjects often do not have panels of their own but academics have been quite successful in seeing that judgements of submitted work are made by disciplinary peers in these cases. Some panels identify a clear hierarchy of esteem between publication outlets, at the peak of which are mainstream journals, representing the dominant perspectives and directions of the discipline. The impacts in universities have varied. As policies of selectivity and the concentration of funding have advanced, more senior academic managements have pressured distinct research groups and whole departments to collaborate or make joint submissions for the RAE, and so to depress disciplinary identity. However, the exercise has also encouraged departments or subject groups in some universities to develop a stronger research culture for themselves and their students, in which through increased interaction and exchange they have developed a more firmly rooted collective identity in their discipline (Henkel, 2000).

"Pure" or foundational disciplines, such as physics, chemistry and economics, may be less well represented in the basic units across the range of higher education institutions. However, the socio-epistemological structure of the discipline, the idea of an epistemic community defining its territory, the problems it will address and the main conceptual, theoretical and methodological frameworks which it will deploy, and organising its review systems and publication outlets, is reproduced by emerging inter-disciplinary communities. As Weingart argues, the science system is strong, as is the assumption of functional differentiation (1997). Increasing numbers of scientists (and social scientists) may work in a context of application and in collaboration with actors outside the university. However, that does not necessarily mean that their work is confined to the solution of externally defined problems or that the processes of knowledge production are uniformly shared between all members of the "hybrid communities" involved. Finalisation theory suggests that the nature and extent of collaboration between academics and other actors are determined by the stage of the development of a science or a scientific paradigm (van den Daele et al., 1977; Weingart, 1997). A period of concentrated theoretical development by academics is often required before it is possible to exploit new knowledge

in external problem solving. There are many domains in which problems are predominantly defined within disciplines or solutions are dependent on theoretical advance in highly specialised areas. It may, for example, be argued that research on ageing is now often conducted in "hybrid communities" of, for example, social scientists and architects or engineers. However, it is also strongly driven within the biological sciences, now that there are productive paradigms in which demonstrable progress can be made on problems previously thought to be insoluble. As a result the field can attract ambitious discipline-based scientists, which it was earlier unable to do (Henkel et al., 2000; Henkel, 2005).

This is not to say that the place of the discipline in identity formation and maintenance remains unchanged. However, there is evidence that disciplines retain substantial power in the organisation and production of new knowledge and in the identities (the values, self-definition and self-esteem) of academics. Cell biologists, for example, still want first to solve the problems of cell biology, even if they are at the same time involved in networks focused on health improvement (Henkel, 2005). For them, the discipline is still powerful in the reputation system and in the definition of intellectual excellence. Arguably, academics are increasingly comfortable in positioning themselves within a matrix of influences: mode 1 and mode 2 or discipline and domain, interdisciplinary basic unit and disciplinary group. Social scientists see themselves as located in women's studies and sociology, health studies and economics, education studies and psychology. In areas such as modern languages where the most exciting work is interdisciplinary, individual roots in a language remain strong (Di Napoli, 2003).

As Becher and Parry (in this volume) argue, critical differences are opening up between higher education institutions in terms of the continued role in them of the disciplines. Decisions about the nature and organisation of knowledge in universities are being made on criteria of financial rather than academic value. Recent research (Di Napoli, 2003) has shown that disciplinary identities are difficult to maintain where managerial decisions impose new structures and connections on academics without strong research roots and recognition in the wider disciplinary community. However, our own research (Henkel et al., 2000; Kogan et al., 2000) supports Delanty's view that current political and economic changes are not imposing a simple polarisation of university identities as between guardians of academic autonomy and industries or businesses (Gumport, 2000; see also in this volume). Rather, universities are subject to competing influences and models (Delanty, 2001). Certainly, there is in Britain a new and more explicit stratification of power, resources and reputation but with that goes a variety of traditions, connections and strengths which means that, at least as yet, their internal epistemic maps and educational models are also multiple. It is possible to retain a collective sense of disciplinary identity in environments where departmental structures have been removed and in new as well as

old universities, if disciplinary groups are able to sustain research activity and to involve at least postgraduate students in that. Recent research evidence suggests that commitment to the research-teaching nexus can also be sustained at undergraduate level in new universities with strategic commitment from university leaderships and academic themselves (Jenkins et al., 2003).

However, if there are reasons to believe that the influence of disciplinary structures and cultures has been undermined less than changing theories might suggest, there is a need for more close-grained research into epistemological maps and structures of practice at individual as well as organisational levels in higher education.

Autonomy, identity and the institution

We now look more closely at the higher education institution and the implications of change for its power, autonomy and identity and those of its members. We focus on two sets of relationships, external and internal. It is clear that universities have been incorporated into the economic and political dynamic, instead of being conceived as outside it. The idea of functional segmentation and its manifestation in professional self-regulation are under threat, as, in consequence, is the concept of bounded academic organisations or "spaces of action". Their changed position in society has led some analysts to regard academic autonomy as "a nonsense" (Barnett, 1988). Universities are involved in multiple external relationships in which they have varying degrees of power and must work both competitively and collaboratively with different knowledge regimes, if they are to survive. At the same time, however, the social and political changes have meant that the institutional level of higher education has acquired more power and significance than before, with implications for internal as well as external relations in universities.

The arguments that universities are increasingly servants of the state and of corporate capitalism (Readings, 1996) have some force in the British context. Governments have been redefining the justification for universities in terms of their contribution to wealth creation, quality of life of the population (OST, 1993), national prestige ("world class universities") (DfES White Paper, 2003), and, more recently, social inclusion. The pressures on universities to reduce their financial dependence on the state, along with the emphasis on performance-related allocation of public funding, have centred attention on universities' income generation capacities and on business as a key source of income for them. Restructuring, including the abolition of departments, on economic rather than epistemic criteria has demonstrated this, even if the two are not always wholly separable.

Universities are not simply passive participants in the new order, although this does not mean that they constitute a challenge to the power of the state and the market. They are becoming increasingly well-equipped to assert intellectual property

rights. They are also more prepared to be "transgressive" (Scott, 1997) as far as roles and organisational boundaries are concerned. There is some evidence of Etzkowitz's "triple helix" model of the relationships between universities, government and industry taking hold in Britain, in which one or more of these actors begin to "take the role of the other, with universities creating an industrial penumbra or performing a quasi-governmental role as local innovation organiser" (1999). It is exemplified when universities adopt leadership roles in the economic development of their region or create incentives in their own institutions for modes of knowledge production that involve external private and public bodies (Henkel et al., 2000).

The concept of stakeholding holds some possibilities for understanding universities' developing external roles in terms other than state or business-domination. It has entered policy discourses in higher education, although it is perhaps less used in Britain now than the concepts of user, consumer and customer. As Neave (2002) reminds us, the origins of stakeholding in the Anglo-Saxon world can be found in a definition of the collectivity centred on ownership and possession: "stakeholders had some share in the common wealth" (16). This idea was certainly historically important in higher education: ownership of the colleges of the old universities was vested in internal stakeholders, the fellows and masters (17).

There might be several reasons for conceiving those external to universities who have an interest in them as stakeholders. First, it moves perceptions away from the "leviathans" of the state and "corporate capitalism". Rather, it reflects the idea that universities are forming relationships with distinct entities, individuals, groups or organisations with a variety of perspectives and goals. Second, it implies that these can be more than users of products or consumers making demands; they have a stake in universities, something to lose if the "common wealth" of those organisations suffers. This argument carries more weight if "common wealth" is defined in other than monetary terms. It directs attention to what is valued in universities and why.

The Association of Commonwealth Universities' (ACU's) argument for "engagement" as an imperative for contemporary universities is also important in these terms. They start from an explicit normative position: that universities must embrace missions of social usefulness without reservation. By engagement they mean "strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world" (ACU, 2000: i). They make it clear that this world includes, but extends well beyond, industries and governments and economic interests. The aims and values with which this world and universities themselves are concerned are social, moral and epistemological, as well as economic. Such values could be encompassed in the "argumentative interaction" that might be developed between them. ACU identifies four spheres in which it might be undertaken: "setting universities' aims, purposes and priorities; relating teaching and learning to the wider world; the back-and-forth

dialogue between researchers and practitioners; and taking on wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens." (ibid.).

However, the meaning and value of such encounters are likely to depend strongly on the second main set of issues to be addressed in this section, of relationships internal to the university. Current university relationships with external organisations can sometimes be represented as a choice between anarchy (dependence on uncoordinated individual initiatives) and management-domination (Gumport, 2000 and in this volume). In either case, the interests of the institution and the individual academic may be in conflict.

Research by Clark (1998) and Stensaker (2004) suggests that universities can manage things differently. Stensaker, in a study of the response of Norwegian higher education institutions to quality policies in the 1990s, finds that institutional leaders best able to adopt and take forward externally initiated change proceeded by translating them in terms compatible with existing organisational identities. Academics could accept new values and even new organisational identities if they could be persuaded to understand them as perpetuating what had hitherto given meaning and a sense of distinctiveness to their working environment (and so fed into their own sense of identity).

Clark's focus is on selected universities in Europe (including two in Britain), identified as successfully adapting to changed expectations. In this context, he suggests, autonomous universities are not necessarily equipped to influence their futures; they may be passive institutions (5)). Rather, he finds that what is needed is "entrepreneurial universities", by which he means organisations able and prepared collectively to take the initiative in a different environment. They combine strong leadership from the centre with the active involvement of academics in the basic units. The latter, he argues, must work together with a "strengthened steering core" to reach outwards with new programmes and initiatives and to help ensure that "academic values will guide [organisational] transformation" (ibid.). (It is notable that, in his view, different modes of knowledge production must be sustained: "academic departments based on disciplinary fields of knowledge will go on being important: their disciplinary competence is essential" (6)). Thus, it seems that strong academic institutions with strong academic values can be sustained not by relying on strong protective boundaries but by active engagement within and across those boundaries.

The conceptions of the university reflected here are at some variance with the ideal of loosely coupled communities of scholars pursuing the agendas of their respective fields free of serious external challenge. Institutional autonomy has been exchanged for engagement with outside bodies that might bring with it more institutional power and enlarged opportunities. Organisational boundaries have become blurred and operational structures more open and transitory and the range of avail-

able research agendas, modes of knowledge production and institutional roles and relationships has extended. At the same time, universities have adopted more corporate aims, models of management and policy making and have become more aware of the importance of organisational identity. While for some this can be a matter of establishing a coherent and convincing public image, for some it is also an exercise in organisational re-integration, in which the identity of the organisation is grounded in strong academic basic units collaborating with a new kind of institutional leadership.

It seems that *pace* the new theories of identity, which posit a weakening of social institutions and their influences on individual actors, the university remains a distinctive and, in some senses, strengthened body, in which the interdependence between institution and individual actors has increased.

However, that, in turn, raises questions about the implications for academic freedom. In the highly stratified British system, they are linked with institutional prestige and resources. Many academics in strong and wealthy research-led institutions have been able to sustain substantial degrees of freedom in the choice and pursuit of their own agendas. Technological innovation that can be exploited in profitable markets is now widely regarded as dependent on theoretical advances in science. Scientific researchers at the leading edge of certain fields can hold onto their freedom in exchange for giving sponsors early access to new lines of inquiry and findings. Some will diversify their activities and involve themselves more directly in technological development, consultancy or entrepreneurship. Although such academics may undertake these forms of activity for instrumental reasons, their own or those of their university or both, they may not necessarily regard them as infringing their freedom. Some appear to relish transgression into external territories or interests (Henkel, 2002). Overall their academic authority enables them to reconfigure their identities and to accommodate new agendas into their overriding academic goals and plans (Henkel, 2005). They do not need the protection of strong boundaries to sustain their freedoms. In a changing context, those freedoms are enhanced through the formation and management of new working relationships. Up till now, in wealthy institutions it has also been possible, in the name of sustaining existing organisational identities, to protect the freedom of subject groups whose knowledge is not in demand from outside interests. Whether this will continue as universities are under increasing pressure to compete in global arenas is less certain.

In the case of most universities, already the opportunities to maintain freedom in the new context are uncertain and likely to be available for only a proportion of their members. Organisational restructuring and resource allocation in the name of rationality, coherence and the enhancement of institutional reputation and income generation potential are likely to be the outcome not just of communicative rationality but also a struggle for power between competing academic interests. Such restructuring

has had sometimes substantial impacts. Individuals with lesser reputations or in fields less open to commercial exploitation have had either to shift their agendas, or to pursue agendas constructed by others or to face threats to their individual and collective identities in their institutions (Henkel, 2000; Henkel, 2005).

There then are questions about what it means if an existing balance is disturbed between the collective and the individual and between coherence and difference in a university, particularly if this is an outcome of a drive for market competitiveness. What then happens to the different values embodied in different disciplines and fields (studies of ancient civilisations and languages as against computer science; sociology as against business studies; physics as against biotechnology), the different contributions they make to societies and the different resources and practices on which they depend? What are the implications for common values assumed to be protected by academic freedom: non-conformity within epistemic communities; intellectual risk and originality; independent, critical analysis and speaking truth to power, internal or external? Underlying these are questions about the purposes for which universities are seen as pivotal institutions in the knowledge society. What are the characteristics of universities that make them "socially useful" and in what terms, economic, political, social, moral, is the idea of social usefulness to be understood?

These are questions of value and of conceptions of knowledge and what sustains it. The answers to such questions can not be taken for granted. They will almost certainly not be agreed. They can be debated throughout institutions and form the basis for strenuous argumentative interaction with stakeholders by institutional leaders but also by academics in the basic units. All must now accept that they must be open to argument about the values and practices embodied in universities, as well as ready to justify their work to the wider society. Moreover, they cannot assume that their criteria for justification will be accepted.

However, the obverse of doing away with the boundaries that separate and protect universities from other sectors of society is that they are now more explicitly part of the polity, involved in struggles for power and ideas, including ideas about the value and definition of academic freedom. It is open to them to seek to shift others' perspectives upon them and in so doing to make an impact on how universities are defined but also on the level and sources of support they are given and on what terms. One way of doing this is to identify and "engage" with a greater variety of stakeholders or in other words to participate in a process of deliberative democracy.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is an attempt to exploit a line of analysis long established by Maurice Kogan, that of the interplay between knowledge, values and power in theory

and in observed experience. Its primary focus has been on the individual in interaction with institutions, in particular the discipline and the enterprise. It has explored the implications of various forms of change for conceptions of academic identities and academic autonomy within the British context.

Recent social theories and analyses of social trends suggest that there have been profound epistemological, structural, political and cultural changes that have challenged the assumptions underpinning the working of academic systems. As institutional and functional boundaries in societies have become blurred and structures more open and transitory, questions have been raised about the distinctiveness of academe and the rationale for the autonomy of its institutions and their individual members. General theories of identity suggest that identity has become more of an individual and open-ended project, as the institutional frameworks in which it has been shaped have become less stable and cohesive. The capacity of key academic institutions, the discipline and the university, to provide a framework for academic identities has come under the microscope, as academic career trajectories, life choices and affiliations multiply. The discipline as the basis for the production of knowledge has been particularly strongly challenged from inside as well as outside academe, as new modes and hybrid structures for the creation and dissemination of knowledge have been developed, together with new evaluative criteria. It has been argued here that the discipline remains a stronger source of identity than is assumed by many social theorists. However, its power and authority may be quite different in different institutional settings. More empirical study of academic lives and working practices and relationships are needed in this area.

Individual identity and academic freedom have both become projects to be managed by individuals but within a context that is not particularly conducive to individuality. It is largely accepted that now that academics and their organisations have become pivotal to the welfare of their society, they must engage with interests and organisations in that society in strategic and operational relationships. This means that individual and collective freedoms in the determination and pursuit of their agendas are not given but have to be realised (cf. Bauer et al., 1999) within often complex sets of relationships, external as well as internal to the academy.

One of the complicating factors is that governments as well as the universities themselves have aimed to strengthen universities at the same time as they have put pressure on them to loosen or blur their boundaries. Universities now have more powerful leaderships. They have sought to integrate at least those whom they regard as their most successful academic members into a more corporate enterprise than before. There is stronger emphasis on coherent and collective academic identities at the level of both the organisation and the basic units. It is possible for academics to enhance their individual identities and freedoms in these circumstances but the

power to achieve this is increasingly restricted as the inequalities of what has always been a highly stratified system increase and become more explicit.

The implications for long held academic values and conceptions of knowledge depend partly on the broader political framework. It has been suggested here that this is not to be regarded as something over which academics have no control. It does not necessarily have to be understood wholly in terms of the state and the market. There are potentially more, and more varied, stakeholders with whom academics and their organisations can engage in "strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction". A key issue for such interaction is the extent to which conceptions of knowledge underpinned by values of academic freedom and the role of the individual must change or whether they should be sustained if universities are to be "socially useful" in the longer term. The resolution of the issue will depend, in part, on the outcomes of argument about how social usefulness is to be defined.

REFERENCES

Association of Commonwealth Universities (2001). Engagement as a Core Value for the University: a consultation document. London: ACU.

Bailey, F. (1977). *Morality and Expediency*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Barnett, R. (1988). "Limits to Academic Freedom: Imposed-upon or Self-imposed?". In Tight, M. (ed.) *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*. Milton Keynes: SRHE and Open University Press, 88-103.

Bauer, M., Marton, S., Askling, B. and Marton, F. (1999). *Transforming Universities. Patterns of Governance, Structure and Learning in Swedish Higher Education at the Millennial Turn.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Bauman, Z. (1996). "From Pilgrim to Tourist – Or a Short History of Identity". In Hall, S and du Gay, P. *Questions Of Cultural Identity.* London: Sage, 18-36.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines.* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press, 1st edition.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education,* London: Routledge, 2nd edition.

Becher, T., Henkel, M. and Kogan, M. (1994). *Graduate Education in Britain*, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: SRHE and Open University Press, 2nd edition.

Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. London: Heinemann

Berdahl, R. (1999) "Universities and governments in the 21st century: the US experience". In Braun, D. and Merrien, F-X, *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*. London, Jessica Kingsley, 59-77.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique.* London: Taylor Francis.

Bohm, G. and Stehr, N (eds.) (1986). *The Knowledge Society*. Dordrecht: D.Reidel Publishing Company.

Bourdieu, P. (1975). "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of Progress of Reason". *Social Science Information,* 14(6), 19-47

Castells, M. (1997). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Vol 1. The Power of Identity*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross National Perspective*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities.* Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: the University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003). *The Future of Higher Education*. Cm 5735, London: HMSO.

Di Napoli, R. (2003). *Modern Languages: Which Identities? Which Selves?* PhD thesis, University of London.

Etzkowitz, H. (1999). "Academia Agonistes: The Triple Helix of Government-University-Industry relationships in the United States". In Braun, D. and Merrien, F-X. (eds.). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

Gerholm, T. (1985). "On tacit knowledge in academia". In Gustavson, L. (ed.) *On Communication*: no. 3, University of Linköping, Department of Communication Studies.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gumport, P. (2000). "Academic Restructuring: Organisational Change and Institutional Imperatives". *Higher Education,* 39, 67-91.

Hall, S. (1990). "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". In Rutherford, J. (ed.) *Identity*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. (1992). "The Question of Cultural Identity". In Hall, S., Held, D and McGrew, T. (eds.). *Modernity and its Futures.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Henkel, M. (2004). "Current Science Policies and their implications for the Formation and Maintenance of Academic Identity". *Higher Education Policy*, 17, 167-182

Henkel, M. (2005 forthcoming). "Academic Identity and Autonomy in a changing policy environment". *Higher Education*, 44(1).

Henkel, M., Hanney, S., Kogan, M., Vaux, J. and von Walden Laing, D. (2000). *Academic Responses to the UK Foresight Programme.* London: Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy and Practice, Brunel University.

Jenkins, A., Breen, R., Lindsay, R. with Brew, A. (2003). *Reshaping Teaching in Higher Education: Linking Teaching with Research*. London: Kogan Page.

Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social Identity*. London, USA and Canada: Routledge.

Kogan, M. (2005, forthcoming). "Modes of Knowledge and Patterns of Power". In *Higher Education* 44(1).

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. and Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: a comparative study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

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

Latour, B. (1983). "Give me a Laboratory and I will Raise the World". In Knorr-Cetina, K. and Mulkay, M. (eds*.). Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Studies of Science*. London and Beverly Hills: Sage.

Latour, B (1987). *Science in Action*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Lyotard, J-F (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: University of Manchester.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After Virtue*: *a Study in Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth.

Mead G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society. From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Moore, R. S. (2003). *Adaptive Responses to Curriculum Restructuring Policy in Two South African Universities: An Enquiry into the Identity Projections of Academics Disposed towards Change,* PhD thesis, University of Cape Town.

Mulhall, S. and Swift, A. (1992). *Liberals and Communitarians*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mulkay, M. (1977). "Sociology of the Scientific Research Community". In I. Spiegel Rösing and D. de Solla Price (eds), *Science, Technology and Society: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective*. London and Beverly Hills: Sage, 93-148.

Neave, G. (1988). "On being economical with university autonomy: being an account of the retrospective joys of a written constitution". In Tight, M. (ed.). *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*. Milton Keynes: SRHE and Open University Press, 31-48.

Neave, G. (2002). *On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seers: Changing vision of the University*. Enschede: University of Twente.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, P. (1997). "The Changing Role of the University in the Production of Knowledge". *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3(1), 5-14.

Stensaker, B. (2004). *The Transformation of Organisational Identities: Interpretations of Policies concerning Teaching and Learning in Norwegian Higher Education.* Enschede: CHEPS/ University of Twente.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self: the Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vabø, A. (2002). *Mytedannelser i endringsprosesser i akademiske institusjoner*. PhD thesis, University of Bergen.

Van den Daele, W., Krohn, W. and Weingart, P. (1977). "The Political Direction of Scientific Development". In Mendelsohn, E., Weingart, P. and Whitley, R. (eds*.). The Social Production of Scientific Knowledge*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 219-242.

Weingart, P. (1997). "From Finalisation to Mode 2: old wine in new bottles?". *Social Science Information* 36(4), 591-613.

White Paper (1993). *Realising our Potential – A Strategy for Science, Engineering and Technology*. Command 2250. London: HMSO.

PART 3: VALUES

11

ACADEMICS AND THE MODE-2 SOCIETY: SHIFTS IN KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SUSAN MARTON

INTRODUCTION

Changes in higher education policies and practices during the past twenty years have resulted in much debate about the primary purposes of the university. Although often discussed in relation to resource constraints (Gumport, this volume), changes in governance models and steering mechanisms have also contributed to the questioning of the primary task of universities and the role of knowledge within them (Bauer et al., 1999; Kogan et al., 2000). As Nybom reminds us, one of the foremost challenges has been to deal with the following question:

How is it possible to construct and then secure the necessary autonomous institutional order, or framework, to modern science and the pursuit of qualified knowledge and, at the same time, prevent it from being corrupted or even destroyed by other mighty and legitimate forces in society such as politics, economy, and religion? (2003: 143).

There is of course, no simple answer to such a question; rather the forces in society battle it out. Gumport's research depicts the current battleground as between those with an idea of higher education as a social institution and those who view higher education as an industry. Identifying and analysing the influence of these societal forces have constituted a major focus of Maurice Kogan's work. By expanding upon the Clark (1983) triangle of professional-collegial; governmental-managerial and market forces, Becher and Kogan (1992) added a welfare state force (adopting Premfors, 1980). In my own work with Maurice, I have had the privilege to benefit from his insights while studying the politics related to shifts in university governance models and their implications for university autonomy (Marton, 2000). Not only did the collaboration with Maurice broaden my knowledge of these various forces behind policy-making, but it also encouraged me to recognize the importance of the process from policy to practice. Maurice has motivated generations of scholars to ask "What are the implications of these policy changes for academic work and

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 169-188.

processes?" In this chapter, I will follow in this Kogan tradition by investigating academics' response to and views of the changing research finance system in Sweden (see also Marton, in press; and Marton, forthcoming).

An important starting point for the study presented in this chapter is the concept of academic identity. Henkel (this volume) investigates the concept of academic identity, and explores the value base of this identity. It is exemplified by belief in the importance of carrying out a "distinctive line of inquiry", which is an "underlying assumption" about the advancement of academic work (see also Henkel, 2000). But what happens to academic identity in the face of threats to "academically-anchored knowledge" (a term used by Kogan & Hanney 2000; see also Gumport, this volume), threats which can be either economic or ideological? Gumport questions whether higher education can define on its own the terms of the "academic enterprise". And Henkel (this volume) raises the vital question, "Must conceptions of knowledge change"? Unfortunately, empirical studies of the academic responses to these issues are few. (See Ylijoki 2003; Becher & Kogan 1992) This chapter will attempt to fill the gap somewhat with an empirical study of the case of Sweden during a period of profound change in the funding system for research.[21]

CHANGES IN SWEDISH RESEARCH FINANCING: A CASE STUDY

There is significant evidence that the financing of research in Sweden has undergone substantial change in the past ten years (Sandström, 2002). Many of these changes can be traced back to government policies from the spring of 1993, when the Parliament passed the "*Research for Knowledge and Progress*" bill. Using government funds amassed from the "Wage Earners' Funds" policy, approximately 15 billion SEK[22] were allocated as starting capital to a number of newly created research foundations. The government outlined two major priorities for these research foundations: to concentrate research investments into "strategic areas" and to strengthen the cooperation between universities and business, and between universities and society in general as well. The government view at the time, as expressed in the bill to Par-

[21] The author would like to acknowledge that portions of this chapter and the interview material upon which the analysis is based are being published in Swedish with the title, "Humaniora och Samhällsvetenskap: Business as Usual?" see "Marton, forthcoming" in the reference list. Furthermore, the author would like to thank SISTER (Swedish Institute for Studies in Education and Research) and STINT (The Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education) for financial support during this study, and the Center for Public Sector Research (CEFOS) at Göteborg University and the Political Economy Research Centre at Sheffield University for providing a generous research environment during the completion of this project.

[22] At current rates, 1 Euro equals approximately 9 Swedish crowns.

liament, was that these funds would represent an extra injection into Swedish research funding in relation to direct state appropriations to university faculties (Marton, 2000: 74).

Yet ten years later, the funds provided from these new foundations can certainly not be viewed as an "extra injection". Rather, their role has become substantial. They represent approximately seven percent of the total funds for research and doctoral education provided to Swedish universities. The problem of financial support for academic research has been aggravated by a reduction in the funding from the Swedish Research Council (known as "VR", Vetenskapsrådet) where decisions are made by a peer-review system, combined with the fact that direct allocations from the Swedish state to university faculties have also barely remained steady and at times decreased. (Meanwhile the number of doctoral students has increased by 18%).[23] Hällsten and Sandström (2002) state that collegial, peer-reviewed research funds have decreased from 68% in 1993/1994 to 55% in 2000 of the total income for research and research education. This leads them to conclude that no matter how one counts, "the results show a clear and precise downturn for 'researcher steered' funds. All indications show that the space for curiosity-driven research is shrinking." (ibid: 83).

Yet the evidence as to the impacts of these financing changes on the individual academic level in Sweden is much less researched. By focusing on the subject areas of the humanities and social sciences, this chapter will attempt to shed some light on the current conditions facing academics in a period of great change. These changes have been depicted in the recent academic literature in a number of well-known theoretical models. They draw on metaphors such as "academic capitalism", the "triple-helix" and "Mode-2" forms of knowledge production. The aim of the chapter will be to flush out some of the assumptions from these models and to analyze to what extent they receive support from the Swedish case.

The material for this case study is based primarily on long interviews with academics and academic managers throughout Sweden, using open-ended questions. Almost all universities with humanities and social science faculties are represented. In total, 65 interviews were conducted during the fall of 2003 and winter of 2004. At the management level, 26 interviews were carried out including seven with rectors, eight with faculty deans, and eleven with heads of departments and other managers. At the academic level, a total of 39 interviews were conducted, including 26 with professors, eight with associate professors, and five with research fellows. Out of the

[23] Nationellt Uppföljningssystem, Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, category "active researcher students", 1994 to 2002.

total portfolio of interviews, 21 can be directly identified with humanities scholars and 28 with social scientists.[24]

The key foundation in focus for this study is the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation's "*Cultural Donation*" (known as "RJ-K") that began to distribute research funds in 1994. For the year 2002, 171 million SEK were distributed for research projects from this fund, with 34.5 million SEK allocated for new projects (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond Årsberättelse, 2002). The "cultural donation" fund was founded primarily to support large, cross-disciplinary projects that would require longer term financing (3 to 5 years). Two additional foundations that have relevance for the subject areas of humanities and social sciences are also included in this study: "*KK*", Foundation for Knowledge and Competence Development and "*MISTRA*" Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research.

In the empirical analysis which follows, the aims of the foundations and their implications, as interpreted by the researchers and academic leadership, will be discussed in relation to the larger system changes which have taken place in the Swedish research landscape. Given the explorative nature of this case study, it is important to keep in mind that no effort is being made to rigorously "test" these interpretations against a set of theoretically derived assumptions (see Section 3). Rather, the interview data will be used to see to what extent the assumptions receive support – and where possible, to comment on how they are, or are not, supported. The discussion of the empirical data is structured around assumptions derived from major themes in the literature that are "our best hope of finding a systematic presentation of evidence which allows common questions about different political systems to be asked" (Kogan, 1996).

THE NEW PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE? THEORETICAL MODELS AND GUIDING ASSUMPTIONS

Recent academic attention on research and the role of the university in society has focused heavily on the "mode 2" form of knowledge production. The "Mode 2" model, first introduced by Gibbon et al. in 1994, described the changes in knowledge production in terms of a movement from Mode 1 to Mode 2. Mode 1 emphasized the discipline as the center of knowledge production in which homogeneity of research and the context of discovery were pre-eminent. In the Mode 2 model, there

[24] In the data presentation which follows, interviews are identified first with a number, then with a title, and lastly –where relevant – an "S" for social sciences and an "H" for humanities. The codes for titles are: "R" for Rector, "D" for Dean, "M" for Manager (including heads of departments), "P" for Professor, "DC" for the Swedish "docent" (which is associate professor) and "F" for research fellows.

was a shift to a context of application, problem-solving, multidisciplinarity and entrepreneurship (Gibbons et al., 1994). In their second work, the "Mode 2" authors argue that "society as a whole has been permeated by science" and in the process science has changed to something else. Borrowing from Latour, they discuss a "culture of research which is more populist, pluralistic and open. The 'social' has been absorbed into the 'scientific'" (Nowotny et al., 2001). Thus, if the lines between the "social" and the "scientific" no longer exist, then the authors argue that it is "reasonable to speak of the emergence of a 'Mode 2 society'" (ibid: 29). Key to their reasoning is the concept of "contextualized" knowledge. Contextualized knowledge is what is needed – knowledge which attempts "to solve problems that have their origins in the concerns of particular individuals, groups or organizations, or even society as a whole" (ibid: 106).

Alongside the Mode 2 knowledge production model, Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff introduced the concept of the "triple helix" to describe the institutional arrangements of this new knowledge production. As Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff explain, "the Triple Helix thesis states that the university can play an enhanced role in innovation in increasingly knowledge-based societies" (2000: 109). Instead of the firm having the central role in innovation, the focus is on "the network overlay of communications and expectations that reshape the institutional arrangements among universities, industries, and governmental agencies" (ibid). Thus, the thesis emphasizes the role of the university in economic development and the institutional arrangements created between the three spheres of university, industry and government in order to generate economic growth and social transformation. Although the Triple Helix thesis is not directly studied in this chapter (see Marton, 2005), it provides an important background for understanding the concept of academic capitalism.

Academic capitalism, developed by Slaughter and Leslie, is defined as "institutional and professorial market or market like efforts to secure external moneys" (1997: 8). Many of these forms of "capitalism", such as patents, licenses, joint-venture companies and associated science parks, are related directly to the generation of profit and to improved economic development. Here the connection to the triple-helix thesis is obvious. However, many activities are not directly related to a profit-maximizing interest, but are carried out under the conditions of a competitive market nonetheless. Such activities include the attainment of research contracts and grants, as well as donations to the universities. Many of these financial sources are linked to organizations and institutions related to "civil society", and thus the "third task" of the university – to promote connections with wider society – is gaining in importance.[25] Given that the empirical material for this chapter is collected from

[25] Tasks one and two are the traditional tasks of teaching and research.

Humanities and Social Science faculties, it is the latter sense of academic capitalism that has more relevance for this study.

Assumptions to guide the analysis of empirical data

Given the body of background literature presented above, the next task is to identify from it some assumptions that will assist in the analysis of the case material. We can start with the fact that the Mode-2 model strongly emphasizes communication and networks with interests outside the university. Nowotny et al. (2001: 77) label this as the "social contextualization characteristic of Mode-2 knowledge". This is seen "as a continuous process in which novel forms of interaction and communication take place between scientists on the one hand and on the other those who speak to science" (ibid: 111). However, they also conclude that scientists have been changing their beliefs as they work more in integrated networks and as institutional boundaries are broken down. (Their empirical basis for this conclusion is vague however.)

We need to ask what happens to values fostered and maintained by the various disciplines when knowledge is now to be created in trans- or even intra- disciplinary environments? Somewhat surprisingly, Nowotny et al. write that this "does not require the abandonment of one's disciplinary 'home' or the loss of one's primary identification as an academic or industrial scientist". They believe that at least two responses are possible for the researcher. First, the transdisciplinary experience may strengthen disciplinary and professional identities, or second, "accommodation processes may be at work, creating multiple and modified identities" resulting in new "hybrid-researchers" (Nowotny et al.: 177). Our first assumption can now be formulated:

A1) Traditional academic identity is not lost, but the research environment is becoming more problem-oriented, with transdisciplinary research projects conducted by research teams working together.

Second, when knowledge production occurs through "social contextualization", academic leadership finds it increasingly difficult to try to "manage" research. As Nowotny et al. highlight, "Control is now exercised through a plurality of disciplines and institutions. New research activities arise in cognitive territory populated by many different kinds of experts who possess different kinds of skills and experience" (ibid: 113). This implies that evaluating the quality of research becomes more complicated. There "are many more actors now involved, all of whom feel able to judge the acuity of problem-selection and the subtlety of possible problem-solutions. They all feel entitled to assess the 'quality' of research" (ibid: 115). Thus the danger of the "audit society" may have found its way into the universities (Power, 1997). This provides the basis for our second assumption:

A2) Judgements regarding the quality of research will be more varied and more prone to critique.

The environment in which academics operate today is described as competitive and market-like. It can also be characterized as containing a high degree of uncertainty. Following the work of Keynes, Nowotny et al. define uncertainty, as opposed to risk, "as a state in which individual actors find it impossible to attribute a reasonably definite probability to the expected outcome of their choice" (2001: 112). Given an environment where it is not at all clear "which direction research will take, what resources will be available and what (and where) leadership will be available, a sensible course of action is to hedge one's bets by keeping your options open and participating in several different ventures" (ibid: 112). At the same time, academics must be concerned about their reputation and image in the marketplace. This leads us to assumptions three and four:

A3) Academics are being encouraged to find other sources of finance, possibly taking on applied research tasks rather than conducting basic research.

A4) In order to attract external funds, institutions and academics are adopting market-like "profiles" and "niche" behaviour.

Lastly, following the work presented in a case study of academic capitalism in Finland (Ylijoki, 2003), the following assumptions regarding the academic response will also be reviewed:

A5) Academic capitalism encourages senior researchers to constantly apply for research funding to support their junior-level researchers.

A6) Research is more often conducted under short-term contracts, raising issues of the quality of research when an environment for longer-term concentration and focus is lacking.

A7) The core functions of senior staff have been greatly expanded, to include the fostering of contacts within and outside the university, the writing of funding applications and reports for evaluation purposes, and more general administrative tasks.

EMPIRICAL DATA PRESENTATION

The empirical data for this study includes fifteen large research projects claiming to incorporate a multidisciplinary approach. Six projects identified themselves as being brand new co-operations with new research contacts as a result of financing provided by the foundations (four in the humanities and two in social sciences). Nine projects identified themselves as arrangements (research contacts, research ideas) that already existed but could not be brought to fruition without the foundations' financial resources (six in the humanities and three in social sciences). Of the six brand-new co-operations, two were heavily supported by their respective faculties, with project initiation funds and support in applying to the foundations.

The majority of the multidisciplinary projects grew out of contacts and project ideas that the researchers had had from the start, for which, however, they were having difficulties in finding financial resources. As explained by a docent, "We were individual researchers doing our own things, but on a similar topic area, so we decided to make a network."[26] There was a common understanding among the interviewees that these multidisciplinary working environments had to "grow from below" and that centralized decisions to force this type of behavior were actually dangerous.[27] Many researchers stated that the success of the research environment depended not only on the quality of the collaborators, but also on geographical closeness. This was explained in the following way by a professor,

To understand other researchers' cultural traditions within the discipline and to be able to communicate these understandings with each other was no easy task. Complications arose due to lack of understanding, however they were discovered early on in the project. It has been a positive development to be required to learn how other disciplines work. This development would have been extremely difficult without the easy logistical connections and geographic closeness of the project members so that we could meet once a month.[28]

This was confirmed by an associate professor:

People think you can have cross-disciplinary research just by sending in an application. That is wrong. And the EU is saying this too, many different disciplines, many different countries – but the research conditions are poor. You need to have much closer relationships – geographic closeness. MISTRA has had a little of the same

[26] Interview 20-DC-S.
[27] Interviews 2-P-S, 21-P-S, 22-P-H, 26-P-S, 27-D-H.
[28] Interview 35-P-H.

idea as EU. But MISTRA should also look for the little groups with parallels or at least some integration.[29]

As for the role of multidisciplinary research versus basic research, there were many mixed views. The most negative comment, illustrating one pole of the debate, was that "Cross-disciplinary research has only an instrumental value; otherwise, it lacks the specific scientific qualities and has a tendency to be a dumping ground for bad research."[30] This was, however, a minority view. On the more positive side, the multidisciplinary approach was seen as extremely motivating, a way of stopping the "boxing" approach of the disciplines – where researchers are contained within their disciplinary "box" and do not have contact with each other. As elaborated by a docent, "It is a shame that this type of research does not happen more often. Instead, people are protecting their disciplinary borders in order to protect their money flowing in."[31] In the middle range, the majority of interviewees stated that it was certainly appropriate that some foundations would prioritize multidisciplinary projects, where the problem being studied required many competences and disciplines.[32] Yet academics were concerned with the way in which such research could dominate the funding possibilities, and one docent pointed out that "one should not have the illusion that this is the only way for the future. It is more important to look at the quality and originality of the research project and the researcher's competence – not the project's formal disciplinary and institutional arrangements".[33]

The topic of the quality of external reviewers also received many mixed views. As one rector explained, the Swedish Research Council was seen as still fighting the "conflict of interests" problem, and that they did not dare to bring in international experts was an indication that "they wanted to spend most of their money supporting the same old stuff".[34] And although many were satisfied with RJ's "Cultural Donation's" application process, especially when the international reviewers were called in, there were still some points of critique. Some professors were skeptical when no one in the research group had ever heard of any of the so-called "experts" and others raised the issue (rather sarcastically) of whether the project was denied because they didn't mention the "expert's" latest published works.[35] Indeed, the entire topic of the neutrality of the experts was raised by academics and managers at all levels in the system, with questions such as "What type of loyalties exist in the network of ex-

[29] Interview 36-DC-H.
[30] Interview 19-R.
[31] Interview 29-DC-H.
[32] Interviews 21-P-S, 26-P-S, 29-DC-H, 33-P-H, 35-P-H, 37-P-H, 38-F-H, 39-P-H.
[33] Interview 36-DC-H.
[34] Interview 3.2-R.
[35] Interviews 22-P-H, 26-P-S, 35-P-H.

perts which pass judgments on others?" and "Are those who are carrying out the judgments also in need of money?" and, "What happens to academic freedoms when the experts are not all academics?"[36] As one interviewee put it, "Researchers should be evaluating researchers; we should not be evaluated by the business world or by representatives of the State. This is a development which puts research freedoms at risk and allows for too much steering."[37] But there was not unanimous agreement on this point. It was suggested by one dean and one associate professor that evaluators should be selected not only from scientific experts. Some-type of "project" expert could also be called in to judge the project against criteria that represent other qualities and dimensions that are not just discipline based.[38]

Regarding changes in financing possibilities, the data shows that academics are responding by taking direct action to increase their chances of receiving these funds. Interviewees at all levels in the system mention a new "entrepreneurial culture", reflected in new money available for "project initiation", new courses for academic staff on how to write project applications, and new job positions for those with expertise in recruiting external funds.[39] However, the "academic capitalism" reflected in the interviews was not adopted by choice. There is plenty of evidence, at all levels, that the need to seek funds externally was a result of a system where "there was no other alternative".[40] The hunt for other sources of research income was driven largely by economic needs and the researchers resigned themselves to this system since it was the only way to get funds. They clearly recognized that these external funds are steering their research, but knew of no way to avoid this. As one researcher expressed it, "Good ideas are accepted, but the priorities at the foundations decide the type of research". [41] Or as another researcher explained, "We were inspired to find new research questions, and listened to what could actually work. We learned to explain our research in a way that would be successful for financing".[42]

As for the balance of financing between basic research and applied research, there are many mixed views on this topic, but the general impression is that the steering of research is leading to a gradual increase in applied research. For the humanities and social sciences, this means trying to provide solutions to societal problems. It is a pressure which researchers experience as moving them away from the

[36] Interviews 18-DC-S, 19-R, 23-D-S, 24-M, 28-DC-S, 33-P-H, 35-P-H.
[37] Interview 25-DC-S.
[38] Interviews 6-D-H, 29-DC-H.
[39] Interviews 7.1-P-H, 7.2-R, 10-R, 17-R, 24-M, 26-P-S, 36-DC-H.
[40] Interviews 3.2-R, 3.3-D-S, 9-M-H, 15.1-P-H, 15.2-P-S, 18-DC-S, 21-P-S, 22-P-H, 28-DC-S, 31-D-S, 36-DC-H, 38-F-H.
[41] Interview 30-F-S.
[42] Interview 36-DC-H.

academic tradition of curiosity driven research. The complexity of the issues is reflected in the following explanation from a docent:

To solve societal problems with a scientific problem through a research program entails many difficulties. The financiers do not seem to understand that there is a value conflict in this. There are too many political preconditions against this. When the financers are looking for applied solutions to societal problems, they miss these inbuilt value conflicts, and these value conflicts get dumped instead on to the researcher. Some researchers will follow through and do this, playing free-time politician at the same time they are researching. But it is extremely difficult to unite these roles. Research should not be carrying out this role of fixing the risks in society. What can be positive about applied research is when you test a theory in an applied environment – to see whether theories actually do help to explain our society, to see what the external validity of the theories are. This is fine, to have applied research questions. It is fine to contribute to an understanding of something, but to try to say what that then means for a solution…that is another task in society to be left to others.[43]

The above problem of scientists "playing politician" has also been mentioned by researchers doing "contract" research for the government and for bureaucracies. The key challenge is to maintain the critical balance between the scientific and the politically correct. As one professor expressed it, "This places your scientific honor on the line".[44] Many academics believed that the competitive system of research funding has gone too far now: "There is a culture spreading of how to search and receive, researchers are learning the rhetoric and they are learning how to design projects so that the money will come in. This type of process doesn't have anything to do with real research."[45] This was described as the "opportunist" behavior, and when "you get into a research field that is driven by political correctness, both the funder and the researcher are taking a risk that quality will fall – in such a culture, there are no questions anymore, just obvious answers."[46]

Included in the theme of attracting research funds was the controversial topic of whether the universities should try to identify and financially support research profiles. On the positive side of the debate, one rector mentioned that, "The research profiles provide guidance for such things as the recruitment of professors and doctoral students, which no longer occur randomly, but instead with strategic awareness. Given that profiles also function as an indicator of quality, it is then easier to get external funds. Research initiatives are then not isolated, but can work in a well-

[43] Interview 20-DC-S.
[44] Interview 39-P-H.
[45] Interview 21-P-S.
[46] Interview 14-P-S.

functioning multi-disciplinary environment."[47] This line of reasoning was also adopted by other rectors and deans arguing that it was a competitive advantage to have a profile and that these discussions were undertaken in particular to attract financing from RJ.[48]

However, there were plenty of negative voices on this issue and they included many professors.[49] One rector stated that the ever more popular discussion of research profiles at universities should be understood not as a simple issue, but rather as one that certainly had the potential of becoming dangerous if profiling were implemented on a wide scale. Further explaining, the rector said, "One can easily see that it could be possible to be politically 'punished' or damaged in the 'opinion-wars' for adopting a profile that did not agree with the 'political truths' of the day.[50] This problem was compounded by the fact that Sweden is a little country. As another rector explained, "there is unfortunately an increasingly strong belief in "top-down" solutions, but research is an activity that is way too complicated to steer this way – almost all experience shows this. In a little country like Sweden, this tendency for political steering of research by ear-marking the funds is very destructive."[51]

In addition, it was pointed out that profiling is very dangerous from a recruitment point of view. What happens to small institutions that have developed a profile that is strongly related to one person, and then they move? Or even more importantly, how does this profiling idea correspond to the Swedish regulations and laws on how to recruit and hire academics? As explained by a Social Science professor, "The Swedish tradition is based on "meritocracy" not on "nepotism". This profiling idea is laying the grounds for a nepotistic system in Sweden. /…/ It is better to have a real, freely competitive market - without having to fit under some profile."[52]

Some interviewees were also aware that the universities are concerned with their status in the higher education "market-place" and that they wish to have a "trademark" to show to the surrounding society. Yet, there is a strong desire for more contemplation regarding the university's role in society. This was elaborated by an associate professor with the following comment:

Do we really need to have all this talk about the university acting in a "market" – is this really what we should be doing? What are the values? Long-term basic research versus short-term views… it is very hard to unite basic research with the market thinking. How do you sell basic research? There is no known usage to society. How do you have market thinking for students- should we break off our traditional educa-

[47] Interview 3.2-R.
[48] Interviews 1-R, 3.2-R, 7.2-R, 7.3-D-H, 26-P-S.
[49] Interviews 20-DC-S, 21-P-S, 22-P-H, 26-P-S, 27-D-H.
[50] Interview 16-R.
[51] Interview 19-R.
[52] Interview 21-P-S.

tion and instead have more vocational/work-related education? With a market way of thinking, you are going to end up with more work-related education and we could lose the type of traditional education that a university is supposed to produce – that of a knowledge producing institution. I see a move toward more application in both of these areas. One must question what our purpose is as a societal institution. Who is going to decide what we are to engage in?[53]

In addition, there was heavy criticism from the interviewees of current discussions of research policy. They concern the possibility that the foundations and the Swedish Research Council would increasingly decide research profiles and research goals for Sweden, and in particular target resources for building up research-environments. The criticism of these ideas reflected many dimensions. First, in rejecting a mode 2 view of knowledge production, many interviewees stated that "pro-activism" from these sources was not a good idea. Their view was exemplified in the following quote: "It would remove the last free breathing spaces in autonomous research. This should come from the bottom-up".[54] Academics accepted the idea that foundations such as RJ could actively react to interesting intellectual ideas and innovations, but these would have to come from the academic community itself. Academics believed that the risks were too high if a foundation such as RJ could be seen as getting too interested in politically correct and trendy investments. The interview material at all academic levels reflected the view that only with autonomy and self-renewal could front-line quality be achieved.[55]

In addition, skepticism towards the idea of research-environment support was based on the view that this support could end up focusing financial resources on secure investments in research groups that already existed – thus risking the chances for innovation and dynamism.[56] Furthermore, it was especially pointed out that if the Swedish Research Council were to start down the "research–environment building track", then it would not be at all appropriate for RJ to do so. Rather, in such a case, it would be even more important for RJ to increase their support for the more traditional types of research projects. In addition many academics, ranging from researcher to rector, underscored that it was not necessarily a "profile" that was the real issue. With just marginal investments of money at the right times, financers could keep already successful research environments from going under.[57] Thus these academics warned of the risks involved in "over-programmatised" research, and

[53] Interview 20-DC-S.
[54] Interview 2-P-S.
[55] Interviews 6-D-H,12.1-P-S, 12.2-P-S, 12.3-DC-S, 16-R, 33-P-H, 35-P-H.
[56] Interviews 1-R, 7.2-R.
[57] Interviews 20-DC-S, 25-DC-S, 29-P-H, 33-P-H, 34-R, 35-P-H, 38-F-H, 39-P-H.

emphasised that the balance between curiosity-driven research and society-relevant research was a delicate one.

As for the pressures of academic capitalism, there is widespread evidence that senior academics are spending much time, effort and worry on the securing of financing for the junior academics.[58] Professors are clearly told when they are promoted to the title of professor that they are "welcome to the job, but you are not here now to do your own research, instead you are here to bring in money for others' research".[59] Many academics registered despair, with statements such as,

> What can you get with the Swedish Research Council? Maybe about 300 000 SEK. Even if our faculty money is OK right now, supporting five doctoral students, there is not enough for the staff – just about half can be financed - the other half has to come from external money.[60]

Short-term contracts also cause anxieties among the researchers. As one dean of a large humanities faculty stated,

> The problem is that you can actually work full-time in chasing the money. Professors are working full-time to get the money and arrange projects, so they are not researching – and this is affecting the work conditions. But there is no choice; the financing of the system requires this when the faculty money doesn't cover research. Another risk is that research funding is so short-term, and people are searching after money wherever they can get it.[61]

The time involved in planning and writing applications is a real source of frustration for the academics. Some describe this as a waste of "expensive social and intellectual energies", and others admit that the time this takes (usually at least two months) makes them feel that they are less active in their own subject area. It was mentioned that if all this time could go into writing scientific journal articles, that would certainly improve research productivity in Sweden. Some even suggest that the application process should be shortened, or that at least an option on future financing could be awarded. In addition, it would be beneficial if the external funders could allocate money for project leadership and administration. Furthermore, there is a much greater awareness of financial concerns within the university that is evidenced in the demands for more budget and audit reports.

[58] Interviews 3.3-D-S, 5-D-H, 22-P-H, 24-M, 28-DC-S, 32-P-S, 36-DC-H.
[59] Interview 27-D-H.
[60] Interview 21-P-S.
[61] Interview 27-D-H.

Summary of results

Seven assumptions were used to guide the presentation and analysis of the empirical material. This section will now summarize the results. They will be placed in a wider theoretical perspective in the concluding section, Section 5.

Assumption one states that although traditional academic identity is not lost, the research environment is becoming more problem-oriented, evidenced by trans-disciplinary research projects conducted by groups. In this case study, the academics perceive traditional academic identity to be under threat, at least when that identity is defined in terms of the ability to conduct research on questions which one determines oneself. The conditions in which this ability can be developed and thrive are seen as deteriorating. There certainly does not seem to be an acceptance of the need to be producing knowledge under a "Mode-2" model. Furthermore, when multidisciplinarity is forced from above – without proper regard to the scientific quality of the research project, to the researchers involved, or to the environment in which they work – then academics again feel that their traditions are being threatened.

Returning to assumption two, the material reveals that academics' views on the evaluation of research by the external funders are at times quite critical. We see that there is uneasiness with the entire judgment process conducted by "experts" – there is a mistrust of these experts' real intentions in a system of shrinking research resources. Academics and university leaders are questioning where loyalties really lie. Furthermore, there is a clear hesitation about the Mode-2 way of evaluating knowledge production, reflected in skepticism that those other than academics could be passing judgment on research quality. Thus, assumption two receives a high level of support in this case study.

As regards assumption three, academic capitalism (as reflected in governmental policy and carried out by research departments) has certainly encouraged academics to find other sources of funding, and they are extremely active and consumed with this process. However, for the humanities and social sciences, evaluating to what extent this means that "basic" research is falling behind to the benefit of applied research has to do with how these terms are defined. If applied research is equated with finding solutions and answering societal problems as outlined and defined by the providers of financing – then assumption three certainly receives quite a lot of support in this case study.

Assumption four, regarding the proliferation of market-like "profiles" and "niche" behaviour, is confirmed in the data. The increasing trend in which research profiles and "centers of excellence" are identified at all levels in the system, i.e. funding institutions, universities, and departments, has been meet with some scepticism. In particular, two concerns are raised: first, over defining profiles outside of the academic community and at a national level. Too much top-down steering of profiles was viewed as dangerous. Secondly, at the department level, profiling be-

haviour had been experienced as a danger to the more open, traditional recruitment procedures.

The interview evidence supports extensively assumptions five to seven regarding specifics of the academic response to academic capitalism. Senior researchers are constantly applying for research funding to support their junior-level researchers. Many researchers desire an environment for longer-term concentration, believing that the many short-term contracts are causing a lack of research focus that puts in question research quality. Lastly, it is quite obvious that the core functions of senior staff have been greatly expanded, to include the fostering of contacts within and outside the university, the writing of funding applications and reports for evaluation purposes, as well as more general administrative tasks.

CONCLUSIONS

Given approximately a ten- year time span, what can we say about the changes in Swedish financing of university research and the academic response to such changes? Without a doubt, the new funds from the foundations had a significant impact on collaborative research patterns compared with the situation a decade or so earlier. In particular, then there were effectively no financing alternatives available for very large projects or for multi-disciplinary projects. The role of RJ-K in contributing to the formation of new research environments in this regard is indisputable. A willingness on the part of academics to work in this way might have existed before the 1990's, but without the resources, it could not have been converted into practice.

It is important to note that this new multidisciplinary activity does not seem to strongly correlate to the "Mode 2" model of knowledge production. Very few of those interviewed discussed their projects in terms of finding a solution to a societal problem. Thus the context of application did not appear to be the critical factor in their reasons for building a multidisciplinary group. Rather the interviewees focused on the expansion of knowledge derived from working in a multidisciplinary group and learning other disciplines' perspectives and methodologies.

In addition, it is quite obvious from our case study data that the visibility of research groups is perceived as extremely important. At the domestic level, this is regarded as crucial for attracting research funds: many of our interviewees mentioned how strategies were devised in order to be "seen", and profiles constructed so that RJ and other funders would take notice. On the international level, visibility is extremely important – but not necessarily for direct financing purposes (many of our interviewees said that the EU programmes were so bureaucratic that it was not worth the time and effort to try to get financing from them). Rather, international visibility was important because it helped to "open doors" to key academic circles for publish-

ing with prestigious publishing houses and participating in prestigious conferences. In turn, this type of visibility provided a "quality stamp" for competing for domestically based research funds.

Has there been a shift from Mode 1 to Mode 2 research? Is basic, disciplinary research being swallowed by "contextualized science"? It is impossible based on an interview study to make a factual answer to such a question, but what is obvious is that academics still strongly believe that too much applied research will threaten academic autonomy. Their academic identity is strongly anchored in this concern, and in comparison to ten years ago, academics feel that they are now, or going to be in the near future, threatened by this development. Thus we might ask ourselves, what is really changing? Is it the rhetoric of "Mode 2" knowledge production that has gained in popularity, while at the level of producing science, things are rather unchanged? We can also ask ourselves if there is something unique about the humanities and social sciences (as against the natural sciences) that can more readily preserve an "anti-mode-2" value base? (Yet in a newly published report on academic freedom in Sweden, Li Bennich-Bjorkman (2004) finds the strongest concerns emanating from the medical and natural sciences.)

Such reflections have been discussed in the literature on the "science-society contract". The prior contract based on the "Republic of Science" (i.e. a self-regulating republic centred on basic research (see Polanyi, 1962) is being subordinated to the "Social Function of Science" model (with applied and mission-oriented research performed for the usefulness and benefit of practitioners) (Knutsson, 1998). Peter Scott addresses the issue by reviewing the normative foundational (philosophical) basis for the "liberal university" versus the "modern university" and concludes that it is exactly this demand for the usages of sciences that explains their "different intellectual styles". The liberal university had a degree of autonomy from society motivated by the demand on the university to protect the "universal intellectual tradition". In the shift to the modern university, the understanding of "science" has become that of a "product" of the "scientific" disciplines, meaning an emphasis on technology; whereas the liberal university had an emphasis on the production of "education", "reflection" and "scholars" (Scott, 1984).

In an earlier work on the relation between science and society, Sven-Eric Liedman makes a particular argument for the role of humanities as a "science". A distinction is made between three types of usage: materialist, administrative and ideological. The "material" usage increases society's production capabilities, the "administrative" usage assists society's political-judicial apparatus, and the "ideological" is used as a tool to influence citizens' preconceptions of the world, of humanity, of religion, of politics, etc. With this as a background, Liedman proceeds to ask what happens when a science's "internal core" of empiry and theory is used too heavily by one type of "usage". If the ideological usage is too strong, then the theoretical

framework can be pulled so far that the empirical observations are weakened. On the other hand, if the practical implications drive forward empiry without theory, then all one has is "unsorted pieces of reality" (Liedman, 1978: 31). Peter Scott argued as early as 1984 that the crisis of the modern university "is to be found much more in these conflicts and tensions within intellectual life [regarding usages of science] than in the present cuts in public expenditure on higher education" (1984: 48).

As mentioned above, the indications from this case-study are that what Peter Scott argued nearly 20 years ago seems to have come about in Sweden today. The academics we have interviewed, both in the humanities and the social sciences, are more concerned about the threats of various "usages of science" to the "internal core" of science than they are about budget cuts and adopting a competitive, entrepreneurial culture for research funds. The research material demonstrates the persistence of traditional academic values in interviewees' definitions of the quality of research and their insistence on the need for research freedom to be upheld as the ideal.

How the humanities and social sciences are going to respond today to these new usages is another question. Elzinga (1997) has investigated this for the humanities and has identified three types of approaches for relating to society. First, a "symbolic approach" would argue that the humanities represent a part of a nation's cultural heritage, and, as such, must be preserved regardless of utilitarian demands. Second, the "instrumental approach" is based on a pragmatism that uses the humanities to produce knowledge wanted by the tourist industry, the foreign language translation business, etc. Third, the "democratic approach" emphasizes the social responsibility of the humanities to "provide guidelines for a democratic future". The struggle between these three for domination is battled out between the policy-making interests dealing with research: the academics, the bureaucrats, the economic interests and the civil society. Whether this battle will be conducted in relation to terms of "deliberative democracy" (Henkel, this volume) remains to be seen.

Barnett writes that, "The modern world is supercomplex in character: it can be understood as a milieu for the proliferation of frameworks by which we might understand the world, frameworks that are often competing with each other" (2000: 409). In this environment, "the university has new knowledge functions: to add to supercomplexity by offering completely new frames of understanding (so compounding supercomplexity); to help us comprehend and make sense of the resulting knowledge mayhem; and to enable us to live purposefully amid supercomplexity" (ibid). To try to understand changes in such a complex system in terms of the model of transformation provided in the Mode 1 to Mode 2 shift seems rather inadequate. Instead, some researchers are arguing that in order to understand the adaptation processes going on in higher education and research today one must look at a set of various factors. As Deem (2001: 11) explains, "These include cultural factors (new

ideas about knowledge) and social factors (new and more diverse student groups) as well as the economic factors (the declining unit of public funding)". To lump all these factors together in something called a "Mode-2 society" hinders our analytical power to understand these changes.

Thus, when looking at the Swedish case, we can recognize that the way in which the research foundations' impact is perceived by academics in the social sciences and humanities is significantly coupled to the budget cuts in higher education (economic factor) and the lack of an overall research policy from the government (political factor). The policy of expanding higher education with new regional colleges and new universities (social factor) has had a large impact as well. Making a significant change in any one of these factors would/could have a major impact on how the research foundations are perceived. For this reason, the argument of this chapter is that to try to understand the complexities of change in this system with only a "Mode-2" society model is insufficient. The desirability of and possibilities for protecting the "inner-core" of science must also be discussed.

REFERENCES

Barnett, R. (2000) "University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity". *Higher Education* 40: 409-422.

Bauer, M., Marton, S., Askling, B. and Marton, F. (1999) *Transforming Universities. Patterns of Governance, Structure and Learning in Swedish Higher Education at the Millennial Turn.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1992) *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Bennich-Bjorkman, L. (2004) "Överlever den akademiska friheten? – En intervjustudie av svenska forskares villkor i universitetens brytningstid." *Högskoleverkets rapportserie*, 2004: 1 R.

Clark, R. (1983) *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross National Perspective.* Los Angeles: University of California.

Deem, R. (2001) "Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: is the local dimension still important?". *Comparative Education* 37: 7-20.

Elzinga, A. (1997) (ed) *Evaluation de la Recherche en Sciences Humaines en Suisse*. Zurich : Conseil Suisse de la Science.

Elzinga, A. (2002) "The New Production of Reductionism in Models relating to Research Policy". Paper presented to the Nobel Symposium, Science and Industry in the 20th Century, Stockholm 21-23 November, 2002.

Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (2000) "The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations". *Research Policy* 29: 109-123.

Gibbons, M. et al. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies.* Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Hällsten, M. and Sandström, U. (2002) "Högskoleforskningens nya miljarder", *Det nya forskningslandskapet. Perspektiv på vetenskap och politik*, (red.) U. Sandström. Stockholm: Nya Doxa SISTER Skrifter 5.

Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Policy Changes in Higher Education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kaukonen, E. and Nieminen, M. (1999) "Modeling the Triple Helix from a Small Country Perspective: The Case of Finland". *Journal of Technology Transfer*; 24: 173-183.

Knutsson, K.E. (1998) (ed) "Culture and Human Development: Report on a Conference on Culture, Cultural Research and Cultural Policy". Stockholm: Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities.

Liedman, S-E. (1978) "Humanistiska forskningstraditoner i Sverige" i Forser, T. (ed) *Humaniora på undantag?* Stockholm: Norstedts.

Kogan, M. (1996) "Comparing higher education systems". *Higher Education*, 32: 395-402.

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

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

Marton, S. (2000) *The Mind of the State: The politics of university autonomy in Sweden, 1968-1998.* Göteborg: BAS Publishers.

Marton, S. (2005) "Implementing the Triple Helix: The academic response to changing university – industry – government relations." In Gornitzka, Å., Kogan, M., and Amaral, A. (eds.) *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Marton, S. (forthcoming) "Humaniora och samhällsvetenskap – business as usual?" in Sverker Sorlin (ed) *Forskningsstiftelserna i kunskapssamhället*. Stockholm: Nya Doxa /SISTER.

Nowotny, H.; Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001) *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nybom, T. (2003) "The Humboldt Legacy: Reflections on the Past, Present, and Future of the European University". *Higher Education Policy*: 16: 141-159.

Polanyi, M. (1962) "The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory". *Minerva*, 1,1.

Power, M. (1997) *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Premfors, R. (1980) *The Politics of Higher Education in a Comparative Perspective*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Sandström, U. (red) (2002) *Det nya forskningslandskapet. Perspektiv på vetenskap och politik*. Stockholm: Nya Doxa SISTER Skrifter 5.

Sandström, U. and Hällsten, M. (2003) "Företagens finansiering av universitetsforskning". SISTER Working Paper 25.

Scott, P. (1984) "Ideologies of the University" in Bergendal, G. (ed) *Knowledge Policies and the Traditions of Higher Education.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ylijoki, O. (2003) "Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research". *Higher Education*, 45: 307-335.

12

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP AND EMERGING KNOWLEDGE REGIMES

IVAR BLEIKLIE

INTRODUCTION

Prevailing ideas about how university institutions should be led and organised have gone through fundamental changes and are connected with the ways in which values and ideas about knowledge have changed. Throughout his academic career as a student of higher education Maurice Kogan has been concerned with values and ideas, some of which he obviously has more affinity to than others. In the current debate, views about the extent to which recent and ongoing changes are beneficial to universities as knowledge generating and knowledge transmitting institutions differ sharply (Gibbons et al., 1994; Readings, 1996). Two fundamentally different positions characterise the debate about the nature of the ongoing changes. Defenders of the traditional university stick to the account of decline, and they hold that previously good institutions are turning into bad ones (Nybom, 2001). Modernisation optimists promote the notion that past tradition is an obsolete guide which we need to leave behind, that the problems of the present are different, that new solutions need to be devised urgently in order to address them, and that a promising future awaits in which bad institutions may turn into good ones, once we embrace modernisation. Yet both groups share the assumptions that ongoing or needed changes are radical, drastic and fundamental. With regard to outcomes of value shifts, however, Maurice Kogan has always been staunchly empiricist: more interested in studying and analysing actual processes and outcomes than cultivating strong opinions. This is clearly demonstrated in his contribution on comparative methods in Kogan et al. (2000). He has also been theoretically eclectic in that he values a conceptual approach for its contribution to empirical analysis rather than for its elegance or simplicity, as is demonstrated by the "synoptic model" for the analysis of change in higher education in Becher and Kogan (1992). In this article I shall try to follow Maurice's lead in the sense that I shall question the shared assumption about drastic change observed above and try to focus on actual outcomes.

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 189-211.

The focus of the chapter is on leadership and organisational forms in universities. Before I start the analysis of change in university leadership, I shall outline a theoretical framework for understanding leadership change. An important point of departure is a conception of leadership developed by Selznick in his path breaking work *Leadership in Administration* (1984) originally published in 1957. By exploring ideas from his work I shall analyse the changes higher education institutions are currently undergoing and some of the implications these changes might have for universities in the future.

In the second part I discuss leadership ideals and values, and certain characteristics of organisational forms. The discussion focuses on values with an international reach, and how they relate to specific national experiences of which universities are a part. What are the traditional leadership values of universities and to what extent were they uniform across countries? What conditions did they offer for institutional leadership? To what extent are the traditional values being replaced by new values associated with mass education and the so-called "knowledge economy"? Does the spread of these values across nations lead to convergence of the organisation of higher education leadership and institutions? How does the emergence of these new values affect the conditions for institutional leadership?

One reason why it is important to highlight these values is, as Maurice has pointed out, that they nourish fundamentally different notions about the nature of academic work – about the academic production process, how it needs to be organised and how far academics can be trusted to organise their own affairs without outside interference.

The third part of the chapter focuses on how processes of change play out empirically in different national settings. To what extent can we observe a global process of modernisation? To what extent and how do the outcomes, the new organisational forms, vary across nations? To what extent do these forms promote institutional leadership in academia?

Finally the chapter discuss how different types of knowledge regimes condition different versions of academic leadership.

LEADERSHIP AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

In recent years a number of authors have argued for and suggested ways in which new-institutionalist approaches may be reconciled with rational choice approaches in order to better understand or explain organisational change. The call for such integration, based on the empiricist argument that these approaches should be considered as supplementary rather than mutually exclusive, is not new (Becher & Kogan, 1992; Bleiklie & Kogan, 2000; Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Thelen & Steinmo, 1995). In combining these perspectives, Greenwood and Hinings (1996) also advocate

crossing a second divide, that between inter- and intraorganisational analysis. It, too, has often been criticized as artificial and detrimental to a full understanding of change processes (cf. Maassen and Stensaker in this volume). Thus they emphasise the interplay between outside pressures, generated by the market and institutional contexts on the one hand and intraorganisational dynamics on the other. This combination of perspectives echoes in many ways how an early 'institutionalist', Philip Selznick (1984), proposed to study leadership nearly 50 years ago. His analysis starts from the following premise: although it is important to regard organisations as instruments in order to handle and understand many day to day administrative and routine concerns in modern organisations, it is not sufficient to understand leadership. The reason is that leadership is about something more than making the organisation into an efficient tool. Leadership is a function that is based in organisations that have become institutionalised, which means that they are infused with value, have a defined mission and role, and have become the embodiment of that role. Leadership is thus about the definition of institutional mission and role, the institutional embodiment of purpose, the defence of institutional integrity, and the ordering of internal conflict (Selznick 1984: 62ff). Institutions are socially embedded "natural organisations". Their leadership turns on the dynamic adaptation of the total organisation to the internal strivings and external pressures to which they are exposed. One of the failures of leadership occurs when organisational achievement or survival is confounded with institutional success. Whilst an organisation such as a university may grow and become more secure if it is efficiently managed, it may nevertheless "fail dismally" if it is led by administrators without a clear sense of values to be achieved (Selznick, 1984: 27).

The need for leadership in the above sense is not constant, but is called for when aims are not well defined, when external support and direction falter, when the organisation finds itself in a fluid environment that requires constant adaptation and when goals and values become contested, corrupted or otherwise undermined (Selznick, 1984: 119). Institutional leadership is necessary in order to maintain integrity – i.e. the persistence of an organisation's distinctive values, competence and role. Institutional integrity is particularly vulnerable when values are tenuous or insecure. The ability to sustain integrity is dependent on a number of factors. Of particular significance is the relationship between elites, autonomy and social values[62]. Simply put, Selznick proposes that the maintenance of social values depends on the autonomy of elites. The reason is that modern social institutions – such as educational

62 The terminology may vary, and the term 'elite' may be substituted by 'profession' or 'professional group'. The important thing is to keep the definition in mind so that whatever term one prefers refers to any social group that is responsible for the protection of a social value (Selznick 1984: 120).

institutions, but also a number of other public and private agencies – are exposed to many demands to provide short-term benefits for large numbers. They tend to adapt themselves to a situation where they cater to large numbers by relaxing the standards for membership. This adaptation makes it increasingly difficult for elites to maintain their own standards, and consequently their particular identity and functions. In the process they tend to lose their "exclusiveness" which has provided the insulation from day to day pressures of outside demands that permits new ideas and skills to mature. Of critical importance to the functioning of elites (in the above sense) is enough autonomy to allow the maturation and protection of values.

The essence of institutional autonomy is therefore to be found not in specific administrative or organisational arrangements, but in its actual functioning with regard to the protection of values. It is therefore a likely proposition that such specific arrangements may vary over time as well as across space, as has been observed in higher education. Within modern universities we can also observe various forms of autonomy operating sometimes together, sometimes in conflict. The forms differ in that they have different collective bases, founded partly in the autonomy of the academic institution, partly in the autonomy of disciplinary and professional communities. In addition autonomy has a collective dimension as well as an individual one. Whereas the autonomy of social collectivities or social groups provides them with a jurisdiction within which they are free to govern themselves and make decisions without outside interference, individual autonomy provides the individual members of the group with the authority to make decisions about how they pursue their profession, without interference from their peers or outsiders. Thus individual and institutional autonomy were supposed to sustain one another, and the traditional organisational form through which the potential conflict between collective and individual autonomy was handled was the collegiate body. Academic institutions - in particular research universities as they emerged in Europe in the 19th century - law firms and hospitals are examples of institutions that in principle have been operated as associations of autonomous individual professionals who govern, within a certain mandate, collectively through collegiate bodies. Such bodies have two main functions. They are vehicles for a) collective decision-making and b) control of professional standards exercised through decisions on the admission of new members and sanctions against members who fail to meet the standards set by the collectivity.

Leaders of institutions that are made up and run by collegial peer groups may have a comparatively easy job in the particular sense that goals and values are internalised by the members and often taken for granted. Individual members tend not to distinguish between their personal mission as professionals and that of the institution. The promotion and protection of values are therefore a collective concern. The leader as *primus inter pares* can therefore count on the support of the members of the organisation in promoting institutional values. In such a situation leadership is

not just easy, it is hardly needed. However, hospitals and universities also afford examples of institutions where these structures are undergoing change and where collegiate bodies to varying extent have been replaced by corporate structures, in which decision making bodies are representative of all categories of organisational members and subject to external control. Modern universities are no longer collegiate bodies of professors in which other employee groups and students are excluded from decision making. Since the 1970s they have undergone two important transformations. First they have become democratised and decision making bodies now include all major employee groups. Secondly external interests have in various ways gained a stronger foothold in university governance and are often represented on university boards.

This process of change in the last decades has two major implications. On the one hand institutions have been reformed from autonomous collectivities to stakeholder organisations (Neave, 2002). One of the major shifts in power relationships in and around universities that follows from this transformation is that universities and the individual academic are supposed to serve the expressed needs of stakeholders for research and educational services. This is a fundamental shift from a situation where the decisions about research and teaching were left to the professional judgement of academics. The current transformation implies, however, that the collective and individual autonomy of academics is circumscribed by the needs of others, rather than by their independent judgement as professionals. On the other hand the values of academic institutions have been called into question, and they are often accused of not having clear aims or not being interested in or able to communicate them clearly. External support has faltered as universities are criticised as self serving and not useful enough to society. Particularly since the late 1980s their environments have become more fluid than previously as student populations have risen sharply, as funding conditions and funding formulas, legislative conditions and steering mechanisms have changed, as outside demands and internal pressures for organisational reforms have mounted and as internationalisation and globalisation have created new real or perceived pressures. These developments have in turn prompted a series of reform attempts. Universities have tried to adapt themselves through a series of organisational reforms aimed at expanding the capacity for doing applied research, for providing education to a growing and increasingly diverse student body, and for expanding their sources of revenue. In order to cope with these challenges organisationally they have sought to strengthen leadership functions and make their operations and performance transparent to the public. The leadership challenges raised by these circumstances are not necessarily met just by finding the best reform measures that can make universities more efficient or useful, although these are no doubt legitimate concerns. However strongly university reformers emphasise goals of improved efficiency or higher quality, all the changes within and

around higher education institutions suggest that a deep values shift is taking place. The problem is that the new values that are supposed to replace the former ones are not clearly identified and specified. Therefore, universities are not only faced with challenges that raise the need for leadership. The conditions for leadership appear to have deteriorated as the elite autonomy that underpins institutional leadership appears to have been reduced.

This general sketch is not intended as a description of a deep crisis and a sad state for contemporary universities. It is intended as a starting point for an empirical exploration that is based on the considerations that were raised above and asks: What are the values that currently underpin university institutions? How are the values promoted and protected? To what extent have values and the arrangements by which they are protected changed over the last decades? To what extent do they vary across nations?

SOCIAL VALUES IN ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

Institutional values are often packaged within more comprehensive leadership – or organisational – ideals. One way of thinking about leadership ideals and organisational forms is that the former serve as models for the latter; as archetypes or "templates for organising" (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991: 27). The adoption of organisational forms is, according to new-institutionalist theory, the outcome of pressures in the institutional environment constituted by organisational fields. For this analysis it is particularly interesting to look specifically at three phenomena that constitute important conditions for institutional leadership: administrative ideologies, creation and protection of elites, and the emergence of contending interest groups (Selznick, 1984 [1957]:14-15.)

Before I move on it may be useful to look at some of the leadership "templates" constituted by the expectations with which modern university leaders are faced. They originate partly in the different tasks with which a modern university is charged, partly in the different ideological conceptions of those tasks and their relative importance. The four templates that are outlined below give different directions for how universities should be led and organised.[63] It follows, however, as I have argued elsewhere, that the templates are not mutually exclusive ideals, although the emphasis on specific ideals varies in time and space (Bleiklie, 1998).

[63] This is a slightly modified version of a typology of leadership ideals that I used in a previous discussion of New Public Management ideals in higher education (Bleiklie, 1998).

The academic authority

The first set of expectations is related to *academic authority*. These expectations are closely interwoven with an ideal of the university as a cultural institution the primary task of which is to engage in academic activity based on autonomous research and teaching. This prototype of the research university took shape in Germany and spread to other European countries during the 19th century. The dominant organisational template was the university as a collegium of autonomous chairs with affiliated apprentice students (Neave & Rhoades, 1987: 283ff). The most important expectation of the university as a cultural institution was academic *quality*, in the sense that each one of the chair holders asserts their scholarly authority through outstanding research, by attracting talented students and by creating good research environments. The core value fostered by these expectations was one of academic freedom granted to the professors on the basis of academic achievement. Only the professors themselves were entitled to evaluate their own performance as a group of peers. The authority thus rested primarily with "the visible and horizontal collegium" of chair holders.

Today there are few formal mechanisms that emphasise this expectation of leaders to represent and dominate entire academic fields. Academic authority has traditionally been sustained through representative arrangements that secured professorial power by granting professors exclusive access to positions in the university senate, faculty council and as department chairs (Bleiklie, 1994, Daalder & Shils, 1982). Although there still remain tasks that are under exclusive professorial authority, the expectation of academic authority is primarily emphasised through formal and sometimes informal ranking of individuals and their academic performance. Most departments are responsible for academic fields that are much too comprehensive to expect any single person to be able to represent the field as a whole. Nevertheless the expectation is still that an academic leader should also be an outstanding academic, and the extent to which decision-making power in university affairs should be based on disciplinary competence is still an important issue. Although the professors have lost their absolute power and even majority on university and faculty boards, positions like department chair, dean, rector, vice chancellor or president are still usually open only to persons that are or have been full professors.

The expectations that face the academic authority are based on the assumption that high disciplinary competence gives the best academic leadership. Beyond the academic status of the leaders the expectations do not specify what the leaders are expected to do and what style of leadership they are expected to espouse. This is also a leadership ideal formulated for a situation where little leadership is needed since institutional values are internalised and protected collectively by the members.

The collegial coordinator

A second set of expectations is related to the *collegial coordinator* and represents another version of the university as a cultural institution. Here the leader primarily claims authority in his or her capacity as a member of an egalitarian and autonomous academic disciplinary community. These role expectations are related to what we may call "the disciplinary university", modelled on the modern American research university. The term refers to the fact that the disciplines constitute relatively egalitarian communities organised formally within disciplinary departments and with a number of professors in each department. According to this ideal a university is composed of disciplinary communities, run by their members, whether they are admitted on the basis of formal examinations or are defined more liberally as any student within the academic field in question.

The ideal is based on the premise that the academic community is granted academic freedom and responsibility for the quality of teaching and research within the discipline. In post World War II Western Europe disciplinary communities gradually and to varying extent replaced the chair holders as the main academic actors. An important aspect of the democratisation process of West European universities during the 1970s was the inclusion in university decision making bodies of a larger cross-section of the academic community, and students. The collegial leader is an elected representative of a discipline (whether it be a department chair, a dean or a rector) who is expected to coordinate the activities of the disciplinary community internally and fight for its interests externally. As a colleague and a coordinator he or she is expected to be an accomplished *interest representative* and *politician* rather than a disciplinary authority.

The expectations directed towards the disciplinary coordinator are focused on the socio-political aspect of leadership, on collegial relations designed to provide protective working arrangements for the academic community and, to some extent, on securing the flow of resources into that community.

The socially responsible leader

A third set of expectations is related to *the social and political responsibility of universities*. This expectation may vary according to how university systems are organised and coordinated. The extremes may be illustrated on the one hand by private institutions that define their social mission or "community service" independently and on the other hand by institutions within publicly controlled systems that are formally part of the civil service and where leaders are considered civil servants. The expectations directed at leaders may thus range from that of an activist who mobilises support from the environment, to the civil servant who loyally follows up

whatever social obligation is defined by public authorities. Two alternative values may thus be identified in connection with socially responsible leadership. One is *loyalty*, an expectation that is directed by public authorities at leaders of universities in public systems. In this case the university demonstrates social responsibility to the extent that it loyally implements public policies. An alternative version of social responsibility, *community service*, may be illustrated by private institutions that autonomously define themselves as having specific social responsibilities for the local community in which they are located or for the nation state. The specific content of the social responsibilities of higher education institutions may vary. It may comprise such functions as providing society with educated elites or exploiting efficiently the human capital of a country. Furthermore higher education may be used actively in order to reduce social inequality by offering support to youngsters from disadvantaged groups. It may also be used to support the spread and development of democratic institutions, or to provide the opportunity for the entire population to get higher education as a welfare right regardless of academic qualifications.

As representatives of public institutions, leaders are supposed to somehow assume and interpret their social responsibilities within the framework of national political goals and programmes.

The socially responsible leader is expected to be oriented towards actions and values that emphasise that the university should give something back to society beyond its traditional "output" of education and research responsibilities. The focus here is on the fulfilment of the expressed wishes of outside constituents, be they politicians, civil service representatives or community members. However, how and to what extent actual university leadership emphasises social responsibility in the above sense depends on how social responsibilities interact with other expectations to which university leaders are exposed.

The business executive

The last set of expectations is related to *the business executive*. This ideal is based on the notion that the university is a producer of educational and research services. It is embedded in the set of ideas that come under labels like "The New Public Management" or "Managerialism". These ideas have served as ideological justification for public administrative reforms internationally in the last decades and have characterised university policies particularly from the latter half of the 1980s onwards (Bleiklie, 1998, Christensen, 1991, Keller, 1983, Lægreid, 1991, Olsen, 1993, Pollitt, 1990, Røvik, 1992).

Seen as a business enterprise a university consists of a leadership and different functional (academic, technical and administrative) staff groups servicing different user groups in need of the services the enterprise offers. Although *quality* and "qual-

ity assurance" are emphasised as fundamental goals, the most important expectation confronting the business enterprise is the *efficiency* with which it produces useful services, in the form of research and candidates, to the benefit of the "users" of its services. The concept of "user" is a wide one, and it may comprise a wide array of groups from the university's own students, faculty and administrators, to employers of university graduates or buyers of research services.

The ideology behind public university reforms in the last decades emphasises the importance of higher education for national economic growth (Bleiklie, 1998). Therefore, it has been a major aim to increase the capacity to produce larger numbers of candidates more efficiently. Together with the idea that increased efficiency can be achieved by means of incentive policies and performance indicators, these notions tend to imply that the administrative element in university governance should be strengthened in order to ensure a standardised and controllable handling of the growing burden of teaching and research. The expectation of increased efficiency in the production of research and candidates means that the tasks of formulating production goals and of mobilising resources and support by means of incentive systems become crucial concerns. The notion, well-known from the American management tradition that comes with this ideal, is that leadership is a profession in itself. Academic achievement as a condition for influence and leadership positions may be problematic in this perspective since the assumption is that highly qualified academics tend to defend the special interests of their discipline rather than those of the entire institution. This has been one of the justifications for bringing in external representatives and reducing the influence of professors on university boards. Furthermore, since leaders need to be qualified as leaders, leader selection should be based on searches for candidates with leadership qualities rather than academic merits.

This leadership ideal, particularly as it has manifested itself in universities, directs attention towards the instrumental aspect of leadership as it focuses on "bottom line" outcomes and the efficiency with which they are produced.

From the leadership perspective outlined here, it may seem somewhat paradoxical that the call for stronger leadership has been justified in terms of a leadership ideal that emphasises efficiency as a general organisational quality and the organisation as an instrument rather than some set of institutional values. This fact should not, however, be exaggerated without closer scrutiny of empirical evidence. Initially it is important to be aware of the fact that leadership ideals come in packages where more than one set of values are bundled together. Secondly, one cannot necessarily deduce actual practices in specific instances from general trends or ideals in policy documents or organisational plans.

As already indicated, the leadership ideals or templates presented here are not mutually exclusive, but, as argued above, the degree to which they are emphasised

and dominate as organisational templates may vary over time and across institutions and educational systems. Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s it shifted from academic authority towards disciplinary coordination, the emphasis since the late 1980s has (at least ostensibly) shifted towards the business executive ideal, whilst the disciplinary coordinator ideal has been under attack as a prime example of "weak" leadership. However, in European public systems the extent to which rhetoric based on the business executive ideal has been followed up in practice varies and exists in a sometimes uneasy relationship with bureaucratic steering and the social responsibility of universities as civil service institutions. One may also ask to what extent one is likely to find additional variation in African, Asian and Latin-American countries. These observations lead towards three kinds of empirical questions. First, how has the value base for institutional leadership and the way it is organised varied over time? Secondly, how does the value base for institutional leadership and the way it is organised vary across nations? Thirdly, to what extent have national differences diminished over time, as supporters of the globalisation thesis argue, or conversely, to what extent do national differences persist in the face of global processes of economic and ideological change?[64] This chapter concentrates on some selected European experiences with some reference to the US.

INTERNATIONAL TRENDS AND NATIONAL VARIATION

The rising influence of the business enterprise model as a template has in most countries constituted an increasing institutional contextual pressure for change over the last decades. Few doubt that the expectations that face university leaders are changing. A number of processes have been identified as drivers behind the changing ideals or values that institutional leaders are supposed to sustain (Bleiklie & Byrkjeflot, 2002). The rise of mass education during the 1980s and 1990s has made higher education and its costs more visible and contributed to a more intense focus on how higher education institutions are organised and managed. New ideas about how universities ought to be managed and funded have altered the political rhetoric and dis-

[64] The globalisation thesis applied to our topic would argue that we are headed for a global model of higher education. It is often based on an underlying presumption that there are standardising forces at work, whether they are based on a Weberian notion of the bureaucratisation of the world (Weber, 1978), on emergence of world systems of education (Meyer & Ramírez, 2000) or on notions about globalisation (Berger & Dore, 1996) and European integration. These theories make an argument that at face value seems convincing and important because they deal with some forceful processes that contribute to shaping our world. This may be seen in contrast to an alternative perspective that we find in historically oriented studies of state formation where the focus is on how specific national settings shape political processes (Evans et al., 1985).

course about higher education issues (Neave 1998, 2002). The idea that universities ought to be organised and managed as business enterprises and become entrepreneurial universities (Clark, 1998) has deeply influenced the debate about organisation and leadership in higher education. Thus enthusiasts who envisage new alliances and forms of cooperation between economic enterprise, public authority and knowledge institutions as necessary and with desirable consequences for academic institutions and knowledge production have coined expressions like "the triple helix" (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997) or "mode 2" knowledge production (Gibbons et al., 1994). Sceptics of these trends have, on the other hand, suggested that stronger external influence over academic institutions leads to the breakdown of internal value systems, symbolised by the rise of 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997) and the 'ruin' of the university as the cultural institution we have known until recently (Readings, 1996). However, enthusiasts and sceptics alike tend to share the assumption that a radical change has taken place and focus on how new ideals and policies based on those ideals change the operating conditions for universities. The implications of such changing expectations are, however, contested issues. At least two questions may be raised in this connection. First, how do social values and leadership ideals change? Secondly, to what extent are changing leadership ideals associated with changes in organisational forms?

The first question raises the issue of the nature of ideological change. Much of the literature on change in higher education focuses on how traditional ideals or 'templates' are replaced by new ones, much as organisations may replace or redefine goals in theories of rational organisational choice. If this is true then universities have undergone a process of radical change. Alternatively one may assume that new ideals are layered on top of existing ones in a process of sedimentation (Bleiklie, 1998). Leaders are therefore faced with a number of expectations, based partly on traditional and partly on new templates. The need for leadership arises, according to the institutionalist perspective adopted here, precisely when new "mixes" of values create uncertainty about the indispensability of previously taken for granted assumptions, established organisational aims and the internal relationship between them.

The answer to the first question, therefore, whether it is based on the assumption of replacement of established ideals by new ones, i.e. *radical change*, or on the assumption of sedimentation or *organic growth* (Becher and Kogan, 1992: 176) has implications for our assumptions about the second question. If leadership ideals develop in a goal replacement process one may hypothesise that organisational forms develop through structural redesign processes. This kind of process gives the impression of well integrated organisations in which activities and changes in one part of the organisation have clear consequences for what goes on in the rest of the organisation. If leadership ideals develop in a sedimentation process, then this might also be true for how organisational development is affected by such ideals – i.e.

through a process of gradual change in which new structures are grafted onto existing ones. This second process gives the impression of a more complex, loosely coupled organisation in which activities and changes in one part of the organisation have no or only diffuse implications for activities in the rest of the organisation. Traditionally organisation theorists have conceptualised universities as complex (Damrosch, 1995), multifunctional (Kerr, 1995, Parsons and Platt, 1973) and loosely coupled organisations (Weick, 1976). Indeed, the very ideas of loose coupling and corresponding "garbage can" processes were developed by students of decision making in universities (Cohen et al., 1972). The new trends that face universities may be regarded as attempts at changing the characteristics that used to be regarded as essential. The two perspectives sketched above produce highly divergent expectations as to the likely outcome of such attempts.

Reforms are often presented as radical changes introduced as the outcome of thorough and well-planned structural redesign, and based on the assumption that human behaviour easily lends itself to steering by changes in formal structures. Actual reform processes, however, resemble more often than not the gradual and organic processes of change, which means that reforms, for better or worse, with relatively few exceptions tend to accomplish less than originally announced. (Musselin presents a similar argument in this volume in which she argues that clear changes at the policy level do not necessarily result in easily identifiable changes at the institutional or individual levels).

Usually, therefore, we expect academic institutions and the conditions for leadership to develop gradually and the introduction of new social values to add to the complexity of rather than radically change the conditions for leadership in periods of change. This does not mean that change cannot take place abruptly and be radical, only that the circumstances under which rapid change takes place are relatively unusual and specific. According to Greenwood & Hinings (1996), variation in market pressure and intraorganisational dynamics may account for considerable variation in the pace and degree of organisational change. If we interpret the term "market" in a wide sense to include most of an organisation's environment, particularly public policies and funding in public systems, it is worth looking more closely into their proposition if we wish to understand variation in change processes in academic leadership.

The most influential account of the processes that have affected the conditions for academic leadership during the last fifty years or so is found in contributions such as those of Gibbons et al. (1994), and Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (1997). Starting with the process of massification, it runs more or less like this: massification, starting in the 1960s, with the last wave of expansion during the 1990s, was an international process that affected educational systems and societies, at least in Europe, North America and Austral-Asia, in a uniform way with respect to a number

of general characteristics (Ramírez, 2003). Increased participation rates made higher education and research important to much larger population groups than before and this, in turn, made them less exclusive and less associated with elevated social status. At the same time the number of higher education faculty grew, and university professors in particular have felt considerably less exclusive than before, as they have experienced a declining income in relative terms and a loss of power and influence inside academia in absolute terms. From the 1980s globalisation and neoliberalism have put increasingly strong pressure on universities to behave like businesses. It is argued that this will make them more efficient in providing education and research services in large quantities, more competitive on the international market place, and better able to secure outside funding, and so to reduce their dependence on public support. In order to enable universities to meet these challenges university reformers have set out to integrate universities, tightening the links between the different parts of the university organisation in order to make them more efficient, manageable and accountable.

Correct as this argument may be, it is important to keep in mind that universities, no less than previously, are pursuing multiple goals, serving various constituencies and interest groups. The replacement or addition of new goals, such as efficiency, manageability, accountability and profitability, does not necessarily have any direct implications for leadership behaviour and organisational behaviour. For this to happen, two conditions must be met. First, leaders and influential (elite) organisational members must embrace and internalise the values implied by the new goals. Secondly, they must develop the means to protect and sustain these values. Teichler (1988) has demonstrated how the exact implications of massification have varied across countries depending on what institutional and organisational patterns were developed in order to deal with higher education expansion (see in this volume.) Comparative evidence from countries such as England, France, Germany, Norway and Sweden suggests that the solutions have been contested and shaped by established institutional structures (Kogan et al., 2000; Musselin, 1999). In particular, the comparative study of university reforms in England, Norway and Sweden during the 1980s and 1990s demonstrates how reforms, apparently justified in terms of common ideals such as autonomy, accountability, efficiency and quality, were not only introduced in institutional settings that were quite different, but also followed different paths.

The reforms of the 1980s and 1990s signalled new directions in higher education policies in all three countries, but with different emphases. One characteristic that applied to all three countries was that higher education had become more politically salient over the years. Accordingly central government authorities, whatever their leaning, were more concerned about the cost of higher education and more interested

in affecting the product of higher education institutions in terms of candidates and research than previously. This meant that although governments might steer in a more decentralised manner than previously, they were interested in steering a wider array of affairs and in this sense power was centralised rather than decentralised.

Traditionally direct regulation by state authorities had been much more salient in the almost entirely state-owned higher education systems of Norway and Sweden than in England, where state authorities hardly tried to wield any authority at all. In the former countries, however, university legislation and other legislative measures determined such important issues as the degree structure, examinations, and the obligations of the academic faculty.

The comparison demonstrates how the general ideological pressure in each country is mediated through specific national policies based on experiences and issues that constitute powerful political, legal and financial operating conditions. These national influences moulded and gave shape to the general trends that affect systems internationally. Thus whereas English universities experienced stronger government control and less autonomy, Swedish universities experienced more autonomy, with Norway in a middle position characterised by less drastic and more mixed combination of reform measures.

Formerly, the ideal university leader was a collegial co-ordinator who claimed authority in his or her capacity as a member of an egalitarian and autonomous disciplinary community. Now, institutional leadership was seen as a task radically different from research and teaching. "One of the genuine challenges for any head of institution is to ensure there is a balance between managerial accountability and giving a say to the academic community" (Kogan and Hanney, 2000:195). University leaders reported quite mixed experiences regarding institutional autonomy. As for institutional leadership, English Vice-Chancellors welcomed the additional executive powers vested in them, Swedish Rectors felt unprepared for their new freedom, and Norwegian Rectors and Directors, within the traditional dual leadership structure that still existed, again reported mixed experiences and found institutional autonomy to be an ambiguous phenomenon. However, the link between academic autonomy at the institutional level and individual autonomy was challenged in all countries although to varying extent.

There were indications in the three studies that the changed rector's role also had an impact on appointment procedures (Askling and Henkel, 2000). Criteria for the election or appointment of academic leaders shifted from the procedural ("now it's turn for a person from the Faculty of Law to take over the responsibilities of a rector") towards the more individualistic ("we need a person who is a visionary and strong leader"). The internal hierarchy, based on scholarly reputation, was replaced by a more informal institutional hierarchy based on personal reputation as a dynamic and successful research manager. Such attributes as leadership and management

skills were now of at least equal importance to academic reputation and a distinguished appearance.

Compared to the European reform experience reported above, the situation in the USA is somewhat different. Overall, the patterns of higher education organisation and leadership seem to be more settled and stable. Among the reasons for this may be the fact that the US system expanded earlier under different economic and social conditions before higher education became "a mature industry" (Levine, 2001). It is also the case that institutions and their leadership structures have evolved over time there and not as part of a master plan (excepting some systems at state level such as the famous California Master Plan); and that US higher education today is regarded as a model for others to emulate rather than a system that needs to learn from others. Finally, one may ask whether the size and diversity of the US higher education system make it uniquely capable of absorbing growth and change while keeping its basic structural features.

A study comparing changes in government regulation of higher education in eight countries – Australia, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom and the United States – during almost the same period (late 1980s and 1990s), found a number of differences that are relevant in our context (Hood et al., 2004).[65] It looked at the use of four types of government regulation in higher education: oversight, mutuality, competition and contrived randomness. The types correspond roughly to what might be called direct regulation, professional autonomy (by collegiate bodies), competition and random control or inspections. The study revealed the following pattern: the US stood out from the other countries by being less exposed to oversight. The US and the UK were characterised by "medium" mutuality compared to the rest that were classified as "high". As for competition, the US scored "high", Australia "medium", Japan and the UK were headed towards increasing competition whereas the rest were characterized by "low", but increasing competition. (The exception here was Norway whose "low" score demonstrated no significant move in the direction of more competition). Finally, the UK stands out as the only country where contrived randomness ("medium") plays a certain role.[66] Thus autonomous collegial decision making still plays an essential role in all university systems, but enjoys a stronger position in continental Europe than in the Anglo-American countries and Japan. Conversely competition plays a stronger role in sys-

[65] For the comparison and the eight country studies included, see Bleiklie (2004), Derlien (2004), Hirose (2004), Huisman & Toonen (2004), Montricher (2004), Peters (2004), Scott (2004a, 2004b), Scott & Hood (2004).

[66] No use is made of unannounced audits or inspections. Most of the uncertainty comes from the difficulty of predicting payoffs for good or bad performance in research and teaching (Scott, 2004b).

tems with many and influential private institutions (Japan, the US) and countries that have pursued more radical New Public Management policies.

I shall conclude this discussion by pointing out that the business enterprise template has influenced the university systems analysed above only to a limited extent. Being affected by common external forces that push all systems in the same direction does not necessarily mean that they are becoming more similar to one another than previously. National distinctive features still exert a heavy influence on the formulation of current reform policies. The findings reported above indicate that national peculiarities have survived and that some of the oft cited differences between regions such as the Anglo-Saxon world and continental Europe still persist.

Furthermore, we may draw two conclusions about the conditions for institutional leadership. Universities in the countries studied still enjoy considerable institutional autonomy and in this sense conditions for institutional leadership are still present. However, the connection between institutional and individual autonomy has been seriously weakened, if not severed, in many countries. This raises the question about which the elites may be that can sustain the autonomy needed to exert institutional leadership. In the next section I shall look at how regional and national organisational leadership configurations may shed further light on the future of academic institutional leadership and the autonomy on which it is based.

LEADERSHIP AND EMERGING KNOWLEDGE REGIMES

The previous discussion has emphasised how changes in the organisation of higher education institutions must be understood against the backdrop of massification, expansion and the need to control costs, linked to a more visible and politically salient higher education system. The developments described may be seen as nationally distinct outcomes of the struggle to define the true nature of knowledge between actors such as states and politicians, institutional leaders and students, researchers and intellectuals, consultants and business leaders. *Knowledge interests* are therefore the key, together with the linked concepts of *knowledge alliances* and *knowledge regimes*. Returning to the Greenwood & Hinings (1996) suggestion that organisational change may be seen as the outcome of market pressure and intraorganisational dynamics, knowledge regimes may constitute the set of social conditions that give direction to the way in which these forces play themselves out. In order to understand the different trajectories higher education systems have followed I shall distinguish between a few ideal typical constellations of knowledge regimes and the actor constellations and interests on which they are based.

Modern universities and higher education systems are influenced by a number of developments that have implied a thrust towards an extended concept of knowledge and a stronger utility orientation. In the following I shall argue that the emerging

knowledge regimes may be divided into at the least two main groups. On the one hand there is *an academic capitalist regime*, driven by university-industry alliances, economic interests and a commercial logic. In spite of its huge influence on the discourse about higher education and as a symbol of current changes in higher education institutions, the notion of "academic capitalism" (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997) or "entrepreneurial universities" (Clark, 1998), industry funding is an important source for relatively few top research universities, particularly in the US (Powell & Owen-Smith 1998, Turk-Bicakci & Brint 2004). In fact the dominant pattern is that most higher education institutions are publicly funded and owned by national or regional governments.. This might be taken as an argument to the effect that stability prevails in the face of all rhetoric about fundamental change. Stakeholder leadership, according to the business enterprise ideal, however, may support the spread of 'capitalism' and be supported by a combination of public austerity policies and stronger influence by other outside interests financially and through university board positions.

Although universities still are predominantly public in most countries, the way in which public authorities run universities has changed fundamentally, and this has been heavily influenced by notions of "academic capitalism" and "entrepreneurial universities". It manifests itself in the notion of universities as business enterprises and the introduction of quasi-market mechanisms in order to promote competition and cost effectiveness. These *public managerialist regimes* are driven by university-state alliances, political-administrative interests and a semi-competitive logic based on incentive policies where public support depends partly on teaching and/or research performance. They come, however, in different versions that may be understood against the backdrop of the previous public regimes from which they have developed. Comparing the systems of England, Norway and Sweden, Kogan et al. (2000) point out that the public regimes that dominated the systems until the 1980s or 1990s were different in important respects. Although all in principle were public, different actor constellations, alliances and interests characterised the regimes.

The English regime was until about 1980 dominated by co-opted academic elites, who under state protection could offer considerable autonomy to the universities. Policies contributed to maintaining the elite structure in which a few top universities stood out from the rest in terms of academic prestige and social standing. The English version of the public managerialist regime that emerged during the 1980s and 1990s was much more centralised than previously. The abolition of the binary divide and the subsequent admission of the former polytechnics into the centralised competitive evaluation procedures of the Research Assessment Exercises, in principle opened up the field for all higher education institutions, polytechnics as well as universities, to compete for research funding and academic status, and made possible an apparently more seamless integration of higher education. However, in practice the Research Assessment Exercises have reconfirmed the academic status hier-

archy, in which a few top institutions receive most of the public research funding, whereas the other institutions must struggle to fund their research from other sources, focus on applied short term research contracts or devote themselves to teaching.

The vice-chancellors had traditionally had a different position from Swedish and Norwegian rectors. They had always been a kind of public notable, and this partly reflected the incorporated or chartered status of the institutions they led. They were also appointed, not elected, until retirement. With the reforms of the 1990s their role was further reinforced with executive power and the enhancement of existing privileges of pay, car and house which constituted a definite pulling away from the professoriate. Thus the English Vice-Chancellors' experience was that the business executive ideal came in addition to, and without necessarily threatening, their academic authority. The preservation of the hierarchical and elitist structure of the English higher education system may also indicate that to the extent that institutional autonomy is based on this structure, the conditions for sustaining it are still intact.

The Swedish regime between 1977 and 1994 had corporatist features, dominated by state authorities and unions and strongly influenced by political priorities. Swedish higher education institutions were all formally called *högskola* although there were clear differences between research universities and non-university institutions. However, the absence of formal divisions between types of institutions meant that there were fewer barriers against integration. The Swedish version of a public managerialist regime was introduced following a transition from a social democratic to a conservative government and came with a decentralising move in which central government authorities in the name of institutional autonomy transferred decision making authority to the institutions. At the same time the internal institutional leadership was strengthened and external influence through representation of other sectors of society on university boards was established. Faced with the increased authority vested in them, Swedish university leaders seemed to look for direction, and it appears that the previous leadership values based in collegial leadership were perceived as inadequate. Thus Swedish rectors were apparently left to navigate between, and find a new balance between, expectations of academic authority, executive efficiency and social responsibilities without very clear directions. The attempt to strengthen central leadership structures by increasing the number of central administrative staff, and not the least the number of vice rectors, may have been one way of trying to create a more solid leadership base and a basis for an elite on which institutional leadership may rely.

The Norwegian regime was statist, dominated by higher education institutions and the Ministry of education. The Norwegian public managerialist regime has come with a mixture of centralising and decentralising moves whereby central authorities have sought to establish a formal framework that will make Norwegian higher edu-

cation institutions more efficient, more flexible, more sensitive to students' needs and more open to student mobility across institutions. Activity planning and incentive policies, emphasising rewarding teaching efficiency and student throughput have been major policy tools. The first major change to the internal governing structure was introduced in 1990 by severing the internal disciplinary chain of representation, whereby elected leaders at lower levels (department chairs and deans) were represented on the governing boards at higher levels so that chairs had seats in the faculty councils and deans in the university boards. This system was replaced by a functional system in which categories of employees and students are represented. This system was believed to be better able to address the interests of the institution as a whole and weaken the role of "special interests" among the faculty (Bleiklie et al. 2000). The higher education legislation of 1995 kept the existing "dual" leadership arrangements – whereby at all levels of institutional leadership there is an elected office (chair, dean and Rector) and an administratively appointed counterpart (head of office, faculty director, and director general) in all higher education institutions. However, it also introduced external board representation and reduced academic staff from a majority to a minority position on the board.

The Government has furthermore tried to deal with the leadership issue in connection with the comprehensive reform process ("the Quality Reform"), which started in 2002. Although it seems to be in favour of introducing a system of appointed leaders, the Government has been reluctant to impose a system that faces considerable opposition without thorough preparations and a period of voluntary experimenting. However gradual and slow the Norwegian reform process has been, it raises with increasing force the question of the basis of institutional leadership and autonomy. Whilst weakening the internal influence and authority of academics, it is not clear by whom institutional values are supposed to be protected. The expectation of executive leadership is less pronounced and less underpinned by organisational arrangements in Norway than in the other countries. At the same time, academic authority is challenged from the Ministry, and the expectation of loyalty that is directed towards leaders of bureaucratic agencies within public administrative systems. One possibility is that this may strengthen the "chain of command" from the Ministry down to individual institutions, unless institutional leaders are given space that enables them to modify and defend a new basis of institutional leadership.

CONCLUSION

These observations suggest first of all that when new knowledge regimes arise, their impact may be partial and vary depending on the conditions with which they are faced. The emerging capitalist and managerialist regimes may be viewed as different responses to a number of general trends such as higher education expansion, the rise

of the "knowledge society", and a different understanding of the purpose of higher education and research. What I have called an academic capitalist regime has in many ways become a global yardstick, despised by some, but espoused by many others. It has until now had a stronger impact on ideology and discourse than on the way in which universities are operated and funded. The practical impact of a commercial logic on Western university systems is still limited and concerns mainly a relatively small number of major research universities. In many public systems in Europe a semi-competitive logic between institutions has been introduced in which they are supposed to compete for students and research funding. This semi-competitive logic may provide an important rationale for academic institutional leadership. However, the way in which this might develop depends on the extent to which executive leadership ideals are balanced by the protection by institutional arrangements of academic individual as well as institutional autonomy. It is also dependent on how leaders will interpret their social responsibilities. The tendencies over the last decades have been to conflate the values of social responsibility and executive efficiency. This has gradually reduced the alternative idea of social responsibility in which universities are considered providers of welfare and democracy through advanced education and research. It is still early to determine to what extent the competitive or semi-competitive drive based on ideas of efficient executive leadership will affect academic leadership in a uniform way internationally, and until recently the extent to which it had gained a foothold varied considerably, weakened by still apparently quite resilient alternative values.

REFERENCES

Askling, B. & Henkel, M. (2000). "Higher Education Institutions". In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study.* London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Berger. S. & Dore, R. (eds.) (1996). *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Bleiklie, I. (1994). "Norwegian and Swedish graduate reform policy". *Higher Education Policy,* 7(1), 18-24.

Bleiklie, I. (1998). "Justifying the Evaluative State. New Public Management Ideals in Higher Education.". *European Journal of Education,* 33 (3), 299-316.

Bleiklie, I. (2004). "Norway: holding back competition?" In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government,* London: Edward Elgar.

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

Bleiklie, I. & Kogan, M. (2000). "Comparison and Theories" in Kogan, M., Bauer, M. Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study.* London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Bleiklie, I. & Byrkjeflot, H. (2002). "Changing Knowledge Regimes – Universities in a New Research Environment". *Higher Education,* 44 (2-3), 1-14.

Christensen, T. 1991. *Virksomhetsplanlegging. Myteskaping eller reell problemløsning?* Oslo: Tano.

Clark, B.R (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways to Transformation.* Oxford, New York, Tokyo: IAU Press/Pergamon.

Cohen, M.D., March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1972). "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice". *Adminstrative Science Quarterly,* 17, 1-25.

Daalder, H. & Shils, E. (eds.) (1982). *Universities, Politicians and Bureaucrats.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damrosch, D. (1995). *We Scholars. Changing the Culture of the Universities.* Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.

Derlien, H.-U. (2004). "Germany: growing competition at the expense of mutuality". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government,* London: Edward Elgar.

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (1997) (eds.) *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations.* London: Cassell.

Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D. & Skocpol, T. (eds.) (1985). *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Society.* London - Thousand Oaks – New Dehli: Sage.

Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C. R. (1996). "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism". *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (4), 1022-1054.

Hirose, K. 2004. "Japan: adapting the American model to centralized oversight". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government,* London: Edward Elgar.

Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.).(2004) *Controlling Modern Government,* London: Edward Elgar.

Huisman, J. & Toonen, T. (2004). "The Netherlands: a mixed pattern of control". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government,* London: Edward Elgar.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kerr, C. (1995). *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study.* London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

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

Lægreid, P. (red.) (1991). *Målstyring og virksomhetsplanlegging i offentlig sektor.* Bergen: Alma Mater.

Levine, A. (2001). "Higher Education as a Mature Industry". In Altbach, P., Gumport, P.J. & Johnstone, D. B. (eds.) *In Defense of American Higher Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Meyer J. and Ramírez, F. (2000). "The World Institutionalization of Education". In Schriver, J. (ed.) *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education.* New York: Peter Lang Publishers, 111-132.

Montricher, N. (2004). "France: mutuality and oversight in tension?" In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government.* London: Edward Elgar.

Musselin, C. 1999. "State/University Relations and How to Change Them: The Case of France and Germany". In Henkel, M. & Little, B. (eds.). *Changing Relationships Between Higher Education and the State.* London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Neave, G. (1998). "The Evaluative State Reconsidered". *European Journal of Education*, 33(3), 265 - 284.

Neave, G. (2002). "The Stakeholder Perspective Historically Explored". In Enders, J. & Fulton, O. (eds.) *Higher Education in a Globalizing World. International Trends and Mutula Observations.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Neave, G. & Rhoades, G. (1987). "The Academic Estate in Western Europe". In Clark, B. R. (eds.). *The Academic Profession.* Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Nybom, T. (2001). "Europa mellan själatåg och pånyttfödelse. En humanistisk plaidoyer för kontinentens kulturella själ." *Tvärrsnitt*, 4/2001.

Olsen, J.P.(1993). "Et statsvitenskapelig perspektiv på offentlig sektor". In Lægreid, P. & Olsen, J. P. (eds.). *Organisering av offentlig sektor.* Oslo: Tano.

Parsons, T. & Platt, G. (1973). *The American University.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Peters, B.G. (2004). "The USA: little oversight, no explosion". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government.* London: Edward Elgar.

Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the Public Services. The Anglo-American Experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Powell, W.W. and Owen-Smith, J. (1998). "Universities and the Market for Intellectual Property in the Life Sciences". *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17 (2), 253-277.

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

Ramírez, F. (2003). "World Society and the Socially Embedded University". School of Education: Stanford University. (Unpublished paper.).

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins.* Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.

Røvik, K.A. (1992). Den "syke" stat. Myter og moter i omstillingsarbeidet, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Scott, C. (2004a). "Australia: linking oversight to mutuality and competition". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government.* London: Edward Elgar.

Scott, C. (2004b). "The UK: hyper-regulation and regulatory reform". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government.* London: Edward Elgar.

Scott, C. & Hood, C. (2004). "Overview". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government.* London: Edward Elgar.

Selznick, P (1984) [1957]. *Leadership in Administration. A Sociological Interpretation.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Teichler, U. (1988). *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System. The Experience of Three Decades.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Thelen, K. & Steinmo, S. (1995). "Historical institutionalism in comparative politics". In Steinmo, S. et al. *Structuring Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turk-Bicacki, L. & Brint, S. (forthcoming 2005). "University-Industry Collaboration. Patterns of Growth for Low and Middle-Level Performers". *Higher Education*, 46.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Weick, K.E. (1976). "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 1-19.

13

THE BLACK BOX REVISITED; THE RELEVANCE OF THEORY-DRIVEN RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES

PETER MAASSEN AND BJØRN STENSAKER

INTRODUCTION

Over the last 20 to 30 years many far-reaching reforms have been launched in Europe aimed at improving the performance of higher education. While these reforms were implemented at various levels[67], the reform initiatives obviously came in the first place from the national level, given that the nation-state in Europe still carries the main regulatory and financial responsibilities with respect to higher education. The core of most of these reforms consisted of efforts to change the way in which the relationship between the government and higher education was organised. This "shift in governance" was expected to lead to more efficient and effective higher education systems.

Throughout his long, impressive career Maurice Kogan has tackled many important questions with respect to the governance of higher education. By discussing these questions from a theoretical and an empirical perspective in his numerous publications he has contributed in a unique way to our knowledge in this area as well as to development of the field of higher education studies in general (see, for example: Becher & Kogan, 1980; Kogan & Hanney, 2000; Kogan *et al*., 2000). We want to use the opportunity this collective homage to Maurice Kogan offers to continue his discussion on higher education governance by applying some of the cultural arguments he developed with respect to system level governance (Kogan, 2002) to the institutional level.

[67] We refer here to reforms, for example, taking place at the global (e.g. WTO/GATS), supra-national (e.g. the implementation of the Bologna Declaration), the national, regional/pro-vincial/Länder, and the institutional level (for the latter see, for example, Clark, 1998).

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 213-226.

One of the main issues explored by Kogan with respect to higher education governance concerns the effects of shifts in governance modes on institutional change, and the relationship between values, governance effects and institutional arrangements for understanding stability and change in educational systems. For Kogan this relationship is critical in that:

People's actions are based on a connection between how they think they ought to behave and what they ought to aim towards, and how they feel about themselves and what they want (Kogan, 1988: 94).

Such individualism necessarily becomes modified, compromised and bound by entering into (exchange) relationships that constitute institutionalisation and, ultimately, various forms of public control and governance models (Kogan, 1988: 119-120). In later works he revisited this relationship numerous times, for example in a comparative study of the impact of higher education reforms on academic working and values in British, Norwegian and Swedish higher education institutions. One of the concerns of this study was to examine how interest groups and elites had influenced policy-making and policy implementation in British higher education (Kogan & Hanney, 2000).

Kogan's work clearly shows that higher education institutions are in general not purely reactive, nor do they respond in the same way to government interventions (see also: Maassen, 2002: 26-27; and cf. Bleiklie and Musselin in this volume). Higher education institutions, like most other modern organisations, "are constituted as active players, not passive pawns" (Scott, 1995: 132). The implication of this is that we cannot assume that there is a "one-to-one" causal relationship between environmental and intra-organisational changes in higher education. We know that changes in the environment are related to changes in universities and colleges, but how they are related and which factors influence the institutionalisation of changes is still something of a "black box" in higher education studies. This is not unlike the situation in organisation studies in general (Trommel and Van der Veen, 1997). Consequently what we are interested in is how change at one level is related to change at another level.

For examining organisational change in relationship to shifts in governance, various theoretical approaches can be used. While the study of shifts in governance in general is dominated by legal and economic studies, Kogan's trademark has been to use a more eclectic approach (see, for example, Kogan & Hanney, 2000: 238). Drawing from theories of the sociology of science, social psychology, political science, social policy and educational sociology he has clearly demonstrated the usefulness of combining various disciplinary perspectives to shed light on the complexity of educational systems and the processes that lead to change in such systems.

This eclecticism has the advantage that most empirical findings can be matched by a theoretical explanation, and that this provides the reader with a richer and more comprehensive picture of the complexity of social action. The disadvantage is, of course, that further theoretical developments within a given perspective may be less stimulated with the result that the international research community becomes even more fragmented (Teichler, 2000; Kogan & Henkel, 2000). We believe that it is important to find a middle position when dealing with this dilemma and that higher education policy research should identify theoretical perspectives robust enough to reduce the need for complementary perspectives, and rich enough to provide sensible explanations to the huge variance researchers usually face when analysing current empirical developments in higher education.

In this chapter we would like to present one such analytical tool, i.e. cultural theory, and reflect upon the relevance of this tool for furthering our understanding of organisational change in higher education – in theory and practice – and upon why more theory-based research in higher education is needed. We will start our discussion of cultural theory by considering how organisational change processes in higher education can be conceptualised.

CONCEPTUALISING INSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

To start with, our view is that instead of being abrupt, absolute and complete, organisational change in higher education takes place through the development of new understandings and symbols that may not be incompatible with those that were in place before. A related argument is that for understanding the nature and effects of institutional change it is necessary to take the process of institutional decline and reform seriously. We need to develop our understanding for the subtle ways in which old and new cognitive schemes compete, collapse or merge.

Following Clark (1983: 74-75) it can be argued that the main sources that feed academic behaviour as well as academic culture are the discipline, the higher education institution, the national system and the academic profession at large. These structures have been interpreted by Maassen (1996) as social institutional contexts. Clark (1983: 74) argues that these four institutional contexts are dominant because they are positioned within the academic system. External contexts are to be found in the surrounding society, but are assumed to be of less influence. Kogan and Hanney (2000: 244), Reed (2002) as well as Fulton (2003) have, for example, discussed the tensions between the persistent internal academic values and the externally initiated "waves of managerialism" in British higher education.

What does the impact of the four institutional contexts consist of? First, concerning the impacts of disciplines, Becher (1987: 297) has identified four major catego-

ries for examining the ways in which a discipline or field influences academic behaviour and culture: a) the initiation or socialisation process of new members of the academic profession; b) the nature of the social interaction in a discipline or field; c) the type and degree of specialisation within a discipline or field; and d) mobility of and change in the academic profession. A problem in this is that there are many disciplinary categories and the more one goes from the broad disciplinary level into the sub-disciplines and specialisations, the less agreement there is on their exact nature and borders. In addition, not all members of a discipline or field experience their work and career in the same way (Austin, 1992).

Second, it can be argued that the higher education institution plays a major role in defining and organising the behaviour and work values of its academic staff. Many factors can be distinguished that contribute to the impact of an individual university or college, for example, its mission and purpose, history, size, age, location, complexity, and financial situation.

Third, each national higher education system has unique characteristics that distinguish it from others. This has to do with the way the system is structured and managed, with its history and traditions, and with national governance and policy dimensions. Fourth, with respect to the influence of the academic profession at large, it can be argued that various professional elements, such as intellectual honesty, integrity, fairness, equality, the notion of community, and the starting-point that the main purpose of academic work is to handle knowledge, can be expected to have an impact on academic behaviour and culture.

The complex nature of the interaction between the four social institutional contexts and academic behaviour and culture can be illustrated, for example, by pointing to Clark's work on the integrating role of organisational saga in certain types of higher education institutions (Clark, 1972). However, later he suggested that in public higher education systems the development of a special organisational culture or saga in individual universities and colleges is in general avoided in the sense that the state aims at creating and maintaining similarity across a higher education system (Clark, 1983: 87-88).

Empirical research on the impact of these four contexts has been mainly focused on the influence of the discipline or field using specific conceptualisations concerning the relationship between discipline and academic behaviour or academic culture (Henkel, 2000). The question is how the relationship between social institutional contexts and academic behaviour and culture can be conceptualised in more general terms.

Within the framework of this chapter this question will be approached from the perspective of "shifts in governance", as discussed at the beginning. Within this perspective the main starting-point in the conceptualisation of the interaction between social institutional contexts and academic behaviour and culture is the issue whether

an academic social institutional context can be influenced by an external actor, i.e. by a national government. It has been argued (Maassen, 1996) that of the four social institutional contexts identified here only the discipline cannot be affected directly by government measures, i.e. disciplinary developments are uncontrollable from the outside. The national higher education system, the higher education institution, and the academic profession can be argued to be sensitive to external attempts to influence them directly (Maassen 1996: 50-53). Summarised it can be argued that:

The behaviour of the academic staff of universities and colleges as well as their values and beliefs are affected by three social institutional contexts (the national system, the higher education institution, and the academic profession) that can be influenced directly by external actors, including the government, and by one social institutional context that cannot be influenced directly by external actors such as the government, i.e. the discipline or field to which an academic belongs.

THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL THEORY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH

The issue discussed in the previous section, i.e. the embeddedness of individual values, norms, behaviour, motivations and preferences in social institutional contexts, has been discussed not only in higher education studies, but also in other fields. Especially in political science and policy studies this notion of embeddedness has been examined with the use of the "grid/group" cultural theory framework (Thompson et al., 1990). Hood (1998: 6), for example, has argued that cultural theory can be used to unravel variations in ideas about how public services should be organised and managed. Another author who has used cultural theory is Dunsire (1995) in his analysis of the emergence of a more pragmatic approach in politics in the United Kingdom after the Thatcher period. Using cultural theory he points to cultural shifts in British society that ask for different, i.e. more complex and subtle, forms of governmental control and public management (Dunsire, 1995: 33). What does this cultural theory stand for and to what extent is it of relevance for the field of higher education studies?

Cultural theory represents an attempt to integrate the cultural notion of individual values and beliefs, and the structural organisation of the social and professional relations of individuals. It is developed by Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky (1990), and is based on the work of Mary Douglas (1982), one of the most prominent "Durkheimian" anthropologists. The conceptualisations of Douglas' cultural theory are based upon her identification of the two dimensions of an individual person's involvement in social life: group and grid (Douglas, 1982: 190-192). The first dimension, group, refers to the strength of group boundaries, while grid has to do with the intensity of the external rules and regulations imposed upon an individual. In

other words, "group is about who you relate to, grid is about how you relate to them" (Wildavsky, 1991: 358). In Douglas' view individual values and beliefs cannot be separated from structure, but are part of structure itself (Douglas, 1982: 199-200).

Thompson and his colleagues have used Douglas' four types of social culture as a basis for developing their cultural theory, which serves as an analytical tool for examining people, culture and politics. Cultural theory assumes that Douglas' four types of social culture can be interpreted as separate "ways of life". A way of life is described as a viable combination of social relations and cultural bias, i.e. shared values and beliefs. The authors claim that the traditional distinction in social science theories between hierarchies and markets is incorporated in their theory. The other three cultural types are added because the traditional dichotomy leaves out other possible forms of social organisation. Consequently the multiple but finite variation offered by the four[68] core "ways of life" provides more variation than the traditional hierarchy – market dichotomy, but less than full-blown cultural relativity. In this way, cultural theory is a promising perspective for dealing with a complex reality while using a single theoretical perspective.

According to cultural theory social institutional contexts combine with the behaviour and values and beliefs of an academic to form his/her "way of life". In order to be successful, a governmental strategy directed at making higher education institutions function more effectively should aim at influencing the social institutional contexts of academics in such a way that they will change their behaviour as well as their values and beliefs accordingly. If this happens it means that academics have moved towards ways of life that are consistent with the ideology underpinning the governmental strategy.

However, since there are four main ways of life, individuals changing their way of life can in normal circumstances choose between three alternatives. Due to the indirect relationship between governmental change strategies and academic behaviour and culture, it can never be guaranteed that governmental steering will affect the social institutional contexts of individual academics in such a way that most, if not all, academics involved will move to the alternative way of life promoted by the government. This can be illustrated by the following example:

Margaret Thatcher's avowed aim is to create an enterprise culture (individualism). The major obstacle, Thatcherites believe, to the establishment of such a culture is

[68] Thompson et al (1990) have added a fifth way of life to the four types of social culture identified by Mary Douglas, i.e. heretic. Given its exceptional nature this way of life is not included further in our discussion.

the clutter of institutional structures based on a careful balancing of privilege and obligation (hierarchy). If hierarchy and individualism were the only two viable social positions, it would follow that policies that dismantled hierarchy would produce an increase in individualism. But if, as we contend, there are four viable social positions… then, we would predict, radically shifting social transactions away from hierarchies may also create … a culture of poverty (fatalism) and a culture of criticism (egalitarianism). This is not to say that such policies should not be pursued, but to say that those who believe that these policies will bring about a world peopled only with individualists will be disappointed. (Thompson et al. 1990: 79)

This quote illustrates the nature of the relationship between governmental change strategies and society as assumed by cultural theory. This is in line with the study by Dunsire referred to above (1995). If a government wants parts of the society to function more effectively, i.e. if it wants to increase the chances that the preferred decisions and actions will be taken , it should dismantle the dominant way of life, if this is not in line with the preferred decisions and actions. The above quote suggests that in the case of "hierarchy" this dismantling takes place through shifting social transactions away from hierarchies. Since any person involved can move in more than one direction, a new change strategy's effectiveness is determined not only by the number of people that move away from a specific way of life, but also by the number of people that move towards the way of life consistent with the aims and nature of the change strategy.

In the field of higher education studies cultural theory was used in 1996 for comparing specific values and beliefs of German and Dutch university academic staff (Maassen, 1996). A basic assumption was that at that time (mid-1990s) Dutch academics had already been confronted with an adaptation of their social institutional contexts while German academics had only experienced the beginning of such an adaptation. Comparison of values and beliefs could reveal whether there were major differences in the "ways of life" between German and Dutch university academic staff. Given the traditional similarities of German and Dutch academic culture any significant difference could be interpreted from the perspective of cultural theory, i.e. as being, amongst other things, the result of the changes in the social institutional contexts of Dutch academic staff of universities.

Even though the results of this application have to be interpreted very carefully, we want to refer to the data in so far as they give an indication of the values and beliefs of the academics in the two countries with respect to the change in governance mode. Dutch universities have since the mid-1980s had extensive experience with a government "steering at a distance". This new governance mode resulted in stronger institutional management structures, introducing, for example, more internal competition and putting more emphasis on performance evaluation. A further result was a decentralisation of authority from the government to the universities.

The study showed no significant differences between the values and beliefs of German and Dutch academics when it comes to their opinions on evaluation and decentralization aspects. Academics in both countries want to have control over their own academic activities in an environment with as few rules and regulations as possible. They also agree to some extent that there should be a direct link between their performance and their salaries.

However, it is striking that the Dutch academics, who at the time already had some experience with internal competition, were more negative about competition than their German colleagues. The data suggest that German academics adhered more to the individualistic way of life, while the Dutch academics had to some extent moved away from this towards an egalitarian way of life. Again, the data have to be interpreted carefully, and follow-up research is needed. This follow-up research should, amongst other things, examine the relationship of behaviour with values and beliefs of academic university staff. The Dutch academic staff might be less positive about competition than their German colleagues, but is this reflected in their behaviour? Cultural theory suggests this would be the case.

If indeed Dutch academic university staff were behaving less competitively than their German colleagues, it would give an important indication as to the effects of introducing new governance modes for higher education. Evaluation of academic performance and decentralisation, at least when it is accompanied by a reduction in externally imposed rules and regulations, can be regarded as characteristics of a deregulation governance model. Competition on the other hand is an element in a market governance model (Peters, 2001; Maassen, 2003). With all the reservations needed as to the validity of the available data, it can be suggested that if a government wants to affect the functioning of its public universities and make them more effective, using a deregulation governance model with an emphasis on managerial autonomy and the evaluation of academic performance as a basis for salaries and specific types of rewards, without the introduction of new external rules and regulations, is likely to be more successful than using a market governance model with an emphasis on competition with the accompanying externally imposed rules and regulations to regulate the competition.

The above suggestion is of particular interest given the shifts in Europe, as elsewhere, from traditional to market models for governing higher education. Hence, studies testing this suggestion and its underlying assumptions could provide the higher education research field with new and interesting insights, especially since the field has such a tradition for engaging in more qualitative and very empirically oriented studies on national reform efforts. Even if these studies are often of high quality and rigour, the main problem in our perspective is that they are difficult to use to develop more analytical generalisations in the field. Hence, a starting-point could be a secondary analysis of existing data to examine whether cultural theory

adds to our understanding of the possible effects of new governance modes on organisational change in higher education.

A recent study by Stensaker (2004) on changes in organisational identities in Norwegian higher education in the 1990s can illustrate the relevance of such secondary analyses. The main aim of this study was to analyse how organisational identities of Norwegian universities and colleges were affected by government policies concerning the quality of teaching and learning during the 1990s. An important characteristic of the Norwegian government policies in this field was deregulation with little use of market tools. Even if quality was put high on the policy agenda in Norway in the 1990s, the government, unlike its counterparts in many West European countries at that time, did not impose rules and regulations in this area.Hence, in Norway systematic evaluation of teaching and learning at the national level was not implemented, quality standards were not imposed, and one can argue that the policies implemented were based more on pedagogical and communicative measures than on judicial and economic ones (Stensaker, 2004: 14).

The study showed how Norwegian higher education institutions responded rather differently to the "policy space" that opened up in teaching and learning. The findings disclosed, amongst other things, that some higher education institutions used the opportunity the new policy created to renew, reinterpret and transform themselves. While keeping important identity labels, such as being an "entrepreneurial", a "reform-pedagogic" or an "interdisciplinary" institution, they attached new meanings to these labels during the 1990s. These processes of reinterpretation contributed to the changes in the teaching and learning practices in the institutions, making them more ready and capable of facing the challenges of a more dynamic higher education landscape in Norway around the turn of the century.

However, not all the institutions studied experienced the same transformation. In some , the governmental stimuli aimed at creating more institutional creativity and activity with respect to the quality of teaching and learning were not effective. There were a number of explanations for this variance in the institutional responses to the governmental policies, including the importance of institutional leaders as creators of meaning. In addition, it was emphasised that these institutions all had been or were going through processes of merger or other forms of radical reorganisation. Further, some of them had other strategic ambitions than emphasising the quality of teaching and learning, such as wanting to become a university. The picture created is, in other words, one emphasising the importance of an "active agency" instigating change, i.e. the institutional leadership, and of problems of organisational capacity to handle several pressing issues simultaneously. Examples included mergers and other institutional developments that took the attention away from government policies in the teaching and learning area.

Reinterpreting these findings from the perspective of cultural theory, our attention is shifting from particularistic organisational factors and an emphasis on process to a more general analytical approach for analysing the relationship between government policies and institutional responses. Hence, through the use of the group/grid framework, new dimensions are added to the analysis in addition to the importance of "strong leadership" or "organisational capacity" highlighted in the cases where organisational transformation took place. Hood's work (1998: 8-9) referred to above can be used as an interesting operationalisation of the group/grid framework for the discussion of these new dimensions. Hood suggests four positions, i.e.

1. High grid/high group, consisting of socially cohesive rule-bound systems (the hierarchical position).
2. High grid/low group, consisting of rule-bound systems and low levels of cooperation (the fatalist position).
3. Low grid/high group, expecting a high level of participation (the egalitarian position)
4. Low grid/low group, emphasising negotiations and bargaining (the individualistic position).

Applying these positions to the case institutions of Stensaker's study we can argue that those institutions that managed to reinterpret important identity labels at the same time as emphasising the need to be more concerned with the quality of teaching and learning can be expected to have been characterised by "socially cohesive rule-bound internal governance structures" (hierarchical position). Furthermore, in the case where policies, too, were dramatically reinterpreted, a high level of participation could be expected to be one of the underlying forces leading to the reinterpretations (egalitarian position). Finally, it is also possible to find examples of institutions reacting in a more fragmented way, with little agreement on how individual staff members should act, and where negotiations and bargaining can be assumed to have been dominant processes in the internal governance structures (individualistic).

Further, more detailed re-interpretation of the findings from Stensaker's study by applying the grid/group, cultural theory framework would allow for an in-depth comparative case analysis of the relationship between "individual motivations and the cognitive framework of reference of the actors involved" (Keman, 1997: 21). This analysis could help us to understand why the case-institutions responded to government policies in the way they did. After all, this type of analysis is argued to be "of value with regard to analyzing policy making in relation to processes of implementation" (Keman, 1997: 21). The point we want to make is simple – drawing on cultural theory makes it possible to incorporate more structure into the analysis while keeping a relatively high degree of multidimensionality.

THE SEARCH AND NEED FOR ROBUST THEORIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY STUDIES

The main argument we have tried to develop by reflecting upon the applicability of the grid/group cultural theory framework is not that this framework is superior to other theoretical perspectives that are relevant for higher education policy research in the future, but that it is vital to search for and use robust and rich theories in our common development of the field of higher education studies. This is in line with Teichler's plea for engaging in "meta-research and continuous reflections" (Teichler, 2000: 22). By reflecting upon their findings, and engaging in secondary analyses through applying alternative theories, higher education researchers can avoid being caught between Scylla and Charybdis: between not being practically relevant enough for the practitioners in higher education, and not theoretically interesting enough for the scholars working in related academic disciplines.

In this endeavour, there are probably many theoretical perspectives that can and should be considered seriously. Students of institutional theory have, for example, in recent years acknowledged that the distinction between "old" and "new" institutionalism as described by DiMaggio and Powell (1991) is of little help in bringing our understanding of the persistence, change and transformation of institutions forward (Scott, 2001: 213). It has been proposed that factors such as power, the state, and an active agency should be included in future studies in the field (Scott, 2001), and efforts have also been made recently to find concrete ways to establish links between older and newer versions of institutional theory (Stensaker, 2004). In line with this, Grenstad and Selle (1995) have proposed that institutional theory and cultural theory could be integrated into a common theoretical framework, arguing that cultural theory could be interpreted as a version of neo-institutionalism. Other scholars have interpreted the grid/group cultural theory framework as a specific approach to institutionalism (Keman, 1997: 11-15). At the very least, it can be argued that the two theories provide complementary perspectives for the project of building more multifaceted explanations of organisational change in higher education, as discussed above.

Furthermore, the current interest and application of theoretical developments with respect to the concept of governance can be regarded as yet another effort to handle the complexity of higher education in a scholarly valid and practically relevant way (Enders, 2004; Kogan and Hanney, 2000; Maassen, 2003; Maassen and Stensaker, 2003).

Finally it can be argued that more theory-driven research in higher education could actually provide the field with a better link between research and policy-making. As suggested by Kogan and Henkel (2000: 39), positivist modes of research are often preferred by policy-makers to critical or interactive modes. Without arguing that higher education research should be more positivist, there are, at least in

some countries, highly skilled and trained bureaucrats and senior administrators that are capable of and probably also interested in more informed policy-making at the national level (Kogan & Henkel, 2000: 41). Here Gornitzka's (2003) recent study into problem choice and the use of research results in two policy areas, agriculture and fisheries, in Norway can also be referred to. Her study provides important insights into the traditional knowledge and information relationships between researchers and bureaucrats. She argues that in the connected but separate worlds of researchers and bureaucrats the legitimacy of the use of research results in policy decisions is dependent on a number of factors, including the quality of the research and the distance between the researchers and the actual decision-making process. One of the lessons from Gornitzka's work for the field of higher education studies is that higher education researchers should not overestimate the importance of the direct applicability of their research findings. There are other factors than direct applicability that determine the possible relevance of higher education research for bureaucrats (Gornitzka, 2003).

A FINAL REFLECTION

In this chapter we have shown how cultural theory (Thompson et al., 1990) could provide a promising framework for studies of the effects of shifts in governance in higher education, but, more importantly, we have argued for applying robust and multifaceted theories for developing higher education research further.

If research in higher education is able to pursue this objective, a possible and desirable result could be that the research community is also provided with more fruitful and sharpened research questions in the future. Looking back at the field of higher education research the last ten to fifteen years, one is often struck by the tendency to formulate changes and developments in the sector as dichotomies or even polarisations. It is not so long ago that studies on governance in higher education were almost exclusively focused around the terms "state control versus state supervising" (e.g., van Vught, 1989). In the area of quality assurance, we are still researching the "accountability versus improvement" dilemma (e.g., Vroeijenstijn, 1995), and for those interested in internationalisation and globalisation of higher education, issues related to "convergence versus divergence" (e.g., Meek et al., 1996) are currently on top of the research agenda. Even if most empirical studies tend to conclude that these dichotomies seldom match empirical realities and are too simplistic to be fruitful as analytical concepts (see e.g., Stensaker 2004), they still tend to dominate our research agenda. By applying more theory-driven research we should be able to move beyond simple dichotomies and search for the complex interaction that characterises the real world. The work of Maurice Kogan has been and is a source of inspiration in this respect. His position and ambition, which have al-

ways been to go beyond the surface to search for the underlying structures and processes, have over the years shown their relevance for bringing higher education research forward. For this he truly deserves to be honoured.

REFERENCES

Austin, A.E. (1992). "Faculty Cultures". In: Clark, B.R. & Neave, G. (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Vol. 3. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1614-1622.

Becher, T. (1987). "The disciplinary shaping of the profession". In Clark, B.R. (ed.) *The Academic Profession. National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1980). *Process and structure in higher education*. London: Heinemann (1st edition).

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1992) *Process and structure in higher education*. London: Routledge (2nd edition).

Bleiklie, I. & Kogan, M. (2000). "Comparison and theories". In: Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. *Transforming higher education. A comparative study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Christensen, T. & Røvik, K.A. (1999). "The ambiguity of appropriateness". In: Egeberg, M. & Lægreid, P. (eds.). *Organizing Political Institutions. Essays for Johan P. Olsen*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Clark, B.R. (1972). "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17,178-183.

Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W.W. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Douglas, M. (ed.) (1982). *In the active voice*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dunsire, A. (1995). "Administrative theory in the 1980s: A viewpoint". *Public Administration*, 73(1),17-40.

Enders, J. (2004). "Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges for governance theory". *Higher Education*, vol. 47 (3), 361-382.

Fulton, O. (2003). "Managerialism in UK universities: Unstable hybridity and the complications of implementation". InAmaral, A., Meek, V.L. & Larsen, I.M. (eds.). *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers,155-178.

Gornitzka, Å. (2003). *Science, clients and the state. A study of scientific knowledge production and use.* Enschede: CHEPS/University of Twente.

Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C.R. (1996). "Understanding radical organisational change: bringing together the old and the new institutionalism". *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022-1054.

Grendstad, G. & Selle, P. (1995). "Cultural theory and the new institutionalism". *Journal of theoretical politics*, 7, 5-27.

Hall, P.A. & Taylor, R.C.R (1996). *Political science and the three new institutionalisms*. MPIFG Discussion paper 96/6. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies.

Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic identities and policy change in higher education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Hood, C. (1998). *The Art of the State: Culture, Rhetoric, and Public Management.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keman, H. (1997). "Approaches to Analysis of Institutions". In: Steunenberg, B. & van Vught, F. A. (eds.). *Political Institutions and Public Policy. Perspectives on European Decision Making.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kogan, M. (1988). *Education accountability. An analytic overview*. London: Hutchinson.

Kogan, M. (2002). National Characteristics and Policy Idiosyncrasies. In Enders, J. & Fulton, O. (eds.). *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations. A Festschrift in Honour of Ulrich Teichler*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Kogan, M. & Bauer, M. (2000). "Higher education policies. Historical overview". In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. *Transforming higher education. A comparative study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M. & Henkel, M. (2000). "Future directions for higher education policy research". In Schwarz, S. & Teichler, U. (eds.). *The institutional basis of higher education research*. Experiences and perspectives. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 25-44.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming higher education. A comparative study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Maassen, P. (1996). *Governmental steering and the academic culture. The intangibility of the human factor in Dutch and German universities.* Utrecht: De Tijdstroom.

Maassen, P. (2003). "Shifts in governance arrangements. An interpretation of new management structures in higher education". In: Amaral, A., Meek, V.L. & Larsen, I.M. (eds.). *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 31-53.

Maassen, P. & Stensaker, B. (2003). "Interpretations of self-regulation: the changing state – higher education relationship in Europe". In: Begg, R. (ed). *The dialogue between higher education research and practice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Meek, V.L., Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. (eds.) (1996). *The mockers and the mocked: Comparative perspectives on differentiation, convergence and diversity in higher education.* Oxford: Pergamon/IAU press.

Oliver, C. (1992). "The Antecedents of Deinstitutionalisation". *Organizational Studies*, 13(4), 563-588.

Peters, B.G. (2001). *The Future of Governing*. (2nd Edition, revised). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Reed, M.I. (2002). "New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance". In Amaral, A., G.A. Jones, & B. Karseth (eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 163-186.

Røvik, K.A. (1998). *Moderne organisasjoner. Trender i organisasjonstenkningen ved tusenårsskiftet.* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. London: Sage publications.

Scott, W.R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. (2nd edition) London: Sage publications.

Stensaker, B. (2004). *The Transformation of organisational identities. Interpretations of policies concerning the quality of teaching and learning in Norwegian higher education.* Enschede: CHEPS/University of Twente.

Teichler, U. (2000). "Higher education research and its institutional basis". In Schwarz, S. & Teichler, U. (eds.). *The institutional basis of higher education research. Experiences and perspectives*. Dorndrecht: Kluwer academic publishers.

Thompson, M., Ellis, R. & Wildavsky, A. (1990). *Cultural Theory*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trommel, W. &van der Veen, R. (1997). "Sociological perspectives on Institutions and Neo-institutionalism". In Steunenberg, B. & van Vught, F. A. (eds.). *Political Institutions and Public Policy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

van Vught, F. A. (1989). *Governmental strategies and innovation in higher education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Vroeijenstijn, T. (1995). *Improvement and accountability. Navigating between Scylla and Charybdis. Guide for quality assessment in higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Wildavsky, A. (1991). "What other theory would be expected to answer such profound questions? A reply to Per Selle's critique of cultural theory". *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 14,355-360.

14

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE TRANSFORMATION TO A COGNITIVE CAPITALISM

ROAR HØSTAKER AND AGNETE VABØ

INTRODUCTION

In their book *Process and Structure in Higher Education* (1980/1992) Tony Becher and Maurice Kogan developed a synoptic model to characterise both the inner structure and the developmental logic of the British higher education system. This model saw a dynamic between external and internal values and interests and how they manifested themselves at the levels of central authorities, the institution, the basic unit and the individual academic. Our previous work on the higher education system in Norway, has found much of its fundamental inspiration from this book (cf. Høstaker, 1997; Vabø, 2002; Bleiklie et al., 2000). However, *Process and Structure* presupposes a particular relationship between higher education, political authorities and society that is now in rapid change. What we will offer in this chapter is an interpretation of the relationship between higher education, political authorities and society in the context of widespread social transformation in the direction of a "knowledge society" or a "cognitive capitalism". It is commonplace to observe that many of the recent organisational changes in the public sector in general and in higher education in particular are inspired by concepts taken from the private sector. We will, however, not limit ourselves to the emergence of a "new public management" but want to transgress "natural barriers" between private and public sectors by pointing to continuities in the development from the former to the latter.

The study of how organisational ideas and concepts travel from different types of organisations and across great distances has become a particular sub-field within organisation theory (Czarniawska-Joerges & Sevón, 1996; Røvik, 1998). However, the wider social processes leading to organisational changes are often missing from these studies. The way we will try to develop our topic is to sketch the changes in how capitalism has been regulated since the 1970s and see what kind of consequences these changes have for the way work is organised. At the same time we will try to outline the influences of new economic doctrines on the nation state and how it is organised and seeks legitimacy. This transformation of the state is then seen in

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 227-243.

relation to similar changes in higher education. Finally, we will give some pointers as to how the relationship between work and education is being remade. Higher education institutions seek legitimacy in new "social needs" and at the same time notions of what professional skills are needed have changed. When society changes, universities and colleges will change with it, but we do not subscribe to the notion that these changes relate only to what can be bought or sold on a market. Our task is simply to outline some general dynamics in the developments taking place and our frame of reference is Western Europe and, in particular, the continental traditions.

THE EMERGING COGNITIVE CAPITALISM

An important question for us here is how to characterise the economic "condition" in the Western world. In order to be able to understand the breadth of social relations involved in the economy, it is now quite usual to talk about different regimes of production for different historical periods (Aglietta, 1979). The current regime regulating production has been characterised as "Postfordist" and in recent years the notion of "cognitive capitalism" has been introduced to characterise a regime of production under which innovation and the accumulation of knowledge constitute the central economic force (Azaïs et al, 2001; Vercellone, 2002). Postfordism (or cognitive capitalism) is usually analysed as the opposite of the "Fordist" regime of production established in the first decades after the crisis in 1929. What characterised Fordism beyond everything else was the development of the factory system in the direction of mass production for a mass market. The workers had to be given viable wages in order to create a demand for goods. Few and standardised products gave economies of scale, while mechanisation and Taylorist work practices gave a steady increase in productivity. The factory and the assembly line were the images of what were thought to be efficient and modern. A central element of the Fordist regime was a sharing of the profits coming from increased productivity between capital and workers. Higher incomes thus fed the economy because they created a higher demand for new products. This mechanism has also been called the Keynesian growth model in which the task of the nation state was to produce different types of infrastructure and to support the economy by ensuring demand in case of a slump in the markets. This growth model ran into problems in the 1970s when both inflation and stagnation emerged at the same time in Western economies (Dockés, 2003: 156-160).

While the basis for the Fordist regime of production was a seemingly insatiable need for more goods that could contribute to the general increase of wealth in the Western world, the situation since the 1970s has been marked by market saturation and difficulties selling products (Piore & Sabel, 1984, ch.7). The 1980s gradually saw the emergence of the new regime of production. Due to market saturation, closer contact with the market and flexibility in production came high on the agenda

of producers. Many of these strategies were inspired by management principles developed by Japanese firms in the 1950s and 1960s. Notable here is the Toyota system (or "just in time" or "flow production") that presupposes a tightly controlled flow of parts downstream in the chain of production and a flow of information upstream. The emergence of stocks of parts somewhere in the chain was seen as a symptom of the chain not working properly. The intention behind flexibility in production and the reduction of stocks was to make the organisation *feel* the market demand at all times. There was also an emphasis upon the *worker's responsibility* for the quality of the work in order to avoid the loss of not only work-time and materials, but also machine-time (Coriat, 1991).

During the 1980s there was a massive import of Japanese management principles into Western management literature. They were sold under titles like "Total Quality Management", "Re-engineering", "Lean Production", etc.. Boltanski and Chiapello emphasise the importance of this literature for forming the world-view of managers at all levels. It generates the spirit of capitalism among those whose commitment to it is the most crucial (1999). For our purposes it is enough to point to the intention of tight control of production both *before* anything has been produced – quality assurance – and *after* it has been produced through an assessment of performance. Dependence upon a variable market is the main justification for flexibility in production leading to alternating periods of overload or underemployment. Although Japan lost its position as a "model country" in the 1990s, these management principles are still with us and have been moulded in their encounter with Western industrial practices. Another important source of change has been the development of new information technology, which has made it possible to gather large amounts of data in order to predict market behaviour and changing consumer preferences. While the relationship between market and production under Fordism has often been claimed to be "mute", Postfordist production is shaped in the image of the service sector (Hardt & Negri, 2000; Marazzi, 1997). The same information technology makes it possible to decentralise production in a way similar to the "cottage industries" of early capitalism. The factory is no longer a "place", but can be scattered all over the globe. Stronger competition for customers in the Western world has also led to a huge emphasis upon research and development, design, branding and advertising. Together with the informatisation of production and market contact this has led to the introduction of new types of workers – often called knowledge workers or immaterial workers.

TRANSFORMATIONS OF WORK

What do the changes in production regime mean for relations at the workplace and for the population in general? Many commentators within the field see Postfordism as a major transformation gradually changing both work and general life-conditions. The investment in information, knowledge and knowledge workers involves a major transformation in the way capitalism works. While Fordist production to a high degree took the market for granted and planned according to what was seen to be best for production, Postfordism involves an enormous flow of information (Corsani et al, 1996; Virno, 1991, 2002). The emphasis given to research, design and branding means that the cultural content of commodities is more important than before. Deregulation and the proliferation of (commercial) mass media have made it more possible than before to control the flow of communication in society (Corsani et al., 1996).

The manipulation of symbols, linguistic processes and other cultural content has given immaterial workers a strategic place. The distinction between material and immaterial work involves something different from the traditional distinction between manual and intellectual work. This latter couple involved a distinction between conception and execution suitable for the Taylorist form of division of labour in which all planning was given to the technical offices and all execution to the workshops. The concept of immaterial work involves a much stronger intellectual, cultural and symbolic stamp on the commodities (Marazzi, 1997; Virno, 1991; Corsani et al., 1996). The immaterial way of working forms a "template" that is closer to the artistic or intellectual way of working than traditional factory work. The Taylorised factory organised work by closely defining each worker's tasks and the worker was paid for doing these tasks for a given time of the day. Work was connected to a quantitative measurement of time. Other important elements of the Fordist regime of production were that the company guaranteed a quasi-stable employment while the nation state provided for education, health services, social security, pension benefits, health insurance and supported unemployment benefits. In this way social risks were moved away from both companies and workers. From the late 1960s, factory work came under strong criticism from the youth and student movements for being too stereotyped and boring. It was "alienated" and represented a kind of "social death". Compared to the freer artistic or intellectual ways of working, it was seen to be inauthentic (Querrien, 2004; Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999, ch. 3). Also among the workers themselves a critique of work conditions grew leading to absenteeism, slowness, sabotage and general unmanageability. During the 1970s

this growing problem with the "work ethic" became a concern for employers[69], and this refutation of work was probably one of the sources of the drive towards flexibility during the 1980s and a reinstatement of the "work ethic" through higher levels of unemployment. One aspect of the transformation to Postfordism is the tendency to adopt an artistic way of working for work that is not completely standardised. The main aim of using the new way of organising work is to exploit the creativity of the worker. Companies have in this way co-opted the arguments of their one-time opponents (Querrien, 2004; Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999).

What does this way of working imply? First of all it is organised as short- term projects for which a temporary group of workers is employed. The group has an allotted time and a budget to spend in order to achieve a goal and their efforts are assessed by their results. Work is no longer connected to "man-hours" or daily output. Only qualitative assessments are relevant. In between projects the workers have to maintain their employability and to try to increase it through experience from previous projects. In the same way as artists and intellectuals, immaterial workers have to "establish themselves" within a network of other workers and entrepreneurs (Querrien, 2004). To make and maintain connections, to work in the new way, has also been characterised as genuinely political or entrepreneurial. To follow through projects is similar to the activities of the politician and demands certain abilities to play a "power-game" and to persuade, to charm and to manipulate[70] (Virno, 2002). The new way of working opens up the path for the political entrepreneur managing and organising projects and constantly combining "odds and ends" to reinvent and create new formulae (Corsani et al., 1996). However, the new way of organising work and employment also involves a transfer of social risks to the workers while most of the gains of flexibility and productivity remain with the companies. Although this is not the most common way of organising employment in Western economies, it represents a template and project-oriented work is more and more common even for workers with stable employment.

It is easy to dismiss the new way of working on quantitative grounds. Even with a wide definition of "worker", only a small minority of the workforce may be characterised as Postfordist in the sense that their work can be described as "artistic", "intellectual", "political" or "entrepreneurial". According to a Norwegian survey, for

[69] For a discussion of absenteeism and new strategies to overcome it in the 1970s, see Sennett (1979).

[70] The inspiration for this interpretation is a rereading of Max Weber's *Politik als Beruf* where Weber describes the abilities of the genuine politician as combining both passionate commitment to a cause and a certain distance to objects and people - even to himself. To seek power is a natural part of politics and is just a means to further the cause (1971:546-547).

instance, somewhat more than one out of ten employees are post-industrial in that the work they do is project-, team- and computer-based, they work at home, and they have flexible work hours and the freedom to decide when to take time off (Rønning, 2002). Such features are mainly a characteristic for higher educated males working in academia, administrative leaders or politicians. Although demands for flexibility have become more common, and employees with traditional work contracts are declining within many areas, it is argued that the image of the hypermobile work life is a myth (Dølvig, 2002). It is also said that the theories of post-industrial work life are too reductive and, besides, describe countries with less regulated labour markets (Ellingssæther, 2001). Descriptions taken from the USA (e.g., Sennett, 1998) cannot be transposed directly to a European setting. We will, however, argue that the changes implied by Postfordism are first of all qualitative and not quantitative. They make the system function differently, although many of the previous forms will often remain. The new way of organising work must be seen as a template that forms a point of reference for already established ways of working.

The new way of working is gradually transforming previous notions of "professionalism". The worker has to be open for most project opportunities that might open up within his/her field. Considerable time has to be committed to keeping oneself informed about "possibilities". Such activities are driven by a fear of being "left behind". Competition and exclusion take the form of a gradual decimation, and the intrinsic opportunism has been characterised as a habit of not having any habits. There is a stark contrast with both Fordism and the traditional public bureaucracies, since both these models of work implied that the worker was given some sort of identity he/she might embrace and make his/her own. The identity followed the job or the profession, while with the artistic mode of production the worker has to form it himself/herself. The worker has to be adaptable to different situations, but maintain a continuity of performance despite abrupt changes (Virno, 1991). Higher emphasis upon employability and flexibility has gradually changed the dynamic of the labour market towards multiple subtle, and some less subtle, lines of exclusion of some members of the workforce (Querrien, 2004: 256). The new work ethic and new work relations have also led to new expectations among employers of the qualities of graduates from higher education, and hence of prospective employees. Employers tend more and more to emphasise broad knowledge, good social skills and flexible attitudes among graduates. Graduates are expected to "shape, innovate and restructure tasks actively" (Brennan et al, 1996:8). Teichler and Kehm (1995) propose that the new work order is characterised (amongst other things) by teamwork requirements among experts in various fields, decentralised and participative management styles, blurring of clear hierarchies and divisions of labour and emerging new areas of expertise in knowledge work, social interaction, globalised operations, and information technology. At the same time there is a growing mistrust in tradi-

tional forms of higher education, on the grounds that they cannot "deliver the goods".

TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE STATE

Fordism grew out of the world crisis from the late 1920s and one of the key "players" in its realisation was the nation state. One of the tasks of the state in the period of Fordism was to guarantee the social peace through the redistribution of wealth between different layers of the population. In many European countries this took the form of a welfare state. Another task was to stabilise the economy between the ups and downs of the business cycles. Only in this way could the economy achieve growth without too severe disturbances, according to the Keynesian doctrine. Increased social spending and expansions of public projects were expected to keep up the overall demand. In the same way as businesses, public sector institutions relied on long-term planning and a growth in future public spending. This situation changed with the economic stagnation in the 1970s and the failure of Keynesian counter-measures. Since this period the role of the nation state has changed dramatically.

While the Fordist regime of production presupposed the nation state as a supportive frame, Postfordism is less connected to a specific territory. This deterritorialisation of capitalism cannot be pursued to the same extent by the nation states. Despite international co-operation and the development of new territorial entities like the European Union, a given territory is still the basis for a state. This territoriality produces a certain division in the focus of western states. On the one side these states contribute to the emergence of a deterritorialised global regime (cf. Hardt & Negri, 2000) and, on the other, they are supposed to represent the interests of a territorially defined people. The electoral basis of governments is still peoples that think of themselves as Dutch, French, Italian, Norwegian, etc. These electorates often find themselves under pressure from the deterritorialisation of economic interests (Marazzi, 1997). The collective national identities formed through centuries of nation building are less a resource for states in the current situation of globalisation. While the state under Fordism secured stability through national markets and the redistribution of wealth, these functions have lost their economic importance under Postfordism. In an economy based on flexible production adjusted to market changes there is no need for a reserve of demand in the public sector or among workers. Public spending and the redistribution of wealth are therefore easily defined as costs to be minimised (ibid.). Spokespersons for economic interests in the private sector are commonly among those most vocal for less public spending and hence lower taxes.

As a consequence of the changed economic regime, most Western European states have implemented programmes to reform and "modernise" their public sectors during the last 25 years. Many states have made severe cuts in public benefits and

parts of the public services have been privatised. However, the extent and form of privatisation vary a lot between countries. The principles underlying the reforms in the public sector are commonly termed "New Public Management" in the social science literature (Henkel, 1991; Pollitt, 1995; Kogan et al., 2000; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000), but this label covers a great range of different practices. We have previously characterised the new way of governing the public sector as a transition from *ex ante* control via budgets and regulations to different forms of *ex post* control of the goods and services produced by public service institutions (Bleiklie et al., 2000: 187). A better way to characterise the reforms is probably to say that in the same manner as flow-production the reforms try to make the difference between *ex ante* and *ex post* as small as possible. Public institutions have to produce goods and services related to some "need" in society – in other words to some sort of market. This market is, however, not always easily defined when it comes to public services. This has led to a great number of experiments to introduce quasi-market mechanisms and funding according to performance indicators, etc. An important part of these reforms has been to decentralise responsibilities, but at the same time monitor results. In this way there might be a flexible use of resources and, according to the doctrine, maximum "value for money" from goods and services.

These new public management doctrines are far from the traditional bureaucratic principles prevalent in the last two hundred years. In this latter tradition, at least in its continental version, the state has an active role in forming and controlling society, while in the current situation, it is society that is the source of legitimacy for public services. Continental bureaucracies were based upon a combination of centrally produced rules, hierarchical control and a professional ethic[71]. In many ways the management and definition of public services were delegated to the professions, while rules and hierarchy were to ensure the prerogative of government in relation to the different branches of the public services. However, the leeway for the professions could be considerable and the bureaucratic form of organisation presupposed a sort of trust in the training and breeding of the civil servant to maintain the government's interests close at heart.

The new situation has changed this to a considerable degree. Public services are seen not so much as an extension of the government's interests in relation to the population; rather they are supposed to gain legitimacy for their existence in the "needs" of the same population. The trust between government and public servants has vanished as the latter are seen to be furthering their own interests rather than those of the government or the population. Management doctrines have at last taken seriously the critique of bureaucratic forms of organising, which has been a feature

[71] Weber described the situation of the bureaucrat as a *Beruf*, i.e., a profession, but also a vocation in a quasi-religious meaning (1976: 551-556).

of organisation theory for decades. Some of this critique concerns the tendency to construct informal hierarchies that are often opposed to the formal one. Bureaucrats tend to make their own interpretations of rules, deviating from those of the leadership, and to amass resources locally in order to avoid excess fluctuations due to changes in circumstances (Cyert & March, 1963; Crozier, 1964; Gouldner, 1954). The conclusion that has been drawn is that hierarchical ways of governing work only to a limited degree. However, less hierarchy and a considerable decentralisation of responsibility do not necessarily mean a relaxation of centralised control – often the reverse. As with the new way of working, the efforts of public services are assessed according to results. Ex ante evaluation is made by assessing the quality of the staff and the execution of their work has to conform to predefined standards. Finally, the work has to be done within strict budgetary and time limits. In this way the time lag between *ex ante* and *ex post* control is minimised and public employees are given more incentives to use their ingenuity to fulfil the task at hand in the best possible way without "corrupting" the process. Tight control of the work process both before and after something has been done is, in many cases, a challenge to the traditional discretion of the professions, and they often experience managerial control as an encroachment on their capacity to do a good job.

TRANSFORMATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The transformations of the public services in most European countries have also had consequences for higher education institutions. In the continental tradition higher education is part of the public sector, and in the same way as other public services it was, according to the bureaucratic way of thinking, supposed to be a branch of the state in relation to the people. This holds true although universities and their teachers have enjoyed a considerable intellectual and organisational freedom. The legitimacy of higher education institutions was to a high degree connected to the fact that they were public institutions. The state guaranteed high quality of teaching and the right to carry out academically driven research. The whole bureaucratic paradigm entailed a strong belief in a transcendent state able to plan and foresee the needs of society. The present change in public management principles, however, entails a belief in the ability of society itself to decide what services are relevant and to what quality. Decisions previously taken in public sector bureaucracies will instead be taken in the marketplace or, if not, at a site very close to the "needs" of a client. The quality of higher education is what is at stake and it cannot be guaranteed by a third party.

The transformation from a bureaucratic way of organising public services and the emergence of a Postfordist regime of production have also had consequences within research and development. Gibbons et al. characterise this transformation in terms of Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge production. While Mode 1 knowledge pro-

duction is described as governed by an academic community, Mode 2 is carried out in a context of application. It is seen to be *transdisciplinary* as opposed to *disciplinary*, *hetereogeneous* as opposed to *homogeneous*; *heterarchical* and *transient* as opposed to *hierarchical* and *stable* (Gibbons et al., 1994). This description is similar to the project-oriented way of working discussed above. More recently, these authors have written about a Mode 2 society, which "speaks back" at the academic communities, while under Mode 1 knowledge production it was the academic communities that "spoke" to society (Nowotny et al., 2001). Although this typology tends to underestimate the presence of "usefulness" and "accountability" as continuing elements in research, it catches some significant aspects of the transformation of research. In the period of nation states science "spoke" to society in order to settle conflicts. It was the age of the expert or technocrat and a scientific argument was an efficient way to make the chattering multitude shut up (Latour, 1997a; 1997b). Furthermore, the natural sciences helped us to master nature, technology revolutionised the technical basis of our civilisation, the humanities told us who we were and, finally, the social sciences tried to solve our social and political problems. To fulfil these public functions the state guaranteed funding and a relative autonomy. The new relationship between science and society emerges with the redefinition of the tasks of the state, but it is a different society that "speaks" to science. Not only is it a society whose members are more highly educated and more knowledgeable than before (Nowotny et al., 2001), but it is a society that depends upon research and development to a higher degree than in previous periods. Many of the problems confronting our societies are more the results of the technical basis of our civilisation than an inability to master a distant and threatening nature (Latour, 1998; 1999).

From the point of view of political authorities, growth in higher education has changed the conditions of political control and management radically. The size of higher education budgets has grown from an insignificant fraction to a considerable percentage of national budgets. The transition of higher education from an elite to a mass system in North America, Europe and elsewhere meant that a system that for centuries catered to a very small share of the population, in the matter of four decades grew to encompass from 30 to 50 percent of each new generation (Bleiklie & Byrkjeflot, 2002). Within the new cognitive capitalism private companies, organisations and public enterprises increasingly demand researched knowledge and educated workers in order to fulfil their tasks. A growing and more differentiated need for formal qualifications has led to a demand for more flexible universities (Clark, 1998). Internationally universities in some extreme cases seem to emulate industries selling goods and services (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; see also Gumport, this volume). The belief in academic capitalism as representing a new era in higher education fails, however, to take into account how universities throughout history have served society. The content of higher education has always been subject to the inter-

ests of many different stakeholders. Among those we might list are students, academics in the different disciplines, the professions and their clients, spokespersons of industry and fields of practice and policy makers at different levels. The power balance between stakeholders changes over time. The challenge is to identify what societal processes trigger changes in the power balance and to understand how it actually affects the content of higher education (Kogan, 2004).

EDUCATION AND WORK

The social changes described above, connected to Postfordism, a new way of working and a transformation of the state, might be seen as parts of a general process of change in which separated realms of society become more and more intertwined. Both the bureaucratic ways of organising public services and previous ways of organising work presupposed a form of separation between different social arenas. These arenas had different orders and hence different rules governed their activities. The family prepared individuals for school and the school prepared them for work. But there was a gap between the rules governing each of them (Zarifian, 2003: 13-16). What was valued within education was often quite different from what was valued in the world of work. Nonetheless, candidates brought with them habits and attitudes that were useful. This is often described as a *hidden curriculum* corresponding to their future workexperience. In the new relationship between education and work this hidden curriculum becomes part of the official curriculum, i.e., a planned correspondence between the way of working and the specific curricular experiences of the students (Saunders & Machell, 2000). More explicitly work oriented processes like work related learning, work in teams, interdisciplinarity, specific projects, the development of social and communication skills are typical examples of the new elements which are now more effectively addressed in the socialising of students. The worker as a self-organising and self-inventing individual, but nevertheless regularly controlled, is imitated in schools.

However, it is important to bear in mind that the impact of the new way of working will produce many different outcomes since educational segments are linked to social structures and fields in different ways. We will illustrate this point by elaborating on a single case: the introduction of a new study model in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Oslo in 1996. A typical feature of the knowledge society is an increased level of educational attainment of the population, which is a development that also contributes to a decline in the authority of the classical professions. In the medical profession this authority is invested in the asymmetric relationship between doctors and patients. The knowledge-monopoly of the medical profession has been challenged due to the easy access for the public to medical information on the World Wide Web. Globalisation, and especially the integration within the EU, has dramatically undercut the old sovereignties and protections provided for professions by the nation state and the national community. Whilst a hospital tradi-

tionally could be seen as a relatively closed world with its own rules and governed by the medical profession, the hospitals and health care systems today confront different standards (Bleiklie, Byrkjeflot & Østergren, 2003). According to Meyer (2002) these standards might be carried by their "real or imagined clientele" who are understood to require treatment in light of the best practices obtaining anywhere. This development raises new challenges for the medical profession concerning how to handle their own knowledge and, furthermore, how to relate to patients with their own access to alternative knowledge about their medical conditions. The expectations of the patients have changed and to a larger extent than before patients prefer to relate to doctors who communicate well with them (Steine et al., 2000). Among medical practitioners, too, the quality of the communication between doctor and patient is now regarded as important for obtaining the information necessary to make the correct diagnosis and offer the right treatment. In Norway, the critique of the practices of the medical profession, put forward not least by the mass media, has led to an increased focus on the human aspects of medical treatment. This means not only improved communication with patients and their relatives but also the need for more collaboration with other professions in the health services.

Against this backdrop we can understand why the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Oslo in 1996 launched a new study model. The aim was to integrate preclinical and clinical subjects that were previously taught in separate phases by the use of problem based learning methods, taking medical problems as a point of departure for teaching, discussion and problem solving in small groups. An important vision behind the reform was to educate students to work independently, preparing them for a work-life that would require a continuous update of knowledge and skills. In addition there was a need to improve the skills necessary for good communication and contact with the patient and to adopt a positive attitude to the patient's own knowledge (Wiers-Jensen, 2004). The new study model hence tries to introduce a way of working that is more in line with the entrepreneurial or artistic way of working than the previous professional model based on the "skilled eye" of the doctor. Changing the examination system by removing grades and replacing them with pass/fail and the introduction of problem based learning methods were deemed important for the development of collaborative skills. This stands in contrast to the traditional socialisation of students into the competitive culture of the strictly hierarchical hospital organisation. New types of health management are characterised not only by ideas of increased competition and consumerism. The idea of hospitals as knowledge-based institutions with the need for blurred hierarchies, more interdisciplinarity and increased collaboration between different health plinarity and increased collaboration between different health professions is spreading.

In line with Kogan (1987) we argue that the actors involved and how they interpret new social needs can be examples of "internal constructions of external prefer-

ences". There are good reasons to believe that the actors promoting the reforms of medical study wanted to seem innovative and proactive in the view of the future changes. But one should not confuse the ideals of this reform with certain realities of the hospital organisation, for instance the new regulations and control systems introduced by managers. The tension it creates between professional autonomy and external control is one out of many paradoxes of the post industrial work life.

PROCESS AND STRUCTURE IN HIGHER EDUCATION – TWO DECADES LATER

An interesting aspect of the case cited above is that the restructuring of medicine came before many of its elements entered the national political agenda following the Bologna Declaration of 1999. During recent years the introduction of new lines of study, forms of teaching and forms of evaluation reflects the fact that the relationship between teaching, learning and work is under transformation in Norwegian higher education. These are changes that to some degree mirror a professional life demanding more differentiated competencies and client orientation, and are all quite obvious signs of a service orientation in higher education. But there are of course alternative interpretations. These suggest that vocationalisation or other adaptations are just ways for the disciplines or the professions to continue to do what they always have done (Vabø, 1994; Henkel, 2000). Whole traditions within the sociology of education are built upon a notion of reproduction (e.g. Bourdieu, 1988; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). To what extent the coming changes in teaching and learning are just such examples of non-identical reproduction is something that is open for the future to decide. Nonetheless, our assumption is that the changes in institutional context, clients, financing, etc. will entail tremendous changes for the institutions and the disciplines. They include, for example, how the establishment of the new (interdisciplinary) study programmes and programme-governing committees will diminish the relatively large degree of autonomy and power of the disciplines and basic units in controlling the content of the education offered.

In the book *Process and Structure in Higher Education* Becher and Kogan (1980/1992) offer a perspective on how external needs are to be fulfilled at all levels in the university organisation (from institutional to individual level) in order to protect internal academic standards and autonomy. However, the relationship between university and society has changed dramatically. The new form of capitalism emphasising flexibility and risk-taking, team- and net working, can be contrasted with the rigid hierarchical organisation of the old capitalism. Some aspects of these changes are visible at universities in both the new ways of socialising students and a number of organisational changes. The university department, which was in the postwar era the main organisational unit to ensure academic freedom, has been chal-

lenged (Henkel, 2000). Today, interdisciplinarity is regarded as a precondition for innovations and collaboration between industry and university and the overall "needs" of the knowledge society. For instance, at Norwegian universities we see attempts at regrouping and mergers of academic departments in order to better fulfil the needs of the new interdisciplinary study programmes. From an optimistic point of view these reforms can be interpreted as an adjustment to a knowledge society in which the disciplines have ceased to have a function (Latour, 1997b; 1998; Wallerstein, 2001). New creative combinations both within research and education can be the outcome. A blurring of boundaries between knowledge-based industries and research units is not necessarily negative. From a critical point of view, however, such developments may be said to diminish the degree of structure necessary for the development of knowledge for the common good. Another critical view is that the reforms are attempts by the institutions to "capture" and control the creative forces of their employees.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have underlined the current changes in the economy and in work-relations and connected these to changes in both the state and higher education. Cognitive capitalism must not, however, be seen as a universalising force making everything the same everywhere; rather it is a new sort of institutionalised dynamic in our societies. This dynamic is first of all an emphasis on society's immanent relations compared to the state's traditional role as transcendent in relation to society. All sorts of activities have to justify themselves in relation to societal "needs" in some way. This "market" does not have to be a market in a strict economic sense. The ascent of immanence has emerged as a way of solving the economic problems of the 1970s, and it has first of all manifested itself as a critique of hierarchy and alienated conditions of work. The liberation from hierarchy has, however, not abolished control and subordination, but it is organised differently.

The artistic way of working has become a new "template" for how work is organised. Work in projects is spreading even in areas with stable employment, although there might be some inherent contradictions in the present conditions. On the one side, the artistic way of working presupposes assessment by results in order to exploit the inventiveness of the workers, while, on the other side, general short-term modes of employment might lead to de-specialisation and hence a depletion of the sources of the same inventiveness. A similar result may be the case with an over strict enforcement of the principles of flow production, with too tight a control of work both before and after its execution.

Higher education is at the juncture of most of these social changes. New relations in work processes lead to demands for new skills among the candidates. Fur-

thermore, changes in the organisation of public services affect higher education institutions directly, while the changed role of the state affects the institutional legitimacy of higher education in a broader sense.

The challenge facing us is to develop further our relatively abstract theories of cognitive capitalism as presented in this article into conceptual tools for the empirical study of the driving forces behind change in higher education.

REFERENCES

Aglietta, M. (1979). *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience*. London: NLB

Azaïs, C., Corsani, A. & Dieuaide, P. (eds.) (date). *Vers un capitalisme cognitif. Entre mutations du travail et territoires.* Paris: L'Harmattan

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1980). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. (1st edition) London: Heinemann.

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. (2nd edition) London and New York: Routledge.

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

Bleiklie, I. & Byrkjeflot, H. (2002); "Changing Knowledge Regimes: Universities in a new Research Environment". *Higher Education*, 44, 519-532.

Bleiklie, I. Byrkjeflot, H. & Østergren, K. (2003). *Taking Power from Knowledge. A theoretical framework for the study of two public sector reforms*. Bergen: Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies.

Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, E. (1999): *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bourdieu, P. (1988) *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Brennan, J., Kogan, M. & Teichler, U. (1996) “Higher Education and Work: A Conceptual Framework.”. In Brennan, Kogan & Teichler (eds.) *Higher Education and Work*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities*. Oxford: IAU Press/Pergamon.

Coriat, B. (1991). *Penser à l'envers. Travail et organisation dans l'entreprise japonaise.* Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur

Corsani, A., lazzarato, M. & Negri, A. (with Y. Moulier-Boutang) (1996). *Le bassin de travail immatériel (BTI) dans la métropole Parisienne*. Paris: Éditions L'Harmattan.

Crozier, M. (1964). *The bureaucratic phenomenon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cyert, R. M. & March, J. G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. & Sevón, G. (1996); *Translating organizational change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Dockés, P. (2003). "Métacapitalisme et transformations de l'ordre productif" i Carlo Vercellone (sous la direction de): *Sommes-nous sortis du capitalisme industriel?* Paris: La Dispute:139-166

Dølvig, J. E (2002) “På vei mot en postindustriell økonomi? Endringer i arbeidslivsorganisering og kollektive forhandlinger”. Avslutningskonferanse NFR-programmet Sysselsetting og arbeidsmarked. Oslo, 26. september 2002.

Ellingssæter, A. L. (2001). “Tidsregimer under omforming”. In *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, årg. 42, nr. 3:347-372.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Society*. London: Sage.

Gouldner, A. W.(1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.
Henkel. M. (1991) *Government, Evaluation and Change*, London: Jessica Kingsley.
Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.
Høstaker, R. (1997). *University Life: A Study of the Relations Between Political Processes and Institutional Conditions in Two University Units.* Dissertation for the dr.polit degree, LOS-senter rapport 9707.
Kogan, M. (2005) "The Implementation Game". In Gornitzka, Å., Kogan, M. & Amaral, A. (eds.) *Reform and Change in Higher Education.* Dordrecht: Springer.
Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.) (2000). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
Latour, B. (1997a) "Socrates' and Callicles' Settlement – or The Invention of the Impossible Body Politic".In *Configurations*, Johns Hopkins University Press, vol.5, no.2, 189-240
Latour, B. (1997b). "Y a-t-il une science aprés la Guerre Froide?". *Le Monde* 18. January.
Latour, B. (1998). "From the World of Science to that of Research?" in *Science*, 208: 208-209.
Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.
Marazzi, C. (1997). *La place des chausettes. Le tournant linguistique de l'économie et ses conséquences politiques.* Paris: Éditions de l'Éclat.
Meyer, J. (2002). "Globalization and the Expansion and Standardization of Management". In Sahlin-Andersson, & Engwall, L. (eds.). *The Expansion of Management Knowledge. Carriers, flows and sources*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.
Negri, T. (2002). "Pour une définition ontologique de la multitude". *Multitudes*, 9, Mai-Juin, 36-48
Nowotny, H., Scott, P. & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
Piore, M. J. & Sabel, C.F. (1984). *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.
Pollitt, C. (1993). *Managerialism and the Public Services: The Anglo-American Experience.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Querrien, A. (2004). "Le capitalisme à la sauce artiste". *Multitudes*, 15:251-261
Rønning, E. (2002). "Jakten på den moderne arbeider". In *Samfunnspeilet* nr. 4-5. Statistics Norway.
Røvik, K.A. (1998). *Moderne organisasjoner: trender i organisasjonstenkningen ved tusenårsskiftet,* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
Saunders, M. & Machell, J. (2000). "Understanding Emerging Trends in Higher Education Curricula and Work Connections". *Higher Education Policy*, 13: 287-302.
Sennett, R. (1979). "The Boss's New Clothes". *New York Review of Books*, 22 February: 42-46.
Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
Slaughter, S.& Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Steine, S., Finset, A. & Lærum, E. (2000). "Hva er viktigst for pasienten i møte med allmennpraktikeren?". *Tidsskrift for den norske lægeforening*, 120:349-53.
Teichler, U. & Kehm, B. (1995). "Towards a New Understanding of the Relationships Between Higher Education and Employment" *European Journal of Education* 30, 13-132.
Vabø, A. (1994). *Universitet og samfunn: Et spenningsforhold sett i lys av yrkesrettingsprosessen*. Bergen: LOS-senter rapport 9405.
Vabø, A. (2002). *Mytedannelser i endringsprosesser i akademiske institusjoner.*Dissertation for the dr.polit.degree, Department of Sociology, University of Bergen.

Vercellone, C. (ed.) (2003) *Sommes-nous sortis du capitalisme industriel?* Paris: La Dispute.
Virno, P.(1991). *Opportunisme, cynisme et peur*. Combas: L'Eclat.
Virno, P. (2002). *Grammaire de la multitude. Pour une analyse des formes de vie contemporaines,* Nîmes & Montréal: Éditions de l'Éclat & Conjonctures.
Wallerstein, I. (2001). *Unthinking social science; The limits of nineteenth-century paradigms*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2004). *Skaper ulike studieordninger ulike leger?* Oslo: NIFU Skriftserie 2/2004.
Weber, M. (1971 [1919]) "Politik als Beruf" in *Gesammelte Politische Schriften*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): 505-560.
Weber, M. (1976 [Posthum]) Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie, Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, zweiter Halbband.
Zarifian, P. (2003). *A quoi sert le travail?* Paris: La Dispute/Snédit.

ANNEX

MAURICE KOGAN – MAIN PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

Higher Education and Research Policy

Becher, T, Embling, J. and Kogan, M. (1977). *Systems of Higher Education: United Kingdom*. International Council for Educational Development.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1980). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* London: Heinemann. Second Edition, London: Routledge, 1992.

Kogan, M. and Kogan, D. (1983). *The Attack on Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.

Kogan, M. and Henkel, M. (1983). *Government and Research: The Rothschild Experiment in a Government Department*. London: Heinemann.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1988). *Calling Britain's Universities to Account.* London: Education Reform Group.

Boys, C., Brennan, J., Henkel, M., Kirkland, J., Kogan, M. and Youll, P. (1988). *Higher Education and the Preparation for Work.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Cave, M., Hanney, S., Kogan, M. and Trevett, G. (1988) *The Use of Performance Indicators in Higher Education*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. Second Edition,1991. Third Edition 1997.

Kogan M. (ed.) (1989). *Evaluating Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Becher, T., Henkel, M. and Kogan, M. (1994) *Graduate Education in Britain*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Kogan, M., Moses, I. and El-Khawas, E. (1994). *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Kogan, M. (rapporteur) (1995). *Reviews of National Policies for Education - Finland Higher Education.* Paris: OECD.

Brennan, J., Kogan, M. and Teichler, U. (eds.) (1996). *Higher Education and Work.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

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

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

Gornitzka, A., Kogan, M. and Amaral, A. (eds.) (2005). *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Education

Kogan, M (rapporteur) (1971). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: United States*. Paris: OECD.

Kogan, M. (1971) *The Government of Education*. London: Macmillan and New York: Scholastic.

Kogan, M., with Edward Boyle & Anthony Crosland (1971). *The Politics of Education*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Kogan, M. & van der Eyken, W. (1972). *County Hall.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. Kogan, M. & Pope, M. (1973). *The Challenge of Change*. Report of the National Children's Bureau Conference held in l972. Slough: NFER Publications Ltd.
Kogan, M. & Packwood, T. (1974). *Advisory Councils and Committees in Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Kogan, M. (1975). *Educational Policy Making: A Study of Interest Groups and Parliament*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Kogan, M. (1978). *The Politics of Educational Change.* London: Fontana & Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Johnson, D. (ed.), Kogan, M., Ransom, E. & Packwood, T. (1980). *Secondary Schools and the Welfare Network*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Kogan, M. (rapporteur) (1981). Reviews of National Policies for Education, *Educational Reforms in Sweden*. OECD.
Kogan, M. and Bush, T. (1982). *Directors of Education*. Allen & Unwin.
Husen, T. and Kogan, M. (1984). *Educational Research and Policy: How Do They Relate?* Pergamon Press.
Kogan, M. (ed.), Johnson, D., Packwood, T. & Whitaker, T. (1985). *School Governing Bodies*, London: Heinemann Educational Books.
Kogan, M. (1986). *Education Accountability*, London: Hutchinson, l986, Second Edition, l988.
Bush, T., Kogan, M. & Lenney, T. (1989). *Directors of Education: Facing Reform,* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
Granheim, M., Kogan, M. & Lundgren, U. (1990). *Evaluation as Policy-Making: Introducing Evaluation into a National Decentralised Educational System,* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Kogan, M. (rapporteur) (1990). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Norway.* Paris: OECD
Cordingley, P. & *Kogan, M. (1990). In Support of Education: The Functioning of Local Government*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Kogan, M. & Tuijnman, A. (1995). *Educational Research and Development Trends, Issues and Challenges,* Paris: OECD
Kogan, M. (rapporteur) (1997). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Greece*. Paris: OECD

Health and Social Services

Cang, S., Dixon, M., Kogan, M. & Tolliday, H. (1971). *Working Relationships within the British Hospital Service*. Bristol: Bookstall Publications.
Kogan, M. & Terry, J. (1971). *The Organisation of a Social Services Department: A Blueprint.* Bristol: Bookstall Publications.
Kogan, M. (1978). *The Working of the National Health Service. Research Paper No.* l, Royal Commission on the National Health Service. London: HMSO, l978.
Henkel, M., Kogan, M. Packwood, T., Whitaker, T. & Youll, P. (1989). *The Health Advisory Service: An Evaluation*. London: King Edward's Hospital Fund for London.
Joss, R. & Kogan, M. (1995). *Advancing Quality. Total Quality Management in the National Health Service*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Kogan, M., Redfern, S., Norman, I. and Robinson, S. (1995). *Making Use of Clinical Audit.* Open University Press.

Government and Politics

Kogan, D. & Kogan, M. (1982). *The Battle for the Labour Party*, London: Fontana and Kogan Page.
Cave, M., Kogan, M. & Smith, R. (1990). *Output and Performance Measurement in Government: The State of the Art,* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1990.

Hawkesworth, M. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, London and New York: Routledge. Second edition, 2004.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS (ARTICLES, CHAPTERS IN BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS)

Higher Education and Research Policy

Kogan, M. (1969) "Audit, Control and Freedom". *Higher Education Review*, Spring.

Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1979). "Process and Structure in the Higher Education System". In *Research into Higher Education, Process and Structures*. Stockholm: Swedish National Board of Universities and Colleges.

Kogan, M., Korman, N. & Henkel, M. (1980). *Government's Commissioning of Research: A Case Study*. Uxbridge: Department of Government, Brunel University.

Henkel, M. & Kogan, M. (1981). *The DHSS Funded Research Units: The Process of Review*. Uxbridge: Department of Government, Brunel University.

Kogan, M. (1984) "Higher Education as a Political System". In Clark, B. R. (ed.). *Systems of Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kogan, M. (1984) "Implementing expenditure cuts in British higher education". In Premfors, R. (ed.). *Higher Education Organisation.* Almqvist & Wicksell International.

Kogan, M. (1985) "The Expectations of Higher Education Project". In Jaques, D. & Richardson, J. (eds.). *The Future for Higher Education.* SRHE & NFER-Nelson, 1985

Kogan, M. (1988). "Government and the Management of Higher Education". *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education,* 12(1).

Kogan, M. (1988). "Policy Studies in Higher Education: Getting an Agenda Together". *Higher Education Policy,* 1(3).

Kogan, M. (1989). "Managerialism in Higher Education". In Lawton, D. (ed.). *The Education Reform Act: Choice and Control*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Cave, M., Hanney, S. and Kogan, M. (1990). "The Scope and Effects of Performance Measurement in British Higher Education". In Dochy, F., Segers, M. & Wijnen, W. (eds.). *Management Information and Performance Indicators in Higher Education: An International Issue*. Assen/Maastricht:Gorcum.

Kogan, M. (1990). "Policy Making and Evaluation in Higher Education", *Higher Education Policy*, 3(4).

Kogan, M. (1992). "Disciplinary Perspectives : Political Science". In Clark, B. R. & Neave, G. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Oxford: Pergamon.

Henkel, M. & Kogan, M. (1993). "Research Training and Graduate Education: The British Macro Structure". In Clark, B. R. (ed.) *The Research Foundations of Graduate Education: Germany, Britain, France, United States, Japan.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kogan, M. (1994). "Assessment and Productive Research". *Higher Education Quarterly,* 48(1).

Kogan, M. (1991). "Quality Evaluation and Improvement: The Case of the United Kingdom". In *SCRE-Action*, No. 96,1991/4. Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents and Vice-Chancellors

Kogan, M. (1996). "Comparing Higher Education Systems". *Higher Education,* 32: 395-402.

Kogan, M. (1997). "Diversification in Higher Education: Differences and Commonalities". In *Minerva* XXV(1):47-52.

Kogan, M. (1997). "An Agenda for Research and Policy Analysis". *Tertiary Education and Management,* 3(3).

Kogan, M. & Henkel, M. (1998). "The impact of policy changes on the academic profession in England". *The European Review,* Autumn.

Kogan, M. (1998). "University-State Relationships". *Higher Education Management,* 10(2): 121-135.

Kogan, M. (1998). “Knowledge about Higher Education for its Different Stake-holders”. In Leitner, E. (ed.). *Educational Research on Higher Education Reform in Eastern and Central Europe*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang: 23-39.
Kogan, M. (1999). “The Culture of Academe”. *Minerva,* 37: 63-74
Kogan, M. (1999). “ The Academic-Administrative Interface”. In Henkel, M. & Little, B. (eds.). *Changing Relations between Higher Education and the State*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Kogan, M. & Henkel, M.(2000). “Future Directions for Higher Education Policy. Getting Inside: Policy Reception of Research”. In Teichler, U. (ed.). *The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research* Dordrecht: Kluwer: 25-44.
Kogan, M. (2000). “Higher Education Communities and Academic Identity”. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 54(3), 207-216 and in McNay, I. (ed.) *Higher Education and Its Communities.* Buckingham: SRHE-Open University Press, 29-37
Kogan, M. (2000). “Lifelong Learning in the UK”. *European Journal of Education,* 35(3).
Kogan, M. & Healy, C. (2000) *Non-Official Higher Education in the UK* . In Kokosolakis, N. (ed.) *Non-Official Higher Education in the European Union*. Penteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Athens: 315-386.
Healy, C., Henkel, M. & Kogan, M. (2000). *Lifelong Learning and the University in the UK.* Uxbridge: CEPPP, Brunel University.
Henkel, M., Hanney, S., Kogan, M., Vaux, J. & Von Walden Laing, D. (2000). *Academic Responses to the UK Foresight Initiative. Research Report.* Uxbridge: CEPPP, Brunel University.
Kogan, M. (2001). “Lifelong Learning and Power Relations and Structure”. *European Journal of Education* 36(3), 351-360.
Kogan, M. (2002). “National Characteristics and Policy Idiosyncrasies”. In Enders, J. & Fulton, O. *Higher Education in a Globalising World: International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 39-52.
Hanney, S., Gonzalez-Block, M., Buxton, M. & Kogan, M. (2003). “The utilisation of health research in policy-making: concepts, examples and methods of assessment” *Health Research Policy and Systems,* 1(2).
Kogan, M. (2004). “Teaching and Research: Some Framework Issues”. *Higher Education Management and Policy,* 16(2), 9-18.
Kogan, M. (2005). “Modes of knowledge and patterns of power”. *Higher Education,* 44(1).

Education

Kogan, M. (1971). “English Primary Schools: A Model of Institutional Innovation”. In Green, T. (ed.) *Educational Planning in Perspective*. Futures, IPC. .
Kogan, M. (1973). “The Plowden Committee on Primary Education”. In Chapman, R. (ed.), *The Role of Commissions in Policy Making*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Kogan, M. (1974). “Participation and Institutional Discretion”. In *Participatory Planning in Education.* Paris: OECD.
Kogan, M. (1975). “Institutional Autonomy and Public Accountability”. *Journal of the British Educational Administration Society.*
Kogan, M. (1976). “Dispersal in the Ealing Local Education Authority Schools' System”. Report to Race Relations Board.
Kogan, M. (1977). “Obstacles to Inter-Sectoral and Social Planning”. In *Inter-Sectoral Educational Planning*. Paris: OECD.
Kogan, M. (1978). “The Impact and Policy Implications of Monitoring Procedures”. In Becher, A. & Maclure, S. (eds.). *Accountability in Education*, Slough: NFER.
Kogan, M. (1979). *An Appraisal of Country Educational Policy Reviews.* Paris: OECD.
Kogan, M. (1981). “Education in Hard Times”. In Hood, C. (ed.), *Big Government in Hard Times*. Martin Robertson.

Kogan, M. (1982). *Legitimating Educational Policy: The Use of Special Committees in Formulating Policies in the USA and the UK*. Stanford: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University.
Kogan, M. (1983). "The Case of Education". In Young, K. (ed.) *National Interest and Local Government*. London: Heinemann, l983.
Kogan, M. (1983). "The Central-Local Government Relationship: A Comparison Between the Education and Health Services". *Local Government Studies*, January/ February.
Kogan, M. (1984). "Curriculum Innovation: the Impact of Central Government Initiatives". *Secondary Education Journal (The Future of Curriculum Development),* 14(3)
Kogan, M. (1987). "Education". In Parkinson, M. (ed.) *Reshaping Local Government*. Policy Journals, Transaction Books.
Kogan, M. (1987). "The Plowden Report Twenty Years on". *Oxford Review of Education*, 13(1).
Kogan, M. & Mann, J. (1989). "Education". In Jackson, P. & Terry, F. (eds.) *Public Domain*. London: Public Finance Foundation with Peat, Marwick, McLintock.
Kogan, M. (1989). "Accountability and Teacher Professionalism". In Carr, W. (ed.) *Quality in Teaching*. London: Falmer Press.
Kogan, M. (1991). "At the Education Ministry". In Gold, A. (ed.) *Edward Boyle. His Life by His Friends*. London: Macmillan.
Atkin, J. M. and Kogan, M. (1991). "Special Commissions and Educational Policy in the USA and UK". In Anderson, D. & Biddle, B. (eds.), *Knowledge for Policy. Improving Education Through Research.* London and Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.
Kogan, M. (1991). "Education: Problems and Constraints". *Political Quarterly*, 62(2) (Symposium on Issues Facing the Next British Government).
Gruson, P. and Kogan, M. (1992). "Education policy". In Hawkesworth, M. & Kogan, M. (eds.) Encyclopedia of Government and Politics. London and New York: Routledge, Volume 2, 670-681.
Kogan, M. (1992). "Corporatism and Accountability: The Case of Education". In Broady, D. (ed.) *Education in the Late 20th Century*. Essays presented to Ulf P. Lundgren on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday. Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
Kogan, M. (1994). "Researching the Powerful in Education and Elsewhere". In Walford, G. (ed.) *Researching the Powerful in Education.* London: UCL Press.
Kogan, M. (1995). "Politics and the Study of Effectiveness in Educational Systems: Analysis of Effectiveness as a Deciding Factor in Educational Policy-Making". In Trier, U. (ed.). *Analysing the Effectiveness of Education Systems*. Bern Symposium, National Research Programme 33.
Kogan, M. (1997). "Learning from Other Areas of Study". In Hegarty, S (ed.) *The Role of Research in Mature Education Systems*. Slough: NFER.
Kogan, M. (1997). "Education Management in Hard Times". In Mortimore, V. & Little, V. (eds.) *Living Education*: *Essays in Honour of John Tomlinson.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
Kogan, M. and Maden, M. (1999). "An Evaluation of Evaluators: the OFSTED System of School Inspection". In Cullingford, C. (ed.) *An Inspector Calls. OFSTED and Its Effect on School Standards.* London: Kogan Page Ltd.
Kogan, M. (1999). "Local Government and Schools". In O' Hagan, B.(ed.) *Modern Educational Myths. The Future of Democratic Comprehensive Education.* London: Kogan Page Ltd.
Kogan, M. (2004). "Education policy". In Hawkesworth, M. & Kogan, M. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics (Second Edition)*, London and New York: Routledge, Volume 2, 682-697.

Public and Social Policy

Kogan, M. (1969). "The Government of the Social Services'. *Charles Russell Memorial Foundation*.
Draper, P., Kogan, M. & Morris, J. (1970). *The NHS: three views*. Fabian Research Series 287.
Kogan, M. (1971). "Management Efficiency and the Social Services: a review article". *British Journal of Social Work*, 1(1).

Kogan, M. (1973). "Social Policy and Public Organisational Values". *Journal of Social Policy* 3(1).
Kogan, M. (1974). "An Over-Simplified Model". Commentary on W. A. Niskanen's *Bureaucracy, Servant or Master?*, London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

SELECTED CONFERENCE AND OTHER PAPERS

Kogan, M. (1969). "Social Services: their Whitehall Status". *New Society* 21 August.
Kogan, M. (1979). "Different Frameworks for Educational Policy Making and Analysis". Speech given at London University Institute of Education, 31 January.
Kogan, M. (1982). "Expectations of Higher Education'". Paper given at Standing Conference of Employers of Graduates, Annual Conference, Christ Church, Oxford, 11 July.
Kogan, M. (1982). "Holding the Middle Ground: The School as a Responsive Institution". Paper given at Association for the Study of the Curriculum National Conference, 7 April.
Kogan, M. (1987). "Knowledge Criteria, Professionalism and Concepts of Excellence in Higher Education", Anglo-American Seminar on Quality in Higher Education, Princeton University USA, September 1987.
Kogan, M. (1987). "The Responsiveness of Higher Education to External Influences". Paper given at International Conference, Rosenon, Sweden, 1-5 June.
Kogan, M. (1991). "Changing Patterns of University Government". Paper given at School of Education, University of Bristol, February.
Kogan, M. (1991) "The Evaluation of Higher Education: An International Perspective" paper given at Swedish National Board of Universities and Colleges Open Day, 1 October.
Kogan, M. (1992) "Competition for Funding of Teaching and Research". Paper given at Reform of Higher Education Conference, University of Southampton, Department of Law. 1 July.
Kogan, M. (1992). "The Internal and External Functions of the University" in *Na Styrsystem for de Nordiska Universiteten*, XVII Seminariet for Nordiska Universitetsadministratorer 8-13 August, 1093.
Kogan, M. (1993). "An Agenda for Research and Policy Studies". Paper given at EAIR conference, Turku, August 1993.
Kogan, M. (1993). "Assessment and Productive Research. Paper given at Conference on Research Assessment: the Way Ahead, University of West of England, Bristol 22 June.
Kogan, M. (1994). "The Evaluation of Higher Education". Talk given at University of Oslo Workshop, 10 January.
Kogan, M. (1995). "Knowledge for Policy Making". Paper given at conference on the Role of Research in Policy Making, University of Trondheim, 15-17 November.
Kogan, M. (1997) "Staffing Higher Education". Paper given to Education Committee, Council of Europe, April.
Kogan, M. and El-Khawas, E. (1995). "Staffing Higher Education". Talk given at Conference on the Academic Profession, Villa Vigoni, October.

SUBJECT INDEX

AUTHOR INDEX

Higher Education Dynamics

1. J. Enders and O. Fulton (eds.): *Higher Education in a Globalising World*. 2002 ISBN Hb 1-4020-0863-5; Pb 1-4020-0864-3
2. A. Amaral, G.A. Jones and B. Karseth (eds.): *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. 2002 ISBN 1-4020-1078-8
3. A. Amaral, V.L. Meek and I.M. Larsen (eds.): *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* 2003 ISBN Hb 1-4020-1575-5; Pb 1-4020-1586-0
4. C.W. Barrow, S. Didou-Aupetit and J. Mallea: *Globalisation, Trade Liberalisation, and Higher Education in North America*. 2003 ISBN 1-4020-1791-X
5. S. Schwarz and D.F. Westerheijden (eds.): *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. 2004 ISBN 1-4020-2796-6
6. P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill and A. Amaral (eds.): *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* 2004 ISBN 1-4020-2815-6
7. A. Welch (ed.): *The Professoriate*. Profile of a Profession. 2005 ISBN 1-4020-3382-6
8. Å. Gornitzka, M. Kogan and A. Amaral (eds.): *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Implementation Policy Analysis. 2005 ISBN 1-4020-3402-4
9. I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.): *Governing Knowledge*. A Study of Continuity and Change in Higher Education – A Festschrift in Honour of Maurice Kogan. 2005 ISBN 1-4020-3489-X