JOAKIM CASPERSEN AND NICOLINE FRØLICH

7. MANAGING LEARNING OUTCOMES

Leadership Practices and Old Modes of New Governance in Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

It is probably uncontroversial to say that the last few decades have witnessed an increasing interest in leadership in higher education. The interest has been spurn by policy changes in higher education and public administration in general that have changed higher education governance profoundly. The general observation is that leadership in higher education has shifted from old modes of leadership based in academic and collegial values to new modes of governance increasingly based in social responsibleness and managerialism (consult for example Bleiklie, 2005; Shattock, 2002). For the last decades higher education has been characterized through labels such as new governance and new public management (Amaral, Meek, & Larsen, 2003; Bleiklie, Høstaker, & Vabø, 2000; Frølich, 2005).

Nevertheless, due to the multi-institutional character of universities there are similar good reasons to expect that currently leadership in higher education draws on more than one leadership template. Recent articles pin-point some of the contested and interpretative character we assume contemporary leadership in higher education imply (Blackmore, 2007; Johnson, 2002; Juntrasook, 2014; Uusiautti, Syväjärvi, Stenvall, Perttula, & Määttä, 2012). Furthermore, policy reforms can been seen as carriers of templates for governance and leadership, but also as carriers of solutions to problems that has yet to be defined (Frølich & Sahlin, 2013).

In this paper we apply the introduction of qualification frameworks and learning outcomes in higher education (HELOs) as a case to investigate contemporary leadership in higher education. HELOs can be seen as a device for teaching, learning and assessment, but also as a tool linked to governance and management, in the sense that the introduction of HELOs entails a move to a results orientation. The underlying assumption is that accountability in higher education will improve as leaders in higher education are assigned the responsibility for meeting set targets, according to measurable indicators (Frølich, 2011). Due to new obligations related to the importance of leadership and management of higher education introduced the last decades (Bleiklie, Enders, Lepori, & Musselin, 2011), the formal, top-down leaderships structures in higher education has been strengthened (Bleiklie, Ringkjøb, & Østergren, 2006; Stensaker et al., 2013).

E. Reale & E. Primeri (Eds.), The Transformation of University Institutional and Organizational Boundaries, 187–202.

However, when trying to understand recent attempts at improving accountability and transparency in higher education, it is also important to recognise that higher education has been used, and is still used, as a means for development and status attainment for professional groups. This process of recognition has developed in tension between the state as a counterpart and as a collaborator, the balance being different in different countries and professions, and has been described by many (e.g., Burrage, 1993). As Abbott argues (1988), professions work to obtain and retain jurisdictions through claims of abstract knowledge (among other claims). Universities serve as legitimators for this knowledge, and through universities this knowledge is promoted and advanced. Universities are also an arena for interprofessional competition. Seen together this implies that new policies (such as learning outcomes), will be taken in, translated and adapted differently.

In our investigation of leadership practices in higher education we take four modes of academic leadership as our starting point (Bleiklie, 2005). Based on the modes of academic leadership, we explore the extent to which these modes of leadership are spelled out in the daily practices of academic leadership. We seek to answer the following questions: How do academic leaders conceive HELOs as a tool? How are different modes of leadership played out in relation to the introduction of HELOs?

We depart from findings that have been established in previous research, and that can be seen as "common ground" for all studies of higher education. First, this means that the historical context of each program and how the tension between profession and state has played out in different cases, is of importance for interpreting changes and development in higher education (see e.g., Muller (2009) for a discussion of how resistance to change can be linked to academic identities developed differently in disciplines and professions). This means that old divisions and tensions, e.g., between discipline orientation and practical orientation, or professional and governmental control, are revitalized when new changes are introduced.

Previous studies on the introduction and implementation of HELOs indicate that the process vary greatly between study programmes (Caspersen & Frølich, 2014): Some leaders use the introduction in order to pursue their own agendas, while elsewhere the introduction is stacked upon other educational reforms. In the former, leaders are eager to implement the reform at all levels, meaning that they use them as managerial tools, providing guidelines for employees and feeds result information back to the leaders. In the latter, the implementation is seen as an imposition, and use and control of the HELOs are mostly symbolic administration.

THE MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER OF ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

Several researchers have underlined the multi-institutional character of university governance (Frølich & Sahlin, 2013) which put weight on the fact that different constituencies address different expectations towards the university, what it is good for and how it should be managed (Krücken, Kosmützky, & Torka, 2007; Olsen, 1987). Looking more closely at studies dealing with higher education leadership,

the multi-institutional complexity of academic leadership are described. Bryman (2007) discusses how policy-changes in the last decades have made new demands on leadership, and searches for indications of effective leadership. Bolden et al. (2008) explore tensions in higher education leadership and tease apart the multilevel nature at individual, group and organizational levels. Jameson (2012) takes as point of departure that the multiple uncertainties of higher education may lead to a decrease of trust in the values, collegial ethos and civic role of universities. The study indicates that it was necessary to challenge managerial cultures, which restrict the self-organizing egalitarian, collegial scholarship. Moreover, that the implication of skillful leadership and being able to listen and reflect may contribute to maintain trust in the purpose of universities. Durand and Pujadas (2004) argue that universities must establish new leadership paths and practices in order to establish community building and value-oriented behaviour. This implies the stimulation and development of a non-utilitarian culture and behaviour at the institution. Stensaker & Vabø (2013) analyze how a sample of Nordic universities perceive the place and role of governance in their strategic development. They find that most universities emphasize leadership and leadership development as a key instrument to strengthen their governance capacity. Nevertheless, the cultural and symbolic aspects of governance, internal legitimacy and trust seems at stake. In line with these arguments, there are reasons to assume that different conceptualisations of academic leadership can be at work at the same time (Bleiklie & Frølich, 2014).

In the following, we spell out Bleiklie's four leadership templates (2005: 194) which are constituted by expectations modern university leaders face. The templates originate partly in different tasks of the university, partly in different normative or ideological conceptualisations of the tasks and their relative importance. The four templates are the academic authority, the collegial coordinator, the socially responsible leader and the business executive. The templates were originally developed to analyse changes in leadership over time or across different higher education institutions. However, they are also a useful tool for studying leadership practices that are played out when academic leaders are confronted with higher education policy reforms such as the introduction of HELOs.

The academic authority template draws its legitimacy from academic quality (Bleiklie, 2005: 195). The expectation is that high disciplinary competence forms the basis for legitimate leadership. Expectations of academic quality form the power basis for legitimate leadership, but the academic authority template does not provide any guidance regarding what leaders are expected to do nor regarding style of leadership. Hence academic authority is a kind of earned leadership ideal. Based on outstanding academic merits, one becomes qualified for leadership.

The collegial coordinator template claims authority based on the leader's capacity as a member of an egalitarian and autonomous academic disciplinary community (Bleiklie, 2005: 196). The collegial leader of a disciplinary community draws his authority from his capacity to represent the community and act as a politician rather than disciplinary authority. The collegial coordinator's power basis rests

in his capacity to protect the academic community, provide protective working arrangements and to some extent to secure the flow of resources into the community. The socially responsible leader draws his power basis from the extent to which he acts in line with expectations directed at a civil servant who loyally follows the social obligations defined by public authorities. The socially responsible leader template is also based on community service as ideal. The university is considered legitimate to the extent to which it provides society with educated elites or contributes to effective exploitation of human capital (Bleiklie, 2005: 197). As representatives of public institutions, academic leaders are expected to assume and interpret their social responsibilities within the framework of national policies and programmes.

The business executive is expected to produce useful services efficiently in the form of research and candidates to a number of users and stakeholders. The administrative element of university governance is expected to be strengthened to ensure controllable handling of the growing burden of teaching and research. The tasks of formulating goals and mobilising resources and support becomes crucial tasks within this leadership template, and suppresses the development of academic quality (Bleiklie, 2005: 198).

The academic authority is first and foremost concerned with the academic quality, and therefore responds to the demands from the academic community. The collegial coordinator, however, must balance and negotiate between the academic community and the state, in order to promote the interests of the academic community. The social responsible leader is perhaps the most difficult role, as it on the one hand answers to demands of loyalty to the national policies and implementation of these, while it on the other hand also holds social responsibilities to the market and society at large. The understanding of the leader as a business executive, means first and foremost that the leader has to answer to demands for relevance to the market, and that quality of content is understood by its measurable output.

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF INTRODUCING HELOS

As the different leadership templates in varying degree respond to different demands, it seems reasonable to assume that the introduction of HELOs will be interpreted differently depending on which of the templates the leadership practices align with. When market and relevance, is emphasised, HELOs can be seen as possibilities for sharpening the relevance of the educational programs. When academic quality is emphasised the introduction can be seen as an imposition of bureaucracy into the academic fields. In the former, learning outcomes can be perceived as useful tools for developing the program further. In the latter, the implementation might take form of an administrative ritual activity, or as political symbols with no real content. Examining how such "pure forms" of use of HELOs are played out provides an opportunity to discuss the complexity of academic leadership.

This way of reasoning is in line with an institutional theory perspective on organizational change (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Leaders

in higher education have to balance the external requirements and claims directed at universities and higher education institutions with the internal functioning of the organisation. One way of doing this is to decouple the external claims from the internal dynamics. In this perspective, HELOs as managerial tools can be managed in a political-symbolist way and administrative management of HELOs may take on a ritual character not closely related to improving the quality of the learning processes. A second way of managing interrelationship between external claims and the internal functioning of the organization is by adhering to external claims that matches the normative foundation of the internal functioning (e.g., academic standards), while rejecting those that conflict with this normative foundation (Selznick, 1957). Yet a third way of combining external conflicting claims, is to adjust and translate the claims so that they match the internal functioning of the organisation in a softer and more adjusted way (Sahlin & Wedlin, 2008). Taken together we apply these expectations to explore how academic leaders conceive HELOs as a tool and how different modes of leadership are played out in relation to the introduction of HELOs. We are interested in, how, where and why the introduction of HELOs are legitimized in line with the academic authority template, the collegial coordinator template, the public interest template and/or the business executive template.

METHODS AND DATA

The chapter is based on qualitative interviews with 15 academic and administrative leaders in 7 study programmes in three fields of science: two programs in the humanities and social sciences (teacher education and linguistics), three programs in natural sciences and technology (master and bachelor in engineering plus leaders from the faculty of mathematics and natural sciences) and three programs in medicine and health (nursing and medicine), during spring 2013.

The different programs were chosen in order to ensure variation within and between different academic and professional fields and disciplines. The shorter professional programs, such as teacher education (four year bachelor program), bachelor in engineering (three years) and nursing (three year bachelor program), have different relations with the state, at least in Norway. Teacher education has been described as politically governed (Heggen, 2010) with rapid reforms aligning with current debate on education. Nursing education has been described as developed under the auspices of the profession, although the development of nursing's role and place in the formal education structure has happened through the general expansion of the public education system.

Engineering has developed as part of the general development of the industrial economy, and the rebuilding period after WWII, and thus had a clear applied focus from the beginning. The division between a bachelor programme with a general, applied orientation and a master program with an academic and applied orientation has been part of the education system for a long time in Norway, and graduated students find work in both public and private sector. Thus, engineering in Norwegian

higher education has been catering for the need of a growing economy, but the supply of qualified graduates has been controlled through the public governance system (see also Caspersen, Frølich, Karlsen, & Aamodt, 2014).

As for medicine, the profession itself has played a profound role in developing the programs, which can be described as elite programs in a Norwegian context. Elite in this sense refers a high ranking in the educational system, and where a large proportion of the students achieve economic and cultural high-status positions (Kingston & Lewis, 1990). It also means that the profession has had a strong position in negotiating and influencing the role of medical training in the higher education system, for instance controlling the entrance demands and content for the specialization programs in medicine, and also playing an important role in the development of the graduate study programs.

Finally, the linguistics program holds a somewhat different position, being a more traditional university master degree, with few direct ties to the labour market. Thus, they are subject to general study reforms from the state, but the problem of relevance is not as clearly framed there, although the general (and global) "crisis of the humanities", which might have escalated in the past decade (see e.g., Nussbaum, 2012) have long traditions (see e.g., Rosenhaupt, 1940).

Together, the programs chosen stand in different tensions between the professional, state and market system (Clark, 1983), which gives different challenges for the leaders. Thus, by interviewing leaders from a broad array of programs, the complexity of the leader role in higher education is covered as good as possible.
The interviews lasted about one hour and notes were taken and shared across the different members of the research team. Two broad questions from the interviews are the starting point for our analysis: What is the perceived purpose of HELOs? How are HELOs used? During the interviews, the leaders were probed as to whether HELOs were seen as political symbols, administrative ritual activity or as useful tools for improving learning activities and outcomes and quality of learning processes.

As this paper aims to explore how HELOs are used as tools by leaders in higher education, the data from the interviews are used as empirical examples from the different cases. In the following section, different uses and approaches to HELOs as tools for higher education leaders will be presented.

FOR WHAT PURPOSES ARE HELOS INTRODUCED

In medicine and nursing the introduction of HELOs was perceived differently. In medicine, it was seen more as a shift in language and descriptions, while in nursing it was welcomed as an opportunity for change, and even described as a "revolution" by one of the leaders. A similar reception was found among the technologists, where the introduction was seen as an opportunity to emphasise relevance and to organize the study in a more multidisciplinary way than before.

In medicine, learning goals similar to learning outcome formulations had been introduced in the early nineties, replacing the traditional curriculum. In their studies,

students have only the definition of learning outcomes to guide after, not a list of curriculum texts. The introduction of HELOs was seen as a continuation of the study organisation introduced in the nineties, as part of a broad curriculum reform. A variation of problem based learning (PBL) was then introduced, and this process entailed orientation towards international trends and pedagogical knowledge, and learning goals was the guiding principle. The introduction of learning outcomes was by and large seen as a continuation of this reform, although some adjustments had to be made. At this particular university, introduction of learning outcomes and the transfer from a "traditional" curriculum organization was also undertaken as a top-initiated project, with pedagogical support offered for all institutes, and in-house courses in writing learning outcomes descriptions in accordance with the qualification framework template. This indicates that the top administration and leaders at the university wanted the process of introduction of HELOs to run as smooth as possible, and it might also indicate a positive orientation towards HELOs as a tool.

In nursing the leaders emphasised that relevance, understood as orientation towards actual work in the health sector, was much easier to emphasise after the introduction of learning outcomes. Being oriented towards learning outcomes means being oriented towards the end goal of studies, the leaders in nursing argued, and during their work in revising local curricula they had found the national qualification framework useful for clarifying the connection between goals and assessment.

If the introduction of HELOs was seen as an opportunity for re-orientating the study programs in health and technology, or, as in the case of medicine, just a continuation of something they were already doing right, the purpose was seen as far more unclear and even threatening in the humanities. In teaching, the introduction of HELOs was seen as an externally forced change, which was introduced together with a new government-initiated reform of the study program. The Norwegian teacher education has been the subject to a row of consecutive reforms over the last decades, and in 2010 a binary model for the primary and secondary school teachers was introduced. HELOs was introduced as a part of this, and the leaders interviewed said that they "drowned" in the new model, giving little time for working with HELOs as a tool. They questioned directly the purpose of introducing HELOs as a "package" together with other changes, and found it hard to separate "the silent reform" of learning outcomes and qualification frameworks from the simultaneously introduced teacher education reform. Teacher education was among the first programs to implement the reform:

> The reform was presented in April/May, and we were to implement from the fall semester. In the middle of exams. This kind of organisation is provoking us. The reform was conceived on the basis of an evaluation from 2006, and the ministry had years to follow up, and they gave us a few months only.

The humanities program at the university had a similar experience to the leaders from medicine. The introduction was seen as less of a change than previous reforms,

and especially the so called Quality Reform in Norwegian Higher Education, implemented in 2003. However, the reception was still more ambiguous than among the teachers. It was on the one hand seen as a continuation of previous work with study quality, on the other hand it was seen as an opportunity to improve the relevance and raise awareness about the quality and purpose of the humanities at the university, which had been questioned in graduate surveys and public debate.

All in all, the purpose of HELOs was differently interpreted in the different fields and study programs, ranging from "what's new" to "why something new, again?", and from providing an opportunity for change and attention to relevance to an unwanted disturbance. As will be illustrated in the next section, these differences in understanding also meant that the use of HELOs as tools also varied greatly.

HOW ARE HELOS USED

In medicine, the use of HELOs varied between the two institutions included, although both programs had been reformed in the nineties and was more or less aligned with the learning outcome thinking at an early stage. At one institution, HELOs as a leadership tool was questioned, with the argument that HELOs provided "an information overload". The massive amount of information included in the outcome descriptions of the courses in medicine, written up in loose-leaf files, was described as hard to navigate in. The lack of a traditional curriculum for the students, only recommended readings were suggested for students so that they could reach the described learning outcomes, also made it unclear what they really were supposed to learn. The fact that learning goals were already a major part of the old PBL-reform meant that the introduction of HELOs was seen as a smaller, and also partly unnecessary, change. This was said to lead to some resistance and hesitation towards the introduction of HELOs, and the use of HELOs was more or less an administrative change.

At the second medicine program, HELOs were used as a tool for change in how the courses were organised and seen as an opportunity for promoting constructive alignment in courses. The associate dean had lead a process where all teachers with coordinator responsibilities from all semesters were invited in order to promote a discussion on the academic quality and design of the study program. Although they had a discussion over this in the nineties, with the old reform of the program, the leader argued that a discussion on quality and outcome needs to be revitalised at regular intervals. However, keeping up the quality of teaching was perceived as hard, as research gives more merit for the individual teacher, and a tension between the academic meritocracy and teaching quality is noted. It was also commented that the students perceive a tension between the level of detail in exams and the relevance of this in an integrated study-model. To some extent, this can also be interpreted as a tension between academic standards and relevance.

The need for ongoing discussions about the quality of teaching was also emphasised in nursing, and the introduction was perceived as an opportunity to shake things up:

> We need to redesign the courses in a totally new way, and we have to ask whether this is the emperors' new clothes, or something genuinely new. This might imply turning everybody's previous contributions upside-down.

The leader interviewed saw this process as a positive development.

In the technological field, the leader from the faculty of mathematics and natural sciences also had experienced the tension between academic orientation and the autonomy of the individual researcher/teacher. The "old" model provided more room for each teacher to design his or hers "private" course, whereas in the new model each course had to be designed to fit in with the overall learning outcomes for the program, and specify how they contributed to this. This made the responsibility less individualised and required more of a collective effort and orientation, and it was described as a "de-privatisation" of courses, and opened up new possibilities for creating core-modules for several programs. The introduction of HELOs provided an opportunity for creating cross-disciplinary courses, which was seen as essential for an efficient organization of the faculty. Courses were also designed in order to be used across levels (bachelor, master, PhD), although with somewhat different content at different levels. The introduction sparked administrative changes with academic implications.

Also within engineering, the introduction of HELOs was seen as a positive opportunity for restructuring and sharpening the cross-disciplinary profile, and emphasising relevance for "users", meaning employers of graduates. To sharpen this perspective even more, representatives from relevant business and industry took part in an evaluation of the program at one institution. However, from the leaders it was argued that this was a way to emphasise the academic quality. Thus, academic quality and market relevance were juxtaposed to some extent. However, also here the experience was that the introduction of HELOs was challenging the academic autonomy, interpreted as the right for each to design his or hers own course. Also, a tension between academic quality and teaching was emphasised, with the argument that it was hard to get top researchers, often assumed to be top teachers as well, to engage in teaching, as their research took so much time. The balance between two core duties of the academic institution, teaching and research, seemed even harder to find when the teaching had to be reorganized and the importance of teaching was increased through the implementation of HELOs. One of the engineering program leaders interviewed argued that his task was more complex than before, they had to seize new opportunities and "complete loops of quality", assure the quality in outcome descriptions and follow up on subject teachers in a new way. This required, according to the program leader, strong leadership, lots of follow-up, and more

attention to consequences and results. These kind of changes cannot be done without having everybody on board, engagement and enthusiasm have to be generated among the teachers: "A stick won't do, you need a carrot", one leader said, and added: "at least it should look like a carrot".

In the humanities, the leaders we interviewed argued in general that HELOs were administrative and academic tools, as well as political symbols. It was also added that HELOs provided a special opportunity for connecting with the labour market and employers' expectations, and providing graduates with easily accessible descriptions of what they can after finishing a higher education degree in the humanities. The introduction of HELOs also made way for administrative changes, where the responsibility for courses was delegated downwards. The change was backed with the allocation of resources as well. By the program leaders it was also argued that besides all good intentions, the introduction of HELOs was hard to administrate, because of an "unruly" academic staff. Too little administrative power was delegated to leaders, meaning that the administrative staff did not perceive program leaders as authorities. This meant that the implementation was probably more of an administrative change, and not the profound change it could have been. The role as a program leader was compared to "shepherding wild cats".

Within the humanities, the teacher education program was a story of its own. The symbolic dimension was heavily emphasised, and it was argued that the process was all about aligning the outcome descriptions with the bureaucratic intention: "The implementation was part of a bureaucratic educational policy, an EU-perspective, although that part of the process has been toned down a bit". The rhetoric behind the implementation was perceived as provocative, implying that the focus on learning was something brand new, while the leaders always had felt that they had student learning and development as the ultimate goal in their teaching.

WHAT DOES USE OF HELOS TELL US ABOUT ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

The analysis of the data indicates that all the leaders we interviewed saw HELOs as both a tool to improve academic quality, an administrative tool and as a mere symbol. They reflect upon crucial dilemmas and contradictions that the introduction of HELOs entails, and conceive of HELOs as managerial tools in all three directions. The findings are summed up in Table 1.

We note that even leaders in the "pure" university disciplines like the humanities and natural sciences underline that HELOs can be used as tools to improve the relevance of their subject. We find also a number of other dilemmas incorporated in HELOs in addition to the pressure for improved relevance. The leaders reflect upon how HELOs push the attention towards teaching and learning, while research activities and academic ambitions still have to be catered for. HELOs also entail a pressure in the direction of "de-privatisation" of teaching in the sense that study programs as collective structures gain more attention, while still teaching in higher

Table 1. Summary of findings in different groups

	For what purposes are HELOs introduced?	*How are HELOs used?*
Medicine	Minor shift in language and descriptions	Gives information overload; replaces curriculum; reorganisation of courses ---> constructive alignment tool,
Nursing	Opportunity for change – "revolution"	Redesign courses, see everything from a new perspective
Linguistics	Minor shift, but also opportunity	Connecting with labour market, but hard to use as tool with "unruly" staff. Administrative change
Teaching	Threat, part of "reform package"	Symbolic alignment with bureaucratic intentions
Technology (BA)	Opportunity for change	Inclusion of employers in panels, provides leaders a tool for follow-up
Technology (MA)	Opportunity for change	De-privatisation of courses; new possibilities for creating core-modules. Tension between research and teaching.

education is related to the individual researcher and his classes. Finally, the leaders experience a pressure towards policy implementation and educational authorities.

As we argued in the analytical section of the paper, we expected that the different leadership roles would relate differently to HELOs as managerial tool. We reasoned that leadership legitimized by the academic authority role would emphasise HELOs as tools for improving learning activities and outcomes as well as the quality of learning processes. The collegial coordinator would perceive of HELOs as tools for political-symbolist activities while also catering for their potential for improving teaching and learning. We saw the business executive as focusing mainly on HELOs as tools for administrative management. Finally the social responsible leader, whom we reasoned would perceive of HELOs as multifaceted managerial tools that can be used as political symbols, to improve management and administration and also as a tool to improve academic quality and relevance, has a clearer presence in out material than perhaps could be expected. Can this presence be related to changes in modes of governance in higher education?

OLD MODES OF NEW GOVERNANCE

Due to increased professionalization of leadership and the introduction of managerialism, higher education has changed. However, our suggestion is that new managerialism is no longer new – but has been around for at least three decades,

as stated in the introduction. Over time, leadership in higher education has shifted as from the collegial coordinator to the business executive, while at the same time different constituencies and stakeholders in higher education still direct diverging sets of claims towards universities (Olsen, 1987). What we might be experiencing at the time can possibly be described as a turn in which the business executive leadership transforms slightly back to the old academic ideals. Also over the last three decades, higher education has changed in the sense that the higher education institutions have gained more autonomy and the national state has withdrawn from detailed steering and control. Since this has been the main way of managing higher education for a considerable long time, the way leadership is conducted might have encapsulated this state of affairs of increased autonomy out of which the social responsible leadership is legitimized. We would also see this development as a modernization of academic leadership. The social responsible leader has to balance requirements and claims from a multi-institutional setting and be able to handle a range of managerial tools to fulfil this task.

In this light, potentially, all leadership templates can be argued to use HELOs as managerial tools in different ways. Leaders, irrespective of leadership ideals, will seek to improve the content of higher education, and to do this they also need to use available administrative and governance tools, and in some instances also invoke HELOs as a symbol. In our understanding, however, we understand the different usages of HELOs as more of a continuum, from a more content-and-quality orientation, to an orientation towards the external relations of higher education with society.

The interpretation above fits well with our data, although teacher education is the odd one out. Leaders in teacher education see HELOs only as an attempt at more and increased top-down steering of higher education. Introduction of HELOs is perceived as yet another reform of higher education pushing and pressing higher education in line with the perspectives of national authorities.

However, relating back to teacher education and the reception of HELOs, it could be argued that, at least in Norway, teacher education has had a different relationship with governance than other groups, being constantly subjected to reforms and changes in order to solve problems in the entire system of education. Thus, the withdrawal from detailed steering and control can be argued to not have taken place to the same extent in teacher education as in other programs. Therefore, the use of HELOs as a leadership tool can be expected to be different in the Norwegian teacher education than in other groups, which is also what we have found.

SHIFTING TEMPLATES OF LEADERSHIP

As shown, leadership means adapting to different policies, and maximising opportunities within given boundaries. Nevertheless, there is still a need for discussing the actual meanings and implications of the different leadership templates. What does the notion of leaders as “business executive” actually imply?

In Bleiklie's account (2005) it is closely linked to New Public Management and managerialism, emphasising efficiency in the guise of quality, and bottom line outcomes. Attention is given to the instrumental aspects of leadership, and leadership is seen as a profession in itself, not dependent on academic subject knowledge in the field one is leading.

However, as Bleiklie also argues, this description should not be taken for given without empirical scrutiny, which is what has been attempted in this paper. And, as discussed, we argue that the business executive-template is less prominent than the social responsible leader. It should also be added that in "real business", in trade and industry, leadership ideals are also rapidly changing. Today's business executive must give more and more attention to all aspects of the organisation: bottom line outcomes come hand in hand with corporate social responsibility and lobbying and interacting with government administration. Strategic leadership, or any other phrase used to coin leadership, implies balancing and handling demands and tensions within and outside the organisation (Kraatz & Block, 2008). Thus, being a business executive might just mean being a socially responsible leader. In this light, leadership in higher education might have seen a similar development. Although the development in leadership in higher education has started from varieties of academic authority, and leaders as collegial coordinators might be idiosyncratic for higher education, the more recent development from "simple" efficiency to social and political responsibility corresponds with larger shifts in leadership ideals. Thus, although the internal development in higher education might be a turn from one extreme to another, followed by settlement in the middle, this is not necessarily only driven by internal developments, but also connected to larger shifts in leadership ideals.

TEMPLATES OF LEADERSHIP OR TEMPLATES OF REFORMS

In a similar line of argument, it can be asked how well the leadership templates actually describe leadership roles, or if they are better understood as presentations of different kinds of reforms and governance. Frølich and Sahlin (2013) argue that much research on institutional change is based on empirical studies of organizational reforms. From such research one can learn that reforms emerge from and carry new institutions, while institutions mix and blend in the idiosyncratic organizational setting. The general discussion on new managerialism implies such a logic. However, institutional mix is as much a feature of university reforms as it is featuring in organizational responses to such reforms. Reforms are not a linear shift from one logic of governance to another, but are themselves carriers of mixed and blended logics and institutions. Thus, reforms carry ambiguous templates, also of leadership. The history and reforms of universities can be described in terms of shifting and distinguishing institutional ideal types of governing and organization, but also in terms of a more profound way of mixing and translating organizations. This perspective implies that new understandings and templates of academic leadership

should be developed. Empirical investigations of leadership, such as in this paper, is one first step on the way in this process.

CONCLUSIONS

We started the paper with two overall questions, to which we now return. Our first question was: how do academic leaders conceive HELOs as a tool? Second, we asked: how are different modes of leadership played out in relation to the introduction of HELOs?

We have found that the leaders we interviewed draw on a complex set of leadership templates in their daily practices in relation to the introduction of learning outcomes. HELOs are seen as a device to improve the quality of teaching and learning. They are also seen as political symbols to which the leaders has to negotiate between these and the academic quality they potentially enhance. In addition, HELOs are clearly seen as measures on which leaders can manage their business of higher education. However, most notably the leaders draw substantially on all these configurations of the introduction of learning outcomes in a way that resonates with the social responsible leadership template.

Our analysis indicates that HELOs as managerial tools are not just a simple question of whether policies are effectively implemented, but of whether LOs primarily serve as a managerial symbol, an administrative ritual activity or work as a tool in academic leadership potentially linked to learning activities and affect the outcome of learning processes. We find that academic leaders cannot chose one approach or the other, but have to manage all of these different aspects of leadership.

Based on our findings we have discussed different suggestions to explain this state of affairs. It could be that we are witnessing a situation where the (previously) new modes of governance are no longer new. Hence, what we see is old modes of new governance, played out in relation to new policy initiatives such as HELOs. Secondly, that over time business administration both in the private and the public sector may have changed into a situation where the business executive template actually resembles more the social responsible manager. And thirdly, that policy reforms are not pure in any sense. They carry mixed and blended versions of the templates themselves, to such an extent that the present leadership templates might be understood as templates of reforms, rather than templates of leadership practices.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Amaral, A., Meek, V. L., & Larsen, I. M. (Eds.). (2003). *The higher education managerial revolution*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publisher.

Blackmore, P. (2007). Disciplinary differences in academic leadership and management and its development: A significant factor. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 12*(2), 225–239.

Bleiklie, I. (2005). Academic leadership and emerging knowledge regimes. In I. Bleiklie & M. Henkel (Eds.), *Governing knowledge: A study of continuity and change in higher education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bleiklie, I., & Frølich, V. N. (2014). Styring, organisering og ledelse i høyere utdanningspolitikk. In N. Frølich, E. Hovdhaugen, & L. I. Terum (Eds.), *Kvalitet, kapasitet og relevans: Utviklingstrekk i norsk høyere utdanning*. Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Bleiklie, I., Høstaker, R., & Vabø, A. (2000). *Policy and practice in higher education: Reforming Norwegian universities*. London, UK and Philadelfia, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Bleiklie, I., Ringkjøb, H.-E., & Østergren, K. (2006). Nytt regime i variert landskap: Ledelse og styring av universiteter og høyskoler etter Kvalitetsreformen. *Delrapport, 9*.

Bleiklie, I., Enders, J., Lepori, B., & Musselin, C. (2011). New public management, network governance and the university as a changing professional organization. In T. Christensen & P. Lægreid (Eds.), *The ashgate research companion to new public management*. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 358–376. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00398.x

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(6), 693–710. doi:10.1080/03075070701685114

Burrage, M. (1993). From practice to school-based professional education: Patterns of conflict accommodation in England, France, and the United States. In S. Rothblatt & B. Wittrock (Eds.), *The European and American university since 1800*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Caspersen, J., & Frølich, N. (2014, forthcoming). Læringsutbytte som styringsredskap for ledelsen i høyere utdanning. In N. Frølich, E. Hovdhaugen, & L. I. Terum (Eds.), *Kvalitet, kapasitet og relevans*. Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Caspersen, J., Frølich, N., Karlsen, H., & Aamodt, P. O. (2014). Learning outcomes across disciplines and professions: Measurement and interpretation. *Quality in Higher Education, 20*(2), 195–215. doi:10.1080/13538322.2014.904587

Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147–160.

Durand, J., & Pujadas, C. (2004). Self-assessment of governance teams in an argentine private university: Adapting to difficult times. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 27–44. doi:10.1080/13583883.2004.9967115

Frølich, N. (2005). Implementation of new public management in Norwegian universities. *European Journal of Education, 40*(2), 223–234.

Frølich, N. (2011). Multi-layered accountability: Performance funding of universities. *Public Administration, 89*(3), 840–859.

Frølich, N., & Sahlin, K. (2013). *University organization as bridging: Ambigous, competing and mediated institutions*. Paper presented at the EGOS, Montreal.

Heggen, K. (2010). *Kvalifisering for profesjonsutøving : sjukepleiar - lærar - sosialarbeidar*. Oslo, Norway: Abstrakt forl.

Jameson, J. (2012). Leadership values, trust and negative capability: Managing the uncertainties of future English higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(4), 391–414.

Johnson, R. (2002). Learning to manage the university: Tales of training and experience. *Higher Education Quarterly, 56*(1), 33–51.

Juntrasook, A. (2014). You do not have to the boss to be the leader: Contested meanings of leadership in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 33*(1), 19–31.

Kingston, P. W., & Lewis, L. S. (1990). *The high status track: Studies of elite schools and stratification.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Krücken, G., Kosmütsky, A., & Torka, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Towards a multiversity? Universities between global trends and national traditions*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript Verlag.
Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutional organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340–363.
Muller, J. (2009). Forms of knowledge and curriculum coherence. *Journal of Education and Work, 22*(3), 205–226.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2012). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities.* Princeton, NJ and Oxford, England: Princeton University Press.
Olsen, J. P. (1987). Universitetet: Sentralisering, autonomi og markedsstyring. *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift, 4*, 16–26.
Rosenhaupt, H. W. (1940). Modern foreign language study and the needs of our times. *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht*, 32(5), 205–216.
Sahlin, K., & Wedlin, L. (2008). Circulating ideas: Imitation, translation and editing. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
Shattock, M. (2002). Re-balancing modern concepts of university governance. *Higher Education Quarterly, 56*(3), 235–244.
Stensaker, B., & Vabø, A. (2013). Re-inventing shared governance: Implications for organisational culture and institutional leadership. *Higher Education Quarterly, 67*(3), 256–274. doi:10.1111/hequ.12019
Stensaker, B., Vabø, A., Frølich, N., Bleiklie, I., Kvam, E., & Waagene, E. (2013). *Styring og strategi. Betydningen av ulike styringsmodeller for lærestedenes strategiarbeid, NIFU Report 43/2013*. Oslo, Norway: NIFU Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education.
Uusiautti, S., Syväjärvi, A., Stenvall, J., Perttula, J., & Määttä, K. (2012). It's more like a growth process than a bunch of answers: University leaders describe themselves as leaders. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69,* 828–837.

Joakim Caspersen
NIFU – Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation
Research and Education
Oslo
Norway

Research Professor Nicoline Frølich (Dr.)
NIFU – Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation
Research and Education
Oslo
Norway