

The Changing Role of Academics and the Rise of Managerialism

Abbey Hyde, Marie Clarke and Jonathan Drennan

1 Introduction

In this review, we situate the changing role of academics within existing national and international literature on the topic. We consider how the traditional model of a university has evolved in the light of recent shifts in the character of higher education institutions under the influence of the private business-sector model. Whilst higher education has arguably always been in transition, this business-like model, known as managerialism, has been the subject of scholarly debates in educational discourse and is linked to wider societal shifts and political ideologies such as the rise of neo-liberalism and the Evaluative State, concepts that will be clarified in the course of this review. In particular, a genre of theoretical and empirical work has emerged that considers the implications of managerialism on academic activities, particularly the diversification of academic work, changes in the control over academic work and the loss of professional power of academics, as well as the impact of managerialism on the nature of teaching and research. At a discursive level, as will become clear as the chapter unfolds, there is a sense of crisis in academia. However, the manner in which academics have actually responded to the alleged crisis, and how they make sense of recent changes as captured in empirical ‘micro’ studies in specific social locations will also be considered.

2 The Traditional Model of a University

At the heart of the debate about the loss of autonomy of academics are notions about the purpose of a university education. The central functions of the university, broadly agreed upon in the literature, are to educate (knowledge transfer), to undertake

A. Hyde (✉) · M. Clarke · J. Drennan
University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
e-mail: abbey.hyde@ucd.ie

research (knowledge production), and to provide a service to the community (using the knowledge base for the greater good of the society; Smeenk et al. 2009). Although universities are generally acknowledged to be amongst the most stable and change-resistant institutions in industrially developed societies with a long history dating back to the medieval period (Smeenk et al. 2009), recent transformations are in progress that share a number of recognisable features.

Whilst it is important not to oversimplify how universities operated in the period prior to the advent of managerialism, they are broadly viewed as having been democratic institutions governed by academics and were protected from direct state regulation (Olssen 2002). Drawing on the writings of John Stuart Mill (1965), Olssen notes that as representative institutions, part of their role was to keep check on central state authority, to foster active citizenship, and to encourage diversity of opinion in an open and transparent environment (Olssen 2002, p. 16). Olssen (2002) reflects on John Stuart Mill's (1965) notion that a representative democracy not alone permits types of participation in public discourses that are educative, but also, at the level of institutions, guards against the negative effects of centralism.

Traditionally, academics were regulated through collegial governance, and according to some commentators, had a particular style of conducting their affairs and making decisions that contrasts with that associated with the private business sector (Scott 2002). Scott describes this as allowing for "... more give and take, more discussion, more commitment to the exchange of ideas, and more respect for differences" (p. 4). The process of interaction is underpinned by deliberation rather than speed, she notes. The scientific capital (wherewithal that enables an individual to make noticed achievements; Bourdieu 2004) deriving from their intellectual endeavours has meant that academics have traditionally not been an easy lot to manage, and as Dearlove (2002, p. 267) has observed, they "recognise no boss ..." and have shown little interest in collective action as they "grumble about the demands [the wider university] makes on 'their' time and the problem of parking".

3 Towards Managerialism in Higher Education: The Rise of Neo-Liberalism and the Evaluative State

There is a general consensus in the literature that at a broad level, European universities have increasingly begun to adopt a working culture and ethos traditionally found in the private business sector, a development that has had a longer tradition in the USA (Smeenk et al. 2009). Whilst Smeenk et al. (2009) date the arrival of the market model of Higher Education in Europe to the late 1990s, in some countries aspects of the model were rolling out much earlier; indeed, Enders and Musselin (2008) note that the extra-scientific relevance of academic research, for example in industry and healthcare, have always been part of the academic world, but that entrepreneurial academic work has become more prevalent since the 1960s. Furthermore, Neave (1988) notes that a concept referred to as the Evaluative State—a

precursor to the market model in universities—has been circulating in educational scholarship since the late 1980s. Thus, whilst there is broad agreement that third level institutions are experiencing a new kind of scrutiny, the reasons why this arose and the pace of its roll-out across Europe has varied. Neave (1998) roots the genesis of the Evaluative State primarily to European political ideas in the case of France, Sweden, and Belgium, and later in Spain, and by contrast, largely to the influence of US economic discourses in the case of Britain and the Netherlands.

Reasons for this shift from the traditional model to a managerialist one in the higher education (HE) sector have been well documented and include fiscal restraints, increasing emphasis on quality and accountability, the ‘massification’ of HE, and its decentralisation (Smeenk et al. 2009). This trend is not unique to HE, being also a feature of public sector areas such as the health services (McDonnell et al. 2009, p. 51), and is associated with ‘New Public Management’ (NPM), a concept strongly linked to ‘neo-liberalism’ and ‘economic rationalism’ (see Olssen 2002). The move towards managerialism has also been linked to the concept of the Evaluative State referred to earlier. Let us explore these notions of neo-liberalism and the Evaluative State as they apply to changes in higher education.

Olssen (2002) notes that whilst neo-liberal theories purport to safe-guard the freedom and agency of the individual whilst limiting the power and control of the state, in reality, they operate in a contradictory manner. Whilst they attempt to rescind the welfare state and position themselves within anti-statist discourses, nonetheless, neo-liberal practices are contemporaneously prescriptive and controlling in their activities. In addition, a defining feature of neo-liberalism is that markets are invoked as a control mechanism through state power and envelop traditionally non-economic spheres (Olssen 2002). Mayo (2009) identifies neo-liberal tenets in the European Union (EU) discourse on higher education over the past number of years as evidenced in a number of communiqués and associated documentation, although he notes that these have been invoked at various paces in different countries. Mayo’s analysis suggests that the adoption of neo-liberal policies within Europe is driven by competitiveness and the EU aspiration to improve its economic position vis-à-vis the United States and Asia and achieve a dominant position in the ‘knowledge economy’ (p. 89). An aspect of the means to achieve ‘a much desired supremacy in the global knowledge economy’ (Mayo 2009, p. 9) is to get European academics working together towards this common goal. Thus, the ‘social Europe’ of student and faculty exchanges through programmes such as Erasmus, Leonardo, and Socrates that ostensibly contrast with the detachment and self-serving motives associated with neo-liberalism are, Mayo suggests, a smokescreen for the real objective of consolidating European power in the global economy. This ‘Europeanisation’ differs from another concept in recent EU discourse on higher education, namely ‘internationalisation’. The latter concerns attracting high-calibre non-EU students who in many instances bring with them substantial fees and facilitate European universities to increase their rankings in the international league tables such as the QS World University Rankings, particularly relative to their US rivals. Another related aspect of EU discourse on higher education, Mayo purports, is the imperative to enhance partnerships between higher education and the business sector. The

implications of this for the type and status of knowledge developed will be taken up in a later section.

The Evaluative State refers to a complex set of ideologies and the shift from the historic ‘routine and maintenance modes of evaluation’ (Neave 1998, p. 267), to a more strategic type of evaluation focused on the appraisal of outcomes. Thus, the product rather than the process is subjected to scrutiny, and higher education ‘steered’ in line with national economic priorities (1988, p. 10). However, this shift does not represent a simple top-down direct imposition of state power; how the state exercises its power within the higher education sector is complex, because as Neave (1998) argues, it “[also] steers *by directly manipulating or adjusting the responsibilities assigned to intermediary bodies* and, in certain instances, abolishing or creating agencies of surveillance [*italics in original*]” (1998, p. 281). An ironic complexity of the Evaluative State is that individual institutions enjoy increased levels of self-regulation and institutional autonomy but are pitted in competition with other institutions to secure the limited resources available.

4 The Changing Role of Academics with the Advent of Managerialism

Managerialism, encompassing discourses and practices established in the private market such as corporate modes of speech, professional administrators, line management, and competition for resources, is now a feature of the entrepreneurial governance of the higher education sector in countries across Europe (see Kolsaker 2008). Additional features of this model are “a hierarchical differentiation of research funding, the increased importance of private funding, and students having to pay a significant share of their tuition” (Smeenk et al. 2009, p. 591).

Managerialist ideology may also be dissected further by considering its position on quality compared with that of a traditional academic perspective (Findlow 2008). As Findlow notes, managerial-audit constructions of quality prioritise “saleability, strategy, demonstrable usefulness of outcome ... and conformity to pre-set, transferable standards” (p. 321) whilst according to the liberal academic perspective, quality was judged in terms of “truth, engagement, accuracy and depth in relation to diverse contexts”. The industrialisation of academic work is exemplified by Muselin (2007) in the case of E-learning: with E-learning, she argues, teaching that was previously the personal exercise of an individual academic and amenable to adjustments according to the needs of specific student groups involves the co-operation of various individuals (academics and technicians) who produce set and standardized products and are separated from the learners. The need to translate operative processes into measurable outcomes and to facilitate harmonisation across Europe through mechanisms such as the Bologna process, Mayo (2009) proposes, have resulted in an increasing shift in power from the academic sector to the bureaucratic sector. Whilst the two ideologies, traditional and managerialist, are frequently con-

trasted and defined in opposition to one another, Fanghanel (2007) has noted that the two have more recently appeared in official British government texts as complementary rather than contradictory educational aspirations. This, she argues, is evident in the repetitive use of the collocation of the terms ‘social and economic’ in official texts on tertiary education as though they were collectively un-problematic. We will revisit the extent to which degrees of traditionalism and managerialism co-exist when considering empirical studies of academics a little further on. First though, we consider the changing role of academics in relation to the increasing diversification of their work; the increasing control over their activities and loss of professional power; and the impact of increased managerialism on teaching innovation and the substance of their disciplinary knowledge.

4.1 The Increasing Diversification of Academic Work

To varying degrees, depending on the country and institution, academic tasks in general have become increasingly diverse (Musselin 2007). Whilst it might be argued that academics have always engaged in a range of activities including academic administration, Musselin notes that, in the past, academic tasks might crudely be divided into teaching and research, and even if the emphasis on one or other gave rise to two different career pathways, the central activities of academics constituted teaching in classrooms and writing in academic journals. Whilst many were also involved in additional endeavours as ‘outside’ activities, these were optional and not seen as part of their work. However, in the current period, management skills have become part and parcel of the expectation of the role and diverse activities characterise the role. The requirement now is that senior academics engage in activities such as proposal writing, bidding for funding, seeking collaborative partners, and arranging patents and technology transfers (Musselin 2007). Promotion to senior posts increasingly requires not just evidence of academic writing (the merits of which are increasingly being judged by quantitative ratings of impact rather than their inherent level of scholarship), but also evidence of leading research teams and organising the activities of others. ‘Teaching’ has also become more diverse and includes embracing teaching technologies and arranging student placements as aspects of that role. Musselin also draws attention to ‘third mission’ aspects of the revised role of academics, a mission that concerns making links with various bodies and decision makers at national and international levels, networking with other academics, engaging in public discourses, and dovetailing with public policy.

Musselin (2007) links the diversification of tasks within academia to the specialisation of academic work. Within scientific disciplines, a division of labour has emerged, with early-career scientists engaged in laboratory work whilst their senior (and particularly professorial) colleagues do less actual science and more strategic work, namely, writing proposals, securing bids, processing contracts and so forth. One consequence of the specialisation of academic work in countries such as the

United States, the UK, and Holland, is the trend towards the fissuring of the professoriate into posts that are either teaching or research. This constitutes a move away from the Humboldtian tradition of the integration of teaching and research towards a more differentiated arrangement whereupon research and teaching are socially organised as two separate activities (see Mayo 2009). In addition to a division of labour according to one's location on the career trajectory, Musselin also identifies the trend towards allocating work according to contractual status, with teaching duties often assigned to part-time or contractual staff. In addition, she observes a trend towards employing mixed competency individuals (with both high-calibre research and management/administrative skills) to staff those realms that straddle academia and management such as technology transfer offices.

4.2 *The Increasing Control over Academic Work and Loss of Professional Power*

Identifying what characterises a profession is problematic, and various characteristics or 'traits' have been mooted over the years that attempt to capture what constitutes a profession and what distinguishes professionals from others. 'Trait theory' to which it is referred, has given way to more diverse ways of examining occupations, particularly in the wake of criticisms about the power and elitist position of the so-called higher professions and criticisms of the apparent objectivity of their scientific knowledge. Even before the advent of managerialism, the notion of the autonomous professional scientist disengaged from societal influences and external forces was criticised by social scientists theoretically associated with constructivist approaches to scientific knowledge (see McDonnell et al. 2009). This genre of work on the problematisation of scientific knowledge is complex and we will explain its substance a little further on when considering how the knowledge developed by academics is mediated by new managerial ideologies.

Whether professionalism has been defended or criticised, the concept is important since it is brought to bear in discussions of the changing role of academics. In addition, the impact of change on academics who educate all other professions has the potential to alter the occupational socialisation process and shape professional discourses across a range of occupations. First, let us pause for a moment to consider how professionalism has been constructed by key writers in the field. Freidson (2001, p. 17) identifies a couple of 'elementary' though key features of professionalism, namely, the notion that particular work is so specialised that it requires a level of training and experience that makes it inaccessible to those without this, and that is it not amenable to being standardized, rationalised, or commodified. In addition, Freidson argues that, "It involves direct control by specialized workers themselves of the terms, conditions, goals, and content of their particular work" (2001, p. 60).

In Freidson's (2001) *Professionalism: The Third Logic*, he defends the autonomy of professions against vested interests, arguing that strategies such as copyrighting, patenting, and casting knowledge as 'intellectual property' (key features of manage-

rialism) undermine the basis for professionalism as an enterprise that enhances the common good. He postulates that these "... should be vigorously and unremittingly opposed, for it means impoverishing the public domain of knowledge and skill that is freely available for all" (p. 219). Freidson observes that the necessity of professionals to be independent of state control has been gravely undermined, and that "[p]rofessional ethics must claim independence from patron, state, and public that is analogous to what is claimed by a religious congregation" (p. 221).

The kind of issues highlighted by Freidson about professions in general have been taken up by those writing about the changing role of academics, the dominant view being that the professional autonomy of academics has been undermined by the recent changes. Managerialism, critics argue, is associated with a move away from the focus on the individual professional, instead imposing "a range of subjectivities that encourage individuals to behave in the best interests of the organisation" (Kolsaker 2008, p. 514). The primacy of the organisational goals over and above individual intellectual interests (ideally serving the greater good) and the concomitant surveillance and monitoring under entrepreneurial governance structures have come under attack. Olssen (2002) castigates managerialist reforms for the erosion of professional academic autonomy and freedom by turning academics into 'skilled entrepreneurs' who are expected to compete in the 'academic marketplace' by deliberately designing courses that attract students away from those of their colleagues. In the process, he argues, a regard for the intellectual merits of the programme is pitted against the need to dumb down standards and the appeal of the course to the requirements of the market.

The changes have also been framed in terms of the proletarianisation of academics, whose status and freedom is becoming akin to a salaried labourer (see Halsey 1992). Stilwell (2003) laments the manner in which academics are increasingly being commodified, whilst Doring (2002) cautions that academics in their altered role are in danger of becoming 'victims' of change rather than change agents, with detrimental effects on their enthusiasm for engaging with students. In a similar vein, Morley (2003) has focused on how the language of audit that has permeated academic work transforms academics into 'hegemonic tools' (reproducing a dominant ideology) rather than 'counter-hegemonic agents' (challenging dominant ideologies). Writing of the 'audit explosion', Power (1997, p. 2) posits that, "the senseless allocation of scarce resources to surveillance activities" impacts upon creative knowledge production. Controlling academics to engage in the monolingualism of managerialism, and keeping them "busy jumping through artificial hoops", according to Findlow (2008, p. 325), leaves little time for them to challenge policy and values, and ultimately "reduces the role of the knowledge producers in defining public knowledge" (p. 326). The development of such public knowledge is an important aspect of Freidson's (2001, p. 122) notion of the "higher goal [of professions] which may reach beyond that of those they are supposed to serve". Others have equated academic work under the reforms as an "academic assembly line" or "academic production line" (Parker and Jary 1995). Kolsaker (2008) spells out the increasing control over academics' work in Britain that began with the requirement

to record course content and define teaching and learning outcomes, and progressed to include the observation of teaching, explicit student feedback, and a research assessment exercise whereupon quantitative indicators are mapped onto research activity. The most recent development is a biennial survey requiring faculty to record their time in half-hour slots (Kolsaker 2008).

An important point made by Musselin (2007) in response to the outcry about the reduction in the professional power of academics is that the increase in control over academics has largely been exercised from within their own ranks. She cites activities such as promotional assessments, editorial board decisions, and research assessment exercises, all of which are academic led. What she argues, however, is that other instruments of regulation have sprouted up alongside peer control, such as institutional surveillance and national requirements that allow others in the public sector to monitor academic work. As Musselin puts it, “[t]here is a great deal of evidence that professional power often supports institutional power ... there is a global increase in the level and intensity of controls which are often enacted through the peer review process” (p. 6). Indeed, as we consider further on, whilst some researchers have found resistance to the managerial culture, others have found academics to be positively disposed to it.

4.3 The Impact of Increased Managerialism on the Nature of Teaching and Research

Whilst the application of managerial principles across the higher education sector has implications for academic work practices (as indicated earlier), it also potentially impacts upon teaching innovation and the type and status of knowledge developed within disciplines. Indeed, it has been posited that differences arise in terms of how knowledge is defined between the traditional value system within higher education and that of managerialism. As Findlow (2008, p. 318) notes:

New managerialism approaches knowledge as a finished product, packaged, positive, objective, externally verifiable and therefore located outside the knower. By contrast, an ‘academic exceptionalist’ ... view of knowledge places it in the minds of knowledgeable individuals, with the holder of the knowledge also the main agent of its transmission ... This kind of expert or ‘professional knowing’, closely related to conventionally acquired ‘wisdom’ ... is produced through an organic process between people in a culture of nurturing new ideas. The process is allowed to take as long as it takes, and knowledge is not seen as a finished product.

An example of how innovation in teaching is affected by managerialist values comes from Findlow (2008) in the case of England. Enhancement of funds for teaching and learning are made available there to address one of the national priority areas outlined by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE 2002); however, as Findlow (2008) argues, the ‘innovation’ being funded is that deemed to be in keeping with institutional priorities that are in effect also state priorities. The language of managerialism ripples through the funding documentation

calls, requiring academics who respond to sell themselves and their proposals in a similar managerialist light. Thus, Findlow argues, ‘innovation’ is already framed in the lexicon of efficiency and standardisation.

In relation to the impact of managerialism on the status of knowledge developed within disciplines, a key question is whether the application of a managerial model, with its intensification of surveillance, increased output control (Smeenk et al. 2009) and links with industry impacts upon academic freedom to create knowledge uninhibited by vested interests. De Vries and Lemmens’ (2006) critical analysis of scientific ‘evidence’ drew attention to the way in which studies funded by industry were more likely to produce positive results about an intervention (or selectively omit negative findings) compared with those funded independently of vested interests. This problematisation of scientific knowledge—claims that such knowledge is socially mediated rather than epistemologically certain—has emanated from a realm of social science scholarship referred to as the ‘Strong Programme’ (see McDonnell et al. 2009, p. 174) within constructivist approaches to scientific knowledge. Advanced by theorists such as Bloor (1991) and Latour (1987), the Strong Programme proposes that it is the scientific community that decides which knowledge claims become universal truths based on their own interests, and sets about ‘proving’ whatever wisdoms they wish to reinforce. They argue that the privileged status of scientific knowledge is culturally derived rather than emanating from some superior method for discovering truth.

It should be noted that the idea of scientific knowledge as essentially a closed system consistent with the dominant knowledge system of the day within the scientific community is not new; as far back as 1935, Fleck ([1935] 1979) identified this, and the problematisation of science was carried forward in the work of Kuhn (1962). Kuhn theorised closed systems as ‘paradigms’ that offered a particular worldview “in which problems are selected, and those educated and socialised within a scientific community follow a standard repertoire of methodologies and theories and, therefore, particular ways of seeing and interpreting the natural world” (McDonnell 2009, p. 173).

Thus, although the truth claims of science have for decades occupied the work of some social scientists, the renewed categorisation of standards of evidence that often determine success in research bids, privileging randomised-controlled trials in the recent period, raises new issues about the status of types of knowledge that academics are producing under managerialist discourses. Although evaluations of scientific quality have remained steadfastly within the scientific community rather than in the extra-scientific community (Enders et al., *in press*), external research-funding bodies often prioritise particular areas of research. In effect, this directs what research questions get asked and what knowledge gets created, notwithstanding the fact that, as we go on to consider, academics also find creative ways of following their own research interests. Nonetheless, prioritising particular modes of inquiry marginalises other realms of inquiry that are not deemed to be priorities according to the prevailing political discourses. In addition, the primacy given to some methodological stances over others in bidding for external funding reinforces particular perspectives on what counts as evidence.

The higher education sector has the potential to construct a range of forms of knowledge, including subjugated knowledge; indeed, arguably the creation of subjugated knowledge forms that challenge conventional thinking and that impact on dominant societal discourses has been a key outcome of academic freedom. The proliferation and construction of novel methodological strategies within some disciplines has come about by a critical analysis of conventional approaches to science. Moreover, questions about what counts as sound knowledge or what constitutes ‘evidence’ have traditionally been both determined and debated in university circles, notwithstanding that the ‘outside’ activities of some academics in the past, as indicated in an earlier section, served to build socio-technical networks that benefited their own scientific reputation (see Musselin 2007, p. 3).

Overall, the implications of managerialism on the university sector may be more far-reaching than simply regulating the work of what are believed to be work-shy academics; the characteristics and the type of knowledge being created within the sector may well be regulated, monitored and prescribed from outside, with far-reaching consequences for society, transforming scholars into ‘knowledge workers’ (Musselin 2007, p. 8).

5 Professional Socialisation Versus New Managerial Values: Empirical Studies at the Shop-Floor Level

The emerging picture in the literature thus far points to concerns about changes associated with managerialism, but to what extent are tensions felt between academics’ worldviews acquired during occupational socialisation in an earlier period, and work practices and values emanating from the reformed approach to work? If these values are indeed at variance with one another, then the possibility emerges of a loss of organisational commitment. The impact of increased managerialism on the job performance of university staff has been the subject of a number of empirical investigations (e.g. Leišytė 2007; Smeenk et al. 2009; Findlow 2008; Enders et al., *in press*).

Let us turn now to explore some of this work that provides insights into how the discourse of managerialism is played out in actual academic settings, particularly in relation to job performance and work commitment.

Smeenk et al. (2009, p. 590) set about empirically testing a number of hypotheses on the effectiveness of managerialism, taking into account both its direct effect on performance (‘direct effect argumentation’) and its indirect effect on the quality of performance mediated by organisational commitment (‘indirect effect argumentation’). Using a web survey that spanned six European countries conducted in 2004–2005, the researchers attempted to measure perceived level of managerialism, organisational commitment, and quality of job performances. Their findings challenged the notion of a ‘managerial contradiction’, that is that managerialism is counter-productive in bringing about the efficiency and effective quality to which it aspires (see Bryson 2004; Findlow 2008). Rather, they reported a modest positive effect of managerialism on the quality of performances. Smeenk et al. put

forward three possible explanations for their findings. The first and most simple of the explanations is that there is no conflict at all—management values are not inherently at variance with academic values. The second interpretation is that universities maintain their own character though adapting, negotiating, and modifying new management principles in line with their ethos. The third explanation of the findings is that universities are in transition, and any possible conflict may boil down to a suspicion of change that will dissipate over the years.

In Kolsaker's (2008) survey of English universities, respondents reported that managerialism augmented both performance and professionalism. In addition, the survey found that managerialism was believed by respondents to supersede trust between academic managers and academics, but not necessarily in a negative sense, as it ensured that academics are valued by society. With regard to professionalism, findings indicated that respondents accepted that external strategies of accountability were necessary to sustain academic professionalism. These findings are broadly at variance with the fears of managerialist pessimists leading Kolsaker to conclude that academics may be "more positive and pragmatic than much of the literature suggests" (p. 522). Kolsaker usefully draws attention to the sensitivities of time lapses in relation to her findings; sceptical commentators whose work proliferated in the 1990s may have been unnerved by the recentness of the shift towards managerialism; however, an acceptance of managerialism across various sectors in society may have signalled a level of acceptance of it amongst academics in the very recent period. Kolsaker (2008) refutes arguments of proletarianisation and demoralisation amongst the ranks of academics, and raises questions about whether managerialism and professionalism are actually incompatible.

The empirical findings of other studies (Findlow 2008; Kolsaker 2008; Leišyte 2007; Enders et al., *in press*) also suggest that academics carry on with their own affairs and play the game of managerialism at a formal level. Kolsaker (2008, p. 515) argues that although definitionally, managerialism constitutes a recognisable set of values and characteristics that confers privilege over one group (managers) to determine the work of others, in practice—as it is played out at the day-to-day environment—all social actors play their part in "bringing discourses into being ... relations are formed and reformed continually by a complex mix of personal, organisational and political variables" (p. 515). She proposes that managerialism has not spelled the disappearance of collegiality altogether even in the face of university reforms, but rather that new practices combine with older ones in complex ways. That there is some kind of mediation at play between new managerialism and university values as suggested in Kolsaker's (2008) analysis is also close to the possibilities nested in Smeenk et al.'s (2009) second explanation referred to earlier that universities adapt managerialism to their own circumstances. Drawing on empirical data from England, Germany, The Netherlands, and Austria, Enders et al. (*in press*) similarly indicate that academics adapt managerialism in ways to suit their own agendas. They found that academics were far from passive recipients of institutional change but rather tended to redefine their own ideas in broad terms to conform to research programmes that were likely to get funded. This practice of symbolic compliance was also found amongst academics in Leišyte's (2007) comparative case study of Dutch and English universities.

That recent changes in higher education have been received in a fluid way rather than by wholesale objection or acceptance, is also evidenced in Fanghanel's (2007) discourse analysis of academics' responses to a piece of institutional policy that incorporated both liberal and economic dimensions. How participants (based at a UK university) positioned themselves in relation to the policy was found to be fragmented, with individual participants at times concurring with the tenets of the text, whilst at other points distancing or taking issue with statements. The extent to which 'liberal education' aspects of the text were favoured over 'economic' components (and vice-versa), Fanghanel argues, are filtered through the individual academic's personal and professional experience, his/her views on the nature and purpose of knowledge, and his/her disciplinary socialisation. Thus, the agency of academics was brought to bear in how the document was interpreted.

6 Summary and Conclusion

Thus far, the general picture emerging in the literature is that of a profession in crisis, though moral panic about the situation is tempered by arguments that higher education has always been in transition, and in any case, a good deal of the increased regulation of academics is overseen by those within their own ranks via peer review. Whilst managerialist ideology is increasingly becoming a dominant discourse within universities, the extent to which it has superseded collegiality is debatable. Empirical studies indicate that managerialism has neither been wholeheartedly rejected nor accepted by academics, but rather has been received in a more fluid and haphazard way. It has also been acknowledged that there are variations in how managerialism has rolled out in terms of its timing, pace, and extent, in different social locations (Hood 1995; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2004). Even within the same country, cultural variations may be observed across universities (Shattock 1999), individual departments (Chan 2001), and in the attitudes of individual faculty (Davies 2007; Ylijoki 2003). Smeenk et al. (2009, p. 591) note that 'within variance' may be greater than 'between variance', that is those working in the same country or institution may construct and experience managerialism more differently from one another than do those across countries.

Musselin (2007) points to the lack of empirical data on how scientific knowledge and innovation is affected by the changes, whilst Kolsaker (2008) suggests that future research could expand existing knowledge by focusing on differences in academics' experiences in relation to discipline, degree of seniority, or particular management practices.

References

- Bloor, D. (1991). *Knowledge and social imagery* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity* (trans: Nice, R.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryson, C. (2004). The consequences for women in the academic profession of the widespread use of fixed term contracts. *Gender, Work, and Organisation*, 11(2), 187–206.
- Chan, K. (2001). The difficulties and conflict of constructing a model for teacher evaluation in higher education. *Higher Education Management*, 13(1), 93–111.
- Davies, C. (2007). Grounding governance in dialogue? Discourse, practice and the potential for a new public sector organisational form in Britain. *Public Administration*, 85(1), 47–66.
- De Vries, R., & Lemmens, T. (2006). The social and cultural shaping of medical evidence: case studies from pharmaceutical research and obstetric science. *Social Science & Medicine*, 62(11), 2694–2706.
- Dearlove, J. (2002). A continuing role for academics: the governance of UK universities in the post Dearing era. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 257–275.
- Doring, A. (2002). Challenges to the academic role of change agent. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(2), 139–148.
- Enders, J., & Musselin, C. (2008). Back to the future? The academic professions in the 21st century. In OECD (Ed.), *Higher education to 2030 volume 1: demography* (pp. 125–150). Paris: OECD.
- Enders, J., Kehm, B. M., & Schimank, U. (in press). Turning universities into actors on quasi-markets: how governance affects research.
- Fanghanel, J. (2007). Local responses to institutional policy: a discursive approach to positioning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(2), 187–205.
- Findlow, S. (2008). Accountability and innovation in higher education: a disabling tension? *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 313–329.
- Fleck, L. ([1935] 1979). *Genesis and development of a scientific fact* (trans: Bradley, F., Trenn, T. J., & Merton, R. K.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: the third logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halsey, A. H. (1992). *The decline of Donnish dominion*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). (2002). *Teaching quality enhancement fund: funding arrangements 2002–2003 to 2004–2005*. Bristol: HEFCE.
- Hood, C. (1995). The ‘New Public Management’ in the 1980s: variations on a theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2/3), 93–109.
- Kolsaker, A. (2008). Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: a study of English universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 513–525.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Leišyte, L. (2007). *University governance and academic research: case studies of research units in Dutch and English universities*. Enschede: CHEPS/UT.
- Mayo, P. (2009). Competitiveness, diversification and the international higher education cash flow: the EU’s higher education discourse amidst the challenges of globalisation. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 19(2), 87–103.
- McDonnell, O., Lohan, M., Hyde, A., & Porter, S. (2009). *Social theory, health & healthcare*. London: Macmillan.
- Mill, J. S. (1965). Principles of political economy. In J. M. Robson (Ed.), *Collected works*. Toronto: Toronto University Press
- Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Berkshire: Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) and Open University Press.

- Musselin, C. (2007). *The transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis* (Research and Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.4.07). Berkeley: Centre for Studies in Higher Education, University of California. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu>. Accessed 16 Nov 2010.
- 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*, 33(1/2), 7–23.
- Neave, G. (1998). The evaluative state revisited. *European Journal of Education*, 33(3), 265–284.
- Olssen, M. (2002). The restructuring of tertiary education in New Zealand: governmentality, neo-liberalism, democracy. *McGill Journal of Education*, 37(1), 57–88.
- Parker, M., & Jary, D. (1995). The McUniversity: organisations, management and academic subjectivity. *Organization*, 2(2), 319–338.
- Pollitt C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, J. W. (2002). The critical state of shared governance. *Academe*, 88(4), 41–48.
- Shattock, M. (1999). Governance and management in universities: the way we live now. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(3), 217–282.
- Smeenk, S., Teelken, C., Eisinga, R., & Doorewaard, H. (2009). Managerialism, organisational commitment, and quality of job performances among European university employees. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 589–607.
- Stilwell, F. (2003). Higher education, commercial criteria and economic incentives. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25(2), 51–61.
- Ylijoki, O. H. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education*, 45(3), 307–335.