TON KALLENBERG

11. ACADEMIC MIDDLE MANAGERS SHAPING THE LANDSCAPE BETWEEN POLICY AND PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions (HEIs) operate in a dynamic and competitive environment. They compete for subsidies from external funding and from the European framework programs; they attempt to win students from the national and international educational market, and they put a lot of effort into attracting and appointing the most talented researchers and teachers. Lastly, they are faced with an increasing necessity to improve the quality assurance and the design of governance structures. This dynamic and competitive environment gives HEIs an important and necessary incentive to reconsider the way in which they respond to their surroundings. Nowadays it is an open environment in which universities attempt to realise their objectives in a complex field that includes a wide range of stakeholders such as clients (students), competitors (other universities), employees, government and external parties (like corporations) (van Vught, 2001; Rowley et al., 1998; Taylor & De Lourdes Machado, 2006).

By means of strategic innovation, HEIs strive in a focused manner to position themselves with respect to their environment in a different (and improved) position. Strategic innovation is the development provided for a major new or significantly improved product, service, process or condition. For example: increasing the offer by starting new programs or specialisations; adapting the pedagogical approach by changing the educational concept; or by arranging the structures of the organisation more efficiently ('doing more with less'). In addition, terminating programs or specialisations can also be prompted by strategic reasons. This all occurs because HEIs are becoming providers of services and are developing themselves into a 'brand'.

The ability to anticipate the continuously changing environment in an adaptive and pro-active manner demands a lot from the HEI management levels. They have to think and act strategically. This, however, is not an easy thing to do. HEIs have a complex organisational structure in which the various organisational components have differing cultures and interests. The numerous management levels do not always know exactly what is happening within the other levels of the organisation. Strategic innovation processes are often influenced by a stubborn force field of involved actors, and as a result they not infrequently advance slowly or sluggishly. Therefore, the implementation of strategic innovations often proceeds laboriously

and does not always lead to the desired result (Leonard-Barton, 1992; Dougherty & Hardy, 1996; Floyd & Wooldridge, 1996). In other words, and popularly said: Changing a university is like moving a graveyard. Not entirely impossible, but don't expect any cooperation from within.

Being able to adapt to a constantly changing environment, and being able to anticipate the changes, demands the ability to think and act at a strategic level. This is based not only on the perceptions, values and competences of the top level managers but also – and possibly even more so – on those of the (academic) middle managers.

There are a significant number of scholars who suggest that middle managers make a worthwhile contribution to the strategic innovation of an organisation (Schilit, 1987; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Earley, 1998; Fenton-O'Creevy, 2000). These researchers draw their conclusions based on research in Business Administration. Whether and to what extent middle managers in HEIs also contribute to strategic innovation has barely been the object of research. Although the attention to academic middle management has increased in the last decade (Hellawell & Hancock, 2001; Hancock & Hellawell, 2003; Gallos, 2002; Smith, 2002, 2003; Clegg & McAuley, 2005; Ehrich et al., 2005; Santiago et al., 2006; Kallenberg, 2007; Mercer, 2009; Fitzgerald, 2009; Meek et al., 2010; Saengaloun, 2012), still no specific research has been carried out that focuses on which roles academic middle managers fulfil during strategic innovations. The present chapter does focus on that question. It subsequently deals with the position and perceptions of academic middle managers, the results of the survey for the roles of academic middle managers and the choices for the strategic innovations. Finally, the article will be rounded off with a discussion and conclusion.

STATE OF THE ART OF ACADEMIC MIDDLE MANAGERS

Because the expected role and the position of a middle manager are unclear, it is difficult to provide an exact stable definition of the term 'middle manager'. It is unclear what or where the limits of the middle manager are to be found. Furthermore there are many different types of middle managers. The lexical item 'middle manager' can therefore be seen as an umbrella term that can be applied to different officials. Higher education middle managers can be divided into administrative middle managers and academic middle managers.

The main focus of the administrator type is of a managerial nature, while the main focus of the academic type is teaching and research. Administrative middle managers are the directors and coordinators of staff departments dealing with educational support processes, and are not part of the present research. Academic middle managers are responsible for managing groups of academics and operate within the academic faculties. These are for example university professors who temporarily and possibly part-time take on this role, in addition to their role as researcher/teacher. There are various designations in the relevant literature for this type of function: academic Dean (Wolverton et al., 2001; Vieira da Motta & Bolan, 2008), academic

manager (Mercer, 2009), mid-level academic manager (Inman, 2007; Larsen et al., 2009; Nguyen, 2013), manager academics (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Castro & Tomàs, 2011), academic director (Kallenberg, 2013), or head of study (Harboe, 2013). In this chapter the academic middle manager is defined as the functionary who has overall responsibility for the curriculum of the degree program(s) within the boundaries of the organisation's central management (Kallenberg, 2007).

Position of Academic Middle Managers

Academic middle managers hold a complicated position in the HE organisation and have to deal with tensions between initiative and focus, functions, interest and control (ibid.). They are hierarchically positioned between the strategic and operational level. Due to this, academic middle managers balance various conflicting interests, for example the stability that academics strive to attain on the one hand and the desire for change that is preached at the strategic level on the other hand. Academic middle managers seek synergy to ensure that both levels better understand each other's interests and connect more effectively. They see to it that the degree program runs as smoothly as possible on an operational level, and focus on strategic issues for which they are responsible in terms of implementation. A second perspective specific to the role of academic middle managers is their position at the interface of the academic and the administrative zones. These zones have their own spheres of influence (academic zone: teaching and research; administrative zone: bureaucratic rationality) and they try to influence each other both formally and informally (Hanson, 2001). In this regard, some authors claim that we are observing the development of new professionals within the university (Whitchurch, 2004, 2008; Klumpp & Teichler, 2008). These new professionals are working in hybrid or blended positions and can neither be seen as part of the routine administration nor do they belong to the academic staff. Schneijderberg and Merkator (2012) describe an overlap between the administrative and academic roles, functions and tasks. Thirdly, academic middle managers are confronted with the distinction in importance between education and research. In principle, academic middle managers are responsible for educational programs and the way in which academics function in those programs. However, their faculty members are mainly evaluated on the basis of their research results, and hardly on their educational results. This imbalance by definition puts them in a difficult position to discharge their roles fully. In the fourth and final perspective academic middle managers have to find a smooth balance between hierarchy and collegiality. They have to find a balance between the temporary hierarchy of their administrative position and the on-going collegiality with their peers (Hellawell & Hancock, 2001; Hancock & Hellawell, 2003). Or as Meek, Goedegebuure, Santiago and Carvalho (2010, p. v) claim:

> [M]iddle-level academic managers are caught in the invidious position of merely occupying the no-man's land between implementing the edicts of their

executive managers and protecting the interests of their academic colleagues and placating their demands.

To conclude, the academic middle manager is placed in a paradoxical in-between position. Or, as an academic middle manager regularly told me: "You're damned if you do, and you're damned if you don't." and "You're in the line of fire, whether you want it or not." It should be noted that such a position is also characterised by a high risk, and a continuously increasing risk, of stress and burn-out (Gmelch et al., 1999).

The main characteristic of academic middle managers is that they are part of various information flows, all streaming in different directions: top-down, bottom-up, horizontal and diagonal. They are confronted with several constraints: they are hemmed in by various processes; there is an imbalance in role expectations and freedom of action; they are held accountable, but have no power; and leadership is expected, but they have to attain managerial targets. On the other hand, academic middle managers have a lot of possibilities. For instance: as a result of the information flows they know very well what is going on within their organisation (tacit knowledge). Middle management is the traditional level at which university policies and strategies are effectively translated into practices and concrete actions. This provides academic middle managers with a great starting point to influence the strategic innovations within an organisation.

In order to meet the set expectations, there are many competencies which academic middle managers have to display. For instance, they have to be able to switch quickly from one role to another (from managerial to subordinate or co-worker; from generalist to specialist), they have to be able to speak more than one 'language' because they have to translate abstract and strategic language into concrete and operational language. Academic middle managers must be able to take a seat at the negotiating table and in addition must be able to discuss an academic subject with their colleagues. They gain insight into the strategy of top management, as well as an understanding of the needs of the academics. They have to keep an eye on the outside world (new social and economic developments) as well as the organisation (the academic layer, asking for peace and stability). Finally, because they work in a largely public organisation, academic middle managers should – in addition to efficiency, quality, flexibility and innovative capacity – also display openness, honesty and integrity.

In short, the academic middle managers' position and the manner in which they carry out the functions of their position – the role that they play – offers them the opportunity to exert influence on the strategic innovations. After all, academic middle managers are quite close to the 'front line' and are able to see the opportunities for synergy where the various practices and skills can reinforce one another. They are able to connect the academic and administrative domains. Especially during the implementation of strategic innovations in the organisation, academic middle managers can potentially play a central role. By being aware of their binding or hinge function, they can use their (tacit) knowledge of what is happening in the

organisation and interpret it within the organisation. This strategic dealing with information, and the way in which they use this linking or hinge function, is called the prism-effect of the academic middle manager (Kallenberg, 2013). To ensure an efficacious prism effect, it is of vital importance that academic middle managers carry out their role adequately.

Perceptions of the Roles of Academic Middle Managers

The role and function of academic middle managers in HE have changed over time. Up to the 1990s, they were perceived as senior teachers/professors who also happened to engage in routine administrative processes. They conceived their role often as a temporary side-task alongside their actual tasks on education and research, and had an internally oriented focus (Tucker & Bryan, 1988).

Table 1. Trends in the perceptions of the roles of academic middle managers

Character	Professionalism	Managerialism
Focus	Internal orientation and control	Management of external relations
Ambition	Leaders with own academic career	Leaders with managerial driving force
Appointment	Temporary part time position	Permanent full time position
Decision making	Garbage can models	Rationalist approach
Interconnection	Loosely coupled systems Collegiality	Tight and controlled Competitive
Focus on	Student learning Academic values Professional autonomy	Efficiency of students; success rate Effectivity of learning processes Common output
Output	Quality driven	Quality and quantity driven ('publish or perish')
Governance	Democratic model	Hierarchic professional model/ integral management
Quality assurance	Emerging peer-review	Necessity to prove quality

Since the new millennium the role of the higher education academic middle manager has drastically changed; it now focuses on efficiency of programs rather than on professional autonomy of students and as a result of external changes (social, economic, political, etc.), academic middle managers shifted from academic leaders to institutional managers. There was a noticeable shift from the model of professionalism based on education, the focus on student learning, attention to academic values and professional autonomy, to a model of managerial planning

based on corporate values, student performance and attention to efficiency and effectiveness (Clegg & McAuley, 2005; Wolverton et al., 2005; Verhoeven, 2007). This trend was evident in many countries under the prevailing term New Public Management. It focused on severe academic managerialism whereby 'professional' managers were specifically appointed and as a result replaced the academics in their former role as leader (Santiago et al., 2006; Vieira da Motta & Bolan, 2008; Meek, 2003; Gmelch, 2002; Middlehurst, 2004; Meek et al., 2010). Table 1 illustrates this trend regarding the views of the roles of academic middle managers.

This shift towards a more managerial perspective brought about a visible change in perspective regarding what is expected of this sector and begs an answer to the question of what these trends in literature on education management currently mean for it.

Activities of Academic Middle Managers

When we view the specific academic management literature, we can distinguish four types of activities in which academic middle managers are involved, namely:

1. *administrative activities* – managing the work of a team or of colleagues; monitoring and controlling structures and processes; curriculum planning; evaluating teachers and programs, etc. (Tucker, 1992; Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Gold, 1998; Gunter & Rutherford, 2000; Boyko & Jones, 2010);
2. *relational activities* – based on the substantive discourse of meetings and building trust among colleagues (Meek et al., 2010; Boyko & Jones, 2010);
3. *intervening activities* – where the relationship and diplomacy between expectations of the central management and the academic values are to be established (Meek et al., 2010; Boyko & Jones, 2010);
4. *result oriented activities* – attending to student performance, efficiency and effectiveness (Clegg & McAuley, 2005; Wolverton et al., 2005; Verhoeven, 2007).

In order to find out to what extent these activities represent roles, further research has been carried out in the survey.

RESEARCH

In order to be able to answer the question as to which roles academic middle managers fulfil during strategic innovations, an empirical research study was carried out among such staff employed at Dutch HEIs.[1] In 2009, 750 randomly selected academic middle managers received a structured survey which 304 respondents filled out. The raw dataset was analysed and tested on aspects such as normality, the relationship between the research variables, missing values and outliers. This led to the removal of a number of respondents and the survey produced a dataset (N = 246) in which respondents from all Dutch HEIs are represented. These respondents stem from the various areas of study, disciplines, institutes etc. This

dataset is therefore representative of the academic middle managers from Dutch HEIs. The survey contained questions about the roles that academic middle managers fulfil. In addition, respondents were asked to provide an example of a strategic innovation with which they had been involved. After that, the roles of academic middle managers were compared with the types of strategic innovations that they indicated. Based on logistic regression analyses an insight will be given into these relations.[2]

Roles of Academic Middle Managers

In order to determine whether activities can be assigned to roles, Quinn and Rohrbauch's Competing Values Model (1983) is used in the survey. Their test comprises 36 items with 8 subscales that indicate the degree to which a manager fulfils a particular role; they claim that managers should be able to fulfil all roles in order to be effective. These 36 items represent the activities that are derived from the great 20th century management theories. The theoretical concept of Quinn and Rohrbauch is regularly used for all kinds of organisations, including HEIs (De Boer et al., 2010; Meek et al., 2010; Ngo, 2013; Geraki, 2014).

Based on this research it appears that the original eight roles of the Competing Values Model do not match with this population. The results of the data analysis (including factor analysis, pattern and structure matrices, reliability and scree plot criterion) suggest that something is amiss with the validity and reliability of the Competing Values Model within the population of academic middle managers. Only four factors, rather than eight, emerged. On basis of these data I distinguished four new roles. Although, theoretically speaking, they fit well with Quinn and Rohrbauch's Competing Values Model, these are not the same roles. For that reason other names were given to these roles, in order to avoid potential confusion with the Quinn and Rohrbauch roles. These new roles were checked on communalities, and the sample adequacy for a principal component analysis (PCA) has been tested using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) system. The common KMO value was 0.888, which makes the data very suitable for the PCA that has been performed. The appendix shows an overview of the eigenvalues and the explained variance of the components (Table a) and the communalities extraction (Table b) indicating that the variance per role is more than sufficient.

The following table illustrates how the new roles relate to both the types of activities (as mentioned in §2.3), the reliability per role (Cronbach's alpha) and the average score in the extent to which the academic middle manager fulfils that role.

These four roles can subsequently be described as follows:

Guard – Guards run a tight show and ensure that all the tasks are properly implemented. They establish an atmosphere of order and reconciliation within the organisation. They are involved in educational support processes (scheduling, etc.) and the preservation of the status quo. They are the cultural guard, one that searches for fixed values, processes and procedures.

207

Table 2. Roles of academic middle managers linked with types of activities

Roles	Comparison with the types of activities	Cronbach's alpha	Mean (scale 1–7)
Guard focuses on keeping the organisation running	Administrative activities	0.728	4.86
Guide focuses on introducing and maintaining cohesion and the development of the employees in the organisation	Relationship focused activities	0.779	5.61
Diplomat focuses on searching in a creative manner for opportunities and means to realise his/her vision	Intervening activities	0.806	5.75
Constructor focuses on achieving goals	Results oriented activities	0.918	5.58

Source: Kallenberg, 2013

Guide – Guides develop and maintain the relationship with their employees. They are focused on implementing cohesion, teamwork and staff development. They are aware of the atmosphere and they focus on aspects such as a rewarding system and the experience of success. They communicate well and are easy for their staff to approach. They are focused on organisation, integration and cooperation by means of consultation and the building of trust.

Diplomat – Diplomats explore ways to realise their vision, purpose and strategy by obtaining and maintaining legitimacy, image, reputation and resources. They propose new ideas on the topic of education and educational processes. Their vision is inspiring and based on substantive arguments. They offer room for adjustments and changes. They are politically sensitive and have powers of persuasion. They act both as liaison persons and as spokespersons.

Constructor – Constructors (henceforth architects) have set a clear goal, based on a clear vision and the willpower to reach these objectives. They combine this with strong leadership based on lucid agreements. They have a functional ambition, are results-oriented, productive and professional.

The survey results show that academic middle managers fulfil the four roles fairly equally. The differences in the extent to which they fulfil those four roles are not

extreme. The role of Guard (M = 4.86) is the least strongly fulfilled, while the role of Diplomat (M = 5.75) is the most strongly fulfilled. One has to take into account that questions about the fulfilment of these roles were asked in the perspective of strategic innovation.

Strategic Innovations

The central question of this article is which role academic middle managers fulfil during strategic innovations.

Strategic innovation is defined as the intended development of an important new or significantly improved product, service, process or condition with which an organisation positions itself in relation to its environment in a different (improved) position (Kallenberg, 2013). Strategic innovations can differ from each other with respect to nature, type, size, and so on. In order to be able to characterise the differences in types of strategic innovations, the value-position-matrix developed by Brockhoff and van Rijn (2006) is used. Accordingly, organisations are trying to improve their value (in relation to their products) and/or their position (compared to other organisations) during strategic innovations (ibid., p. 22). By considering the value and the position as two dimensions it creates a concrete, general reference framework, where each quadrant represents an overall strategic direction, namely: exploring, transforming, revitalising and rationalising.

- exploring stands for 'starting new things.' It is about building and strengthening its strategic position. For example: an institution starting a new study program.
- transforming stands for 'customising existing things for a changing environment.' For example: when a study program (course) needs to refresh its curriculum. Transforming is more about educational changes.
- revitalising stands for 'ensuring that existing things work better.' For example: when student pass rates are too low for a long time, it results that the HEI should spend more effort to bring students to their degrees. This is associated with higher costs, while at the same time the HEI receives less revenue due to the low success rate. Revitalising therefore focuses mainly on improving the economic value.
- rationalising stands for 'stopping existing things.' For example: when student success rates are low and the influx of new students is low too, this will lead to lower financial resources and the emerging necessity to stop a study program.

The respondents were asked to provide an example of a strategic innovation in which they were recently involved. These examples are classified into one of the types of strategic innovation. A team of four scholars executed the process to classify the strategic innovation types. Based on their answers and interpretations, the following format appears.

Table 3. Frequencies of mentioned types of strategic innovations

Type	N	Percentage
Rationalising	2	0.9
Revitalising	70	30.4
Transforming	97	42.2
Exploring	61	26.5
Total	230	100.0

Source: Kallenberg, 2013

From the above table it is obvious that Rationalising as a type of strategic innovation is hardly mentioned. This is noteworthy, but can be explained due to the fact that it is not common to terminate (parts of) organisations in the public domain. For example when a course has only a few students and a large staff, then there is a disturbed financial balance. In this case, Moore (1995) speaks of a 'bleeder', which is a heavy loss component of an organisation, and according to him, the analysis of bleeders would be less likely to take place in the public domain. In HE, no one is eager to mention bleeders because they can have a negative impact on the image of the institution.

Roles and Strategic Innovations

As stated earlier in this chapter, academic middle managers play an important role in translating the strategy of the Executive Board to the workplace. So if a particular type of strategic innovation is pushed by the organisation, it is also relevant and important to have an academic middle manager who can give and wants to give a positive contribution to it. Organisations can benefit from identifying the preferences of academic middle managers for a particular type of strategic innovation.

Using logistic regression analysis we try to predict what an increase in '1' on a variable means for increasing the likelihood that someone mentions a particular type of strategic innovation. With logistic regression analysis we try to show everything alongside a linear equation. In other words: what is the effect of an increase on one variable with regard to another variable. The following tables list the results of the logistic regression analyses on the three strategic innovations: revitalise, transform and explore.

When we compare the roles of academic middle managers with the three types of strategic innovation, we can name some interesting links.

For the Guide it means that his/her role is not significantly related to a particular type of strategic innovation. This can possibly be explained by the fact that this role is people-oriented rather than results-oriented (neither substantive nor business

Table 4. Findings of logistic regression analysis of academic middle manager roles on types of strategic innovations

Revitalise					
	B	Wald	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Guide	–0.103	0.191	0.902	0.569	1.431
Guard	**0.444	4.353	1.559	1.027	2.367
Diplomat	0.192	0.524	1.212	0.720	2.040
Architect	**-0.629	4.842	0.533	0.304	0.934
Transform					
Guide	–0.032	0.021	0.968	0.629	1.491
Guard	–0.233	1.568	0.792	0.550	1.141
Diplomat	***–0.664	6.981	0.515	0.315	0.843
Architect	**0.507	3.279	1.661	0.959	2.877
Explore					
Guide	0.141	0.260	1.151	0.671	1.975
Guard	–0.341	2.501	0.711	0.466	1.085
Diplomat	**0.741	5.313	2.097	1.117	3.937
Architect	0.318	0.819	1.375	0.690	2.740

*** p < .01, ** p < .05, * p < .10*
Source: Kallenberg, 2013

related). Guides will be especially committed to their staff in all three types of strategic innovation and they therefore will perform similarly in all types.

Guards have a significantly positive relationship with Revitalise (0.444). This clearly shows the preference of Guards for the structuring of the organisation. This in contrast to Architects, who have a significantly negative cohesion with Revitalise (-0.629). If academic middle managers are acting more like Architects, they will have less preference for Revitalise. Architects have a positive affinity with the Transform (0.507), while Diplomats have a negative affinity with Transform (-0.664) and a positive affinity with Explore (0.741).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Pivotal for this study were views on the position and roles of academic middle managers.

Regarding their position it can be said that they occupy an in-between position with some limitations and significant advantages. These are called limitations

because there are often unclear and shifting responsibilities and the academic middle managers must deal with an imbalance between role-expectations and freedom of action. Their position is located at the interface between demanding stakeholders in the organisation. This leads to important benefits, because academic middle managers have a lot of tacit knowledge which they can use in the organisation. Academic middle managers select, interpret, and synthesise this information in a congruent or divergent way, and then use this information in a different way in the organisation. In this way, they influence the landscape between policy and educational practice.

Mainly because academic middle managers have ample opportunity to make use of their position at the intersection of policy and practice; their role fulfilment and the associated prism-effect are of vital importance for the course of the strategic innovation. Needless to say, the prism-effect displays a different image for each role. That is to say, a Diplomat will cross the border between academics and administrators, or an organisation and the workplace, more frequently than a Guard.

A conclusion can be drawn from the relationship between roles of academic middle managers and types of strategic innovations: there is a clear preference per role for a particular type of strategic innovation. The Guard revitalises, the Architect transforms and the Diplomat explores. With regard to the role of the Guide it should be noted that there is no affinity with any of the strategic innovation types. This is essential knowledge because having the right person in the right place during strategic innovations is of vital importance for smooth implementation. As previously noted, academic middle managers have an important position within the organisation. They are also able to use the prism effect both consciously and unconsciously. It is therefore important for the Executive Board to know with what type of academic middle manager they are dealing. For example, suppose that the Board wants to start a new program: if the department's academic middle manager is a Guard, chances are that it will be a troublesome innovative process. In this case it would be better to replace the Guard with a Diplomat. In other words, depending on the type of strategic innovation the Executive Board pursues, it is relevant to have a fitting style of academic middle manager. In practice it happens regularly that an Executive Board conducts a review (based on certain management style theories) among the management levels, but that they are not aware of the relationship between the review and the strategic innovation. This is exemplified by the example below which is given by one of the respondents (Kallenberg, 2013, p. 166):

> …At the arrival of the new Executive Board we went all into a review. The colour theory was used, but nothing happened. There was so much resistance from the managers and too little pressure from the Executive Board, with the result that this line was not continued. In addition, I did not have the impression that the Executive Board used the review based on a vision of the future… I think they just wanted to pull the power toward themselves…

The challenge is to link the preferred style of the academic middle manager and the strategic innovation type that is pursued. In addition, it is important that they –

precisely because of their in-between position – actually receive the opportunities (money and resources) to carry out a strategic innovation.

Thus, when there is a mismatch between the academic middle manager and the type of strategic innovation pursued, it is also evident that there will be – in addition to a troublesome innovation process – complaints from different quarters within the organisation about the functioning of the academic middle management levels. HEIs would be over-managed and academics would have to be freed of the types of managers that focus too much on productivity (for example, student success rates) and their coercive managing. My interpretation is that this criticism also arises when there is a mismatch between the fulfilment of the role of an academic middle manager and the intended strategic innovation: for instance in the above mentioned example of starting up a new program, in which a Guard tries to control the organisation, while academics are pursuing renewal and change. This leads to a negative prism effect, in which the Guard slows down the innovation process and (sometimes) brings it to a halt. The Guard has that opportunity because top management is generally primarily focused on the initiation and the decision-making process, and s/he leaves the implementation and realisation to others. In addition, academics are generally mainly focused on their education and research agenda and are not primarily focused on management duties or on the strategic innovation. As a consequence there is a blank space between the domains of academics and administrators. Academic middle managers can link these two domains and thus achieve an important influence on strategic innovation. The interpretation of the role of academic middle managers is therefore a crucial factor in the success of the strategic innovation.

NOTES

[1] The Dutch higher educational system knows two types of organisations, i.e., universities of applied sciences (HBO) and universities. The differences between these two institutions fall outside the scope of this article and will therefore not be discussed.

[2] For more data and analysis of the results, see: leidenuniv.academia.edu/TonKallenberg. Then click: bijlage bij Prisma van de verandering? De rollen van academische middenmanagers bij strategische innovatie in het hoger onderwijs (in Dutch).

REFERENCES

Bennett, J. B., & Figuli, D. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Boer, H. De., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek V. L. (2010). The changing nature of academic middle management: A framework for analysis. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, R. Santiago, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 229–241). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Boyko, L. M., & Jones, G. A. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of middle management (chairs and deans) in Canadian universities. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, R. Santiago, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 83–102). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Brockhoff, G. C., & van Rijn, R. (2006). *Strategie vanuitvisie: Groei en herstructurering van organisaties*. Deventer, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Castro, D., & Tomàs, M. (2011). Development of manager-academics at institutions of higher education in Catalonia. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *65*(3), 290–307.

Clegg, S., & McAuley, J. (2005). Conceptualizing middle management in higher education: A multifaceted discourse. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(1), 19–34.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *31*(2), 217–235.

Dougherty, D., & Hardy, C. (1996). Sustained product innovation in large mature organizations: Overcoming innovation-to-organization problems. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(5), 1120–1153.

Earley, P. (1998). Middle Management: The key to organisational success? In D. Middlewood & J. Lumby (Eds.), *Strategic management in schools and colleges* (pp. 148–162). London, UK: Paul Chapman.

Ehrich, L. C., Cranston, N., & Kimber, M. (2005). *Academic managers and ethics: A question of making the 'right' decision*. Paper presented at the HERDSA-conference "Higher Education in a Changing World" July 3–6, 2005, Sydney, Australia.

Fenton-O'Creevy, M. (2000). Middle management resistance to strategic change initiatives: Saboteurs or scapegoats? In P. C. Flood, T. Dromgoole, S. J. Carroll, & L. Gorman, L. (Eds.), *Managing strategy implementation* (pp. 152–167). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Fitzgerald, T. (2009). The tyranny of bureaucracy: Continuing challenges of leading and managing from the middle. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 37*(1), 51–65.

Floyd, S. W., & Wooldridge, B. (1996). *The strategic middle manager: How to create and sustain competive advantage.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gallos, J. V. (2002). The dean's squeeze: The myths and realities of academic leadership in the middle. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *1*(2), 174–184.

Geraki, A. (2014). Roles and skills comparison among principals in Greek schools: Application of competing values framework. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(4 S), 45–64.

Gmelch, W. H. (Ed.). (2002). *Deans' balancing acts: Education leaders and the challenges they face*. Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. *Research in Higher Education*, *40*(6), 717–740.

Gold, A. (1998). *Head of department: Principles in practice*. London, UK: Cassell.

Gunter, H., & Rutherford, D. (2000). Professional development for subject leaders: Needs, training and impact. *Management in Education*, *14*(1), 28–30.

Hancock, N., & Hellawell, D. E. (2003). Academic middle management in higher education: A game of hide and seek? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *25*(1), 5–12.

Hanson, E. M. (2001). *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Harboe, T. (2013). *Subtil ledelse I en ny og mere insisterende form – et kvalitativt studie af studieledere ved danske universiteter* (Subtle leadership in a new and more persistent form – A qualitative study of heads of study at Danish universities). Copenhagen, Denmark: University of Southern Denmark, Dissertation.

Hellawell, D., & Hancock, N. (2001). A case study of the changing role of the academic middle manager in higher education: Between hierarchical control and collegiality? *Research Papers in Education*, *16*(2), 183–197.

Inman, M. (2007). *The journey to leadership: A study of how leader-academics in higher education learn to lead.* Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham. School of Education, Doctoral thesis.

Kallenberg, T. (2007). Strategy innovation in higher education: The roles of academic middle managers. *Tertiary Education Management*, *13*(1), 19–33.

Kallenberg, T. (2013). *Prisma van de verandering? De rollen van academische middenmanagers bij strategische innovaties in het onderwijs* (Prism of change? The roles of academic middle managers within strategic innovations in higher education). Den Haag, The Netherlands: Boom/Lemma.

Klumpp, M., & Teichler, U. (2008). Experten für das Hochschulsystem: Hochschulprofessionen zwischen Wissenschaft und administration. In B. M. Kehm, E. Meyer, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Hochschulen in neuer Verantwortung: Strategisch überlastet, divers?* (pp. 169–171). Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Larsen, I., Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2009). Four basic dilemmas in university governance reform. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *21*(1), 41–57.

Leonard-Barton, D. A. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal*, *32*, 111–125.

Meek, V. L. (2003). Governance and management of Australian higher education: Enemies within and without. In A. Amaral, V. L. Meek, & I. M. Larsen (Eds.), *The Higher Education managerial revolution?* (pp. 179–202). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Meek, V. L., Goedegebuure, L., Santiago, R., & Carvalho, T. (2010). *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management*. London, UK & New York, NY: Springer.

Mercer, J. (2009). Junior academic-manager in higher education: An untold story? *International Journal of Educational Management*, *23*(4), 348–359.

Middlehurst, R. (2004). Changing internal governance: Discussion of leadership roles and management structures in UK universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *58*(4), 258–279.

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ngo, J. (2013). *Lions or lambs? How deans lead and manage their faculties at Indonesian universities*. Enschede, The Netherlands: Twente University, Dissertation.

Nguyen, T. L. H. (2013). Middle-level academic management: A case study on the roles of the heads of department at a Vietnamese university. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *19*(1), 1–15.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbauch, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, *29*(3), 363–377.

Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., & Dolence, M. G. (1998). *Strategic choices for the academy. How demand for lifelong learning will re-create higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Santiago, R., Carvalho, T., Amaral, A., & Meek, V. L. (2006). Changing patterns in the middle management of higher education institutions: The case of Portugal. *Higher Education*, *52*, 215–250.

Saengaloun, S. (2012). *The middle manager's role and professional development needs in Lao higher education*. Auckland, New Zealand: Unitec Institute of Technology, Master thesis (Educational Leadership and Management).

Schilit, W. K. (1987). An examination of the influence of middle-level managers in formulating and implementing strategic decisions. *Journal of Management Studies*, *24*, 271–293.

Schneijderberg, C., & Merkator, N. (2012). New higher education professionals. In B. M. Kehm & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The academic profession in Europe: New tasks and new challenges* (pp. 53–92). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Smith, R. E. (2002). The role of the university head of department. *Educational Management and Administration*, *30*(3), 293–312.

Smith. R. (2003). *Understanding the changing role of the university head of department: Resurrecting and refining role theory as a theoretical framework*. Leicester, England: University of Leicester, paper.

Taylor, J., & De Lourdes Machado, M. (2006). Higher education leadership and management: From conflict to interdependence through strategic planning. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *12*(2), 137–160.

Tucker, A. (1992). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1988). *The academic dean: Dove, dragon and diplomat*. New York, NY: MacMillan/ACE.

Verhoeven, J. C. (2007). *Academic middle managers and management in university colleges and universities*. Presentation at the Douro seminar. 25–30 mai 2007. Leuven, Belgium: Katholieke Universiteit. Geraadpleegd dd. 21 sept 2012. Retrieved from www.kuleuven.be/~u0003309/School/HogerOnderwijs/Douro2007.pdf

Vieira da Motta, M., & Bolan, V. (2008). Academic and managerial skills of academic deans: A self-assessment perspective. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *14*(4), 303–316.

Vught, F. van (2001). Globalisering en nieuwe prestige definitiesdwingenuniversiteitenkeuzestemaken (Globalisation and new prestige definitions force universities to make choices). *Globalisering en nieuwe prestige definities dwingen universiteiten keuzes te maken. THE&MA*, *8*(4), 30–33.

Whitchurch, C. (2004). Administrative managers – A critical link. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *58*, 280–298.

Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of third space professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *62*(4), 377–396.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Mortez, J., & Nies, C. T. (2001). The changing nature of academic deanship. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *28*(1).

Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(5), 227–238.

Ton Kallenberg
Leiden University, The Netherlands

APPENDIX

Table a. Own values and explained variance components

Inititial Eigen values				*Extraction sums of squared loadings*			*Rotation sums of squared loadings[a]*	
	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	Total	
1	9.521	34.005	34.005	9.521	34.005	34.005	7.968	
2	2.542	9.077	43.082	2.542	9.077	43.082	5.146	
3	2.044	7.301	50.383	2.044	7.301	50.383	4.854	
4	1.716	6.130	56.513	1.716	6.130	56.513	3.235	

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.
a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loads cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Table b. Communalities – extraction

Guide	Initial	Extraction	*Diplomat*	Initial	Extraction
Average communality:		0.553	Average communality:		0.543
Guard	Initial	Extraction	*Constructor*	Initial	Extraction
Average communality:		0.549	Average communality:		0.592

Overall average = 0.565 Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.