

Towards a cartography of higher education policy change

A Festschrift in Honour of Guy Neave

For Prince Guy the Navigator

In recognition of a life-time's work on the seven seas of higher education policy.

You read the currents, felt the winds, listened to the waves and meticulously recorded your findings to guide others entering troubled waters.

With our thanks and admiration

The Officers and Crew of HMS Network

ISBN 978-90-365-2530-5

© 2007, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, the Netherlands.

Alle rechten voorbehouden. Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand, of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.

Voor zover het maken van kopieën uit deze uitgave is toegestaan op grond van artikel 16B Auteurswet 1912 jº, het besluit van 20 juni 1974, Stb. 351, zoals gewijzigd bij het Besluit van 23 augustus 1985, Stb. 471 en artikel 17 Auteurswet 1912, dient men de daarvoor wettelijk verschuldigde vergoedingen te voldoen aan de Stichting Reprorecht (Postbus 882, 1180 Amstelveen). Voor het overnemen van gedeelte(n) uit deze uitgave in bloemlezingen, readers en andere compilatiewerken (artikel 16 Auteurswet 1912) dient men zich tot de uitgever te wenden.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system of any nature, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying or recording, without prior written permission of the author.

Cover design: Lucy Keizer, the Netherlands.

Printed by UNITISK, Czech Republik.

Published by CHEPS, University of Twente, the Netherlands, cheps@mb.utwente.nl

List of contents

List of Contributors	7
Preface.....	19
Introduction	21
<i>Jürgen Enders and Frans van Vught</i>	
I. THE HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION	29
Change and continuity in Dutch internal university governance and management.....	31
<i>Harry de Boer</i>	
University and economy: the Italian way	39
<i>Stefano Boffo</i>	
Prolegomena to an Inquiry into the Campus Invisible	45
<i>Sheldon Rothblatt</i>	
Understanding transplanted institutions: an exercise in contemporary history and cultural fragmentation	53
<i>Simon Schwartzman</i>	
The 'Nationalisation' of UK Universities 1963-2007	59
<i>Peter Scott</i>	
On Traditions and Historical Layers in Higher Education.....	67
<i>Jussi Välimaa</i>	
II. HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND THE EVALUATIVE STATE	77
From Quality Assurance to Accreditation - A Satirical view	79
<i>Alberto Amaral</i>	
Paradox! More Freedoms, More Controls Simultaneously in U.S. State Accountability Patterns: the Virginia Experience	87
<i>Robert Berdahl</i>	
The Social Foundations of the Evaluative State and the Universities as Stakeholder Organisations	97
<i>Ivar Bleiklie</i>	
The rise of the 'evaluative society' and the legitimisation of 'difference' in UK higher education.....	105
<i>John Brennan</i>	
Resisting the Evaluative State: Irish Academics Win the Battle but Lose the War	111
<i>Patrick Clancy</i>	
'Doing a Neave': Reflections on the Evaluative State, Academic Standards, and Blind Mice	119
<i>David D. Dill</i>	

Policy Laboratories or Garbage Cans? State Policies for University Science and Technology in the United States.....	125
<i>Roger L. Geiger</i>	
On Governance, Accountability and the Evaluative State.....	133
<i>Ben Jongbloed</i>	
The Evaluative State and Higher Education Policy in Germany.....	139
<i>Barbara M. Kehm</i>	
Steering from Without and Within: Mechanisms of (Self) Control in Higher Education.....	149
<i>Gary Rhoades and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado</i>	
III. EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NATION STATE... 157	
A Tale of Two Reform Styles	159
<i>Thierry Chevaillier and Jean-Jacques Paul</i>	
Historical legacies and New Modes of Governance in European Education Policy - the inception of the Open Method of Coordination	165
<i>Åse Gornitzka</i>	
Some Legal Aspects relating to the Internationalisation of Higher Education Quality Assurance.....	173
<i>Jan de Groof</i>	
Travelling in time and space.....	187
<i>Jeroen Huisman</i>	
Higher Education and Science Policy in Finland.....	193
<i>Osmo Kivinen</i>	
Creativity as a Challenge for European Universities and Foundations.....	201
<i>Wilhelm Krull</i>	
European integration and higher education: strong convictions, weak evidence	207
<i>Peter Maassen</i>	
Revisiting the definitions of 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'	213
<i>Simon Marginson</i>	
'But where is the beef?': The Confrontation between <i>le Pays Politique</i> and <i>le Pays Réel</i> in the Implementation of the Bologna Process in Italy	221
<i>Roberto Moscati</i>	
Internationalisation Strategies of German Universities	227
<i>Ulrich Teichler</i>	
Corrosion of the Character and European Politics of Higher Learning.....	233
<i>Voldemar Tomusk</i>	
Universities and the European Dimension.....	239
<i>Frans van Vught</i>	
On Unity and Diversity; The EU, Bologna and higher education.....	245
<i>Kurt de Wit</i>	

IV. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES.....	255
The Disciplinary Characteristics of Comparative Higher Education: a Sociological Approach	257
<i>Akira Arimoto</i>	
Dr. Prometheus visits Latin America.....	25765
<i>José Joaquín Brunner</i>	
Financial Austerity, Cost-Sharing, and Culture: Perspectives on Comparative Higher Education	273
<i>D. Bruce Johnstone</i>	
The Devil's in the Detail; Guy Neave and Comparative Higher Education ...	281
<i>V. Lynn Meek and Leo Goedegebuure</i>	
Comparative aspects in higher education: The value of learning from others.....	287
<i>Barbara Sporn</i>	
V. HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES: RESEARCH AND POLICY.....	293
Wisdom and Wit in the Study of Higher Education	295
<i>Ronald Barnett</i>	
Research and Knowledge Transfer: New Goals, Old Dilemmas	301
<i>Elaine El-Khawas</i>	
Higher Education in the 21 st Century: Seven Pairs of Contrasting Trends	307
<i>Sarah Guri-Rosenblit</i>	
Social Scientists and Higher Education Policy Studies	315
<i>Grant Harman</i>	
The Evaluative State: some contradictory consequences for the research-policy relationship.....	321
<i>Mary Henkel</i>	
On Guy Neave and Spider-Man: Reflections on Higher Education Research and Meaningful Metaphors	327
<i>Glen A. Jones</i>	
Academic drift - a reinterpretation	333
<i>Svein Kyvik</i>	
Scientific Neutrality and Objectivity 100 Years after Weber: Still Relevant in the Era of Big Science?	339
<i>Jan-Erik Lane</i>	
On story-telling, Frank Sinatra and scholarship in disguise	347
<i>Bjørn Stensaker</i>	
The Recusancy of Higher Education Research in the Age of Knowledge.....	353
<i>James S. Taylor</i>	

Education policy and research on higher education in Belgium	357
<i>Jef C. Verhoeven</i>	
Reflections on Forty Years of Higher Education Policy Research	365
<i>Gareth Williams</i>	
VI. POSTSCRIPT.....	371
In Honour of Neave the Unique.....	373
<i>Bob Clark</i>	
The publications of Guy Neave.....	375

List of Contributors

Alberto Amaral

Alberto Amaral is a Professor at the University of Porto, Director of CIPES and Chair of the Board of CHER. Recent publications include articles in *Higher Education*, *Higher Education Quarterly*, *Higher Education Policy*, *Higher Education in Europe* and *European Journal of Education*. He is editor and co-editor of several books, including *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?*, and *Reform and Change in Higher education: Analysing Policy Implementation*.

Akira Arimoto

Akira Arimoto is Professor and Director of Higher Education at the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hijiya University, Japan. He is chair of the UNESCO's International Scientific Community for the Asian & Pacific Region, former President of the Japanese Association of Higher Education Research and President of the Japan Society of Educational Sociology. His latest publications include: *Recent Issues in Higher Education Reform in Japan: The Relationship between the Social System and the Higher Education System* (Higher Education Forum, Hiroshima University); *Case Study: Japan* (in S. Sorlin and H. Vessuri, eds., *Knowledge Society vs. Knowledge Economy, Power and Politics*)

Ronald Barnett

Ronald Barnett is Pro-Director for Longer Term Strategy and Professor of Higher Education at the Institute of Education, University of London. His books include *The Idea of Higher Education*, *Realising the University in an age of supercomplexity* and *Beyond All Reason: Living with Ideology in the University*. He is also the immediate past-Chair of the Society for Research into Higher Education.

Robert Berdahl

Robert Berdahl is Professor Emeritus of Higher Education at the University of Maryland. He has taught at San Francisco State University, State University of New York at Buffalo and the University of Maryland. His field of research has been relations between higher education and governments.

Ivar Bleiklie

Ivar Bleiklie is Professor and Head of the Department of Administration and Organization Theory at the University of Bergen, Norway and Adjunct Researcher at the Rokkan Centre for Social Studies. Among his publications are: *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*, (ed. with M. Kogan, M. Bauer, & M. Henkel). *Governing Knowledge: a study of continuity and change in higher education* (ed. with M. Henkel) and *Policy and Practice in Higher Education: Reforming Norwegian Universities*. (with R. Høstaker & A. Vabø).

Harry F. de Boer

Harry F. de Boer is a senior researcher at the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Twente. His research interests in the field of higher education studies concern governance and steering models at macro level, institutional governance, management and leadership styles in professional organisations, and strategic planning and decision making. He frequently publishes in these areas and has conducted several studies for ministries and national agencies.

Stefano Boffo

Stefano Boffo is Professor of Sociology at the University of Sassari, Faculty of Political Sciences. His main research interests are technological change, knowledge and higher education. In this field he has published more than fifty books, articles and papers. His latest publications include: *Oltre la torre d'avorio-Sul difficile rapporto fra università e società della conoscenza in Italia*, *Il governo dell'università: rettori e presidenti in Italia e Francia* (with P. Dubois e R. Moscati), and *Saperi locali e società della conoscenza* (with F. Gagliardi).

John Brennan

John Brennan is Professor of Higher Education Research at the Open University in the United Kingdom where he is also Director of the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information. He has written several books and many reports and articles on topics such as graduate employment, quality and evaluation systems, and the relationship between changes in higher education and wider social and economic change and transformation. His books include *Managing Quality in Higher Education* (with Shah), *Students, Courses and Jobs* (with Lyon, McGeever and Murray) and *Graduates at Work* (with McGeever). He is a Fellow of the Society for Research into Higher Education.

Jose Joaquín Brunner

Jose Joaquín Brunner is Professor at the Government School, Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, Chile. He is a Board Member of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) - UNESCO, and a member of the Advisory Council of the Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (ANECA), Spain. Between 1994 and 1998 he served as Secretary of State in the Chilean Government.

Patrick Clancy

Patrick Clancy is a Professor in the School of Sociology at University College Dublin and former Dean of the Faculty of Human Sciences. In addition to a large number of journal articles and book chapters his publications on higher education include four national studies of participation in higher education published by the Irish Higher Education Authority. He has served on a variety of National Advisory and Policy groups. He was selected as a Fulbright New Century Scholar

in 2005 to explore the theme of *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response*.

Bob Clark

Bob Clark has been the Allan M. Cartter Professor Emeritus of Higher Education at the University of California, Los Angeles since 1991. He has taught at Stanford, Harvard, Berkeley, Yale and UCLA. He has made major contributions to comparative higher education since the early 1970s.

Thierry Chevaillier

Thierry Chevaillier is Professor of Education at the University of Burgundy (Dijon, France) and a member of IREDU, a Research Institute on the Sociology and Economics of Education. He has served as a member of the Steering Board of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER) and the French Network on Research on Higher Education (RESUP). His research interests are the economics of higher education, educational finance and analysis of educational systems.

David D. Dill

David D. Dill is Professor of Public Policy at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has conducted research in university and industrial settings, has consulted with academic and government organisations and agencies in the U. S., Europe, and Asia, and has written numerous articles, chapters, and books. He is Director of the Research Program on Public Policy for Academic Quality a cross-national study of quality assurance policies in higher education supported by the Ford Foundation.

Jürgen Enders

Jürgen Enders is Professor and Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Twente. He is member of the editorial board of the book series 'Higher Education Dynamics' and the journal *Higher Education*. He serves as a member of the German Educational Council, of an Advisory Board for the Swiss Science and Technology Council and of the Dutch Association of Universities. His research interests are in the areas of the Political Sociology of Higher Education, Governance and Management of Higher Education and Research, Higher Education and the World of Work, and the Academic Profession.

Roger L. Geiger

Roger L. Geiger is Distinguished Professor of Education and head of the Higher Education Program at Pennsylvania State University. His major publications include: *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*; *To Advance Knowledge: the Development of American Research Universities, 1900-1940*; *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research*

Universities Since World War II; and The American College in the Nineteenth Century. He has edited *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* since 1993, and is Senior Associate Editor of *The American Journal of Education*.

Åse Gornitzka

Åse Gornitzka is a senior researcher at ARENA – Centre for European Studies at the University of Oslo. Building on previous comparative research on policy and governance in higher education and research, Gornitzka's current research focus is on European integration in the field of education and research policy and institutionalisation of a European dimension in these policy areas. She has been senior researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education (NIFU) and at the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) and a visiting scholar at SCANCOR, Stanford University and at the Department of Sociology, Michigan State University.

Jan de Groof

Professor Jan De Groof is Professor of Education Law and Comparative Education Law at the College of Europe (Bruges) and the University of Tilburg. He is Governmental Commissioner of the Universities for the Flemish Community and has worked as a consultant to the OECD, EU, OSCE High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNESCO, and many other inter-governmental, governmental and non-governmental organisations, and is President of the European Association for Education Law and Policy. He is UNESCO Designated Special Envoy for the Right to Education.

Ben Jongbloed

Ben Jongbloed is a senior researcher at the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente. Since joining CHEPS in 1992 his research has concentrated on the theme of higher education economics. He has written extensively on topics such as funding methodologies, marketisation, private higher education, and per student costs. Together with Peter Maassen and Guy Neave he edited *From the Eye of the Storm: Higher education's changing institution*. From 2004 until 2006 he shared his CHEPS office with Guy Neave.

Elaine El-Khawas

Elaine El-Khawas is Professor of Education Policy at George Washington University. She has published widely on trends and policies affecting higher education, including issues in accreditation and quality assurance, organisational change, faculty and governance. She is a past-President of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, a winner of the 2006 ASHE Award for Leadership, a member of UNESCO's Scientific Committee for Europe and North America, and serves on the editorial boards of several international journals. She has undertaken consultancies for the World Bank, UNESCO, OECD, and the Association of African Universities.

Barbara Kehm

Barbara M. Kehm is Professor of Higher Education Research at Kassel University and Managing Director of the International Centre for Higher Education Research. Her fields of expertise include internationalisation of higher education, governance reforms, the Bologna process and changes in doctoral education and training. She is also responsible for an international Master Programme 'Higher Education Research and Development' at Kassel University.

Osmo Kivinen

Osmo Kivinen, is Professor of Sociology of Education, Director of the Research Unit for the Sociology of Education (RUSE) and Director of the Institutions and Social Mechanisms (IASM) Graduate School at the University of Turku, Finland.

Leo Goedegebuure

Leo Goedegebuure is Associate Professor at the Centre for Higher Education Management and Policy at the University of New England in Armidale, Australia. Until 2003 he was Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS). His areas of specialisation are higher education governance and management, restructuring policies and system dynamics, on which he has published widely. In these areas he also has been active as a trainer and consultant to governments and institutional management in Central and Eastern Europe, Africa and South America.

Sarah Guri-Rosenblit

Sarah Guri-Rosenblit is a Full Professor at the Department of Education and Psychology at the Open University of Israel. In the last fifteen years most of her studies have been conducted in the field of comparative research on higher education. She is a member of the Scientific Committee of Europe and North America in the *UNESCO Forum of Higher Education, Research and Knowledge*. In 2005/6 she was selected as one of the 30 New Century Scholars in the Fulbright Program *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response*.

Grant Harman

Grant Harman is an Emeritus Professor of Educational Management at the University of New England in Armidale, Australia. His research interests have concentrated mainly on higher education management and policy. He is a Fellow of the Australian College of Educators and Editor in Chief of *Higher Education*. He has worked as a consultant for various international organisations including UNESCO and the World Bank

Mary Henkel

Mary Henkel is Professor Associate, Brunel University, UK. Her main research interests are in the implications of higher education and science policies for

academic institutions and the academic profession. Her publications include *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*; *Governing knowledge. A study of continuity and change in higher education. A Festschrift in Honour of Maurice Kogan*. (co-editor with I. Bleiklie); and *Government and Research. Thirty Years of Evolution*. (co-author with Kogan and Hanney).

Jeroen Huisman

Jeroen Huisman is Professor of Higher Education Management and Director of the International Centre for Higher Education Management (ICHEM), School of Management, University of Bath, United Kingdom. Before that he was research coordinator at the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS). His research interests are: higher education policy, higher education management, organisational change in higher education; diversity in higher education; and Europeanisation/internationalisation in higher education. He was recently involved in the OECD Tertiary Education Review of Estonia. He is co-editor of *Tertiary Education and Management (TEAM)* and editor of *Higher Education Policy*.

D. Bruce Johnstone

D. Bruce Johnstone is Distinguished Service Professor of Higher and Comparative Education Emeritus at the State University of New York at Buffalo and Director of the International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project. He is former President of the State University College at Buffalo and former Chancellor of the State University of New York system.

Glen A. Jones

Glen A. Jones is Professor of Higher Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the University of Toronto. His research and teaching focuses on higher education systems, politics (including the changing role of faculty and students) and governance. His recent edited books include *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance* (with A. Amaral and B. Karseth), and *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education* (with P. McCarney and M. Skolnik). In 2001 he received the Career Research Award from the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education.

Wilhelm Krull

Wilhelm Krull is the Secretary General of the Volkswagen Foundation which is located in Hanover, Germany. He is currently the Chairman of the European Foundation Centre, and a member of the Advisory Board of the German Bundesverband Deutscher Stiftungen. He has been Chairman of the Hague Club of major European foundations, and member of numerous advisory committees and governing boards of universities, Max Planck Institutes, academies, and research organisations. At the European level he has chaired expert panels on benchmarking of scientific and technological productivity as well as on

monitoring of the Sixth Framework Programme. He was also strongly involved in developing the concept for establishing the European Research Council.

Svein Kyvik

Svein Kyvik is a senior researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Education – Centre for Innovation Research (NIFU STEP) in Oslo. His present research focuses on the development of a non-University higher education sector, on the research mission of non-university higher education institutions, on changes in the academic researcher role, and on the employability of PhD graduates.

Jan-Erik Lane

Jan-Erik Lane has taught Politics and Economics at many universities around the world. He is a member of many editorial boards of political science journals and has published some 250 books and articles. He has contributed to N-person game theory (power indices), voter volatility, comparative democracy theory and the principal-agent approach to public administration. He has been visiting Professor at several universities in the US and Asia, receiving a Lady Davis Professorship at the Hebrew University in 2006 and a German Humboldt award in 1996.

Peter Maassen

Peter Maassen is Professor of Higher Education at the Faculty of Education, University of Oslo where he is also the Director of *Hedda*, a consortium of European centres and institutes in the area of higher education studies. His academic areas of specialisation are the public governance of higher education, and higher education and development. Previously he was Acting Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS). He is the editor of the book series *Higher Education Dynamics*.

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado is Assistant Professor of Higher Education in the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education. Her research focuses on international organisations and the ways in which epistemic communities within developing countries translate and influence the implementation of policies advanced by organisations such as the World Bank. She is currently also engaged in a comparative study of faculty and students in U.S. and Mexican universities positioned in the borderlands, examining peoples' conceptions and constructions of the border.

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is Professor of Higher Education at the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia, and a government-funded Australian Professorial Fellow. He is working on international and global relationships in higher education, including potentials for agency freedom in the

global setting. Recent papers have been published in *Higher Education; Globalization, Societies and Education*; and *Journal of Studies in International Education*. He was rapporteur for the OECD's thematic review of tertiary education in the Netherlands.

Lynn Meek

Lynn Meek is Professor and Director of the Centre for Higher Education Management and Policy at the University of New England in Armidale, Australia. His specific research interests include governance and management, research management, diversification of higher education institutions and systems, institutional amalgamations and the comparative study of higher education systems. He has published some 30 books and monographs and numerous articles and book chapters, sits on various editorial boards and is a member of the UNESCO Scientific Committee for Asia and the Pacific.

Roberto Moscati

Roberto Moscati is Full Professor of Sociology of Education at the Università di Milano-Bicocca. Fields of interest include comparative higher education, sociology of professions and sociology of organisation. His recent publications include *University Reform in Italy: Fears, Expectations and Contradictions* (with G. Luzzatto in A. Gornitzka, M. Kogan, A. Amaral (eds.), *Reform and Change in Higher Education*); *Il governo dell'Università. Rettori e Presidenti in Italia e Francia* (with S.Boffo and P.Dubois); and *Italy* in J.J.F.Forest,P.G.Altbach (eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education*.

Jean-Jacques Paul

Jean-Jacques Paul is a Professor of Economics of Education and the former Director of IREDU. He is presently the Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Management at the University of Burgundy (Dijon, France). He has published numerous papers and books on the economics of education and comparative education, in the fields of higher education and the labour market for graduates.

Gary Rhoades

Gary Rhoades is Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona. His research focuses on the restructuring of higher education institutions and professions, in the U.S. and internationally. His two recent books are, *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*, and *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (with S. Slaughter). The first comparative higher education piece that Rhoades wrote was co-authored in 1987 with Guy Neave, *The Academic Estate in Western Europe* (in Burton Clark's book, *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*).

Sheldon Rothblatt

Sheldon Rothblatt is Professor of History Emeritus at the University of California, Berkeley, a former Departmental Chair and Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education. He holds an honorary degree from Gothenburg University in Sweden and is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of Britain, a Foreign Member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and a Member of the National Academy of Education (U.S.A.). His newest book is *Education's Abiding Moral Dilemma: Merit and Worth in the Cross-Atlantic Democracies, 1800-2006*.

Simon Schwartzman

Simon Schwartzman works at the Institute for Studies on Labor and Society (IETS) in Rio de Janeiro. In the 1990s, he was the Research Director of the Research Group on Higher Education at the University of São Paulo, and later the President of Brazil's National Statistical Office (IBGE). His publications include *The Challenges of Education in Brazil* (with C. Brock); *Science and Technology in Brazil: a New Policy for a Global World* (with E. Krieger, O. Bertero and F. Galembeck); *The new production of knowledge the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies* (with M. Gibbons, H. Nowotny, M. Trow, C. Limoges and P. Scott).

Peter Scott

Peter Scott is Vice-Chancellor of Kingston University, London and was formerly Professor of Education at the University of Leeds and Editor of The Times Higher Education Supplement. Among other books he is author of *The Globalization of Higher Education*; *Governing Universities* (with C. Bargh and D. Smith); *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*; and *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty* (with H. Nowotny and M. Gibbons). He is President of the Academic Cooperation Association in Brussels and Chair of the Universities Association for Lifelong Learning in the UK. He was also a member of the Board of the Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Barbara Sporn

Barbara Sporn is Full Professor at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration in Austria, and Vice-Rector for Research, International Relations and External Affairs. She has been Acting Assistant Professor at the School of Education and Research Fellow at the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement at Stanford University. Her empirical work is based on extensive field studies in the United States and Europe. She has been a visiting scholar at New York University, the University of Michigan, and the University of California at Berkeley. Her publications focus on environmental forces and organisational responses shaping higher education systems. Her work has concentrated on international and comparative aspects of university management and adaptation to changing environments.

Bjørn Stensaker

Bjørn Stensaker is a Programme Director at NIFU STEP in Oslo. He has a special interest in studies of quality, leadership and organisational change in higher education. He is the Editor-in-Chief of *Tertiary Education and Management (TEAM)*, one of the editors of *Quality in Higher Education*, and has written extensively on issues related to quality assurance and organisational change in journals such as *Studies in Higher Education*, *Higher Education*, *Higher Education Quarterly*, *Higher Education Policy*, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *Quality Assurance in Education*, and *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.

James S. Taylor

James Taylor is currently a Professor and Advisor to the Rector for Strategic Planning at the University of Aveiro, and a Senior Research Associate at the Center for Research on Higher Education Policies, both in Portugal. He is a former Professor and Vice President Emeritus at Pittsburg State University, USA. His areas of research are higher education leadership, strategic management and planning, enrolment management, and student and Faculty retention and satisfaction.

Ulrich Teichler

Ulrich Teichler is Professor at the International Centre for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel, Germany, and was Director of the Centre for many years. His major areas of research are: higher education and the world of work, systems of higher education, internationalisation of higher education. He was Chairman of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers and President of the EAIR for several years. Recent publications include: *Higher Education and Graduate Employment*, *Die Internationalisierung der Hochschulen*, and *Higher Education Systems*.

Voldemar Tomusk

Voldemar Tomusk is the Deputy Director of the International Higher Education Support Program of Open Society Institute, affiliated with the Open Society Foundation-London. His recent works include the book *The Open World and Closed Societies: Essays on Higher Education policies 'in Transition'*, and an edited volume *Creating the European Area of Higher Education: Voices from the Periphery*.

Jussi Välimaa

Jussi Välimaa is a Professor in Higher Education Studies at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland and the Head of the Higher Education Research Team in the Institute for Educational Research. His research interests are in social studies of higher education.

Jef C. Verhoeven

Jef C. Verhoeven is Professor of Sociology at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium). He was also extra-ordinary Professor at the University of Tilburg (the Netherlands) and visiting Professor at Tunghai University (Taichong, Taiwan) and has offered guest lectures in many universities in Europe, Asia, Africa and America. He has published in the field of theoretical sociology and the sociology of education including several books, and articles in, among others, the *European Journal of Education*, *Journal of Education Policy*, *Educational Management and Administration (EMAL)*, *Higher Education Policy*, *Teachers' development*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *Tsinghua Journal of Education*.

Frans van Vught

Frans van Vught was the founding Director of CHEPS (1984-1996) and Rector and President of the University of Twente (1997-2005). He now is Policy Advisor to the President of the European Commission, Board member of the European University Association, President of the Center for Strategic Management of Universities and President of the Netherlands' House for Education and Research. In addition he is a member of the Dutch Social Economic Council, of the University Grants Committee of Hong Kong and of the German Akkreditierungsrat. He has been awarded several academic honorary degrees and has published widely on higher education issues. He has worked together with Guy Neave in many different settings and is proud to have edited two books with him.

Gareth Williams

Gareth Williams is Emeritus Professor of Educational Administration at the Institute of Education, University of London where he founded the Centre for Higher Education Studies. He previously worked for Lancaster University, the London School of Economics, Oxford University and the OECD. Since 1992 he has concentrated particularly on higher education finance and policy. Books include *Changing Patterns of Finance in Higher Education*; *Paying for Education beyond Eighteen: An Examination of Issues and Options*; and *The Enterprising University*. He has done consultancy work for the OECD, World Bank, UNESCO, EU and many other organisations in over 40 countries.

Kurt de Wit

Kurt De Wit is a staff member of the Education Policy Office of the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium. He has published on developments in higher education and higher education policy in Flanders (Belgium) and the European Union. He is editor-in-chief of the social-scientific magazine *Facta*, editor of *The Flemish Journal of Sociology* and vice-chairman of the Flemish Sociological Association.

Preface

This *Festschrift* is dedicated to Guy Neave who celebrated his 65th birthday at the end of 2006. Guy Neave is a central actor in the development of research on higher education in Europe and beyond. He is an outstanding representative of a group of scholars who have taken higher education seriously as a key social institution, and who have seen research into higher education as a significant field of enquiry for the humanities and social sciences. Their work was strongly influenced by the analysis of the changing educational needs of society, the massification and restructuring of higher education, the shifts in higher education policy and management and the rise of comparative studies on these and related phenomena. Guy Neave is one of a small group of scholars world-wide who led the way in research on higher education as a field of study, and he brought to his chosen field the spectacular wisdom and sparkling brilliance of a learned historian.

As editors, we are proud to offer Guy Neave this volume of essays by so many scholars of international reputation in higher education research, who constitute in various ways his fellow-researchers, colleagues, collaborators and friends. We were confident that a wide group of scholars would enthusiastically take up our invitation to join in this scholarly celebration. In our invitation we suggested five themes that have long been major complementary areas of Guy Neave's work: the history of higher education; higher education policy and the evaluative state; European higher education and the nation state; comparative perspectives in higher education studies; and higher education studies: research and policy. The authors reflect in their contributions the richness, breadth, and innovativeness of Guy Neave's work and the ways in which his work inspired them and others. Our warmest thanks go to them for their stimulating essays and their commitment to this publication. In addition to all their scholarly insights, the contributions highlight the unique and inspiring approach that is characteristic of Guy Neave's thinking and writing.

It is a pleasure to dedicate this book to Guy Neave on behalf all who have had the privilege to work with him and to enjoy his company, breadth of knowledge, depth of reflection, enthusiasm and sense of humour. While such a book acknowledges his great achievements, it is no farewell: rather, it recognises and celebrates the ongoing work of an active and committed scholar.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) at the University of Twente, with its excellent infrastructure, for all of its support in the production of this book. In particular, Harry de Boer helped inspire the agenda for the *Festschrift* and took responsibility for communication with the authors, Jon File navigated the contributions through

the currents of today's academic lingua franca, while Gillian Luisman and Marlies Golbach greatly improved the book through their editorial and lay-out work.

We are proud to dedicate this book to Guy Neave who has made a major contribution to the work of CHEPS for two decades, first as a close scholarly collaborator and then as a CHEPS professor, and who will remain part of the CHEPS team as an honorary professor. We all look forward to enjoying the pleasure of his professional and personal company for many years to come.

Jürgen Enders and Frans van Vught
Enschede, May 2007

Introduction

Jürgen Enders and Frans van Vught

The tradition of the *Festschrift* is to celebrate and mark the achievements of an important scholar. In a *Festschrift* a group of distinguished colleagues come together in print at an appropriate temporal landmark to celebrate the achievements - to date - of the scholar's life and work. They do so by contributing an example of their own scholarship and essayistic reflection. Producing a *Festschrift* for Guy Neave implied offering the kaleidoscopic range of perspectives that have been part and parcel of his research across a wide area of higher education studies. Even an abbreviated version of his *Curriculum Vita* highlights his wide scholarly achievements.

Guy completed a degree in history at the Queen Mary College of the University of London, and finished his Ph.D on 'Agricultural syndicates and interest groups in French politics 1884-1910' only three years later at University College, London. Right from the beginning of his post-doctoral career, his special orientation to comparative modern European history and the sociology of education was apparent in his appointments and fellowships at the University College of North Wales, the School of Education of the University of Leicester and the Center for Educational Sociology of the University of Edinburgh. His writing focussed on the relationship between school and higher education, the reform of secondary and higher education, as well as on R&D and education and the organisation of knowledge. In 1976 Paris became one of the centers of his scholarly life when he accepted a position as a *Maitre de Recherche* at the *Institut Européen d'Education et de Politique Sociale* at the *Université Paris IX Dauphine* - a position he held for a decade. Ten (co-)authored books and more than forty contributions to multi-author collections and journals testify to his astonishing scholarly productivity during that period. This creative productivity continued as the breadth of his scholarly curiosity and expertise expanded to further work on the equality of education, the transition from school to work, the regional dimension of higher education, the academic profession, accountability and control, new trends in educational policy, and the relationship between higher education and the state in Western Europe. The latter including a number of important country studies, for example, on France, Germany and Sweden. In 1986 Guy accepted an appointment as Professor of Comparative Education at the Institute of Education, University of London. In 1990 he returned to Paris as the Director of Research at the International Association of Universities (IAU).

During the second half of the 1980s Guy came into contact with the new higher education policy research center that had been established at the University of Twente, the Netherlands in 1984. This acquaintance with CHEPS marked the beginning of an academically productive relationship and long friendship. Since those early days Guy and several CHEPS colleagues have worked together closely and effectively. In the early 1990s one of us (Van Vught) had the pleasure to edit two major books on international comparative higher education with Guy Neave. In addition we collaborated in conferences, seminars and study-visits in many countries around the world.

In 1997 Guy Neave became professor and research director of CHEPS alongside his IAU position. He contributed to the programmatic reflection on the drivers and effects of higher education policy, the changing relationship between higher education and the nation state and to the comparative study of the changing interfaces between higher education, society, and the economy. Taking over this professorial responsibility clearly spurred his scholarly productivity. In the last two decades, Guy has published 15 books and more than 100 contributions to multi-authored books and journals. His writings on the history of higher education, on changes in European higher education policy and the rise of the evaluative state, on the nation state and the European dimension in higher education, and on higher education in the stakeholder society belong among the modern classics in this field. We are confident that his most recent books on the European research university and on higher education and research in the knowledge society will soon become classics as well.

Guy has held numerous fellowships and guest professorships including at the University of Amsterdam, the University of Berkeley, California, the City University of New York, and the ACT, Canberra. He was one of the major driving forces in efforts to enhance international communication and co-operation in higher education research. The Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER), the most successful international network of higher education researchers, was established in 1988 with Guy Neave as one of its founding scholars. He served also as the Vice President of the Comparative Education Society in Europe, as a member of the Governing Council of the Society for Research on Higher Education (SRHE), and most recently as President of the European Higher Education Society (EAIR). He has worked as a consultant and a member of advisory committees in a number of countries and as a member of international committees for the Council of Europe, the European Commission, and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and Manufacturers, Honorary Vice President of SRHE, and a member of the Global Scientific Committee of the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

Guy's outstanding contribution to the field is equally underlined by his role as the joint editor-in-chief of the 'Encyclopedia of Higher Education', as the editor of the book series 'Issues in Higher Education' and the journal *Higher Education Policy*, and his membership of numerous editorial boards such as those of the *European Journal of Education*, *European Education*, *Comparative Education*, and the *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*.

Guy Neave's research and writing have been shaped and guided throughout his career by the depth of his scholarship and his passion for higher education research (see Bob Clark in this volume). He has played his role widely on a European and global scale: studying reform in contemporary higher education from the perspective of political history, communicating with the wide range of researchers from other disciplinary backgrounds in this field of study; and striving to ensure a balanced view on change and stability in higher education and the multitude of functions that the modern institution of the university is expected to fulfil. His contribution to this trans-disciplinary and problem-oriented field of research is well documented in his astonishing record of scholarly publications. The depth, breadth and artistic elegance of his writing are well reflected in the contributions to this volume.

We have organised these contributions into five broad categories. The first section is focused on a theme that has been one of the most important foundations of Guy's work: the study of higher education in historical perspective. Scholars from three continents - Europe, Latin America and the USA - have contributed to this section. Harry de Boer, Stefano Boffo, Sheldon Rothblatt, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott and Jussi Välimaa highlight in different ways the importance and relevance of understanding the historical development of the university as an institution, and its embeddedness into a certain historical setting, including the range of social values and beliefs within a given society. At the same time, they highlight the dynamics of the transformation of higher education, looking at the long waves of modern history as well as the short waves of contemporary history. The authors are thus well aware of the Janus head of such a dynamic historical perspective: the conceptual conservatism that is built into the contextual approach of understanding the historical setting and the path dependencies of higher education on the one hand; and the conceptual dynamism that is built into an evolutionary approach to understanding the wider forces and trends of change in higher education on the other hand. The authors highlight this dynamic steady state of higher education in talking about historical waves, layers and transformations.

What is equally pertinent in all of these contributions is the notion of the struggle between the university as a (partly) autonomous institution and the external influence that bears upon higher education. Such influence has its own history and comes in variations that may include the prominent role of the church and

later the state in higher education, the tensions and conflicts between interest groups within society, and, last but not least, the influence of people, practices and ideas travelling across countries and continents. What is striking, though, is that the contributions meet in the observation that contemporary higher education is more externally driven than in the past. The contributions show both the dynamics of change and reform in some higher education systems, and inertia and resistance in other higher education systems. Obviously, higher education and research have become much too important to be left on their own. They are embedded into the transformation of modern societies that call for universities and colleges to play a key role in innovation, wealth creation and citizenship.

In the second part of the book the focus is on higher education policy and the evaluative state. Clearly, Guy Neave's seminal writing on the 'rise of the evaluative state' has become a modern classic that identified a most remarkable change in the history of higher education policy: the shift from 'input control' to 'output control' with its related expectations as regards efficiency and effectiveness in mass higher education. Guy and his colleagues in the study of higher education policy identified this trend first for the European landscape while subsequent analyses highlighted the inspirational power and diagnostic validity of the 'evaluative state' on a nearly global scale. This is well reflected in the appreciation of 'Doing a Neave' in the contributions of Alberto Amaral, Robert Berdahl, Ivar Bleiklie, John Brennan, Patrick Clancy, David Dill, Roger Geiger, Ben Jongbloed, Barbara Kehm, and Gary Rhoades and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado. Their analyses highlight a number of subsequent topics that deserve further attention in scholarly investigation.

First, the rise of the evaluative state stands out as an example of a universal trend that is translated into and modified by national characteristics. Various papers apply the concept to a number of national settings and the (sometimes shifting) attempts of governments to find appropriate instruments for 'steering higher education from a distance'. The grand unifying theme is the search for quality and for mechanisms to assure quality. But there are many ways to this holy grail, including strengthening the autonomy of the university and related managerial responsibility, growing competitiveness in quasi-markets, evaluations and quality audits run by central or regional governments or quasi-governmental organisations, the use and misuse of rankings in higher education, and increasing accountability to users and stakeholders. The evaluative state provides a rich field for the analysis of policy experiments that accompany the 'decentration' of the state. Reading the papers, it seems likely that this permanent revolution in higher education will persist.

Second, a number of papers appropriately question the capacity of hierarchies and markets to make valid statements about quality in higher education and research. Governments and their various sub-units struggle with the well known

problems in the relationship between 'the prince and the lamb': information imperfections and window-dressing, free-riding and anti-competitive trust building. Markets need goods and services, producers and consumers, and valid information on the quality of the product. Universities, however, are involved in many markets and are multi-product organisations with a potentially ubiquitous number of consumers. This has implications for the related need for quality indicators which tend to be imperfect if not misleading or available only at a high cost. Some of the contributions thus highlight the trend towards a growing evaluative bureaucracy with high transaction costs and unclear benefits.

Third, it is undeniable that the policy laboratory of the evaluative state has contributed to a culture of evidence in higher education and has had a mobilising effect on the vertical and horizontal differentiation of the institutional landscape. There certainly is a need not only for a further understanding of these ambivalent dynamics but also for policy relevant research on appropriate mechanisms for a balance between external and internal control and responsibility.

The third part of the book centres on European higher education and the nation state - another perennial scholarly concern of Guy Neave. He was among the first to highlight the outstanding role universities' played in the establishment and preservation of the nation state and among the first to acknowledge the growing influence of what he calls the 'European dimension' in higher education in general and in higher education policy more specifically. He was equally tempted to discuss the struggle between those who perceive 'Europe' as a problem, those who perceive 'Europe' as a solution, and those who perceive 'Europe' as a most interesting phenomenon in a multi-layered policy setting. Thierry Chevaillier and Jean-Jacques Paul, Áse Gornitzka, Jan de Groof, Jeroen Huisman, Osmo Kivinen, Wilhelm Krull, Peter Maassen, Simon Marginson, Roberto Moscati, Ulrich Teichler, Voldemar Tomusk, Frans van Vught and Kurt de Wit discuss the rise of the European dimension in higher education policy and its interplay with national policy-making, the rise of the European university and the challenges ahead, including internationalisation and globalisation.

One outstanding theme is the historical legacy of the relationship between the universities and Europe, their role in building the 'idea of Europe' and the cultural image it has of itself. The making of the nation states fostered a new national framework in which higher education and research were expected to operate. The nation state provided the means and the ends for the universities and this is still the dominant perspective today. Another drift towards Europe is, however, undeniable and all the more remarkable as higher education belongs to the most protected spheres of the political and cultural sovereignty of the nation states. The 'Europeanisation' of higher education policies has many faces that are addressed by many of our authors. The Bologna process has been enacted by an inter-governmental initiative of the nation states in search of a European higher

education area. This initiative has in turn provided national governments with further legitimacy for reform on the home turf and for the search for creative local adaptations of the Bologna model. The newly developing higher education policy of the European Union has added a supra-national layer to the policy field and addresses the European universities mainly as an important actor for overall innovation policies, not unlike its national partners. Soft instruments of idealistic steering, agenda setting, benchmarking, naming, faming and blaming accompany this development that highlights another most delicate interplay between the national level and the European level. Certainly, the contributions support the theses of Guy Neave that how European nation states will respond to European developments will not be divorced from their historical legacy. The question of convergence and variety in higher education policy and in the design of higher education systems across Europe will, however, need further attention.

Finally, a large-scale social experiment such as the European Union with all of its implications for the higher education and research landscape asks for normative political analyses and debate. Do European policies provide a much welcome incentive for national reform and the building of a truly European higher education and research landscape? Will the richness of intra-European diversity disappear in the global struggle for dominance? Will Europe liberate national universities or does it provide another, even though larger, 'fortress' for higher education and research? Is there really no alternative to an instrumentalist perspective on the economic role of the university, and who is going to strengthen the European agenda for the role of higher education in civil society? And finally, what about those countries in the European landscape who have so far been left behind by the European Union? Thus, the question raised by Neave and Van Vught in 1991 about Prometheus being bound or unbound is still high on the agenda and has gained in importance across Europe.

The fourth part of the book sheds light on the study of higher education in cross-national and cross-regional comparative perspectives. Akira Arimoto, José Joaquín Brunner, Bruce Johnstone, Lynn Meek and Leo Goedegebuure, and Barbara Sporn reflect on comparative higher education studies and the substantial contribution that Guy Neave has made to this approach. Much of Guy's analysis has indeed been of a comparative nature. He has studied historical models in higher education such as the Humboldtian, the Napoleonic, and the Anglo-Saxon; has investigated issues of diversity and convergence of national higher education systems; and has reflected on the influence of internationalisation and Europeanisation policies in comparative perspective. The contributions to this part of the book highlight these topics as well as the various levels, layers and approaches in cross-national comparative perspectives. Obviously, macro-level studies that focus on the structure, functioning and dynamics of higher education systems, the role of the nation state and public policies for higher education are strongly influenced by comparative perspectives

and approaches. The organisational level has received increasing attention in comparative studies investigating the changing role, identity and functioning of universities and other higher education providers. This trend has partly been driven by growing insights into the different models and practices of universities as organisations, and partly by the growing importance of more autonomous universities for self-organisation in higher education. This has been followed by increasing interest in the comparative study of the influence of changing institutional frameworks on the substantial processes and outcomes in teaching, research and knowledge transfer, and on the shop floor level of higher education.

One important contribution of Guy to these developments has been the constant emphasis on the importance of context, of time and place, for the understanding of higher education dynamics. For Guy, this always includes an examination of the ideas and beliefs within a given context and their role in shaping and changing higher education systems and organisations. Such a perspective also implies an interest in the study of how and why ideas and beliefs travel between countries and regions. Obviously, this interest in the 'idealistic steering' of higher education is interrelated with the phenomena of internationalisation and globalisation. The contributions show that Guy was among the first scholars to point to the virtues and plights of policy borrowing, and to the extent to which national higher education systems are challenged by international trends and supra-national integration in higher education. Yet we live in a world where the national and the trans-national co-exist and comparative studies can no longer treat the phenomena of internationalisation and globalisation as being beyond their domain.

In the fifth and final part of the book the focus is on the development of higher education studies as a field of research as well as on its relationship to policy and practice. Monsieur Guy is indeed an outstanding figure in the establishment and development of this field as well as in reflecting on the relationship between research, policy and practice in higher education. Ronald Barnett, Elaine El-Khawas, Sarah Guri-Rosenblit, Grant Harman, Mary Henkel, Glen Jones, Svein Kyvik, Jan Erik Lane, Bjørn Stensaker, James S. Taylor, Jef C. Verhoeven and Gareth Williams contribute to this tribute via approaches that highlight distinctive features of Guy's scholarship within the wider dynamics of the growing field of higher education studies. Various papers indicate the role Guy and others played in establishing the study of higher education as a serious field of academic endeavour in its own right. They point to the different components of the institutionalisation process via the establishment of a growing number of specialised journals and book series and their increasing output, to the establishment of learned societies and centers focussing on higher education, and to the visibility higher education studies have gained in national and international policy and practice. Guy's contributions to this success story are manifold and characterised by a unique personal style that combined disciplinary

mastery with multi-disciplinary innovativeness, long-term historical perspectives with contemporary agenda setting, and individualistic scholarship with collaborative endeavour. In doing so, he is well aware of the virtues and plights of higher education studies that are analysed by various papers in this section. Higher education studies are a heterogeneous field in terms of their multi-disciplinary perspectives, their object-related focus, and the range of themes that need to be addressed. The field is and needs to be grounded in a range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences while it benefits from inter-disciplinary exchange and cooperation. It applies discipline-based theories and methodologies to a specific institution of modern societies and feeds its insights back into their further development. It benefits from the issue attention cycles of policy in higher education while it has to preserve a certain distance from the 'world of practice' to ensure a critical long-term perspective. In other words, it shares the mixed blessings of a historically well-known socio-epistemological phenomenon in academe that in the words of Gibbons and colleagues has been called 'mode 2'. Spurred by national, European and global trends, policy attention in many nations and regions increasingly focuses on the role and functioning of higher education and research in their knowledge societies. The future role of universities and colleges is increasingly being paid close attention, including new perspectives on education quality and innovative capacities.

The various developments in higher education mentioned in this Introduction not only provide new material for comparative studies on higher education and research, but also pose new challenges to our underlying rationale for such research. It comes as no surprise to those who know his inspiring and restless spirit of inquiry, that the writings of Guy Neave will be a source of inspiration and clarification for the challenges higher education studies are facing. He was one of the first scholars to emphasise the growing importance of higher education for, and within the dynamics of, modern societies, and to reflect on the theoretical, methodological and practical implications for higher education research. As we have indicated, the essays collected here constitute an attempt to reflect the breadth and the scope of his international activities, of his comparative scholarship and of their unifying themes. They also raise important questions and provide a stimulus for further research enlightened by the concepts and insights contained in Guy Neave's work. We dedicate this volume of essays to the navigator in the field of higher education, our colleague and friend with whom we study and analyse the exciting past, present and future of higher education.

I. The history of higher education

Change and continuity in Dutch internal university governance and management

Harry de Boer

(...) the ability of the individual university to meet, and to show it has met, the expectations of society - and they are far from being either constant or homogeneous - places governance, like Uriah the Hittite, 'at the forefront of the battle'. (De Groof, Neave and Svec 1998, p. 156)

In many respects present-day governance structures of universities are very different from their ancestors. At the same time path dependency can by no means be denied. The past has clearly left its marks while remarkable changes are indisputable. What hasn't changed, however, are the ongoing discussions, peppered with emotions and strong language, about the most desirable or the most effective governing structures. 'How the university should be governed, by whom and to what ends have been recurring issues across the history of that institution' (De Groof, Neave and Svec 1998, p. 155). Judgements about a university structure are context-dependent. And as university contexts have indeed been changing, adjustments in university governance, big or small, have been called for. In this contribution I would like to sketch in broad outline the changes and continuities of the internal governance structures¹ of Dutch universities² over the last two centuries.

In the nineteenth century Dutch universities were 'part of the state', in the sense that they were not legally autonomous entities. The state ruled, in theory, the university: the Crown appointed the professors, the state's guardians ('curatoren') had to approve the budget, and the state determined the curricula and the university's governance structure (De Ranitz 1938). The state's authority was for the greater part executed by a five member board of guardians ('college van curatoren'). These lay members were appointed and dismissed by the Crown. Their position was always worrisome; being squeezed between the state and the university. Being a buffer trying to protect the university's freedom and simultaneously overseeing the implementation of state policies, frequently led to

¹ Governance is a highly contested term. Here 'internal university governance' refers to structures dealing with authorities and responsibilities ('powers') of governing bodies such as supervisory boards, rectors, deans, or councils as regards academic and non-academic affairs. I will call this interchangeably 'governance structure' or 'governance organization', or 'organisational structure'.

² During the last two centuries the number of Dutch universities has increased. In 1815 there were three universities, at present there are thirteen. Here we present the general picture of the 'average university', acknowledging that local differences exist, as they have always done.

situations in which they 'could do too much harm and could do too little good' (Huizinga 1951, p. 22). Although being criticised from the beginning, the board of guardians survived many storms, mainly in 'the absence of a better alternative' (Hermans 1986, p. 6). Some observers, for instance, advised against the possibility of abolishing the board of guardians and granting academics more authority. The professors' capabilities to run their universities were questioned. As the well known historian Huizinga (1951, p. 24) stated:

unity, direction, swiftness, coherence, that is what is lacking in our university governance (...). How to achieve all these ends? - By abolishing the board of guardians and placing the cabinet directly opposite to the rector and the senate? - Heaven forbids! (...) He who knows from experience the functioning of the academic senates shall not desire to grant this jellyfish the powers of an effective governing body.

The Board's countervailing power in the university was the *senatus academicus*, made up of the university's professors. The senate's main responsibilities, besides the 'ius promovendi', concerned teaching schedules, the duration of lectures, and the division of teaching hours. In practice, the senate's powers were limited, because of the guardian's supervision on the one hand and the faculties' power on the other. The faculties, or in fact the chairs dominated the scene internally (Idenburg 1964, p. 448).

The rector magnificus chaired the senate. He was appointed by the Crown having consulted the senate for a one-year term. Although the rector was assisted by four assessors, representing different faculties, and a clerk ('secretaris'), he had a serious work load because he not only had to represent the university but also to fulfil the regular tasks of a professor ('scientific work and teaching'). It seems clear that such a governing configuration at the top of the university could not be very successful in terms of decisive decision-making. In the 19th and the first decades of the 20th century the faculties, and particularly their chairs, were the central decision making powers. It is an example of Clark's continental mode of authority distribution: 'in vertical profile, the traditional Continental distribution of authority has placed authority at the bottom, in guild forms; secondarily at the top, in ministerial bureaucracy that accommodates to the faculty guilds; and has only weakly provided for authority at the middle levels of the system, in the form of institutional administration of trusteeship.' (Clark 1983, p. 127; Neave and Rhoades 1987). Within this structure professors had almost absolute professional autonomy, particularly with respect to research.

Following the general discussions during and shortly after WW II to fundamentally reorganise society ('doorbraakgedachte') several higher education publications raised the question 'restoration or reconstruction'? In April 1946 the national committee to Reorganise Higher Education - the committee Reinink -

was set up to make recommendations on among other things higher education governance. Although there was in general consensus that universities should have a substantial degree of self-governance controversies about the best internal governing structures remained. From 'both sides' stereotype accusations fuelled the debates. Take for example complaints expressed by some professors who condemned state interference. They spoke of 'a minister who has usually neither a clue nor serious attention for university matters, and of series of administrative bureaucrats of whom one can expect even less.' (Hofstee 1950, p. 132). After lengthy deliberations the committee Reinink - made up of nearly one hundred persons - proposed a university structure in which three stakeholders - the academic community, society, and the state - were represented in a central decision making body, counterbalanced by a university senate. This central decision making body should be composed of five members: two members appointed by the senate (among them the rector), two members put forward by alumni and appointed by the state, and one state representative. The latter could not be the chair, but should have a veto concerning certain issues. Following the work of the committee Reinink, its successor, the committee Van der Pot, was commissioned to design a new higher education act. Consensus was not reached and despite long discussions the existing structure was largely kept in place. In 1960 a new national act on higher education was published, succeeding the old law of 1876. An important change was that the universities were granted legal status, but the internal governing structure was hardly changed. In fact, as the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) argued, *de facto* the old structure was maintained, or, one could even say, reinforced (WRR 1995, p. 30).

It is, certainly with hindsight, no surprise that the university governance structure, laid down in the 1960-Act, was already out-of-date at the time of its implementation. Due to among other things the massification of higher education existing structures were explicitly challenged. In practice, the assumed model of collegial decision-making did not function anymore. The senate lost most of its legitimacy and its meetings were characterised by high levels of absence (Van Braam 1970; Lammers 1973). Also the board of guardians with its lay members were regarded as hampering the required management professionalisation. Jansen, the chair of the Dutch Academic Council, said in 1967 that by then everybody acknowledged that the universities' decision making capacity had to be strengthened, but 'there are differences in opinion how such a strengthening could be achieved'. How right he was!

One of the first concrete initiatives to change the university governance structure came from the committee Maris (1968), installed in 1965 as an *ad hoc* committee of the Academic Council. It took a 'business perspective', using 'centralisation', 'hierarchy', 'efficiency', 'effectiveness' and 'professionalisation' as key elements. It proposed to abolish the senate, the board of guardians and the rectorate and to replace them by one central governing body, the presidium, consisting of three

persons. This governing body should be assisted by a central ‘management team’ (‘algemeen college van overleg’), made up of the members of the presidium and the faculty deans, who should be ‘executive deans’. The academic community should be represented by a university council, having the presidium, academic, and student and alumni representatives, as its members. The Presidium should *not* be accountable to the university council.

The Maris proposal met severe criticism. It was seen as too conservative by some and too progressive by others (de Gaay-Fortman 1968). Moreover, extremely bad timing in putting forward a ‘business-driven’ structure contributed to its failure. It was, as De Gaay-Fortman (1968, p. 109) mentioned, ‘psychologically inexplicable that some notable Dutchmen misread the signs of the time to such an extent.’ It may even have contributed to further radicalising the student movement (Arriëns 1970, p. 155). Then, as in many other countries, the discussions on governance gained momentum as a consequence of an emerging subculture that challenged authority in Dutch society in general and the student protest and riots in particular.³ Not efficiency and effectiveness but participation and democracy ‘suddenly’ became the key elements in discussions about desired university structures. A university should be a cooperative community with great opportunities for all constituencies to participate in decision making, albeit that many different forms were advocated.⁴ In these unsettled times minister of education Veringa managed with ‘spit and string’ to put forward a proposal in 1969⁵ in which he tried to combine the new demands for democracy and more traditional notions of efficiency. He proposed to install a small governing board with full time executives and a representative university council that should run the university together.

On 9 December 1970 a new act on university governance was passed by Parliament; a revolutionary change (Arriëns 1970, p. 4) that marked the birth of the university as a ‘representative and functional democracy’. The university council, consisting of representatives from academics, non-academics, students and lay members became the main decision making body. The council’s decisions were executed by the three person executive board (among them the rector magnificus). A more or less similar structure was put into place⁶ at the faculty

³ As Daalder (1982, p. 181) argues, ‘student agitation (...) might still have had little impact were it not for the more fundamental political and social changes that were taking place simultaneously in Dutch society’.

⁴ Too often it is assumed that the student body, advocating this kind of democratization, was a homogeneous group; in fact, they were internally divided (e.g. De Boer and Stensaker 2007).

⁵ The white paper ‘Governance reform of universities and *hogescholen*’ [Bestuurshervorming universiteiten en hogescholen].

⁶ ‘Put into place’ is definitely an understatement because in many universities it took years before all the formal governing bodies were installed (committee Polak 1979).

level, where a faculty council (half of the seats for academics and the other half for non-academics and students, chaired by the dean) and a five person faculty executive board (chaired by the dean) were established. At the shop floor level, disciplinary groups ('vakgroepen') were established. These disciplinary groups inherited most of the authorities that in the past belonged to the individual chairs. Since these disciplinary groups held significant powers and were dominated by academics, it has been argued that at the end of the day the 'real degree of democracy' was questionable (e.g. Van Strien 1970, Daalder 1982). And, as Daalder (1982, p. 208) argues, 'More 'democracy' in the universities has not meant more autonomy from central government control.'

Particularly in the 1970s bitter internal fights took place with sometimes paralyzing effects on the primary processes. Besides the rather painful and laborious implementation of the 1970-Act (partly due to rule unclearness), the side effects were bureaucratisation and politicisation (e.g. Daalder 1982). In many instances the 'democratic' structure institutionalised particularism and sectionalism, which were hampering change such as innovations in teaching. And, it also contributed to 'navel gazing' and neglecting an outward orientation (e.g. Van Gils and Linthorst 1984, p. 13). In the 1980s some changes in the internal authority distribution were implemented, meaning among other things a shift from a system of 'representative leadership' to 'mixed leadership' (De Boer et al. 1998). Mixed-leadership meant that the three person executive board and the university council with its representatives from academics, non-academics and students formed a delicate horizontal system of checks and balances, in which they ruled the university together (system of co-determination).

The 'democratic experiment' ended in 1997 with the introduction of a new act on university governance (the MUB-act); a clean break with the ideology of the 1960s and 1970s. The 1997 MUB-act promoted efficiency and effectiveness in university decision-making. It abolished the system of 'co-determination' by board and council and the system of power fusion. Most powers regarding academic and non-academic affairs were allocated to executive positions at central and faculty levels. In addition, the structure became less decentralised in several ways such as through the abolition of the organisational third layer - the previously powerful *vakgroepen* (disciplinary groups). From 1997 on, the dean has been given the authority 'to arrange the faculty's organisation'.

The MUB-act provided for a form of executive leadership of universities. At the central level, nearly all powers regarding both academic and non-academic affairs were assigned to the central executive board, which continued to consist of three appointed members (including the rector magnificus), now appointed by and accountable to a new supervisory body, the *raad van toezicht* (a lay body of five persons appointed by, and accountable to, the Minister). The representative councils were retained but lost most of their former power and became mainly

advisory bodies. A new hierarchical management system based on appointments replaced the former, democratic arrangements. The new governing bodies comprise a system where executive and legislative powers are concentrated. Compared to the past, the academic community has little *formal* say in final decisions.

This short overview illuminates the struggles on some core questions on governance. Can lay member guardians adequately look after the state's interests and simultaneously protect the university? What kind of qualifications and competences must a university ruler have? Are academics sufficiently equipped with the expertise and knowledge that is required to govern? Or are enlightened guardians, or professional managers better suited for such a task? Should powers be concentrated or dispersed? Concentration may increase transparency and decisiveness, whereas a division of powers may increase engagement and legitimacy. Finally, how many 'rulers' there should be: only the one (the benevolent dictator), the few (autocracy, technocracy, or oligarchy), or the many (representative democracy)? The Dutch, as have many others, have struggled with these issues. They are, as Cobban has noted (1975, p. 35), the 'hard core of perennial problems which have taxed the minds and ingenuity of university legislators from the thirteenth century to the present day.' And they will continue to do so after Guy Neave's retirement despite all the insights he has given us on these matters in his impressive body of work.

References

- Arriëns, T.E.H. (1970). *Universitaire bestuursorganisatie*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- de Boer, H., Denters, B. and Goedegebuure, L. (1998). 'On boards and councils; shaky balances considered. The governance of Dutch universities', *Higher Education Policy*, 11, 2/3, 153-164.
- de Boer, H. and Stensaker, B. (2007). 'An internal representative system: the democratic vision', in Maasen, P.A.M. and Olsen, J.P. (eds.), *University dynamics and European integration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 137-163.
- van Braam, A. (1970). *Universitaire organisatie en bestuur*. Rotterdam: Universitaire pers.
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *The higher education system: academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley, California.: University of California Press.
- Cobban, A.B. (1975). *The medieval universities: their development and organization*. Chatham: Methuen & co.
- commissie Maris (1968). *Zelfstandige taakvervulling van de universiteit en hogeschool. Rapport van de commissie Ad hoc onderzoek zelfstandige taakvervulling van de universiteit en hogeschool* (Vol. 6). 's-Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij.

- commissie Polak (1979). *Gewubd en gewogen. Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, zitting 1978-1979, 15 515*. 's-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij.
- Daalder, H. (1982). 'The Netherlands: Universities between the 'new democracy' and the 'new management'', in Daalder, H. and Shils, E. (eds.), *Universities, Politicians and Bureaucrats; Europe and the United States*. Cambridge: University press, pp. 173-232.
- de Gaay-Fortman, W.F. (1968). 'Geen managers, maar wat dan wel?' *Universiteit en Hogeschool*, 15, 2, 109-113.
- van Gils, M.R. and Linthorst, J. (1984). 'Vernieuwingen in het universitaire bestel', *Universiteit en Hogeschool*, 31, 1, 9-20.
- de Groof, J., Neave, G. and Svec, J. (1998). *Democracy and governance in higher education* (Vol. 2). The Hague/London/Boston: Kluwer Law International.
- Hermans, H.L.C. (1986). *De bestuurlijke zelfstandigheid van de universiteiten in Nederland: preadvies*. Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink.
- Hofstee, N.F. (1950). *Organisatie en bestuur der universiteit. Een vergelijking tussen Amerika, Engeland en Nederland*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.
- Huizinga, J. (1951). *Verzamelde werken, deel VIII (universiteit, wetenschap en kunst)*. Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink.
- Idenburg, P.J. (1964). *Schets van het Nederlandse schoolwezen*. Groningen: Wolters.
- Lammers, C.J. (1973). 'De zwanezing van de Leidse senaat', *Universiteit en Hogeschool*, 20, 1, 3-35.
- Neave, G. and Rhoades, G. (1987). 'The academic estate in Western Europe', in Clark, B.R. (ed.), *The academic profession. National, disciplinary, and institutional settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 211-270.
- de Ranitz, C.J. (1938). *De rechtspositie van de rijksuniversiteit en van haar elementen*. Alphen aan den Rijn: N. Samson NV.
- van Strien, P.J. (1970). 'De universiteit als open arbeidsorganisatie', *Universiteit en Hogeschool*, 16, 5, 364-399.
- WRR. (1995). *Hoger onderwijs in fasen. Rapport van de Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgeverij.

University and economy: the Italian way

Stefano Boffo

The Italian view of the higher education system has been traditionally mainly inspired by the idealistic philosophy and the usual approach to the economic functions of the university (the largest, predominant and public core of Italian tertiary education) has been largely indirect. In the post-war period, this perspective was based on the assumption that the extension of the higher education system (a still elitist university) can be better seen as an external factor, a basic 'cultural fertiliser' for development and hence as an investment in infrastructure (Myrdal 1968). In this view, higher education was a general (or, better, *generic*) requirement for economic development and the development of human capital was not a matter of individual choice, but rather of public policy (Rosenstein-Rodan 1943; Nurkse 1953). This lack of a direct relation between higher education and economic reasoning led, among the other things, to the fact that establishing a new university in a specific area, especially in backward regions, was seen as preferable to importing the benefits (supply of graduates, research and development, consultancy and so on) of an already established university outside the region.

This does not mean that public policy completely neglected the need to bring the education system directly into a closer relationship with the labour market and economic demands. Rather, this was a perceived need met at a lower level, through public professional schools and through non-school-based vocational training, often directly promoted and managed by firms.

This perspective on higher education was to last until the 1980s, when mass higher education, the increasing gap with the economy and the relatively poor conditions of Italian research led to initiatives to bring universities and economic demand closer together. In fact, in relation to the broad policies launched in other countries in order to achieve closer ties between higher education and the economy, the Italian answer in this field can be considered quite limited¹.

In this framework, it is the creation of new higher education structures which represents the peculiar way the republican Italy found, if not to match economic

¹ Here we might mention the experience of *Diplomi Universitari*, a vocational university track established in 1990, mostly in engineering, economics and para-medical professions; their predecessors, the Special Professional Schools *Sdafs -Scuole dirette a fini speciali*, established in 1982 and the activities of *curricular review*, through which some disciplinary fields were 'refurbished' (see Boffo 2006).

demand, at least to try to establish diffuse relations with local socio-economic realities.

Since its foundation in the second half of the XIX century, the newly-born Italian State absorbed the pre-existing university institutions without reshaping the system according to its new needs. This 'genesis by summation' (Capano 1998, p. 140) implied a serious imbalance in the geographical distribution of institutions, which mirrored the social and economic gap between the relatively developed Centre-North and the backwarded *Mezzogiorno*, the southern part of the country: an imbalance which persisted throughout the years until the Second World War. From the fifties a tendency began to establish new university structures (institutions, branches or courses) all over the country but especially in the South, determined by a number of different factors. Pressure was exerted by local communities, who saw the university as a source of prestige and as a potential promoter of development. Secondly, the government was conscious of the need to overcome the serious gap between relatively developed and less developed areas in the supply of higher education. Lastly, new policies for local development (especially in the South) created the need for adequately trained human capital. It was mostly the pressure from local communities, through Parliamentary lobbying, that was crucial in the decision to establish new structures, whose growth took place in three different ways: the creation of altogether new *public* higher education institutions; the establishment of so-called *libere* (i.e. not state-owned) universities, which very often became state-owned at a later time (through a process called *statalisation*); and the opening of new branches, campuses or courses of existing universities at locations different from the 'mother' institution, which were later to take on the status of new autonomous institutions.

The important role in the decision-making process played by local communities in the establishment of such new structures was closely linked to two other relevant aspects. First of all, the governance framework for the establishment of new structures was characterised by an extreme degree of centralisation. The Ministerial level had, in addition, high discretionary power over funding. The second aspect relates to the connection the government made between local development policies and the establishment of new academic structures: '...the location of new university structures in the South should represent a ... measure capable of producing significant and definite effects for development, and aims at providing the presence of State universities in the South [where they are] particularly scanty and unbalanced' (Parliamentary Commission on the South 1978, p. 99-100). The establishment of a new university structure was seen as providing not only an element of prestige but also an almost *automatic* invigoration of the local economy, regardless of the type of education it might actually supply. An aspect well illustrated by the preference given to low-cost

degree courses (humanities or social sciences), no matter what the training needs for local development might be.

This attitude helps to explain why, during the 1960s and 1970s, the expansion of the Italian higher education system continued in a disorderly manner and why the new planned growth and geographical distribution of university structures implemented during the 1980s had no direct relationship with the economy. In fact if through multi-year university planning, governance of the system's expansion was enforced, the logic for the approval of new structures was still far from a real recognition of the actual needs of the economy.

An important point was that new actors (regional Governments, Rectors' Conference, National University Council) were invited to take part in the drafting of the new university development plans. At the same time, new actors were also called on to participate in the institutional life of the universities: the Board of Directors of universities were allowed to incorporate representatives of local institutions and, more limitedly, of the financial contributors (Boffo et al. 2006). This was a sign of the perceived need to involve economic and institutional stakeholders in the life of universities, but still represented a quite indirect ability to connect universities with economic life. Local political pressures undoubtedly still had a predominant weight in decisions on the location of new university structures, thus frustrating most attempts to plan and steer the processes. As a consequence, this policy issue '...progressively took shape as the sum of all local events and through the extremely passive attitude of the system's governance centre' (Capano 1998, p. 142).

The introduction of new curricula through the general reform law adopted in 1997 for didactical activities had the goal to enable the system to fulfil new functions: a differentiation of degrees in order to lower the number of drop-outs, to achieve a graduation age comparable with the average in Europe and to produce intermediate skills required by the economy. In particular, the first degree (*Laurea*) was conceived, simultaneously, as a necessary step to a further one (*Laurea specialistica*), and a qualification for the labour market. Seven years after the implementation of the reform, it is necessary to state that the latter aspect failed almost completely, showing the persistence of the distance between university education and market needs.

The overview sketched above shows the difficulties of implementing effective, explicit and complex policies to bring higher education closer to economy and its institutions in Italy. As it was previously argued, this difficulty mostly stems from a view that locates the university system in the famous *ivory tower*, fully autonomous and detached from the economic world. A system whose mission is to educate citizens for cultural rather than professional aims and economic growth. Even the policy for the creation of new structures, which we have

interpreted as a policy to lessen the distance between the university and the economy, can be explained in this light. Despite aimed, as it was, to strengthen the links between higher education institutions and the economic and institutional community, at local and national level, this policy hardly achieved any specific economic goals. It did not represent a serious step away from the indefiniteness of the 'cultural fertiliser' perspective nor from the view of higher education as an investment in general infrastructure, through which human capital might -in some, not specified way- contribute to the development of a given region. The many relations between universities and the economic world which, quite obviously, existed throughout this period, were built mostly on consultancies offered by individual professors. Attempts were made, starting from the 1980s, to correct this approach: the review of some curricula, the explicit introduction of goals related to the productive world in the 'rationale' of the multi-year university development plans, and finally the launch of DU courses. But the general view of the higher education system still remained one of substantial independence from economic problems, including those of occupational training and development.

Much fuel was of course added to these difficulties by the strongly centralised approach to the governance of the university system which prevailed until the 1990s, when the idea of institutional autonomy for universities was introduced. Among other things, the old centralised system brought about a remarkable *passivity* in most Italian universities so that the behavioural framework in those years can be summarised in the idea that everything which was not explicitly permitted was forbidden. Not too paradoxically, this attitude did not change even when the legislation finally 'permitted' something in the field of active relations with economic world. In such cases universities were simply left to decide by themselves, with no proactive support by the government and, as a result, many universities tended to remain inactive and take no initiative.

This passive attitude seemed in many cases to have been retained as a sort of 'cultural heritage' even when the new institutional autonomy should presumably have represented a remarkably powerful factor in pushing universities to be active and enterprising, to take action and take responsibility for it. Not all nor most universities were willing, or adequately equipped, to take advantage of this opportunity. As a consequence, policies such as the creation of new structures, the establishment of short vocational courses or the new opportunities offered by the reform law of 1997 - policies, in other words, that were meant to build a strong and straightforward link with local economies and communities - were utilised only at the margins, thus picking up on only a few of the possibilities potentially offered in the field of a better relationship with the economic world. This is the origin of the present deep dualism among Italian universities, that presumably is likely to grow wider. On the one hand, there is a group of more active universities, which will progressively consolidate their autonomy and their

initiative-taking abilities towards firms and other external institutions. On the other hand, there is a broad group of universities still inclined to remain inactive and not to exploit the opportunities offered by autonomy. This dualism is bound to become more pronounced as a consequence of the full implementation of the new autonomous phase of the Italian university system and of the quite inevitable competition it will trigger between institutions. What we can expect in the future is that those institutions that are better equipped - through links with the community, through disciplinary characteristics or through a combination of both - and are more persuaded that their own role is projected as an external one (Dubois 1997) or as an entrepreneurial model of university will prevail (Clark 1998). These institutions will be able to make good use of all the instruments made available in order to strengthen their links with local economic and institutional actors; while the others will remain constrained by a type of relationship with the economic and social environment that they will not be able to push beyond the formal level.

References

- Boffo, S. (2006). *Oltre la torre d'avorio- Sul difficile rapporto tra università e società della conoscenza in Italia*. Sassari: EDES.
- Boffo, S., Dubois, P., Moscati, R. (2006). *Il governo delle università. Rettori e presidenti in Italia e Francia*. Milano: Guerini e Associati.
- Capano, G. (1998). *La politica universitaria*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial Universities*. Kidlington: IAU-Pergamon.
- Commissione Interparlamentare per il Mezzogiorno (1978). 'Parere sui provvedimenti di statizzazione ed istituzione di nuove università', in Pertempi, S. (ed.), *Intervento Culturale e Mezzogiorno*. II. Roma: Ricerche e Studi Formez, pp.123-141.
- Dubois, P. (1997). 'L'organisation des universités: complexification, diversification, rationalisation, évaluation', *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 28, 35-44.
- Myrdal, G. (1968). *Asian Drama*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Nurkse, R. (1953). *Problems of capital formation in underdeveloped countries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P. (1943). 'Problems of industrialization in eastern and south-eastern Europe', *Economic Journal*, 53, 53-78.

Prolegomena to an Inquiry into the Campus Invisible

Sheldon Rothblatt

The word 'campus' is said to derive from the broad expanse of lawn at Princeton University (Turner 1984, p. 21). Thus modestly, at the end of the eighteenth century, began a spatial planning tradition that spread all over the United States to become entangled with the New World's various interpretations and experiments with undergraduate liberal education. The campus as a landscaped park filled with neo-historical architecture, sculpture, iconography, gardens and conspicuously of the picturesque style imported from English country estates, became the hallmark of any college or university aspiring to recognition (Keller 2004). Formed during the decades in which undergraduate education became associated with the youth culture of the Romantic era, the campus proved to be a prime piece of real estate indeed, a Campus Visible affecting moods, feelings, sensations and above all providing a sentimental recollection of what graduates recalled as the springtime of their lives. Seizing upon this bounteous emotional inheritance, campus leaders learned how to use their attractive spaces to retain the loyalties and gift-giving propensities of generations of former undergraduates. This is particularly true of institutions that in one way or another qualify as elite or select, which includes some state-assisted universities and many that are private (Rothblatt 1997; Clark 1992).

The campus as dedicated space, especially when residential, competes for attention with the home, the locality and neighbourhood, the workplace or the city. Indeed, contrary to the university's medieval inheritance, the Campus Visible is in some respects a profoundly anti-urban construction, although eventually invaded by high-rise structures. And again unlike medieval predecessors, the American campus was often sited in frontier areas, where land was plentiful, or nervously on the edges of growing population centers. Because American undergraduates were often younger than most European counterparts, the Campus Visible was particularly vigilant in guaranteeing safe environments. The many faith-related colleges in the United States took this to be a prime necessity in order to assuage the fears of parents and preserve religious legacies. More generally, age-grading grew in importance in the nineteenth century, becoming a special way of defining self and status (Chudacoff 1989, p. 5).

An interesting historical question was whether the Campus Visible would prove to be the primary model for the day when higher education systems expanded to accommodate mass access enrolments and even universal education (Trow 1974, pp. 55-101). That it has had some success in meeting the demands of the first is well indicated by the adoption of campus planning tools and objectives in Europe

after the Second World War. The Robbins Era of 1960s Britain, for example, was characterised by the development of many 'greenfields' campuses in lovely small town or rural settings. These have been termed 'utopianist' because of their ambitious union of educational and planning values (Muthesius 2000, pp. 6, 31, 220). But it is now more apparent than decades ago that the utopianist campuses were also part of an elite system of higher education and were eager to rank with predecessors.

Inevitably, utopianist planning and construction, ambitiously undertaken, were over-run by costs. Almost by definition, the Campus Visible is expensive, requiring continual expenditure for grounds and buildings, or for upgrading technologies. Because some of these costs are passed on to students (how much is difficult to calculate), modern societies have created alternatives or Campus Invisibles in which dedicated space, residence and tutorial teaching play a limited role, if at all. A seeming forerunner, once termed 'invisible colleges', may be mentioned if only to indicate the differences with the Campus Invisible. The reference is to those networks of communication and cooperation, often across national lines, that unite scholars and scientists in the many scholarly domains. These go back to the middle ages (and indeed to the *responsa* literature of far-flung rabbis). The Campus Invisible is something altogether different. If the Campus Visible is a tactile artifact of the Romantic Era, the Campus Invisible vigorously operates over wider spaces. Territory is relatively unimportant. The traditions that are invoked are more associated with the European and American Enlightenment than with the Romantic eras that followed. Those traditions, undoubtedly intellectual, also feature popular education and what was once termed 'useful knowledge.' The larger goal was to make these non-elite forms of education into a program for advancing what came to be known (from the French) as 'civilisation.'

Popular education in the nineteenth century took multiple forms. Part-time courses, evening classes, library and museum lectures, art institute lectures, lyceums, athenaeums, mechanics institutes in Britain and the later Workers' Educational Movement, the Chatauqua (New York) summer camps and courses of America, the *folkbildning* movement starting in Denmark in the 1850s and spreading to Sweden are examples of outreach efforts that brought various forms of instruction to mainly if not invariably urban populations. So did the *Arbetarinstitut* in Stockholm, founded by a medical doctor of radical inclinations named Anton Nyström, who aimed the institute's lectures at the skilled workers of the capital. Strange as it may appear in retrospect, the participants asked for more demanding teaching, to include examinations in anatomy and physiology and a more open forum. The experiment even received the attention of parliament. The motives of organisers and promoters of popular educational movements were many: to spread new ideas; to further the agenda of particular religious groups; to combat the effects of poverty and drink; to provide learning

opportunities for non-Anglophone immigrant groups in America; to unite societies that appeared in danger of descending into class conflict (Knowles 1977, Kett 1994, Kärnfelt 2000, Leander 1978, Wallerius 1988, Poppius 1970, Karlsson 1987).

Strictly speaking, not all of these movements could be classified as distance learning; the main point is that they were not so wholly dependent upon a unique physical environment. But distance learning as we understand it was certainly in the offing. A form of it was an unexpected byproduct of the founding of the University of London in the 1820s. After a dispute over whether a 'godless', that is to say, a university without ties to the Anglican establishment, should be chartered by the Privy Council to offer degrees, London was empowered to offer both internal and external degrees. External degrees could be awarded solely on the basis of examinations that could be taken and invigilated almost anywhere.

But distance learning proper belongs to the extra-mural teaching programs started by Cambridge University, notably by a Scot, James Stuart, who was also instrumental in establishing engineering studies. Scotland's more democratic heritage may have been an influence in Stuart's desire to create a sort of 'peripatetic university' the professors of which would circulate among the big towns. Regional centers were established, out of which eventually sprang new university colleges such as Nottingham and Exeter. Cambridge University lent its name to a Local Lectures Syndicate with the understanding that it was not to be a charge on general revenues (Welch 1973, pp. 25, 43-44). Afterwards St. Andrews University in Scotland created a licentiate in arts external degree for women mainly that could be taken worldwide. In America extra-mural courses were given the name 'university extension' (later 'continuing education'). They developed, appropriately enough, out of the land grant mission, the 'people's universities' as legislated by Congress during the Civil War period. There may have been an influence, if not specific, from the state-supported adult education movements in Germany encountered by American educators studying abroad.

Differences in audience and mission in American extension divisions are well illustrated by a brief comparison between the University of Wisconsin and the University of California at Berkeley, especially up to the 1940s. The first, located in a state with a German and Scandinavian social democratic inheritance, defined its university extension program with the entire citizenry of the state in mind, the so-called 'Wisconsin Idea,' and planned an extensive outreach effort heavily backed by state funds to reduce the costs to students. As much as 40% of the extension division's budget was subsidised directly by taxpayers.

The model adopted by the University of California developed out of an admiration for British extra-mural studies by professors acquainted with it, and this early imprint guided extension through its first 60 or 70 years. The earliest curriculum reflected the high culture model of Britain. Courses in the arts and

humanities were first offered in 1891 (the tragedies of Shakespeare) essentially at the initiative of individual professors. After about two decades of indifference, campus administrators took interest. The reason, according to the memoirs of a sometime dean at the University of California at Los Angeles, was a sudden appreciation of the public relations possibilities of continuing education. As the Berkeley campus moved increasingly towards a research mission, more or less evident in the sciences around 1915, the extension program began to offer somewhat more specialised courses. Other extension programs in the state, those offered by the segment of four- and five-year colleges and the two-year community colleges, provided preparatory and vocational courses, such as teacher-training or general education for local markets (Sheats 1965, pp. 65-75, 88-118).

The first major excursions into Swedish university extension teaching came in 1893 at the instigation of Harald Hjärne, a professor of history at Uppsala. It was a summer school for mainly lower secondary teachers and those who worked in the system of folk schools, featuring courses in the humanities and psychology (science attracted less interest from the teachers). In the next year Lund followed suit, and the summer schools at the university colleges in Stockholm and Göteborg commenced in 1902, remaining at the latter until 1931. Additional university involvement was through lecturing societies formed in Uppsala, Lund, Stockholm and Göteborg in the first half of the twentieth century. By far the closest ties between the societies and the universities were at Lund, where academics sat on the board of the Central Bureau for Popular Scientific Lectures. But the Bureau operated under severe limitations, having no buildings or lecture halls of its own. It was really another version of the popular adult education courses that drew from temperance societies and labour unions (Kärnfelt 2000, pp. 205-206; Leander 1978, pp. 210-211; Wallerius 1988, pp. 98-100, 112-119, 128-132; Poppius 1970).

Stockholm, now elevated to university standing, formed an Extra-Mural Board in 1933. In the Swedish folk democratic manner, the classes were informal, guided by 'leaders' (usually students from the university) rather than 'instructors.' Those in attendance were unemployed white collar workers, office clerks and secretaries who disliked the usual academic style of *ex cathedra* lecturing as perhaps a sign of social class superiority and condescension. These sentiments were often shared by members of the political parties who were interested in adult education, but their approval was necessary if extra-mural courses were to be subsidised by central government¹ (Wallerius 1988, pp. 98-100).

None of the foregoing examples of adult education movements were ever really part of the Campus Visible, even those programs created by extra-mural

¹ I am grateful for the assistance of Pär Eliasson in the use of Swedish sources.

divisions. Courses might be offered on university grounds in unused classrooms on weekends or evenings, but no one could claim that the occasional walk on campus, however momentarily pleasing, or a camp-like setting for summer programs, was the equivalent of being a regular, full-time inhabitant of the campus city, cosseted by professors and welcomed as citizens of a special kind of republic. Still, they were places of some kind, territories and locations, however unassuming. In the post Second World War era, 'open universities' continued the traditions of extra-mural teaching, although offering degree advantages. While first dependent upon radio and even more upon television, some had (and have) drop-in tutorial centers, others do not. But the 'distance' of a newer kind is genuinely invisible. Electronic technology, the cyberspace or virtual university, the world of the internet have produced a vision of learning that is at once magical and frightening (as magic is), promising and threatening. It is too new to properly assess, but it is very real, and it poses an alternative to the Campus Visible that no adult education movement has ever mounted in a period of 150 years. Scholars such as Sarah Guri-Rosenblit in Israel, Diane Harley in the United States and Thomas Pfeiffer in Austria are busily examining the arguments, the circumstances, the possibilities, the varieties, the fears and the meaning of a particular kind of technological revolution.

Doubts will unquestionably linger as to many of the claims for the invisible internet when compared to the campus university and its appealing sensuous characteristics, especially the elite variety. Their history shows rather clearly that they retain their advantages across the centuries, remaking themselves whenever competition arises (as the Ivy League universities of the Atlantic seaboard in the United States made themselves 'ivy' in the first part of the twentieth century) (Thelin 1976). Brand-name recognition and a continuing faith in their social and networking advantages cannot be underestimated, although the success of such expectations can neither be guaranteed nor easily measured. A new world of unprecedented mobility, of circulating talent, of special opportunities for the risk-takers, of intense international competition brings with it uncertainties that challenge prior beliefs about optimal educational methods and educational achievement. It is in this world that cyberspace learning has taken hold. In the words of Guy Neave: 'what was once heralded as the daring experiment in distance teaching universities has now become the template: the referential vision against which even well-established universities now seek, in varying degrees of accommodation, to align themselves' (Guri-Rosenblit 1999, p. x).

As the nations of the world embrace the Campus Invisible, our task is not to question the validity of the Campus Visible, a great aesthetic contribution to modern culture, but to explore the Romantic assumptions upon which it was built: a human scale for learning, a belief advanced by poets that being young required exposure to beauty (*vide*: John Keats, *Ode on a Grecian Urn*), some isolation from the hurly-burly of cities and a sense that human fulfilment could

only occur in environments filled with the best that nature had to offer. Against that ideal the Campus Invisible offers convenience, regard for the independence and initiative of the learner, respect for other learning environments and recognition that education is a lifelong commitment that produces continual re-shaping and growth. In those respects the Campus Invisible has in fact influenced the Campus Visible (Landow 1996, p. 360). It has also strengthened communication between the invisible colleges.

Most students today are not 'young' in the older Romantic sense. And while it is correct to say that the Campus Visible made room for professional alongside undergraduate education, it is equally correct that law, medicine, social work, architecture, city planning and engineering - supremely urban-relevant occupations - have not always needed a Campus Visible. Nor does the modern commitment to research require the enchantments of environment. Just how contemporary notions of fulfilment, personal or career, require a Campus Visible is a subject well worth investigating as we enter new arenas in the long history of the connection between education and the Good Life.

References

- Chudacoff, H. (1989). *How Old Are You? Age Consciousness in American Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1992). *The Distinctive College*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books. First published in 1970.
- Guri-Rosenblit, S. (1999). *Distance and Campus Universities, Tensions and Interactions: A Comparative Study of Five Countries*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Karlsson, J-S. (1987). *Folkbildning i utveckling*. Stockholm: Folksuniversitetets skriftserie.
- Kärnfelt, J. (2000). *Mellan nytta och nöje: Ett bidrag till populärvetenskapens historia i Sverige*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University Press.
- Keller, G. (2004). *Transforming a College: the Story of a Little-Known College's Strategic Climb to National Distinction*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Kett, J. (1994). *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties, From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1900*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Knowles, M.S. (1977). *A History of the Adult Education Movement in the United States*. Huntington, NY: R.E. Krieger Publishing Co.
- Landow, G.P. (1996). 'Newman and the Idea of an Electronic University', in Turner, F. (ed.), *The Idea of a University, John Henry Newman*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 339-361.
- Leander, S. (1978). *Folkbildning och folkföreläsningar: Ur en folkbildares tänkebok - Folkbildningsstudier och föreläsningshistoria 1800-1975*. Stockholm: LT-förlag.

- Muthesius, S. (2000). *The Postwar University, Utopianist Campus and College*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Poppius, U. (1970). *När: Lundaprofessorerna höll bondföreläsningar: Centralbyrån för populära vetenskapliga föreläsningar. Folkbildningsavdelning vid Lunds universitet 1898-1970*. Lund: Lunds Offset.
- Rothblatt, S. (1997). *The Modern University and Its Discontents, The Fate of Newman's Legacies in Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheats, R. (1965). *University Extension, a History*. Oral History Program, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Thelin, J. (1976). *The Cultivation of Ivy, a Saga of the College in America*. Cambridge MA: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- Trow, M. (1974). 'Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education', in *Policies for Higher Education, from the General Report on the Conference on Future Structures of Post-Secondary Education*. Paris: OECD.
- Turner, J.V. (1984). *Campus, An American Planning Tradition*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Wallerius, B. (1988). *Vetenskapens Vägar: om akademiker och folkbildningsarbete*. Stockholm: Folksuniversitetets skriftserie.
- Welch, E. (1973). *The Peripatetic University, Cambridge Local Lectures 1873-1973*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Understanding transplanted institutions: an exercise in contemporary history and cultural fragmentation

Simon Schwartzman

Higher education institutions are supposed to deliver goods to society - skilled manpower, research, services, and opportunities for social mobility - and are often evaluated and managed in terms of their ability to achieve these goals. However, they are also institutions with their peculiar histories and traditions. It is impossible to fully understand them, and their different ways of responding to these demands, without a good understanding of their historical and cultural context. Guy Neave stresses this point in his article on 'Higher Education Policy as an exercise in contemporary history' (Neave 1996, p. 408). In his words,

For those working in an historical setting, context - the subtle variations that go to make up the social, cultural and political fabric within which an issue is situated - is essential. Having an intimate grasp over say, the historical or contemporary development of a given system of higher education, of the laws that regulate it, the procedures that govern its administration, the conditions which govern access, are certainly necessary, but not sufficient. For the higher education system of any nation is seated not simply within the academic culture of that nation. It is also firmly anchored within the whole range of social values and beliefs which, by their nature, tend very often to be opaque to the outsider for the very reason that they form part of that civilisation's central norms and thus are largely taken for granted by its denizens.

One difference between higher education as a discipline and other fields of education research and scholarship is that, in the former, the historical dimensions tend to be much more present and salient than in the latter. A possible explanation is that, historically, higher education institutions have been much more autonomous and reflexive than basic and secondary education, whose subordination to outside influences and power - governments, economic planners, the Church, businessmen - is usually taken for granted. In the last decades, as higher education expanded, its costs increased, and its potential economic relevance became more salient, it became also the subject of growing outside assessment and interference. The conceptual tensions between the historical, 'comprehensive', contextual approach to higher education policy and the more functional, analytical and quantitative approaches are a reflection of the all-too-real tensions between autonomy and external oversight, typical of higher education institutions in most countries today. As Guy Neave has remarked, it can probably also be argued - and certainly researched - that 'never in recent times has higher education been more externally driven than over the course of

the past decade' (Neave 1995; Neave 1996, p. 404). One could argue that the historical, 'comprehensive' approach is inherently more conservative than the external views, with its stress on the 'private life' of higher education institutions, to use the phrase coined by Martin Trow and adopted by Neave. But one could also argue that policies based on the proper understanding of the historical, cultural and institutional context of higher education institutions are more likely to succeed than those which ignore and do not really care about this 'private life'.

Besides, the historical approach need not be conservative, particularly if it not bounded by the idea of unified, coherent historical traditions, but taking into account the fact that higher education institutions are the product of different, and often conflictive historical trends, and that public policies are, more often than not, the process of taking the side of some trends against others.

Latin America is an interesting case of this clash of historical traditions, as well as the clash between the historical and the functional approaches. A frequent, naïve view of higher education in this region is to consider the universities as 'modern institutions', created by governments and planners to make their societies more competent and efficient, against anti-intellectual, pre-scientific traditions. According to this view, as new institutions, these universities did not have traditions of their own, except, perhaps, the institutional models which are copied from other countries, very often without a proper understanding of their 'private life'. In this perspective, the problems facing the establishment of universities in Latin American countries would be just one part of a broader modernisation agenda.

However, Latin American countries, for the most part, have never been 'traditional societies' in the usual sense,¹ and their culture is better described as the 'shattered mirror' of modernity, in the phrase coined by José Joaquín Brunner (Brunner 1988). All fragments of the broken mirror reflect the modern world, but from different angles, each with its own history, and it is necessary to understand at least some of these fragments to understand also the peculiar features of the higher education institutions in the region, their trends and potentials for change.

The first fragments are the historical tensions between Church and State. The standard image of early Latin America is the Priest and the Conquistador

¹ The exception are the large native populations in countries like Guatemala, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru and Paraguay, which still stand separate from the European white colonizers and their descendants, the criollos, with many of them speaking their traditional languages. However, these populations have been in contact with the Europeans for centuries, and their culture and traditions were shaped by these experiences. The same applies to the descendants of African slaves, brought to Brazil and many Caribbean countries, as well as the United States, in large numbers until the mid-19th century.

working hand in hand to bring the Incas, the Aztecs and Atlantic natives under submission. The first Latin American universities in the 16th Century were organised by the Church (the universities of San Marcos in Peru, Mexico, Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic, Santo Tomás in the Dominican Republic, the Colegio Mayor de Santo Tomás in Guatemala and others), and the Church was also responsible for all formal education that existed during the colonial period. These early institutions were part of the cultural enlightenment that prevailed in Spain in the 16th and 17th century and extended also to the colonies, in which the partnership between clerical and civilian elites was often tense, and culminated, in the 18th Century, with the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain and Portugal, ending also the Catholic grip on the Spanish and Portuguese universities (Carneiro et al. 2000; Linz 1972; Maxwell 1995).

With political independence in the early 19th century, the new nations inherited the complex and heavy bureaucracies created by Spain and Portugal to administer their colonies. These bureaucracies have been described as patrimonial, meaning that they did not embody the Weberian principles of separation of public and private interest and property, nor the recognition of an autonomous and free citizenship (Eisenstadt 1973; Schwartzman 1977; Uricochea 1980). At the same time, the new elites imported from France the ideas of how a modern nation should be organised, which included the creation of modern military, health and legal institutions and their corresponding learning centers. In practice, the new nations established in the early 19th century did not remain in the hands of the leaders that created them and worked for their consolidation - San Martín, Simón Bolívar, Hidalgo, José Bonifácio, and later Sarmiento and Andrés Bello - but succumbed often to the power of small oligarchies and caudillos. The Catholic Church did not disappear from the region with the expulsion of the Jesuits and political independence. Some of the old Catholic universities became lay, state controlled institutions; others closed down; and others were able to survive as independent institutions. In some countries more than others, a new urban, professional social group started to emerge, also looking to Europe for their professional identities and political ideologies, and trying either to capture the levers of political power on the name of their claimed scientific and technical expertise, or to free themselves from the controls and oversight of the new political establishments (Schwartzman 1991b).

The University Reform Movement, which started in Córdoba, Argentina, in 1918 and spread to many other countries after that, can be seen as part of this conflict between the emerging, educated middle classes and the political elites. Basically, the Reform Movement established the power of the students to participate in the management of the universities, and the notion that the universities should be autonomous from interference from governments and politicians, who should, however, keep on paying for their maintenance.

Throughout the 20th century, as mass higher education became prevalent in the region, new fragments would grow and reflect other dimensions of modernity and post-modernity. The reformed universities adopted universal admission, free tuition, and the election of rectors by the students, lecturers and alumni. They became very large - some of them, like the universities of Mexico and Buenos Aires, among the largest in the world - very politicised and did not allow much space for scientific research and academic scholarship (Levy 1980; Schwartzman 1996). European immigrants, first, and international cooperation, later, would create a new segment of research oriented academics, who would look at Europe first, and later American research universities, as the new model for the reorganisation of the universities in the region (Albornoz et al. 1996; Cueto 1994; Schwartzman 1991a; Vessuri 1998). A new academic profession would emerge, organised in part as an academic community of scholars, but mostly as strong unions of civil servants, often in association with different political parties. (Balbachevsky and Quinteiro 2002; Gil Antón 1994; Schwartzman and Balbachevsky 1996). The issues of cost, rationalisation and effectiveness, stressed by institutions such as the World Bank and OECD, would justify the strengthening of national ministries and agencies for science, technology and higher education; and new demands for access, equity and affirmative action, reflecting the concerns of new social movements and international agencies, also grew in importance.

The shattered mirror metaphor should not be understood as meaning that Latin American societies do not have their own personalities, histories and traditions. It just means that Latin America is, and has always been, part of a much broader picture, which it reflects and modifies in its own ways.

References

- Albornoz, M., Kreimer, P. and Glavich, E. (1996). *Ciencia y sociedad en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.
- Balbachevsky, E. and Quinteiro, M.C. (2002). 'The changing academic workplace in Brazil', in Altbach, P.G. (ed.), *The decline of the guru: the academic profession in developing and middle-income countries*. Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts: Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, pp. 75-106.
- Brunner, J.J. (1988). *Un espejo trizado: ensayos sobre cultura y políticas culturales*. Santiago, Chile: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales.
- Carneiro, A., Simoes, A. and Diogo, M.P. (2000). 'Enlightenment Science in Portugal: The Estrangeirados and Their Communication Networks', *Social Studies of Science*, 30, 591-619.
- Cueto, M. (1994). *Missionaries of science - the Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Eisenstadt, S.N. (1973). *Traditional patrimonialism and modern neopatrimonialism*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- Gil Antón, M. (1994). *Los rasgos de la diversidad un estudio sobre los académicos mexicanos*. Azcapotzalco, México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Azcapotzalco.
- Levy, D.C. (1980). *University and government in Mexico autonomy in an authoritarian system*. New York: Praeger.
- Linz, J. (1972). 'Intellectual roles in sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain', *Daedalus (Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences)*, 59-108.
- Maxwell, K. (1995). *Pombal, paradox of the Enlightenment*. Cambridge England, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Neave, G. (1995). 'On Living in Interesting Times: Higher Education in Western Europe 1985-1995', *European Journal of Education*, 30, 377-393.
- Neave, G. (1996). 'Higher Education Policy as an Exercise in Contemporary History', *Higher Education*, 32, 403-415.
- Schwartzman, S. (1977). 'Back to Weber: corporatism and patrimonialism in the seventies', in Malloy, J.M. (ed.), *Authoritarianism and corporatism in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 89-106.
- Schwartzman, S. (1991a). *A space for science the development of the scientific community in Brazil*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schwartzman, S. (1991b). 'Changing roles of new knowledge: research institutions and societal transformations in Brazil', in Wagner, P., Weiss, C.H., Wittrock, B. and Wollman, H. (eds.), *Social sciences and modern states national experiences and theoretical crossroads*. Cambridge England, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 230-260.
- Schwartzman, S. (1996). *América Latina: universidades en transición*. Washington: Organization of American States.
- Schwartzman, S., and Balbachevsky, E. (1996). 'The academic profession in Brazil', in Altbach, P.G. (ed.), *The international academic profession: portraits of fourteen countries*, Princeton, N.J: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, pp. 231-280.
- Uricoechea, F. (1980). *The patrimonial foundations of the Brazilian Bureaucratic state / O Minotauro Imperial - A Burocratização do Estado Patrimonial Brasileiro no Século XIX*. Berkeley, Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo: University of California Press / DIFEL.
- Vessuri, H.M.C. (1998). *La investigación y desarrollo (I+D) en las universidades de América Latina*. Caracas: Fondo Editorial Fintec.

The 'Nationalisation' of UK Universities 1963-2007

Peter Scott

Introduction

Once upon a time - the fairy-tale beginning is apt because appearance and substance were not the same - universities in the United Kingdom enjoyed exceptional autonomy. A favourite metaphor, also reminiscent of a fairy-tale, was that of the tree stump in the forest on which the State left the money and then departed leaving the universities to pick it up unmolested and unseen; the 'tree-stump' was the University Grants Committee, the celebrated buffer body between universities and the State established in 1919 and widely admired as an ingenious English device to reconcile the public funding of higher education with the preservation of university freedom (Berdahl 1959; Shinn 1986; Shattock 1994). Today UK universities are still regarded as exceptional - but in a very different context. Their former autonomy, the 'donnish dominion' in A H Halsey's resonant phrase (Halsey 1992), has been replaced by entrepreneurial freedom; and collegiality (and institutional solidarity) by competition. Compared with other European universities, they are seen (or, certainly, see themselves) as leaders in the 'marketisation' of higher education. How has such a collection (not really a system, of course) of traditional, even venerable, universities been transformed into cutting-edge institutions in the knowledge wars of the 21st century?

The key to this transformation has been the evolving relationship between the universities and the State. In the course of this evolution two myths have been exposed. The first is that, while the post-war welfare state attempted to curb the freedom of universities in the interests of social justice, its successor, the 'market state' coined by Philip Bobbitt (Bobbitt 2002), was (and is) eager to set them free. But in the United Kingdom the subordination of universities to the State, which in the hey-day of the welfare state in the 1960s and 1970s, was a gentle, tentative and (above all) negotiated process, accelerated and intensified after Margaret Thatcher came to power, becoming during the 1980s a rough, categorical and non-negotiable process. Nor has this trajectory been reversed under New Labour, purged of sentimental allegiance to social democracy; indeed it is plausible to argue that only in the past ten years has an unambiguously state-controlled system of higher education emerged. The second myth is that a state system of higher education, in which the freedom of the universities has been restricted, is more likely to embody the idea (and ethic) of the 'public', because state control implies this orientation, than a looser collection of more traditional, and more

autonomous, institutions. Once again the experience of the United Kingdom contradicts this assumption. In the case of higher education privatisation has seemed rather to be a higher form of nationalisation not its reversal. The latter process, with its explosion of control measures, proliferation of steering mechanisms and ever increasing burden of accountability, has been intensified, not to promote 'social engineering' in its widest and best sense, but to 'force universities to be free' - in other words, to pursue their (selfish?) destinies as knowledge 'businesses'.

The particular story of State-university relations in the UK, therefore, takes on a more general significance. It is no longer the story of an exceptional case-study, as outlined at the beginning of this chapter, however much that may appeal to the vanity of the British. Rather it illuminates not only the changing purposes of universities during the past four decades, from being educative and values-imbued (and social?) institutions to become agents of competitive advantage in the global knowledge economy, but also the evolution of the post-welfare state, and its shifting definitions and provision of 'public' services. This chapter is divided into three sections: (i) the emergence of a national-public system of higher education from the publication of the Robbins report in 1963 to the collapse of the so-called 'post-war settlement' in 1979; (ii) Margaret Thatcher's 'war' on higher education; and (iii) the consolidation of a national-but-privatised system of higher education under Tony Blair.

Robbins and Crosland

At the start of the 1960s the UK higher education system - and, in particular, its universities component - was an anachronism. First, it had yet to experience the rapid expansion of student numbers which was later to transform it into a mass system, an expansion already under way in the United States and much of the rest of western and southern Europe. Secondly, as has already been said, the universities enjoyed an exceptional degree of autonomy, never having been incorporated into the state bureaucracy as in the rest of Europe ('public' but not 'state' institutions) and not yet swept up in the tide of democratisation that had been a consequence of the GI Bill in the United States.

Four developments during the 1960s and 1970s began to modify this picture.

1. The first, and most decisive, development was the expansion of student numbers, magisterially endorsed by the Robbins report of 1963 (Committee on Higher Education 1963). This was by no means a foregone conclusion in the early 1960s; there was prolonged and influential resistance to expansion under the slogan 'more means worse'. Although this expansion affected all institutions, brand new universities were established and the colleges of

advanced technology were designated as technological universities - both top-down initiatives which strengthened the hand of the State;

2. The second development, which flowed from the first, was that the higher education budget soared. As a result the universities, and more specifically the UGC, had to justify their bids for increased public resources - not least in competition with other parts of the education system. In 1963, for the first time ever, the UGC failed to receive all the funding it had requested on behalf of the universities. A year later the universities became responsible to the new Department for Education and Science; previously the UGC had answered only to the Treasury;
3. The third development was that university accounts were opened to the scrutiny of the Comptroller and Auditor-General and, through this state official, to the House of Commons' Public Accounts Committee. This indicated that universities were no longer regarded as private corporations, although in receipt of state funding, but as public institutions;
4. The fourth development was the first, rather tentative, moves towards articulating a national higher education policy. This took two main forms. The first was a series of gentle suggestions to the universities about their future direction. For example, in 1967 the UGC issued its first ever 'letter of guidance' to universities and a year later a junior Minister, Shirley Williams, proposed '13 points' for what would now be called modernisation of the university system (all of which were, condescendingly, rejected). The second, associated with the Secretary of State for Education Anthony Crosland, was to encourage the development of an alternative, non-university, sector of higher education spearheaded by the newly established polytechnics (which were created by mergers of colleges of technology and art in another forceful demonstration of state action) (Department of Education and Science 1966; Robinson 1968).

Although these four developments had gone a long way to establishing a national higher education system by the mid-1970s, the process was still incomplete. The universities continued to be treated with due deference, their autonomy dented perhaps but not destroyed. Only limited progress had been made towards the integration of universities and polytechnics into a single system of higher education. Most significant of all, state-university relations depended on a delicate compromise - an unspoken concordat in which (limited) political direction was accepted in return for (generous) public funding. During the economic troubles of the late 1970s that concordat broke down, initially with regret under the Callaghan Government and then with relish when Margaret Thatcher came to power in 1979.

The Thatcher years

For almost two decades political life in the UK was dominated by radical Conservative policies - first triumphantly (and triumphally) under Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister and then, as a bathetic coda, her successor John Major (Scott 1989, 1994). It is not an exaggeration to say that the face of higher education in the UK was changed for ever during these years; certainly state-university relations were recast in ways that would have been unconceivable even in the 1970s. The impact of so-called Thatcherism was felt in three ways.

1. The first, and (remarkably) the weakest, was the ideological. For all the talk of the entrenchment of a left-liberal consensus in British universities, the UK did not experience the 'culture wars' which so disturbed higher education in the United States. The only overtly ideological attempts to combat this left-liberal consensus were associated with Keith Joseph, Thatcher's second and most celebrated Secretary of State for Education - notably his insistence that the then Social Science Research Council expunge the word 'science' from its title. Just as left-wing revolt had never really taken hold in UK higher education during the 1960s, so right-wing *revanche* never fully triumphed in the 1980s;
2. The second, and most powerful, way in which the impact of Thatcherism was felt was in terms of reduced public funding for universities. This had already begun under Labour in the second half of the 1970s but reached a dramatic climax in the summer of 1981; the '1981 cuts' acquired an almost legendary significance in British universities. The scale of these cuts had many ramifications. First, they destroyed any remaining illusions that state-university relations were a partnership rather than a master-servant relationship; it was this, rather than the rather puny ideological assault of Joseph, that produced the adversarial them-and-us relationship between higher education and the State which has persisted to this day (Kogan and Kogan 1983). Secondly, the cuts exposed the anachronistic character of the national 'governance' of UK universities - and, in particular, the political naivety and unaccountability of the UGC. Thirdly, they demonstrated how limited was the capacity of most universities to manage 'bad times', serious retrenchment and/or hard strategic choices;
3. The third way in which Thatcherism impacted on UK higher education was the enhanced steering capacity which the Government acquired. First, the UGC was abolished in 1988 to be replaced to a more compliant agency - or, rather, two agencies because the second development was the removal of the polytechnics from (politically unreliable as well as managerially inept) local government. Third, the logic of this (actual) nationalisation of the non-university sector was allowed to take its course when the binary system was abandoned, a unified higher education sector created and the polytechnics 'promoted' to become universities in 1991. Fourth, a range of new assessment

and accountability tools were developed, no longer confined to financial matters but now designed to monitor academic standards and also, most dramatically, research quality. Finally, much more attention was paid to developing management capacity in universities, explicitly at the expense of traditional collegiality; thus was the divisive phenomenon of 'managerialism' born.

The modernisation of higher education

The Dearing report on the future of higher education was commissioned by the outgoing Conservative Government but published after a (New) Labour Government had come to power in 1997 (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education 1997). It was an (almost) worthy successor of the Robbins report. But its effectiveness was hobbled by this politically ambiguous context. Although the new Government eventually accepted the need for higher tuition fees, and the all-important principle that students (or graduates) should make a direct financial contribution to the cost of their higher education, its residual social democratic instincts made it difficult to reach this conclusion so soon after coming to power. Other, less contentious, recommendations by the Dearing Committee were accepted. The Government eventually published its own strategy for higher education in a White Paper (Department for Education and Skills 2003).

In one respect the Blair Government's approach to higher education was very different from that of its Conservative predecessors. It ended the erosion of funding-per-student which in the two previous decades had produced 'efficiency gains' of more than 30 per cent. Although higher education did not benefit to the same extent as the health service, the long decline in public funding was arrested - and, to a limited extent, reversed. But this reversal came at a price. First, much of the additional funding was provided either on a 'something for something' basis - in other words, Government priorities had to be accepted by the universities and targets met - or in the form of special initiatives for which funding was earmarked. The effect of both was to increase the State's detailed control over universities. Secondly, by 2007 much of the additional funding was now being provided in the form of cheap (State) loans to students to repay the higher fees which universities were now obliged to charge. Arguably this could have had the effect of reducing the State's control by introducing more of a 'market' into higher education. But in practice all the key levers remained in the hands of the Government - the level of fees, eligibility for loans and the terms for repayment.

In most other respects the Blair Government continued the policies of its predecessors. The burden of accountability increased - not only to ensure value-for-money and check up on standards but also now to empower student

'customers' (and other stake-holders) by providing rankings and other information. The State's capacity to steer the higher education system also increased as the intermediary bodies, the higher education funding councils, receiving ever more detailed annual instructions. So much was predictable. However the degree of intrusion increased in two new ways. First, the university curriculum, the content and structure of courses, was no longer out-of-bounds for politicians. New qualifications were introduced, such as two-year vocational Foundation Degrees. Secondly, the State sought to influence the organisation and culture of universities more directly as even greater emphasis was placed on (executive) management and (lay) governance. After ten years of New Labour, despite 'market' rhetoric, the impression that higher education in the UK was now tightly managed by the State remained strong.

Conclusion

The use of the word 'nationalisation' to describe the evolving relationship between universities and the state in the UK, of course, is controversial. It will be argued, as it was by successive Governments, that universities remain independent legal corporations which employ their staff and own their assets and are responsible for developing and implementing their own strategies, and also that the bulk of the public support for higher education comes in the form of a block grant. However, it is difficult to deny that between 1963 and 2007 a national system of higher education has emerged strongly in the UK, and that the autonomy of individual institutions is severely constrained by their (involuntary) membership of this system. The shape, size and character of this system are determined by political forces rather than by the universities themselves. It is in this sense that 'nationalisation' has been used to describe the evolution of state-university relations.

However, the evolution of these relations in the UK has a wider significance. Although it reflects the particular characteristics of both UK universities (highly autonomous in legal terms, although bound into a wider, and highly collusive, political, socio-economic and cultural 'establishment') and the UK's political culture (antiquely pragmatic, and resistant to abstract principles and legalistic constitutions), it also reflects wider forces - notably the development of a 'knowledge society', in which the trading of symbolic services has acquired greater significance, the acquisition of cultural capital and technical expertise are more dependent on various forms of credentialisation, and a (mass?) 'graduate culture' is decisively shaping social forms; and also the emergence of a global knowledge economy in which competitiveness is increasingly calibrated in terms of expert knowledge and high-level skills. Other phenomena such as the 'risk society' and the 'audit society' have also heavily influenced state-university relations. As a result participation in higher education has become a key

component of citizenship in 21st-century societies and investment in higher education a key component in wealth generation. The construction of much stronger national systems of higher education, therefore, is inevitable. Higher education is just too important to be left alone. Whether these systems take the form of classic social-democratic state bureaucracies or politically managed 'market' systems is a secondary matter. The experience of the UK suggests that, in practice, elements from both forms are employed - in complex, shifting and ambiguous combinations.

References

- Berdahl, R. (1959). *British Universities and the State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bobbitt, P. (2002). *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace and the Course of History*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Committee on Higher Education (1963). *Higher Education*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department of Education and Science (1966). *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department for Education and Skills (2003). *The Future of Higher Education*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Halsey, A.H. (1992). *Decline of Donnish Dominion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kogan, M. and Kogan, D. (1983). *The Attack on Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997). *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Robinson, E. (1968). *The New Polytechnics: A Radical Policy for Higher Education*. London: Commarket.
- Scott, P. (1989) 'Higher Education', in Kavanagh, D. and Seldon, A. (eds.), *The Thatcher Effect: A Decade of Change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 198-212.
- Scott, P. (1994). 'Education Policy', in Kavanagh, D. and Seldon, A. (eds.), *The Major Effect*, London: Macmillan, pp. 332-350.
- Shattock, M. (1994). *The UGC and the Management of British Universities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Shinn, C. (1986). *Paying the Piper: The Development of the University Grants Committee 1919-1946*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

On Traditions and Historical Layers in Higher Education

Jussi Välimaa

Introduction

The topic of this essay 'the historical development of higher education' is an issue that every higher education scholar should take seriously. I will approach this topic from the perspectives of historical traditions and historical layers, and borrow my examples from Finnish higher education -which I know the best - even though it is tempting to think that the same logic of historical description may also be applied to other national systems of higher education. The idea of the historical layers has been introduced in earlier papers (Välimaa 2004a, 2004b, 2005). Here I try to develop it further.

A tradition is normally understood beliefs or customs that are passed from one generation to the next (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 1995). It is a way of thinking or acting which has its origins in the past. This kind of understanding of traditions is also quite common in the field of higher education where both higher education institutions (normally: universities) and epistemic traditions (disciplines) are firmly rooted in their past historical development. However, this traditional way of thinking of traditions may be misleading, since it puts too much emphasis on conserving what has already been achieved. I would like to suggest a more dynamic approach to traditions. Namely, in the real life of higher education institutions - especially when transmitting epistemic traditions to the next generation - the focus of a tradition is not on the past, but on the future. A university teacher needs to consider carefully what is worthy of transmitting to his or her students. Traditions are tested in their relationship with the present day and the future - they are negotiation processes more than handbooks of right behaviour.

After this intermezzo on the nature of traditions I would like to continue with the problem of the historical development of higher education. Is the historical development of higher education like a linear timeline where epistemic traditions first introduced in Greek philosophy wander through the medieval universities to modern higher education institutions? Or should it be understood as a development consisting of institutional histories focusing on their internal developments? I am asking these provocative questions to focus attention on the fact that the history of higher education too often focuses on one or the other of these lines of development. I find it intellectually challenging to try to develop

intellectual devices which take into account both of these developments. Analyses of the historical development of higher education should take them both into account, because epistemic traditions and their manifestations (disciplines and chairs) can flourish only inside the institutional walls of administrative structures.

Marginson and Rhoades (2002) have discussed the dynamics of higher education development with the help of a glonacal agency heuristic. They pay attention to the need to develop new intellectual devices in order to understand the interaction between global, national and local processes which take place in the contexts of historical layers and geographical spheres. I would like to continue this line of reasoning and take a closer look at historical layers as an intellectual device. The understanding of historical layers may combine linear passing of time with the Hegelian philosophical tradition of history according to which history advances through struggles following the logic of thesis - antithesis - synthesis resulting in qualitative changes. I would like to emphasise, however, that each historical layer is influenced by preceding historical developments, because previous layers may continuously influence the intellectual landscapes and everyday practices of new layers. New historical layers are not necessarily created through revolutionary developments - and even when this might be the case - it does not mean that everything is changed with one stroke. Therefore, it is sometimes difficult to see where previous historical layers end and where new ones begin - just as is the case with archaeological layers. As an intellectual device, the historical layer aims to draw attention to continuities with the present-day and with past worlds. With the help of historical layers it is also possible to acknowledge that the past has always been full of details and competing and conflicting traditions and practices. The aim is to analyse practices that have a historical continuity in the present-day world. It also seems probable that historical layers as an intellectual device suits the analysis of institutions well, because continuities can be seen in and through institutions in societies. In addition to universities these kinds of institutions include e.g. churches, military regiments and other social institutions with long traditions of passing beliefs and customs to the next generation.

For the functioning of higher education the fact that historical developments have always been influenced by the interaction with society is essential - simply because higher education is part of society. These various societal relationships have left their mark on the functioning of higher education institutions, even though it is not always easy to see their origin. In order to reveal these different 'marks', the development of higher education can be outlined with the help of the idea of historical layers deposited over time one upon another like archaeological layers. To elaborate the metaphor further towards an intellectual device, earlier historical layers exert a continuous influence on modern practices not only because traditions consisting of ideas, norms and practices have provided starting points for new developments, but also because they have given form and shape to

more recent layers. In academia, traditions are also crucially important for intellectual activities, because all new and emerging knowledge is related to what was known and understood before. This is important, especially in the academic world where epistemic traditions and academic identities are more closely related to each other than in other social spaces of societies (Henkel 2000; Välimaa 1995). The nature of academic identities is rooted in the nature of the problem - as Becher (1989) puts it - and to the practices of academic communities.

Historical layers: The case of Finnish higher education

In order to develop my argument on historical layers as an intellectual device I will use Finnish higher education as an example.

The basic historical layer underpinning Finnish higher education was deposited in the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church linked Finland culturally with continental Europe. This was also one of the factors, together with the Finnish region's incorporation into the Kingdom of Sweden as the 'Eastern provinces', that made Finland a part of the Western European cultural sphere. Thus, Finnish higher education has its roots in the Western tradition of universities. This tradition began in the Middle Ages when a number of Finns were sent to European universities - most often to Paris - and they returned back to work as bishops or other high clerical officials in the Catholic Church in the Eastern provinces of the Swedish Kingdom (Nuorteva 1999).

By the beginning of the 17th century the need to improve the training of priests to defend the (right version of the) protestant religion and to train civil servants for the Swedish King emerged together with the expansion of the Swedish Kingdom. The already existing Turku Cathedral School was expanded and became the University of Turku in 1640. This built up the *second historical layer* of Finnish higher education. It also meant the beginning of the development towards a national system of higher education. At that time, Finland was still part of the Swedish Kingdom and universities served mainly the purposes of the Lutheran Church and those of the Swedish King. This social function as an educator of civil servants continues to be an important part of Finnish higher education with two thirds of university graduates and more than half of polytechnic graduates being public-sector employees (Välimaa 2001).

The third historical layer making up present-day Finnish higher education accumulated during the time when Finland was an autonomous Grand Duchy as part of the Russian Empire from 1809 to 1917. This was a historical period when Finland and the Finnish nation developed culturally, politically and economically. It has been said that Finland developed from a geographical concept into a political concept during this period. The only university in Finland,

the Imperial Alexander University (the former University of Turku and later known as the University of Helsinki), played a particularly prominent role in the cultural, political and economic processes that created the basis for the independent nation state which was established during the First World War. Among the essential starting points for the development of a Finnish conception of a university was the idea that university is a *national cultural institution*. This view was rooted in the *Humboldtian ideals of the university* which focused on the moral development of students during their studies and on the institutional autonomy of the university and the academic freedom of its professors. These understandings of the idea of the university have remained alive in Finnish universities (Huusko 2006). In addition, two-year Teacher Training Seminars were established from the 1860s onwards. These higher education institutions opened an educational channel for the sons and daughters of peasants and workers during the 19th century. School teachers were also an important group in the education of the emerging nation. The Imperial Alexander University and higher education were considered both culturally and politically to be important aspects of the development of the nation and the nation state (Välilä 2001).

The fourth historical layer underlying Finnish higher education was laid down between the two World Wars, when Finnish higher education continued to be *an elite system*, and the number of higher education students remained small (Nevala 1999). University professors enjoyed a high social status and many of them acted as ministers in the governments of the 1920s and 1930s. The high social prestige of universities and university degrees remains a social reality in Finland at the beginning of the 21st century. According to a recent survey, science and scholarship both enjoy great public confidence. In a national study universities and other higher education institutions scored top marks in comparison with other institutions of Finnish society. As many as 70 per cent of the respondents expressed great confidence in higher education institutions and only 9 per cent little confidence (Finnish Science Barometer 2004). The high social status of higher education degrees is a problematic matter to explain in a mass higher education system (see next paragraph). Why do higher education degrees continue to enjoy high social esteem even though their exchange value in the labour market is diminishing? This is a difficult question to answer especially if one relies on rational choice theories explaining human behaviour as something based on rational calculations. However, this question is much easier to answer if one takes into account the previous historical layers during which higher education degrees were both highly appreciated and secured a good position in society. This indicates strong cultural appreciation of universities and their degrees. The high reputation of a higher education degree is a cultural assumption, which has a strong symbolic continuity. Using historical layers as an intellectual device makes it easier to remember historical continuities stretching over historical periods.

The fifth historical layer forming Finnish higher education was added through expansion in the direction of a mass higher education system. This development began in the late 1950s with the establishment of the University of Oulu in Northern Finland, followed by the establishments of universities all over Finland by the end of the 1980s. Measured by student numbers, higher education in Finland became a mass higher education system during the 1970s - about two decades earlier than in other Nordic countries. In 2003, there were about 304,000 students in Finnish higher education institutions - 174,000 in universities and 130 000 in polytechnics. A comparison of these numbers with the size of the relevant age cohort reveals that about 70 per cent are admitted to higher education institutions (Ahola 2004).

The expansion of Finnish higher education can be explained by its close relationship with the goals of a *welfare-state agenda* supported by the major political parties. The provision of equal educational opportunities became one of the most important objectives on this agenda, implemented over a period extending from the 1960s to the 1990s. The expansion of higher education has been supported by the *egalitarian policy* principle in all the Nordic countries. These traditions are, in turn, historically rooted in the economic and political structures of Nordic countries with their tradition of free and independent peasants - often allied with the king against high nobility. These Nordic egalitarian traditions developed in societies which have had smaller income and wealth distribution differences than those in other Western European countries (Välilmaa 2001).

In Finland the founding of a university has been seen as symbolically but also culturally and economically important to the development of a given region. This policy has been successful in promoting national development because areas with higher education institutions have been able to support knowledge-based regional economic growth, whereas other - often rural - areas are losing their labour force and economic dynamics. This state of affairs has also meant that provinces that did not succeed in founding a university have been very active in establishing polytechnics. (A national policy of creating regional centres of growth also promoted the foundation of new higher education institutions which lead to the establishment of polytechnics in the 1990s.) In the Finnish context of a beneficial state, it is quite natural that all present-day Finnish political parties share the conviction that higher education is important to the well-being of the country. It also seems that a nationalist tradition of higher education remains alive even though it has taken different forms in different periods of history. During the 19th and the 20th centuries, universities were an important factor in the making of the Finnish national identity. Today, official national rhetoric sees higher education institutions as a part of the national innovation strategy (Välilmaa 2005).

Recent changes in Finnish higher education policy reflect managerial ideas which have been defined as New Public Management (Pollit 1995). The decentralisation of management authority has been a strong element in higher education. The official arguments emphasise the fact that universities have (procedural) autonomy in deciding how to reach the targets (such as the number of academic degrees awarded) set by the Ministry of Education. The second main trend has been the introduction of market or quasi-market type mechanisms into Finnish higher education. The marketisation of higher education has led to competition both among and within higher education institutions. In fact, the Ministry of Education uses competition as a national steering instrument in its 'management by results' negotiations with each university. In this sense, the social context of Finnish higher education may be described as academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997). The shift in the funding structures together with decreasing public funding is related to academic capitalism, because it increases the impact of market-like behaviour, thus changing social dynamics inside universities. In Finnish universities there are at least two administrative layers acting simultaneously: the layer of the static 'basic administration', concerned with obeying laws and statuses and not willing to take risks; and a new layer of 'dynamic project management' that has developed alongside to the traditional administration, aiming at being flexible and reacting quickly to changes (Välilä et al. 1998).

Recent changes indicate the need to develop more efficient management techniques and practices in order to support institutional planning and strategic thinking in an unpredictable environment. The Bologna process provides an illustrative example in this regard (Välilä et al. 2006). The change of curricula structures and the need to develop institutional quality assurance systems, both introduced by the Bologna process, may be translated into academic and managerial practices because an institutional quality assurance system assumes the existence of (high quality) academic activities and their (managerial) assurance. This requires, in turn, a closer connection and cooperation between academic staff and institutional quality assurance management (Ursin 2007).

Discussion on the mechanisms of historical layers

A crucial question that I have not yet addressed: is whether there is a new *-sixth-*historical layer developing on top of the previous ones? This question should be asked because clearly there are trends and changes in (Finnish and European) higher education which fundamentally challenge the traditional dynamics of higher education institutions and national systems of higher education. These changes have been identified by a number of higher education scholars (e.g. Becher and Trowler 2001; Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Marginson and Considine 2000; Tuunainen 2005) and include increasing global, national, institutional and

disciplinary competition. In addition, these changes include the increasing influence of managerial ideals aimed at making higher education institutions more efficient, effective and economic. The third major social force is created by the marketisation of knowledge both in research and teaching. Increasingly, knowledge is becoming a commodity to be sold and to be exchanged. Knowledge society discourses draw attention to universities as potential sources of innovation, thus supporting new industrial production and the wealth of nation states (Välilä and Hoffman 2007).

However, one may also argue that competition has always been part of the academic world in disciplinary fields. Globalisation, in turn, can be seen as an extension of the internationalisation of higher education which had already begun in the Middle Ages. Furthermore, universities have always produced knowledge that has been used for industrial production and the development of societies. One of the new tasks for universities seems to be the 'third mission', which signifies moral, economic and practical demands on academics to be more useful to society. However, this can also be seen as one of the traditional tasks of universities as in the Finnish case, in which universities have traditionally taken care of the training of state officials. Basically, the question is what is changing and whether these changes alter the dynamics of higher education institutions and the ways academic and epistemic traditions are transmitted to the next generation? Do they change the functioning of higher education institutions?

These questions draw attention to the nature of the changes and whether these are on the same continuum as previous developments or whether they cause discontinuities? This is where the idea of historical layers may be helpful in analysing the nature of these changes. With the help of this intellectual device it is clear that there can be both continuities and discontinuities because of the nature of tradition as a negotiation process. One of the problems with the glorious ideals of 'mode 2' knowledge production (Gibbons et al. 1994) and 'triple-helix' ways of organising the relationship between academia, industry and society (Etzkowitz 2000) lies in the fact that they often neglect the power of traditions. Normally, intellectual and institutional traditions cause the processes of negotiation in which new challenges are reflected in relation to existing practices and intellectual devices. These processes are not only the source of conservatism and resistance to change in higher education, but also the source of innovation in higher education. These negotiation processes also describe the mechanism of previous historical layers and how they exert their influence on present-day practices. In fact, historical layers are formed in and through everyday practices and negotiations taking place in higher education institutions, in departments and in academic work done by academic staff. Historical layers grow organically on top of previous historical layers in interaction with previous traditions and practices. The same holds true with managerial ideas and ideologies. Administrative practices within higher education institutions have their own

traditions. Trying to change these practices is a slow process, because most significant reforms are quietly resisted. Simultaneously, however, inertia may also indicate that university administrators have developed local interpretations of the reform. This dimension of tradition has also been called *tacit knowledge*, because it is rooted in ways things are done more than in handbook knowledge of how things should be done. This may be one of the reasons why ideas travel faster than new practices (Czarniawska and Sevón 1996) and why new challenges tend to create new historical layers on top of the existing ones.

The key question is whether these new ideologies have created a new historical layer in Finnish higher education? It is evident that one may speak about a new historical layer if the number of basic tasks of the universities is either increasing or decreasing. However, rather than new tasks what seems to be taking place is the extension of previous tasks with the consequence of speeding up everything carried out in higher education institutions which are expected to be more efficient, more competitive, and more economic. This speeding up means that old practices are challenged to change, which forces people to redefine and negotiate their core activities and the objects of their work. These challenges, in turn, create a need for new intellectual devices to be taken into use and for new managerial instruments to be implemented. In short, a new historical layer seems to be emerging in Finnish universities, growing in and around the needs and practices of efficient management. This new historical layer introduces new (global) quality assurance procedures and management technologies, and engages more academics in managerial processes. It seems that managerialism, indeed, will leave a mark which will also be seen in the universities of the future.

References

- Ahola, S. (2004). *Yhteishausta yhteisvalintaan (From joint application for entry to joint selection procedures)*. Helsinki: Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä, 9.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories. The Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Bury St. Edmunds: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories, Second Edition*. Oxfordshire: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Czarniawska, B. and Sevón, G. (1996). *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2000). 'The Norms of Entrepreneurial Science: Cognitive Effects of the New University-Industry Linkages', *Research Policy*, 27, 8, 823-833.
- Finnish Science Barometer (2004). *Finnish Society for Scientific Information*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Huusko, M. (2006). 'Sivistysyliopiston mahdollisuus' (The Possibility of a Humboldtian University)', in Ursin, J. and Välimaa, J. (eds.), *Korkeakoulutus teoriassa -Näkökulmia ja keskustelua*. Jyväskylä: Institute for Educational Research, pp. 115-134.
- Marginson, S. and Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marginson, S. and Rhoades, G. (2002). 'Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic', *Higher Education*, 43, 3, 281-309.
- Nevala, A. (1999). *Korkeakoulutuksen kasvu, lohkoutuminen ja eriarvoisuus Suomessa (Growth, Fragmentation and Inequality in Higher Education in Finland)*, Helsinki: Bibliotheca Historica, 43.
- Nuorteva, J. (1999). *Suomalaisten ulkomainen opinkäynti ennen Turun akatemian perustamista 1640. (Finnish Study Abroad Before the Foundation of the Royal Academy of Turku (Academia Aboensis) in 1640)*. Societas Historica Finlandiae. Helsinki: Hakapaino.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1995). *Fifth edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollit, C. (1995). 'Justification By Works or by Faith? Evaluating the New Public Management', *Evaluation*, 1, 2, 133-154.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuunainen, J. (2005). 'Hybrid Practices? Contribution to the Debate on the Mutation of Science And University', *Higher Education*, 50, 275-298.
- Ursin, J. (2007). *Yliopistot laadun arvioijina. Akateemisia käsityksiä laadusta ja laadunvarmistuksesta. (Universities as quality evaluators. Academic conceptions of quality and quality assurance)*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Institute for Educational Research.
- Välimaa, J. (1995). 'Higher Education Cultural Approach', *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*, 113. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Välimaa, J. (2001). 'A Historical Introduction to Finnish Higher Education', in Välimaa, J. (ed.), *Finnish Higher Education in Transition. Perspectives on Massification and Globalisation*. Jyväskylä: Institute for Educational Research, pp. 13-54.
- Välimaa, J. (2004a). 'Nationalisation, Localisation And Globalisation in Finnish Higher Education', *Higher education*, 48, 1, 27-54.

- Välilä, J. (2004b). 'Three Rounds of Evaluation and the Idea of Accreditation in Finnish Higher Education', in Schwartz, S. and Westerheijden, D.F. (eds.), *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European High Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 101-126.
- Välilä, J. (2005). 'Globalization in the Concept of Nordic Higher Education', in Arimoto, A. Huang, F. and Yokoyama, K. (eds.), *Globalization and Higher Education*. Hiroshima: RIHE International Publication Series No. 9., pp. 93-114.
- Välilä, J., Aittola, T. and Kontinen, R. (1998). 'Impacts of Quality Assessment: the Case of Jyväskylä University', *Higher Education Management*, 10, 2, 7-30.
- Välilä, J. Hoffman, D. and Huusko, M. (2006). 'The Bologna Process in Finland: Perspectives from the Basic Units', in Tomusk, V. (ed.), *Creating the European Area of Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 43-68.
- Välilä, J. and Hoffman, D. (2007). 'Higher Education And Knowledge Society Discourse'. Presented in HELF Interim Conference, Brussels.

II. Higher education policy and the evaluative state

From Quality Assurance to Accreditation - A Satirical view

Alberto Amaral

... noui consilia et ueteres quaecumque moneatis amici, 'pone seram, cohibe.' sed **quis custodiet ipsos custodies**, qui nunc lasciuae furta puellae hac mercede silent? crimen commune tacetur. prospicit hoc prudens et ab illis incipit uxor.

... I am aware of whatever councils you old friends warn: 'Bolt her in, constrain her!' But **who will guard the guardians**, who now keep silent the lapses of the loose girl - paid off in the same coin? The common crime keeps its silence. A prudent wife looks ahead and starts with them. (Juvenal or Juvenalis, VI satire)

Introduction

Neave (2004) initiates one of his inspired and inspiring papers with the quotation from Juvenal, 'quis custodiet ipsos custodies?' that can be translated as 'Who Guards the Guardians?' Juvenal, a Roman poet that lived probably between the 1st and 2nd year BC, used that phrase in his VI satire that some name 'Against the women' and others 'Against marriage'. Juvenal commented on the difficulties of ensuring the fidelity of wives, a problem that could not be solved by locking them under guard because this just raised the problem of guarding the guardians.

Today, we encounter the same phrase in a political context: who is looking after the politicians who should be looking after us? Neave uses Juvenal's quotation to ask if evaluation systems are today's equivalent of the Guardians to the Temple of Higher Learning (Neave 2004, p. 225). I will use Juvenal's satire to inquire about who has the task of guarding the Guardians and how far the Prince trusts them and appreciates their work.

The rationale supporting quality assessment

Neave argues that 'quality is not 'here to stay' if only for the self-evident reason that across the centuries of the university's existence in Europe, it never departed' (Neave 1994, p. 16), evaluation being 'an intrinsic part of policy making' (Neave 1998, p. 265). Before the emergence of the evaluative state, two modes of coordination were used, the routine verification and maintenance mode being a 'formal, administrative verification' (Neave 1988, p. 8) and the strategic change or

exploratory model (Neave 1988, p. 8; Neave 1998, p. 267), used to 'assess the previous performance of a particular dimension of national policy with a view to carrying out major change in the light of what is found' (Neave 1988, p. 9). Administrative verification included upholding the principle of legal homogeneity to ensure 'equality of opportunity for the individual on the one hand and, on the other, to ensure that competition for places in public service is itself placed on a footing of equality' (Neave 1996, p. 34).

The emergence of the 'evaluative state' (Neave 1988, p. 7) was observed in the late 1980s, with increasing public relevance given to quality. Several factors contributed to this change, including the massification higher education (Trow 1996); the increasing role of the private sector as the main employer of university graduates; the increasing use of market regulation as a tool of public policy; and the emergence of the governmental 'New Theology' (Neave 1988, p. 7) celebrated by Margaret Thatcher as the 3Es of public management - economy, efficiency and efficacy (Trow 1996).

The increasing complexity of higher education systems as a result of massification and their diversification to make them more flexible and adjustable to the needs of the volatile and changeable private labour market were incompatible with detailed systems of centralised oversight and control, and legal homogeneity. Therefore, the rise of the evaluative state corresponds to an 'alternative to regulation by bureaucratic fiat' (Neave 1988, p. 11), by looking for more flexible, less heavy and faster steering mechanisms 'to speed up what might be termed 'the administrative time'' (Neave 1998, p. 273). This did not imply less control by the state. On the contrary: ...it involves the state withdrawing from the murky plain of overwhelming detail, the better to take refuge in the clear and commanding heights of effective strategic 'profiling' (Neave 1988, p. 12).

Evaluation systems are grounded on different rhetorical doctrines depending on national cultural and political contexts. Neave (1998, 2004) compares national cases (UK, the Netherlands, France and Sweden) to distinguish two different political discourses, one mainly European and political, the other mainly economic or market-based. The latter discourse was present in the UK and the Netherlands, where the role of the state was considered excessive and this should give way to market regulation. In France and Sweden, universities were assumed to be a public service and institutions, at least in official rhetoric, did not compete for a market. In both countries the need for improvement of the quality of higher education was recognised without any attempt at replacing 'the state as society's prime regulator by the market' (Neave 2004, p. 275). Despite the differences in political discourse, quality assessment systems share a number of procedural elements - internal self-evaluations, visits by external expert review panels, external evaluation and public reporting (Thune 2002). However, there are

important differences in the ownership of the systems and in the objectives and consequences of evaluation.

Trust and the law of anticipated results

For Neave (1994, 1996) the law of anticipated results is a factor that operates in systems change, mainly at institutional level, 'giving the impression of autonomous institutional action to what is in fact an institutional reaction to actual or anticipated external forces, directives or events' (Meek 2002, p. 250). Institutions try to guess what will be required by government policy and act in anticipation, making it difficult to determine whether change is actually imposed top-down. Neave (1994, p. 127) presents the case of the Flemish universities as 'a remarkable example of the Law of Anticipated Results'. Flemish universities anticipated the government movements in quality by initiating a quality assessment system in collaboration with the Dutch VSNU (Dutch Association of Universities). This resulted in entrusting the VLIR (Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad) with the responsibility for quality assessment. Portuguese universities followed the same road, and the Evaluation of Higher Education Act (Law 38/94 of 21 November) entrusted the ownership of the quality agency to 'representative institutions', similar to the Dutch VSNU (Amaral and Rosa 2004).

In the UK, where the government had largely withdrawn its trust in institutions (Trow 1996), the pre-emptive strike of the British Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals in establishing the Academic Audit Unit in 1990 failed, and did not forestall the implementation of the Higher Education Funding Councils with 'primary status', that is, with powers of financial allocation and regulatory enforcement (Neave 1992). On the contrary, the strong trust between government and institutions, allowed Dutch universities to claim for themselves the major responsibility for quality, convincing the Ministry they should control the quality assurance system through an 'independent' agency, the VSNU.

The loss of trust

The level of trust between higher education institutions and the state and society plays an important role in determining the major characteristics of quality assessment systems. The literature shows a general decline of the level of trust in public institutions and in professionals. For a long time regarded as disinterested guardians of knowledge and producers of new knowledge, academics are facing a gradual proletarianisation of their professional status (Halsey 1992), and the academy no longer enjoys the prestige on which higher education can build a successful claim to political autonomy (Scott 1989).

Under new public management, students become customers or clients, and in most higher education systems quality assurance and accountability measures were put in place to ensure that academic provision meets client needs and expectations. The transformation of students into clients also transforms academics from disinterested professionals into service providers. As such, academics are no longer recognised by their almost monastic qualities, becoming venal contractors whose activities should be inspected. When academics become contractors their inherent qualities of altruism and probity are no longer taken for granted and their self-regulation capacity is questioned as they have an interest in institutional decisions. This opens the way for professional managers and a reinforced presence of external stakeholders in governance bodies.

Performance conditionality and the principal-agent dilemma

The evaluative state is associated with increased institutional autonomy, and diversity at the institutional and programme levels. This means that the principle of legal homogeneity is no longer a convenient limitation, being replaced by performance conditionality (Neave and van Vught 1991). For Neave (1996, p. 38):

The principle of performance conditionality ... does not do away with uniformity nor does it abolish convergence. Rather it makes them, as I have suggested, minimal conditions against which the health of individual establishments is judged.

The freedom given to autonomous institutions to compete in a market raises an interesting question: can autonomous universities be trusted to pursue the public good even under market competition or, on the contrary, will the state have to intervene using quality tools to ensure compliance? (Amaral and Magalhães 2004). Governments use quasi-markets as a tool to create competition. Cave and Kogan (1990, p. 183) consider that a quasi-market is in operation when goods or services, instead of being bought by their final users, are bought by an agent (in general a public agent) on behalf of clients. These agencies face the classical principal-agent dilemma: 'how the principal [government] can best motivate the agent [university] to perform as the principal would prefer, taking into account the difficulties in monitoring the agent's activities?' (Sappington 1991, p. 45 cited in Dill and Soo 2004, p. 58).

When providers have considerable autonomy and competition is excessive, or when the state cuts public subsidies that curtail the institutional capacity for discretionary spending, non-profit institutions behave as for-profit ones, ignoring the promotion of the public good inherent in their missions (Massy 2004). This forces the state to intervene by changing the rules of the market or by using mechanisms enforcing compliance to ensure the fulfilment of its own political

objectives. Therefore, we observe a contradiction between a neo-liberal rhetoric that favours market regulation and a *de facto* increase in intervention by the state.

Recent trends

Comparing state approval versus accreditation schemes with evaluation activities in the years 1998 and 2003 reveals an overwhelming movement from state approval towards accreditation schemes (Schwarz and Westerheijden 2004). There is also a trend of replacing quality assessment agencies owned by universities or by organisations representing universities, using instead independent accreditation agencies (the Netherlands, Flanders and Portugal), while some new initiatives are also based on accreditation rather than on quality assessment (e.g. Germany, Austria and Norway). This might reflect an increased lack of trust in higher education institutions to satisfy the government and society about their capacity to ensure adequate standards of quality.

At European level, the Commission has pushed for an accreditation system, as documented by Amaral and Magalhães (2004). The system of multiple agencies proposed by the Commission is compatible with a stratified European Higher Education Area and with the more neo-liberal model that occasionally becomes visible in European policies, which tends to emphasise the importance of the efficiency of higher education systems. Using the two different political discourses referred to by Neave (1998, 2004), the EU discourse supporting a European system of quality assurance is classified as mainly economic and market-based.

Conclusion: A return to Juvenal's satire or the guardians replaced

Quality systems are today an intrusive reality of every higher education system and will remain an important regulation and steering tool for many governments. Being initially an almost exclusive concern of the academics, quality became progressively a matter of public concern, the two main objectives of quality assessment being quality improvement and accountability. Later other functions were added, ranging from the more academic concern with quality improvement to the implementation of markets and the interests of government control and supranational policy implementation (Amaral et al. 2006). Now it is time to conclude going back to Juvenal's satire and to discuss 'Who Guards the Guardians?' Neave raises an important question:

...is the evaluative state to rely on academic expertise by extending the system of peer group review as part of grinding the levers of national policy to a finer edge? Or is it, on the contrary, to place trust in the views and opinions of its professional servants? (Neave 1988, p. 15).

The Prince never fully trusted the guardians that depended on the higher education institutions. In the Netherlands a system of meta-evaluation run by the Inspectorate for Higher Education was supposed to ensure that the assessment procedures were properly run. In Portugal a special commission was set up to coordinate the quality assessment process and to issue recommendations for the rationalisation and improvement of the higher education system; i.e. to meta-evaluate the system. However, the guardians of the guardians were not able to satisfy the Prince.

Apparently the Prince was not satisfied either with the guardians or with the meta-evaluation, and did not fall in with his courtiers to indefinitely stay the execution (Neave 1994). The cases of Portugal, Flanders and the Netherlands, where the quality assessment agencies owned by the higher education institutions themselves were replaced by independent accreditation agencies, show that the Prince knew that the quality assessment systems were not offering a clear picture of the situation; or, as Juvenal argued, we cannot trust guards because they are 'keeping silent the lapses of the loose girl'. In Flanders:

in the second half of the 1990s, criticisms began to be heard about VLIR quality assurance system. Some policy makers, employers and journalists questioned the vagueness of the visitation reports and the lack of a clear overall conclusion (Van Damme 2004, p. 144).

And in Portugal:

...the final reports ... very seldom offer a clear basis for drastic decisions. ...the Minister has publicly complained ...that the conclusions of the reports of quality evaluation agencies were quite obscure... (Amaral and Rosa 2004, pp. 415-416).

Recently the Portuguese government decided to extinguish the present quality assessment system run by the higher education institutions. A new accreditation agency will be created using the recommendations laid down by ENQA, which was commissioned to undertake an evaluation of the Portuguese quality assessment system.

The new agencies, including those replacing agencies owned by higher education institutions - in the Netherlands, Portugal and Flanders - are accreditation agencies, based on independence from both the Prince and the institutions. Like

the husband in Juvenal's satire who would never allow the wife to have a say in choosing the guardians, the Prince seems determined not to fall again into the trap of allowing the evaluated institutions to choose the guardians and determine the 'guard shifts'. However, the intervention of the EU in the area of European accreditation may open another possibility: institutions will be allowed to choose the guardians from a list of reliable guardians approved by the Prince.

Neave (2004, p. 224) argues 'evaluation systems are not independent of what a government's intentions are, nor from what its policy is'. One of the risks is the government using quality assessment and performance indicators as instruments to ensure compliance, despite the rhetoric of increased autonomy. In the words of Mahony (1994, p. 125) 'The 'new' autonomy is then a paradox: it is the autonomy to be free to conform'.

References

- Amaral, A. and Magalhães, A. (2004). 'Market Competition, Public Good and State Interference'. *Presented at the 17th Annual CHER Conference*, Enschede.
- Amaral, A. and Rosa, M.J. (2004). 'Portugal: Professional and Academic Accreditation - The Impossible Marriage?', in Schwarz, S. and Westerheijden, D. (eds.), *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, pp. 127-157.
- Amaral, A., Rosa, M.J. and Tavares, D. (2006). 'Assessment as a tool for different kinds of action: from quality management to compliance and control'. *Presented at the Conference Quality assessment of higher education in Europe: problems, practises and solutions*, Pavia.
- Cave, M. and Kogan, M. (1990). 'Some Concluding Observations', in Cave, M., Kogan, M. and Smith, R. (eds.), *Output and Performance Measurements in Government - The State of the Art*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 9-13.
- van Damme (2004). 'Quality Assurance and Accreditation in the Flemish Community of Belgium', in Schwarz, S. and Westerheijden, D. (eds.), *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, pp. 127-157.
- Dill, D. and Soo, M. (2004). 'Transparency and Quality in Higher Education Markets', in Teixeira, P., Jongbloed, B., Dill, D. and Amaral, A. (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 61-85.
- Halsey, A.H. (1992). *Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mahony, D. (1994). 'Government and the Universities: The 'New' Mutuality in Australian Higher Education - A National Case Study', *Journal of Higher Education*, 65, 2, 123-46.

- Massy, W.F. (2004). 'Markets in Higher Education: Do they promote internal efficiency?' in Teixeira, P., Jongbloed, B., Dill, D. and Amaral, A. (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 13-55.
- Meek, L. (2002). 'On the road to mediocrity? Governance and management of Australian higher education in the market place', in Amaral, A., Glen A. Jones, G.A. and Karseth, B. (eds.), *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 235-260.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986-1988', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 1/2, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1992). 'On Bodies Vile and Bodies Beautiful: the role of 'buffer' organisations', *Higher Education Policy*, 5, 3, 10-11.
- Neave, G. (1994). 'The Policies of Quality: development in higher education in Western Europe 1992-1994', *European Journal of Education*, 29, 2, 115-134.
- Neave, G. (1996). 'Homogenization, Integration and Convergence: The Cheshire Cats of Higher Education Analysis', in Meek, V.L., Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O. and Rinne, R. (eds.), *The Mockers and the Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. London: Pergamon Press, pp. 26-41.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'The Temple and its Guardians: An excursion into the Rhetoric of Evaluating Higher Education', *The Journal of Finance and Management in Colleges and Universities*, 1, 211-227.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education Institutions in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Sappington, D.E.M. (1991). 'Incentives in Principal-Agent Relationship', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5, 2, 45-66.
- Schwarz, S. and Westerheijden, D. (2004). *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Scott, P. (1989). 'The Power of Ideas', in Ball, C. and Eggins, H. (eds.), *Higher Education into the 1990s: New Dimensions*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 7-16.
- Thune, C. (2002). 'Future Relationships and Dilemmas of Quality Assurance and Accreditation'. Presented at the 24th EAIR Annual Forum, Prague.
- Trow, M. (1996). 'Trust, Markets and Accountability in Higher Education: a Comparative Perspective', *Higher Education Policy*, 9, 4, 309-324.

Paradox! More Freedoms, More Controls Simultaneously in U.S. State Accountability Patterns: the Virginia Experience

*Robert Berdahl*¹

This paper argues that there is a public policy resolution to the apparent contradiction of two current U.S. state trends in the accountability for public higher education. On the one hand, some state governments are pushing agendas of deregulation, privatisation and greater use of market forces. Yet some of them are also shifting state critical analysis from inputs to outputs and demanding both more assessment of outcomes and more university efforts to meet state-chosen goals. What's going on? Are American public universities more free, or more controlled, or, paradoxically, both of the above at the same time?

The policy resolution lies in distinguishing the realm of *procedural autonomy* - the 'HOW' (Berdahl 1971) or process control (Neave and Van Vught 1991) from that of *substantive autonomy* - the 'WHAT' or product control. The state then deregulates the former, but maintains sovereignty over some crucial aspects of the latter, in particular, those relating to basic role and mission, but not to domains like curriculum where issues of academic freedom might come into play. Increasingly, also, states have begun to establish requirements that universities work more aggressively to achieve state-chosen goals for higher education.

In 2005 the state of Virginia passed a law allowing public colleges and universities to apply for special status under the terms of which they would receive greater freedoms (purchasing, personnel, construction, faculty salaries, tuition charges) in exchange for moving to achieve 11 state goals (detailed below). This paper is a case study of the efforts by the three so-called 'flagship' universities, University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic and the College of William and Mary to obtain such special status. It certainly illustrates Guy Neave's interest in the state as an Evaluative Agent.

Virginia's General Assembly passed legislation in its 2005 session to 'restructure' the Commonwealth's relationship with its 15 public universities and system of 23 community colleges. As subsequently amended by Governor Mark Warner, the

¹ An abridgement of a paper by the same title co-authored by David Leslie, Senior Author, College of William and Mary, and Robert Berdahl. This paper was delivered to the Rome Conference of the European Association for Institutional Research, September 2006.

legislation established three levels of increased autonomy from state regulations, eligibility for which was to be determined by an institution's financial and management capacity. In return for this increased autonomy, the covered institutions must agree to achieve satisfactory performance on a variety (originally 11, now 12) state goals for higher education. The 'case history' of the legislation has been thoroughly documented by observers from inside the process (Blake 2006; Breneman and Kneeder 2006) and outside (Couturier 2006; Leslie 2005). In this paper, we build on the background provided by those observers to project how 'restructuring' may unfold during the initial implementation. Thus, our orientation is to seek informed speculation on the consequences, both intended and unintended, of the future progress of this legislation. The act and its provisions went into effect with the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 2006.

In addition to our own review of legislation and related documents, we have interviewed 15 individuals who either now hold leadership positions in affected agencies or institutions or who have been directly involved in the legislation. Since many aspects of restructuring remain 'works in progress,' and since we wished for our informants to be candid, we opted to promise them anonymity. The paper draws principally on these interviews and the works cited above.

The senior institutional leaders of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Tech, three public, but relatively autonomous, institutions, began a campaign leading up to the 2004 legislative session to convince legislators, the governor, and the business community that erratic funding and bureaucratic control by the state had constrained their ability to plan and threatened the quality of higher education in Virginia.

Their initiative originally took the form of proposed 'charter' status for these three venerable universities. Initiatives in several other states, experience with earlier Virginia exceptions to state regulation, as well as the University of Virginia's own efforts to run its medical school more autonomously and to operate its law and business schools without state funds, provided both motivation and experience on which to base the proposal. (Gumport and Pusser 1999, provide background and context for the University of Virginia's experience.) The 'charter' proposal reasoned that freedom from regulation along with the capacity to raise and manage funds would improve institutions' efficiency and allow reduced dependence on the state, a net benefit to both institutions and an increasingly constrained state budget.

Because the other public institutions eventually expressed interest in the impact of any legislation on their relations with the state, both Governor Mark Warner and legislative leaders felt constrained to broaden the agenda beyond 'charters' and beyond the original three.

Instead of 'chartered' status for the 'Big 3,' the newly christened 'restructuring' legislation provided opportunities for all 15 four year institutions and the community colleges to negotiate their level of independence from state regulation with three levels provided. An elaborate two-track process was written into the law. First, the state formally established 11 (later 12) state goals in higher education, providing that institutions would initially need approval of a six-year commitment to meet performance benchmarks established by the State Council of Higher Education on these goals, enumerated below. A second track required submission of a management plan via a 'memorandum of understanding' that would establish an institution's fiscal capacity and management expertise to operate free from rules and regulations that govern state agencies, although the universities would remain 'state agencies' in a legal sense. The stronger the institution's capacity, the more likely it will achieve operating freedoms. At the time of writing, the 'Big 3' have all been granted 'Level III' status, the highest available. The other public universities (and the community college system) are automatically granted 'Level I' status under the legislation. Level II eligibility remains to be fully defined.

The State Goals for Higher Education in Virginia are to:

1. Provide access to higher education for all citizens including underrepresented populations.
2. Ensure that higher education remains affordable, regardless of individual or family income.
3. Offer a broad range of undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate programs, and address the . . . need for sufficient graduates in particular shortage areas.
4. Ensure that academic programs maintain high academic standards by undertaking a continuous review and improvement of academic programs, course availability, faculty productivity and other relevant factors.
5. Improve student retention.
6. Develop articulation agreements that have uniform application to all Virginia community colleges.
7. Stimulate economic development of the Commonwealth and the area in which the institution is located.
8. Increase the level of externally-funded research and facilitate the transfer of technology from university research centers to private sector companies, consistent with its institutional mission.
9. Work cooperatively with elementary and secondary school administrators, teachers and students to improve student achievement.
10. Prepare a six-year financial plan.
11. Conduct the institution's business affairs in a manner that maximises operational efficiencies and economies.

12. (A 12th goal committing institutions to promote the safety of their campuses and students, was added during the 2006 legislative session.)

It was the position of the governor and his staff that the state had to articulate its goals clearly before agreeing to give ground to the institutions seeking more freedom (Blake 2006). He believed that the goals ultimately included in the legislation were goals that public universities should be achieving as fundamental parts of their missions. Most observers we interviewed also concluded that the state's goals were both uncontroversial in substance and welcomed as adding clarity to the expectations for universities. In fact, institutions typically believed that the enumeration of goals actually validated what they were already doing.

In return for their commitment to meeting these goals (known collectively as 'the state ask'), institutions were to gain measures of freedom from state control over purchasing, personnel administration, capital programs, and instructional technology. (Management standards for performance in these areas remain to be specified by the Governor).

Impact of restructuring

Our interviews surfaced a varied set of perspectives on how restructuring will affect the corporate management of public colleges in Virginia, how it will affect the overall coordination and governance of public sector institutions, and how the newly authorised relationship between institutions and the state may evolve.

Corporate impact

The obvious effect for the Big 3, all of whom are now 'Level III' institutions, is the authority to manage capital projects, human resources, purchasing, and technology independently of former state controls. All public institutions, subject to performance certification, may also retain interest on tuition and fee revenues, and may carry forward unexpended funds from one fiscal year to the next. These new freedoms may (or may not) produce savings and the ability to stretch increasingly tight state appropriations further. One knowledgeable estimate suggests that as much as \$25 million to \$30 million per year in additional funds will reach the institutions. Institutions will likely have initial costs associated with building their capacity to manage the decentralised functions. They project the need to hire new staff and strengthen policies and investments to cover operations once managed elsewhere. The cost side of this new independence is still speculative. How institutions fare without the benefit of the state's economies of scale, but free from its bureaucratic constraint and overhead, cannot be easily determined. Nor can concrete estimates be made of prospective efficiencies and savings. It is also possible, some speculate, that institutions will find ways to

leverage their independence to generate new sources of revenue. But most respondents believed that definitive judgments could only be rendered on actual savings with at least several years of experience.

The other 'covered' universities have yet to commit themselves beyond accepting the reality of their status under the law. They believe they do not have the financial resources or flexibility to manage 'Level III' autonomy on the one hand. On the other, they anticipate being able to negotiate at least incremental approval for greater autonomy as the experience of Level III institutions establishes precedent. But the pathway for these institutions is as yet unclear beyond their obligation to meet the goals of the 'state ask,' and their right, if certified, to receive interest on tuition and fee revenue and to carry forward unexpended funds.

SCHEV's role

The State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) has historically been a coordinating board, not a governing board. It is generally acknowledged that SCHEV's influence was substantially reduced during Governor James Gilmore's term in office. Its new role represents a dramatic expansion and a new centrality for SCHEV in the policy arena. The agency staff profile may have been adequate for its former role, but its new functions may require expansion of both the skills and stature of SCHEV's professional management. A new executive director was appointed at roughly the same time as the proposed law was being studied by the joint legislative commission, an appointment on which much of SCHEV's credibility and ultimate influence may rise or fall.

The law gives SCHEV far more direct regulatory power than it may ever have had, something the historically very independent institutions may not easily accept. How SCHEV performs in mediating the inevitable tests of political will may well determine the fate of restructuring. SCHEV's current leaders affirm that its role is to 'help higher education help the state.' SCHEV sees this as less a 'restructuring' than an effort to align the goals of the state and its universities. Nevertheless, SCHEV's role will change under restructuring. It will now make judgments about whether institutions are responding to the 'state ask.' It first reviews and approves the institutions' six-year academic plans in which institutions resolve to meet the state's goals. These plans have been approved. Now SCHEV is developing performance measures to assess whether institutions have met the state's goals.

Various measures - as many as 70 by one observer's count - have been proposed, and the list has been revised a number of times. The most current count is 26, reflecting one or more measures for each of the state's 12 goals. Once the measures have been established SCHEV will work with institutions to establish standards for performance on each. SCHEV respondents reported that many of the institutions were already undertaking many of the activities outlined in the 12

state goals, so the process would largely formalise their achievement of such goals. But there is little doubt that the outcome of its performance assessment will entail high stakes for both the agency and the state's public universities

Performance assessment

SCHEV staff have met with campus leaders to explore institutional sets of benchmarks, all tailored to each institution's mission. Each institution negotiates its level of performance on standards that cover its financial and management responsibilities as well as its performance relative to the 12 state goals. Data will ultimately be reported to SCHEV, the General Assembly (and its joint audit committee, known as JLARC), and other agencies as may be needed. With a variety of sources of judgment about the data, and ambiguous criteria of 'success' on some of the measures, institutions are concerned about the risk that one could be 'performing' for one purpose in one agency's view, but not for another. What is 'affordability,' for example, and is it the same for a College of William & Mary, a Norfolk State University and an historically Black institution? And, how far should the state push something like 'access?' Is it 'access' to the institution, or access to required courses? In addition, the new regime seems to emphasise negative sanctions as much as positive incentives for institutions to 'perform.'

But SCHEV and other actors on the state's behalf, as well as leaders of the covered institutions, see the overarching goals for 'covered' institutions as uncontroversial - things higher education ought to be doing with or without restructuring. In one view, performance measures should basically answer the question, 'Does the sum of institutional efforts add up to more than the sum of the 'scores' on all the individual performance measures?' In other words, is the state better off for the efforts of its public universities? In this view, a balance is needed between focusing too closely on data themselves and thoughtful analysis of overall performance to assure the state that it is getting value for its investment in higher education. The state and the public will judge the credibility of the process on whether that thoughtful analysis is conducted and whether it can be clearly communicated.

Do the benefits outweigh the costs?

The cultures of state agencies and higher education institutions differ profoundly, so these agreements may be helpful in laying down the ground rules by which conversations between the two sides will proceed. Perhaps more importantly, higher education had not been seen as fully or consistently responsive to what the state perceived as its most important goals. SCHEV's most recent (2004) 'strategic plan' focused only on accommodating more students with less funding, strengthening funded research, and enhancing instructional quality, in retrospect

a relatively narrow and pedestrian set of goals when arrayed against a far broader 'state ask' in restructuring legislation. Now those goals are clarified and written into law. The expectations are made clear and explicit, and it is believed by some that the whole process has helped the parties to re-think some major issues in the relationship of the state and its universities. The state is far more explicit in stating what public funding should provide for, and, by implication, the institutions are on notice that all else is ancillary to these central purposes.

In fact, many of our respondents indicated that the renewed focus on substance - what the state wants and what institutions are supposed to do about it - has been salutary. As one said, 'We are all getting more focused on output, what are we accomplishing, than on process.' Process has been covered in the law and in management agreements, making both the relationship and its content more explicit and predictable.

On the other hand, the legislation could serve as a vehicle for legislative mischief. Simple amendments could add new goals or reform performance standards painstakingly negotiated by SCHEV. In fact a 12th goal was legislated in 2006, a signal that the door may be open to future such amendments. We acknowledge that no current state legislature can, by normal statute, bind future legislatures to act in specified manners. But some respondents speculated that the explicit nature of the restructuring process and the very involved negotiations that preceded it might have some moral carry-over effect in coming years.

The Virginia policy may offer substantial benefits to both the state and its public colleges and universities. Management flexibility, saving costs on construction, holding and managing funds, operating a tailor-made HR system, and the promise of tuition and fee predictability all appear to hold promise for institutions in the Level III group. Their experience may well break the path for the other institutions, providing them with opportunities for more independent operations than they would otherwise have enjoyed. Likewise, the intangible effect of having a clear blueprint for what the state expects and how institutions' performance will be judged is, in the view of most, a salutary outcome in itself. As with any newly signed agreement, though, the sterner test will be in how the parties choose to live up to both its terms and its spirit.

Conclusion

Seeking more autonomy from the state, Virginia's public universities found themselves achieving more procedural autonomy on the condition of the state's assertion of tighter substantive control. This procedural/substantive dichotomy is taken up in a different context by John Donahue (1989) of Harvard University. Writing on privatisation in US society (and not covering issues in education or higher education), Donahue uses the text sub-title of 'Public Ends; Private Means', and argues that to be successful, privatisation must include rigorous definition of the purposes of public ends and a rigorous process for evaluating their attainment. To us, the Virginia scene has attempted just such a package. (For elaboration on the procedural/substantive theme, see Berdahl and Bayer-Contardo, 2006.)

The state deregulation on the procedural side is supposed to lead to more day-to-day managerial flexibility, to more entrepreneurialism and to higher institutional morale that comes with more real self-government. Whether the increased state role in defining and evaluating the purposes of its public universities and colleges will come to be seen as having demanded too high a price for the greater procedural freedoms remains to be seen. Having taken the initiative to loosen their relationship with the state as appropriations failed to keep pace with institutional costs, Virginia's 'Big 3' public universities appear to have unleashed an uncontrollable 'garbage can' agenda that had a different outcome than anyone anticipated.

The ultimate reality for publicly supported colleges and universities is that they serve their states. The ultimate reality for state government is that they have to make explicit what they expect, how much they will pay to get it and how they will evaluate the results. In other words, there is a relationship that has to be continuously sustained. Most critical of all, both sides need to focus on how best to achieve the quality of outcomes that serve the state's most pressing interests. If the Virginia reforms result in better quality service to the state, while still protecting and enhancing the academic quality of the covered institutions, they will be worth emulating.

References

- Berdahl, R. (1971). *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Berdahl, R. and Bayer-Contardo, J. (2006). 'The Quasi-Privatization of a Public Honors College', *Planning for Higher Education*, 34, 4, 35-48.
- Blake, P. (2006). 'Restructuring Relationships in Virginia', *Change*, 37, 4, 25-33.

- Breneman, D. (2004). *Are the States and Higher Education Striking a New Bargain?* Public Policy Paper Series, No.04-02. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards.
- Breneman, D. and Kneedler, L. (2006). 'Negotiating a New Relationship with the State: The Virginia Experience', in Clark, R.L. and d'Ambrosio, M. (eds.), *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 54-74.
- Couturier, L. (2006). *Checks and Balances at Work: the Restructuring of Virginia's Public Higher Education System*. San Jose: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Donahue, J. (1989). *The Privatization Decision*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gumport, P. and Pusser, B. (1999). 'University Restructuring: The Role of Economic and Political Contexts', in Smart, J.C. and Tierney, W.G. (eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (Vol. XIV)*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Leslie, D. (2005). 'Constitutional Limits to Public University Autonomy'. *Presented to the National Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, Pa.*
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus Unbound*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

The Social Foundations of the Evaluative State and the Universities as Stakeholder Organisations

Ivar Bleiklie

Introduction

The unique quality of Guy Neave's work is to be found in a skilful application of the methods and knowledge of a classic historian, combined with the analytical orientation of a social scientist and a personal talent for coining concepts and using metaphor to form elegant arguments. Thus the best of his contributions are not only important and innovative, but also fun and interesting pieces to read. Two of Guy's most well known contributions may be pinpointed by the use of two concepts: 'the evaluative state' and 'universities as stakeholder organisations' (Neave 1998, 2002). Both concepts were used to identify significant developments in university policy and institutional organisation. Whereas the first suggests how modern states have tried to adjust their *modus operandi* in terms of a specific set of ideals that emerged and took hold during the 1980s and 1990s, the second concept suggests how modern universities have changed in terms of a new set of organisational ideals that emerged in the same period. The two developments are closely related, some would say two sides of the same coin. Nevertheless, the close relation tends to be assumed rather than demonstrated. In this brief article I do not intend to undertake the daunting task of providing proof. I shall instead argue that there are different ways in which we may go about the task of demonstrating the relationship. I shall start with an illustration, the case of Norwegian university reforms of the last ten years, embodied in the so-called 'Quality Reform'.

The Norwegian 'Quality Reform'

Previous analyses of Norwegian higher education reforms and their effects on the higher education system have depicted Norway as a slow reformer characterised by localism and incrementalism that makes planned reforms difficult (Bleiklie 2004; Bleiklie et al. 2000; Kogan et al. 2000). There are clear indications that this picture has changed if we look at the outcomes of the Quality Reform (Aamodt et al. 2006; Bleiklie et al. 2006; Dysthe et al. 2006; Halvorsen and Faye 2006; Michelsen et al. 2006). The Quality Reform adopted in Parliament in June 2002 and implemented from August 2003, signalled massive changes over a broad range of issues. Among them were a new degree system (as part of the Bologna process), introduction of a course credit system throughout the higher education

system, new leadership and management structures, a new funding system, a strong drive for internationalisation and an extension of the teaching semester. Central among the stated objectives was the goal of increased efficiency - reducing dropout rates, reducing time to exam, and increasing research output and research funding acquisition capacity. In order to achieve this, a funding system of higher education institutions has been put in place where at the start of the new funding regime about 60% of the institutions' budget was supposed to be a basic grant, about 25% a reward for teaching productivity and about 15% a reward for research productivity. A quality insurance agency (NOKUT) was established the primary task of which has been evaluating quality assurance systems in individual institutions and the degree to which they fulfil established formal criteria for institutional accreditation, e.g. percentage of full professors, associate professors and doctoral degree holders among the academic staff. Thus important mechanisms of the Evaluative State that had gradually been introduced since 1990 were now in place in full force. Furthermore leadership structures were put in place that strengthened leadership and increased capacity for strategic planning and action. Although institutions were given several options regarding how they wanted to organise their internal decision making structures, the majority of the institutions chose to opt for elected rectors and appointed deans and departments heads. External representation on the institutional boards that had been introduced since 1995 was strengthened and representatives of the academic staff no longer held the majority. At faculty and department levels elected bodies with decision making authority to which leaders previously were answerable, were replaced by bodies with an advisory function. These formal changes seem to shape the institutions as stakeholder organisations in which power is transferred from the academic staff and other employee groups to appointed leaders and external stakeholders.

Three Perspectives on Higher Education Policy Change

The Quality Reform demonstrates that where reformers once tended to be cautious and act with care, they have in recent years shown a hitherto unprecedented capacity for radical structural reform. There may be several explanations for this renewed capacity for policy reform, such as changing environmental pressures, changing power constellations or changing belief among relevant actors. Let us therefore have a brief look at these explanations and see whether any of these are probable candidates for explaining the most recent turn of events in Norwegian higher education policies.

Environmental pressure and functional needs as policy drivers

One perspective which we may call neo-Weberian focuses on the *functions* of governance and reform processes whereby new aspects of public activities are

formalised and made accessible to outside administrative and political control (Ferlie and Andresani 2006; Willmott 1995). This perspective assumes a positive role of the state, a distinctive public service and a particular legal order. Policy change, therefore, might testify to the adaptability and resilience of state structures faced with a changing environment and new challenges demanding new organisational arrangements. This perspective is useful for two reasons. First it allows us to focus on current reforms in a long term perspective which makes it possible to check the extent to which current reforms are the outcome of gradual processes rather than of changes that have occurred over the last couple of decades. Secondly, the neo-Weberian perspective is open to the idea that changes in state policies may be a necessary product of environmental changes. One set of environmental changes is the emergence of a 'knowledge society' and 'knowledge economy', the perceived needs for expansion in higher education and research, an increased integration of higher education and research with state and society (stakeholder perspective) and therefore also an increased need for transparency and efficiency that may be accommodated by the new forms of incentive policies and evaluation instruments provided by the evaluative state.

New actor constellations in governance

This perspective focuses on *the actors* that influence or shape policies and their interrelations. Policies are the product of the actions of major actors such as policy makers and affected groups where policies are understood in terms of the preferences of the actors involved in the decision process (Ostrom 1990; Scharpf 1997; Tsebelis 1999). In such a case the degree and pace of change depend on the aims of the actors and may be explained either by changing values and aims among actors or changes in the constellation of the actors involved. A recent version of the perspective 'network governance' refers to a situation where horizontally organised networks of actors - government agencies, business enterprises and voluntary organisations - are left to formulate, administer and implement public policies rather than hierarchically organised public bureaucracies. This is also assumed to have further organisational implications as policies are implemented in a more non-hierarchical, discursive and open ended fashion (Jones et al. 1997). In higher education these changes may reflect changes in the conception of universities, from a situation in which their organisation is based on the idea that they are academic collegial communities - 'republics of scholars' - to a situation where they are considered to be stakeholder organisations (Neave 2002). The actor oriented perspective may explain current higher education reforms if the reform measures can be traced back to the emergence of new actor constellations as opposed to traditional bureaucratic forms. These new actor constellations may then result in new perceptions of policy problems in higher education and reform proposals consistent with these perceptions.

New forms of governance

One of the most commonly used perspectives in social science analyses of public sector reform over the last decades is New Public Management (NPM). It represents a perspective that focuses on changes in *the instruments of governance*, whereby public agencies are induced to operate as business enterprises in the market - *in casu* producers of educational and research services - rather than rule following bureaucratic units (Bleiklie 1998; Christensen and Læg Reid 1998; Ferlie et al. 1996; Pollitt 1990, 1995). The NPM perspective focuses on changes of *the instruments of governance* designed to increase the efficiency of service production. Particular attention is devoted to new instruments that reflect a changing logic of steering - such as the shift from *ex ante* regulation in the form of established rules, practices and budget decisions to an emphasis on *ex post* control with a focus on goal formulation, performance measurement and evaluation. When the emphasis is moved from rule production and rule adherence to goal formulation and performance control *evaluation* becomes a core activity and thus changes the way in which the state goes about its business of governance (Neave 1998). NPM is often traced back to the ideological transformation of the 'managerial revolution' from about 1980 (Keller 1983). The NPM perspective may therefore explain current higher education reforms if the reform measures can be traced back to NPM inspired ideological changes since 1980 that subsequently led to a formulation of higher education policy problems and thereafter the development of reform proposals consistent with NPM-ideology. It is thus a special version of general institutional perspectives that emphasise beliefs and rule like assumptions as explanations for the behaviour of relevant actors.

Realist and institutionalist interpretations

In the concluding discussion I shall use these three main assumptions about the sequence of events driving the reform process as a basis for the analysis. The most common understanding of the three perspectives above is that the former two represent different causal sequences reflecting real world or objective events (actors' needs/preferences, or functional needs) that have caused some kind of reaction. The validity of such explanations according to the realist interpretation which they represent should be tested by observing whether the sequence of events that is suggested by the models, actually occurs or not. However if we look closer at the evidence it indicates that one cannot find direct links between changes in the organisation and expansion of higher education and 'objective' needs. Whether we look at how the Norwegian case developed over time (Bleiklie et al. 2000; Bleiklie 2006) or compare it with the development of higher education systems in other countries (Frank and Meyer 2007; Meyer and Schofer 2007) it is difficult to find support for functional or actor oriented explanations. Neither increasing student numbers nor indicators of economic development are sufficient to explain satisfactorily higher education expansion and organisation.

The actor constellations are also quite stable, where institutions and state authorities have remained the main actors. Although increasing student numbers represent real world changes, the expansion itself tends to be worldwide and consistent over time since 1960. The expansion itself cannot be explained in terms of economic development. According to Frank and Meyer (2007) it has taken place globally regardless of the level of economic development and the needs of the labour market and of industry. They conclude that it may best be explained in terms of beliefs and rule like assumptions made by the actors involved. In our study of the Quality Reform there are some interesting findings regarding the beliefs of the actors involved that may contribute further to explaining the outcome. In our national survey of academic staff we found that they defined the ability to plan strategically as the most important leadership quality they expected to find among their immediate superiors, more important than academic authority and excellence. Furthermore, in spite of the reforms being rather comprehensive and structural, they have not produced clear gains in terms of efficiency. This has not yet led to any discussion or reflection regarding the efficiency of the reform measures, and there is little indication that the basic assumptions on which the reform was based might be affected by the possibility of the reform failing in terms of its own success criteria.

References

- Aamodt, P.O., Hovdhaugen, E. and Opheim, V. (2006). *Den nye studiehverdagen. Evaluering av Kvalitetsreformen, Delrapport 6*. Oslo: NFR, Rokkansenteret, NIFU STEP.
- Bleiklie, I. (1998). 'Justifying the Evaluative State. New Public Management Ideals in Higher Education', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 299-316.
- Bleiklie, I. (2004). 'Norway: holding back competition?', in Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B.G. and Scott, C. (eds.), *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Bleiklie, I. (2006). 'Norway as Higher Education Policy Maker - from Tortoise to Eager Beaver?'. *Revised paper prepared for meeting of the SUN-PRIME network*, Rome, October 27-28.
- Bleiklie, I., Høstaker, R. and Vabø, A. (2000). *Policy and Practice in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bleiklie, I., Ringkjøp, H-E. and Østergren, K. (2006). *Nytt regime i variert landskap. Ledelse og styring av universiteter og høyskoler etter Kvalitetsreformen. Evaluering av Kvalitetsreformen. Delrapport 9*. Oslo: NFR, Rokkansenteret, NIFU STEP.
- Christensen, T. and Læg Reid, P. (1998). *Den moderne forvaltning*. Oslo: Tano - Aschehoug.

- Dysthe, O., Raaheim, A., Lima, I. and Bygstad, A. (2006). *Undervisnings- og vurderingsformer. Pedagogiske konsekvenser av Kvalitetsreformen*. Evaluering av Kvalitetsreformen. Delrapport 7. Oslo: NFR, Rokkansenteret, NIFU STEP.
- Ferlie, E. and Andresani, G. (2006). 'Organisation Theory and University Governance: Towards a Neo Weberian Model'. *Unpublished presentation at The Second PRIME Annual Conference, PRIME Scientific Days, Marne-la-Vallée*.
- Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996). *The New Public Management in Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, D.J. and Meyer, J.W. (2007). 'Worldwide Expansion and Change in the University', in Krücken, G., Kosmützky, A. and Torca, M. (eds.), *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Halvorsen, T. and Faye, R. (2006). *Internasjonalisering, Evaluering av Kvalitetsreformen*. Delrapport 8. Oslo: NFR, Rokkansenteret, NIFU STEP.
- Jones, C., Hesterly, W.S. and Borgatti, S.P. (1997). 'A General Theory of Network Governance: Exchange Conditions and Social Mechanisms', *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 4, pp 911-945.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy. The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. and Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Meyer, J.W. and Schofer, E. (2007). 'The University in Europe and the World: Twentieth Century Expansion, in Krücken, G., Kosmützky, A. and Torca, M. (eds.), *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Michelsen, M., Høst, H. and Gitlesen, J.P. (2006). *Kvalitetsreformen mellom undervisning og forskning*. Evaluering av Kvalitetsreformen. Delrapport 10. Oslo: NFR, Rokkansenteret, NIFU STEP.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265 - 284.
- Neave, G. (2002). 'The Stakeholder Perspective Historically Explored', in Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalizing World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the Public Services. The Anglo-American Experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Pollitt, C. (1995). 'Justification by works or by faith? Evaluation of New Public Management'. *EVANPM for EGPA Workshop Administrative Reforms and Modernization*. Rotterdam.

- Scharpf, F.W. (1997). *Games Real Actors Play: Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tsebelis, G. (1999). 'Veto players and institutional analysis', *Governance* 13, 4, 441-474.
- Willmott, H. (1995). 'What's Been Happening in Organization Theory and Does it Matter?' *Personnel Review*, 24, 8, 51-71.

The rise of the 'evaluative society' and the legitimisation of 'difference' in UK higher education

John Brennan

Introduction: from 'evaluative state' to 'evaluative society'

Guy Neave has contributed much to the discussion of the implications of the rise of the evaluative state for higher education (Neave 1988, 1998, 2000). The tentacles of the evaluative state were particularly in evidence through the growth of the quality movement during the 1990s as state-sponsored, if not always state administered, agencies set about evaluating the qualities of higher education institutions and some mixture of their teaching programmes, their research, their staff, their administrative mechanisms and much else (Westerheijden et al. 1994; Brennan and Shah 2000).

In some jurisdictions, the evaluative state was regarded as relatively benign since its arrival signalled the relaxation or even the removal of other state controls (Neave and Van Vught 1994). Some elements of authority were transferred from the state to the higher education institutions, if not to the academic profession itself, and it was not therefore perhaps so unreasonable for the state to wish to know what the publicly-funded institutions were doing with their new-found freedoms. This is what evaluation activity sought to provide. However, in other jurisdictions where institutional autonomy had traditionally been high, there were no offsetting freedoms to be found from the introduction of the new evaluation and quality mechanisms. In such places, evaluation was perceived to be an attack on existing and long-held freedoms, producing a lot of extra work for institutions and their staff and running the risk of producing considerable public embarrassment if negative results ensued. The celebrated 'quality wars' (Brown 2004; Dill 2004) in the United Kingdom were born of this perceived conflict between higher education's traditional freedoms and growing state interference, in large part through the arrival of new evaluation and quality assessment mechanisms.

Fast forward to the beginning of a new century and there are signs that the evaluative state has transformed itself into a multi-layered and multi-functional 'evaluative society'. An average evening's television will likely contain both celebrity and public evaluations of citizens' business acumen, their dress sense, their dance expertise and much else. Much of the popularity of such evaluative activity is that it entails the creation of 'winners' and 'losers'. The concepts and terminology of the 'stakeholder society' also indicate that the state has lost much

of its evaluative monopoly. It is not that the state is evaluating any the less but that, now, everybody is doing it!

This chapter will examine how higher education is faring in this evaluative society, mainly through consideration of the case of the United Kingdom. As already indicated, this is not to claim that the UK case is typical. In many ways, it is not, especially from a European perspective. But the UK example of evaluation in higher education has been fast-moving and controversial and, it will be argued in this chapter, has seen the reversal of its original rationale: from attempting to ensure that higher education was broadly 'all the same' (comparability of standards) to emphasising its differences and legitimising its hierarchies (through rankings and league tables).

Ensuring comparability

Historically, evaluation processes in UK higher education were overwhelmingly based on peer review and their essential purpose was to ensure comparability of standards across a system of largely independent, though mainly state-funded, universities and other higher education institutions. Central as far as the education function was concerned was the system of external examiners through which the assessed academic work of students was examined by experienced academics who were external to the institution where the students were being taught. The central duty of the external examiner was to confirm that the standards being applied to the assessment of student work at the 'examined' institution were the same as those being applied at the examiner's home institution and at other institutions with which the examiner was familiar. (Over an academic career, an individual academic could expect to be an external examiner at several universities.) While the external examiner role subsequently expanded to include commentary on the quality of the courses and the teaching that the students had experienced, the central function of comparability of standards remained.

Peer review was also central to ensuring that comparability of standards was maintained during the expansion of higher education during the 1970s and 1980s. This period saw a major expansion of polytechnics and other non-university institutions. Unlike non-university sectors in many other countries, the standards in the polytechnics and colleges were anchored in those of the universities. Not only did the external examiner system of the universities extend to these new kinds of institutions but an independent body, the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), exercised national authority over academic standards (it awarded the degrees to the polytechnic students) through the use of a peer review system of course evaluation, involving site visits by external academics (drawn from both universities and polytechnics). The CNAA was required by

Royal Charter to ensure that the degrees awarded in the polytechnics and colleges were equivalent in standards to those awarded in and by universities.

Accreditation of vocational programmes by professional bodies used similar mechanisms of peer review and had as its purpose the guarantee that graduates would be equivalent in terms of knowledge, competence and skills irrespective of the institution where they had studied.

These unifying features of UK higher education traditions are sufficiently well-known and recorded (e.g. Silver 1990; Brown 2004,) not to require any further elaboration here. The point to underline is that evaluation had historically played a central role in underpinning a claim that the experience and achievements of students were broadly similar, irrespective of where they studied. Evaluation reports were private to the evaluated institutions. All that wider publics needed to know was that evaluation systems were in place to ensure that standards and qualifications were equivalent irrespective of where one had studied.

Ensuring difference

If the role of evaluation processes had historically been to attempt to ensure comparability of standards or at least to play down differences, from the nineties onwards it was all about creating and legitimising difference. A national Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) introduced in the late 1980s was already demonstrating that not all universities were equivalent in terms of research standing. Public funding of research based on the RAE results ensured that differences continued and, indeed, were accentuated. It also ensured that any research aspirations in the former polytechnics that might have been created by their re-designation as universities were kept firmly under control.

A national 'quality assessment' regime introduced in 1993 and administered by the higher education funding councils (separate ones for England, Scotland and Wales) was set to create similar reputational differentiation of teaching. The essential and novel feature of the system was the grading of the quality of university teaching on a subject basis. Visiting teams of 'peers' observed classes and met with faculty members and with students to question them about their intentions and experiences. Reports of the assessments were published and contained an explicit statement of 'relative' quality, initially on a three point scale - of excellence, satisfactory and unsatisfactory - but subsequently on effectively a 24 point scale based on six separate dimensions of teaching quality. Rankings and league tables followed, though never published by the assessment agencies. National newspapers were left to do this part of the job.

The above arrangements were the focus of continuing ‘quality wars’ during the nineties (Brown 2004; Dill 2004). While the main protagonists were the universities and the state, each had their allies, their agendas (hidden and public) and their supporters. A messy compromise of a subject-based quality assessment system operated by the funding councils alongside a continuing academic audit process operated by the institutionally-owned Higher Education Quality Council continued until the late nineties when the two systems were merged and a single nominally independent Quality Assurance Agency was created. In reality, the Agency was owned by the institutions but took its orders from the funding councils. Research assessment remained the direct responsibility of the funding councils.

The most recent evolution of the UK quality assessment regime has been the replacement of the peer review of teaching by an annual student satisfaction survey. All final year students complete a questionnaire. The results are published. League tables are constructed. The market has arrived.

The underlying belief - central to other areas of public service under the Blair government - is that informed consumer choice is central to driving up quality and standards. The satisfaction levels of existing ‘consumers’ are conveyed to intending ‘consumers’ who will draw the obvious conclusions and their resulting decisions on university applications will force universities to improve their quality if they are to survive in an increasingly competitive marketplace. (There is plenty of evidence, however, that students decide on where they want to study for all sorts of reasons and are hardly affected by this student survey information.)

What we see from the evolution of the UK case over a 20 year period can be summarised as a movement through four phases of ‘authority’ over the work of higher education institutions.

Table 1: The changing locus of authority in UK higher education

Phase 1: Academic authority	External examiners CNA
Phase 2: Managerial authority	Institutional audit
Phase 3: State authority	Quality assessment, RAE,
Phase 4: Consumer authority	National student survey, Teaching Quality Information

The table indicates something of the 20 year evolution of evaluation arrangements in the UK and the changing power relationships that underlie them. It should be remembered, however, that new arrangements never wholly replace the arrangements that preceded them. External examiners continue to ply their trade. The culture and processes of the CNA are still much in evidence in many of the former polytechnics. And there was considerable overlap between phases 2 and 3.

Today, open warfare may have gone underground in the UK quality wars. No clear winner can yet be discerned. But the important change which has occurred is that evaluation processes that were originally about ensuring that quality and standards were broadly *the same* in UK higher education are now concerned with demonstrating that they are *different*.

From state to stakeholders

The implications of the growth of the 'stakeholder society' for higher education evaluation systems is that their intended use has extended beyond the organs of the state to include a wide range of stakeholders, including higher education's users and consumers, the people who work in higher education, the employers of higher education's graduates, the commissioners of research, and so on. And as a central part of the prevalent ideology, it is important that all these stakeholders have real choices and options. It is not sufficient to simply ensure that minimum standards are everywhere in place. The whole point is to demonstrate publicly that differences exist and should be differentially rewarded. The theory is that this will motivate people to do 'better'. But differentiation also can be used to justify the unequal treatment of graduates from different higher education institutions, the unequal support for research, the unequal rewards for academic staff, and so on.

An emphasis upon 'legitimised difference' in the evaluative society reflects for higher education the consequences of expansion and the need to perform simultaneously mass and universal functions alongside traditional elite functions (Trow 1974, 2006). Evaluation systems and processes legitimise differences by providing the evidence for their existence. The UK system has been marked by 'vertical differentiation' (Teichler 2006) whereby differences are generally set out in a hierarchical order - hence, rankings and league table. In other places, a more 'horizontal' and functional differentiation is emphasised. But in both cases, evaluation plays an important role in demonstrating that 'things are different' and are 'better' in some places than in others.

It sometimes seems as if everyone is evaluating everyone else in UK higher education today. Academics are evaluating each other and their students. The students are evaluating their teachers. Managers are evaluating academic staff. External agencies are evaluating the management. The use to which the resultant mountains of evaluation data are actually being put is so far unclear. But it is undoubtedly the case that many academics take the evaluations very seriously, especially those concerned with research which have considerable implications for future reputation and funding. For the rest of it, when so many things are being evaluated, it is generally possible for most of us to find something that we appear to be good at!

References

- Brennan, J. and Shah, T. (2000). *Managing Quality in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, R. (2004). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: the UK experience since 1992*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Dill, D. (2004). 'Colonel Bogey March: Roger Brown's History of the UK Quality Wars', *Higher Education Digest*, London: CHERI/Open University, 49, Summer 2004, 2-3.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: An Overview of Recent Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe, 1986-1988', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 1-2, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.
- Neave, G. (2000). *The universities' responsibilities to society*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1994). *Prometheus Bound: the Changing Relationship between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- Silver, H. (1990). *A Higher Education*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Teichler, U. (2006). 'Changing structures of higher education systems: the increasing complexity of underlying forces', *Higher Education Policy*, 19, 4, 447-461.
- Trow, M. (1974). 'Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education', in OECD, *Policies for Higher Education*, Paris: OECD, pp. 51-101.
- Trow, M. (2006). 'Reflection on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII', in Forest, J.E. and Altbach, P.G. (eds.), *International Handbook on Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 245-280.
- Westerheijden, D.F., Brennan, J.L. and Maassen, P.A.M. (1994). *Changing Contexts of Quality Assessment: Recent Trends in West European Higher Education*. Utrecht: Lemma.

Resisting the Evaluative State: Irish Academics Win the Battle but Lose the War

Patrick Clancy

Introduction

A perennial problem for comparative scholars of higher education policy and indeed in the social sciences more generally is the tension between seeking to understand the operation of universal processes which apply in all social settings and the necessity to take account of national specificities which lead to particularistic developments in different countries. Scholars who have sought to apply institutional theory to the study of higher education have emphasised the extent to which local higher education organisations arise in good measure independent of local circumstances - derived from wider socio-cultural environments that support and even require local structuration around exogenous models and meanings (Meyer et al. 2006, p. 5). While this endorsement of 'isomorphism' as the master trend, which also seeks to explain commonalities in change trajectories, does not preclude some national variations, some scholars argue that the evolving diversity of higher education systems needs to be a more central focus in comparative analysis (Levy 2006). Guy Neave's comparative analysis of policy changes in higher education stands uniquely as the most sophisticated treatment of this intellectual domain. His biennial reviews of policy development in the *European Journal of Education* and his continuing analysis in *Higher Education Policy* and in a variety of other papers and monographs offer an extraordinary rich theoretical analysis of the complex interaction between universal global trends conditioned by national characteristics. His penetrating analysis of the rise of the Evaluative State offers a good example of this work (Neave 1988, 1998, 2004). In this short paper I want to draw on Neave's analysis of the Evaluative State to discuss changes in the governance of Irish higher education.

Central to Neave's analysis are his distinctions between: routine and exploratory/strategic evaluation; *a priori* and *a posteriori* approaches to funding; his analysis of the role of intermediary bodies; and his recognition that changing governance patterns reveal many paradoxes. In his analysis, the growing interventionist role of the state is consistent with apparently contradictory trends towards increasing self-regulation and institutional autonomy, although not necessarily self-governance on a collegial basis (Neave 2004, p. 23). The transfer of functions away from national oversight does not necessarily mean that there is a corresponding increase in latitude and discretion at the institutional level. He

points out that what is yielded at the top does not necessarily straightaway flow to the base; it may gather in the hands of intermediary bodies and/or institutional leaders (Neave 1998, p. 278). The price of enhanced self-management is acceding to enhanced public scrutiny and accountability, exercised via intermediary bodies. He sees the rise of the Evaluative State in Europe as coterminous with the installation of new agencies, procedures and criteria for judging quality in higher education. Contractualisation is a central feature of the operating frame created by the Evaluative State, designed to enforce change. This implies 'conditionality' and 'renegotiability' involving complex interchanges between government, agencies of surveillance and higher education institutions (Neave 1998, p. 277).

The perceptiveness of Neave's theoretical analysis is matched by his sensitivity to differences in national contexts. For example, within Western Europe he identifies two approaches towards the Evaluative State. One, as exemplified by Belgium, France, Spain and more recently Italy, was the political pathway, where change in higher education is part of a broader ranging political reform while the second, as exemplified by UK and the Netherlands, was conceived with economic goals in mind attempting to make HE institutions more responsive to market forces.

Growing State Intervention in Irish Higher Education

In Ireland, prior to the 1960s, the relationship between the state and all education providers is best captured by the notion of subsidiarity. The Irish educational system evolved within a tradition of state-aided rather than state owned education. This relationship of subsidiarity was reflected in the higher education sector whereby the annual grant to the universities came from the Department of Finance, not the Department of Education. This implied that the state was not envisaged as having any planning role in relation to higher education.

The interventionist role of the state commenced with the modernisation programme of the 1960s and the introduction of economic planning. In future, priority was to be given to achieving economic growth through an industrialisation programme, which was to be founded on export-led growth with a strong involvement of foreign multi-nationals. As a late-industrialising country, it quickly emerged that the scope for growth was in knowledge-based industries and the development of human capital was the essential factor in facilitating this development. The expansion and restructuring of the educational system became an integral feature of the government's economic growth strategy. The essential rationale for spending on education, especially higher education, was its contribution to achieving economic growth targets in respect of industrial development and employment creation.

Contrary to the advice of the Commission on Higher Education, which endorsed the traditional view of the university (Clancy 1991), the government formed the view that new and emerging labour market needs were unlikely to be met by the university sector. The view was that the universities were not sufficiently adaptable and that their mission statements showed little emphasis on the application of knowledge and meeting the needs of the labour market. The mechanism chosen was to develop a non-university sector which would have an explicit vocationalist orientation. The main expression of this policy was to set up a network of Regional Technical Colleges (RTCs), designed as short cycle vocationally oriented institutions. These new colleges supplemented the existing Dublin Colleges of Technology, which were greatly expanded and reconstituted to form the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT). An important characteristic of the new sector was that it would be controlled by the government Department of Education, directly, rather than by the Higher Education Authority, the buffer body which had been established by the state to regulate the university sector. It would appear that the strategy to establish a binary system was motivated, primarily, by the desire to fashion the new sector in a manner which would best respond to meet the labour market needs of the economy. This new sector became the main vehicle for expanded provision, and was privileged in terms of the flow of state resources.

The other new development was the establishment of two National Institutes of Higher Education (NIHES) designed to offer technologically oriented education at a higher level than that which was provided by the RTCs or the DIT. The decision to establish the first of these new institutes in Limerick, rather than to establish a university there as demanded by the local community, reflected a very explicit government determination. It was felt that while there was a need for additional higher level institutions, the country at that time did not need another university.

The government's success in establishing a vibrant higher education sector outside the university sector began to influence developments within the university sector. The state gradually became more interventionist vis-à-vis the universities, and was no longer willing to allow the buffer agency (HEA) to exercise the level of discretion it previously enjoyed. While in its early days its relative autonomy from government enabled it to earn the trust and confidence of its client institutions (the colleges), gradually the government-HEA interface has proved to be more permeable (Clancy 1991). Examples of the increased intervention, which followed this shift in the direction of penetration (Neave 2004, p. 16), include the state's greater budgetary control, effectively regaining some of the functions which it had earlier delegated to the HEA and the state's increased influence over the supply of additional third level places; extra resources are made available contingent on the perceived need for particular kinds of graduates.

Academic Resistance: Protecting Autonomy

Notwithstanding this overall trend of declining autonomy some evidence of successful resistance is noted. Some of this is associated with a process of academic drift. The NIHEs have been given university status following the report of an international study group which reported that the standards of scholarship in the NIHEs were the same as in the universities. While noting that the mission statements of the NIHEs stated that their teaching and research are largely determined by what is needed in Ireland, it concluded that there is no inherent conflict between what is useful and what is scholarly. All of the RTCs have been renamed, Institutes of Technology, and following a review process each has been given delegated power to validate its own diplomas and degrees within the framework of the Higher Education and Training Awards Council. The Dublin Institute of Technology had previously been given power, via legislation, to validate its own qualifications although it has been refused university status. The increased autonomy given to the DIT and the former RTCs provides a good illustration of Neave's distinction between *product* and *process* control. Now that the colleges, which developed in the non-university sector, have internalised their more vocationally oriented mission they can be allowed more procedural autonomy. The final stage in the evolution of the non-university sector was taken earlier this year when the Institutes of Technology were designated under the Higher Education Authority. In her speech to the inaugural meeting of the reconstituted HEA the Minister for Education and Science referred to the enhanced autonomy and managerial freedoms being provided to the institutes (Hanafin 2007).

Perhaps the clearest examples of resistance to the evaluative state come from the university sector. Two developments are especially worthy of note. The first relates to the enactment of the Universities Act, 1997 while the second relates to the issue of external evaluation. The Universities Bill was enacted after a prolonged debate, incorporating substantial amendments. The original bill, as published, was perceived as involving an assault on university autonomy. It proposed to give much greater power to the state, mainly by extending the regulatory powers of the Higher Education Authority. After intense lobbying by the Heads of the Universities and the Federation of University Teachers, and with the support of the parliamentary opposition and the senators representing the university panel, the bill was amended very substantially. The outcome was broadly acceptable to the Heads of the Universities who felt that they had successfully neutralised the main threats posed by the bill as originally envisaged. Changes achieved in the Bill included:

1. Curtailing the proposed detailed financial oversight of the universities by the HEA
2. Locating the prime responsibility for academic evaluation/quality assurance with the university's governing authority rather than the HEA
3. Inclusion in the Bill of a strong section on academic freedom of individual staff members and of institutional autonomy
4. Placing 'tenure' on a firm legal footing
5. Increased representation for academic staff on the governing authority of the universities
6. Deletion of the detailed reference to the university's role in relation to 'innovation and job creation policies' while retaining the more generic objective 'to support and contribute to the realisation of national economic and social development'

The issue of evaluation and quality assurance has been on the policy agenda for some years with various proposals to introduce more rigorous external assessment of research and teaching. A government Green Paper (1992) suggested that an Academic Audit Unit would be created within the Higher Education Authority - i.e. external to the institutions - while the Committee of Heads of Irish Universities (CHIU) suggested that it should be located within the university system. In this instance the universities were successful in retaining the 'ownership' of the quality assurance system, albeit under the overall supervision of the HEA.

In relation to research funding and its assessment, government thinking favoured the introduction of separate budgets for teaching and research. The universities resisted strongly the idea of separate budgets, arguing that the unified budget, which is reflected in the block grant given to colleges, should provide the basic level of research funding. It was acceptable that selectivity would arise in relation to additional funding for which academics would be expected to bid. The university view prevailed through the 1990s, although as we report below the issue was not finally settled. In any event there was no suggestion that Ireland would move towards an elaborate Research Assessment Exercise such as that which prevails in the UK. It is envisaged that research assessment will be part of the quality assurance procedures, which are the prime responsibility of the colleges. Osborne (1996) has commented critically on the resistance of Irish academics to the demand for the separation of teaching and research budgets arguing that to the extent that universities in the Republic of Ireland have failed to ensure that academics have fulfilled their contractual obligations, to do research and teaching, there has been a breach of trust with the funders of higher education, ultimately the public.

Marketisation and Managerialism

The successes made during the 1990s in resisting the Evaluative State may be judged to be something of a pyrrhic victory. Paradoxically the changes, which fundamentally altered the relations between the state and the academy, came benignly packaged as the state's first major attempt to address the weak research infrastructure in Irish higher education. The Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions (PRTLTI) was introduced in 1998 with an allocation of €604 million. This was allocated on a competitive basis to institutions, primarily on the basis of the quality and coherence of the institution's research strategy. Science Foundation Ireland was established in 2000 with a budget of €646 million with a specific mission to fund research in ICT and biotechnology, areas which were deemed to be crucial for the development of Ireland's knowledge based economy. The third element in the enhancement of the research infrastructure was the establishment of new Research Councils for the humanities and social sciences (2000) and for science and technology (2001) with more modest budgets.

This new research funding environment heralded the introduction of unbridled market principles into the steering of higher education and represented the government's most serious attempt to exert control over the internal workings of the university. Ó Riain (2007, p. 193-196) has given a perceptive account of how this progressive process worked. While the first tranch of PRTLTI funding was biased towards science and technology it had something of a 'bottom-up' character. From 2002 onwards, a process of 'softening up' of the universities operated as the PRTLTI programme was 'paused' (for what turned out to be almost four years) and university non-pay budgets suffered cuts in real terms.

When the new streams of funding started to re-emerge in late 2005, they were more closely linked to the vision of the corporate university. New funding mechanisms were introduced that linked increases in funding directly to universities competing with each other to serve government goals - a portion of the 'block grant' was cut and moved to a Strategic Innovation Fund where universities competed for funding based on proposals around organisational restructuring, improved access, increased research, teaching innovation and so on (p. 194).

Ó Riain argues that the new corporate vision of the university has narrowed the range of the nature of knowledge to be developed in the university, has increased the level of corporate control of academic staff and has led to increasing direct involvement of corporate actors in the government of the university. The changed relationship between university and society, whereby the universities are more directly engaged in servicing what the state and business define as crucial issues, has been effected through competitive funding.

The response to the changed political climate and funding environment was that the universities embarked on an unprecedented level of restructuring. This was most evident in the three largest universities, University College Dublin (UCD), Trinity College Dublin and University College Cork (UCC). The changes introduced in UCD were typical where some ninety plus departments and eleven faculties were amalgamated into thirty-five schools and five colleges where the new College Principals (replacing Deans) were assigned managerial roles with responsibility for setting targets and monitoring outputs which were to be benchmarked against best practice nationally and internationally. The prioritisation of research which was seen as the foundation of national competitiveness was a central focus in the new environment. The new managerialism faced strong opposition from many staff and, in the case of UCC, resulted in a very public battle between the President and some senior academic staff. This opposition was reflected in a spirited correspondence in national newspapers, especially the *Irish Times*, where the principal accusations being made were: collegial culture was being replaced by a pro-business, corporate, audit culture; the prioritisation of science and technology was leading to the neglect of arts/humanities subjects; minority subjects were being downgraded; one university was accused of poaching staff from other Irish universities in an effort to increase competitiveness; authoritarian leadership styles were emerging; and there was a serious decline in staff morale. Barrett (2006) has examined the economics of Irish university restructuring and finds serious deficiencies, arguing that the request by the heads of Irish universities for government financial support for restructuring showed elements of rent-seeking and power-play in internal university governance. He is especially critical of the downgrading of undergraduate teaching relative to postgraduate teaching and research and the ignoring of consumer preferences in resource allocation.

Conclusion

Neave's analysis of the Evaluative State provides an apposite framework within which to understand changes in the governance of Irish higher education. The apparent successes in resisting the state's intrusion occurred in a situation where 'legal instrumentality' (Neave 2004, p. 13) is of declining significance. Recent developments suggest that the decisive move has been the state's mobilisation of market mechanisms to achieve explicit political objectives (see also Middleton 2000). The introduction of competitive funding and the consequential institutional response of the centralisation of power in university 'managers' have proved more potent than earlier attempts by the state at more direct steering and micro management. I share with other higher education scholars, an indebtedness to Guy Neave for his incisive theoretical analysis which illuminates this process.

References

- Barrett, S.D. (2006). 'The Economics of Restructuring Irish Universities', *Administration*, 54, 2, 43-62.
- Clancy, P. (1991). 'Numerical Expansion and Contracting Autonomy in Irish Higher Education', *Higher Education Policy*, 4, 1, 30-6.
- Green Paper (1992). *Education for a Changing World, Government Green Paper*. Dublin: Stationery Office.
- Hanafin, M. (2007). *Address by Minister Hanafin T.D. to the Heads of Higher Education Institutions following the Inaugural Meeting of the New Higher Education Authority*. 28 February, Archive Speeches <www.education.ie>
- Levy, D.C. (2006). 'How Private Higher Education Growth Challenges the New Institutionalism', in Meyer, H.D. and Rowan, B. (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Education*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 143-161.
- Meyer, J.W., Ramirez, F.O., Frank, D.J. and Schofer, E. (2006). 'Higher Education as an Institution' *CDDRL Working Papers*, 57, Stanford: Stanford University.
- Middleton, C. (2000). 'Models of State and Market in the 'Modernisation' of Higher Education', *British Journal of Higher Education*, 21, 4, 537-554.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: an Overview of Recent Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 1, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Higher Education*, 33, 3, 265-84.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'The Bologna Process and the Evaluative State: a Viticultural Parable', in *Managerialism and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series, Paper No. 7.
- Ó Riain, S. (2007). 'The University and the Public Sphere after the Celtic Tiger', in Kelly, T.A.F. (ed.), *What Price the University? Perspectives on the Meaning and Value of Higher Education from the National University of Ireland, Maynooth*. Maynooth: National University of Ireland, pp. 189-201.
- Osborne, R.D. (1996). *Higher Education in Ireland: North and South*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

'Doing a Neave': Reflections on the Evaluative State, Academic Standards, and Blind Mice

David D. Dill

Over his illustrious career Professor Guy Neave has contributed a large number of seminal writings to the field of higher education. His concept of the 'evaluative state' clearly identified a signal change in the history of higher education policy. Governments that traditionally had monitored inputs to universities as part of their fiduciary obligation to the public and occasionally had assessed the strategic direction of higher education (e.g., the Robbins Report), were now widely adopting for the first time *a posteriori* analyses. These attempts to evaluate the actual outputs or outcomes of universities were usually justified as a concern with efficiency and effectiveness in the new context of mass higher education.

Many of the subsequent analyses of the evaluative state have appropriately questioned the capacity of policymakers and their designated representatives to make valid assessments about university performance, particularly in the area of academic quality. This criticism stands on firm theoretical ground reflecting the well known principal-agent model first articulated by organisational economists. That is, the principal (the government) finances universities to provide public goods that might be undersupplied by the private market. Because these agents (universities) are not subject to truly competitive markets, the principal must monitor their performance to assure the public interest. However, information imperfections make external monitoring difficult and inefficiency likely. In the case of universities a lack of valid information about the academic standards of academic programs - that is the added educational value they provide to the student and ultimately to society - effectively 'blinds' the principal and leads to predictable government failures.

What is less often acknowledged, however, is that in the new global and massified environment of higher education, imperfect information also effectively blinds the other potential evaluators of higher education, the market and the university itself. This suggests the problem confronting higher education and society is more complex than that of the blind, evaluative state. It is the problem of the three blind mice of higher education - the state, the market, and the university.

The Blind State

The tools of the evaluative state have included new forms of external quality assurance such as subject assessments, academic audits, and program accreditations, as well as contractual instruments such as performance funding. Research on these new policy instruments has revealed limitations with each, problems predictable from the perspective of principal agent theory. For example, the process of subject assessments as implemented in the UK was captured by former school inspectors and therefore came to reflect their professional interests rather than those of the larger public. Consequently the assessments focused on direct inspections of teaching and thereby sometimes encouraged pedagogical conventions rather than the improvement of academic standards. Program accreditation as implemented in Europe, similar to subject assessments, is a comprehensive process and therefore highly costly in faculty time and effort if regularly repeated. Because of their focus on subject fields, both program accreditations and subject assessments also fail to strengthen collective institutional responsibility for maintaining and assuring academic standards. In contrast, academic audits were designed to evaluate institutional-level processes rather than subject fields, and are therefore an inherently less costly external quality assurance mechanism. But because of information imperfections audits also may suffer from misdirection, for example placing too much emphasis on assessing institutional policy documents or administrative and governance processes, rather than evaluating the effectiveness of core academic processes known to influence academic standards. Each of these external quality assessments has had some positive impacts, primarily in encouraging greater discussion and debate about improving academic quality and quality assurance within programs and institutions. But the challenges of conducting valid external assessments of academic standards also have encouraged a wasteful 'culture of compliance.' Administrators and academic staffs have often responded to external quality assessments with superficial actions, such as creating formal policy documents or visible quality assurance committees and/or quality assurance offices, rather than taking the more significant steps necessary to improve academic standards.

The newest instrument for evaluating university performance is performance funding. As with external quality assessments the major limitation of performance funding policies is inadequate data and measurements of the value added by educational programs. Performance funding measures still tend to rely upon existing input and process-oriented indicators of academic quality. As a consequence performance funding policies as currently designed have had minimal influence on the quantity or quality of student learning.

In sum this evidence of the blindness of the evaluative state has motivated many observers to advocate the use of true market competition as a means of assuring the public interest in maintaining and assuring academic standards.

The Blind Market

In an effort to increase the efficiency of their higher education systems, many countries have attempted to stimulate greater market competition among universities through quasi-markets for state funded instruction and research. But market efficiency is also dependent upon the availability of appropriate information on both price and quality. With many goods and services, a lack of needed consumer information on quality will offer a market opportunity for commercial entities to provide the needed information. This has also occurred in higher education as many publishers rushed to fill the void in academic quality information by providing university league tables and guides designed to inform student consumers. However, commercial league tables and guides also suffer from information imperfections and when combined with the demonstrated nature of student choice in mass higher education the evidence suggests that the evaluative market also suffers from blindness.

As already noted the challenge and cost of developing valid indicators of the educational value added by academic programs are significant and for-profit publications have little motivation to make such investments. Instead they enjoy substantial sales and influence among opinion leaders, higher achieving students, and even university personnel by focusing on readily available and/or highly subjective indicators of academic prestige such as reputational surveys and financial or student inputs.

These indicators of academic prestige tend to obscure the weaker signals of the quality of teaching and student learning and as a consequence the aggressive pursuit of prestige in more competitive markets crowds out activities associated with the improvement of academic standards. Because of the flawed indicators utilised in commercial rankings, universities in a number of countries are making costly investments calculated to enhance their international prestige, such as recruitment efforts and merit awards designed to 'cream skim' the student market as well as new PhD programs, research facilities, and the hiring of highly visible researchers.

This 'market failure' demonstrates that legitimate information on academic quality is a true public good that will be undersupplied by commercial entities. As a consequence both government and non-profit agencies in countries such as Australia, the UK, Germany, and the US have been motivated to subsidise the provision of more valid and reliable information on the quality of academic

programs for student consumers. While these efforts have helped correct some of the limitations of commercially provided information on higher education, they are unlikely to make the evaluative market less blind. High achieving students, who are the group most likely to be influenced by league tables, select universities based primarily upon indicators of academic reputation rather than valid measures of the quality of teaching and learning in academic programs. They believe - correctly - that graduation from these institutions will provide a signal to society that assures their future financial status. Other students choose universities for a wide variety of reasons including consumption benefits that they value personally, but which may ultimately produce limited benefit to society. These include the pleasures of living in attractive university surroundings, the appeal of university social life, and in the US the distractions of university athletics.

In sum, students in mass systems of higher education increasingly choose universities primarily for the private benefits they will receive, not because of the social benefits that an effective education may eventually provide society. The rational choices of even better informed student consumers are therefore unlikely to create sufficient pressure for universities to improve academic standards.

The Blind University

The observable blindness of the evaluative state and the evaluative market lead many to conclude that the only effective means of assuring academic standards is the university itself. Unfortunately information imperfections within institutions of higher education have contributed to the blindness of the university as an evaluative instrument as well.

As Sir Eric Ashby candidly observed in 1963:

All over the country these groups of scholars, who would not make a decision about the shape of a leaf or the derivation of a word or the author of a manuscript without painstakingly assembling the evidence, make decisions about admission policy, size of universities, staff-student ratios, content of courses, and similar issues, based on dubious assumptions, scrappy data, and mere hunch (Ashby 1963, p. 93).

Some forty year later Don Anderson and his colleagues in Australia surveyed university administrators about how they evaluated the academic standards of their universities:

... when we asked how they knew, there was no VC or dean who had any valid or reliable means of knowing about the intellectual standards of their university's degrees, e.g. how they might have changed over time, how they compared between departments or how they compared with other universities' (Anderson et al. 2002, p. 36).

Of the many external quality assurance practices external examining, as conducted in the UK and some Scandinavian countries, most clearly assesses academic standards. External examiners traditionally assessed the actual performance of students on subject examinations used to award honours degrees in UK universities. However, the practice was not regulated nor codified until, under pressure from the government to assure academic standards, the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals published the first Code of Practice in 1986. Subsequent research revealed that only a minority of universities were following these professional standards, challenging academic assertions on the effectiveness of the practice.

The numerous academic audits conducted in many countries have also publicly revealed the limitations in the evaluation processes universities employ to assure academic standards. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) in the US now conducts arguably the most valid academic audits, featuring evidence-based assessments of quality assurance processes in university education programs. Their assessors have been consistently surprised to discover that while university academic staff are clearly well trained in research inquiry they have not been systematically applying those methods to their academic courses and programs.

With the rising world-wide incentives for academic staff to invest more time and effort in research than teaching, the increasing demands from students for higher marks and grades, along with the widespread adoption of modular instruction and continuous assessment, the limitations of existing university processes for evaluating academic standards have become more obvious.

Conclusion

The blindness exhibited by the evaluative state, market, and university requires I believe limited state interventions to improve the evaluative capacity of the market and most especially the university. This would require first the state subsidising the costs of producing quality information of demonstrated value both to students choosing an academic program and to universities and their academic staffs seeking to improve academic standards. Second, it would require an ongoing program of valid external academic audits, which are designed to assure that all universities have in place evidence-based internal processes for

assuring the quality of their education provision. Such external evaluations are warranted because those universities that have made some measurable progress in improving the assurance of their academic standards have done so only after receiving well-targeted external quality assessments. And as a process originally designed by the academic community, audits are superior to other external assessments in their clear and necessary assumption that universities themselves are responsible for assuring their academic standards.

In short given the acknowledged limitations of the evaluative state, market and university, I have concluded that an academic or quality audit approach offers the most responsible way for addressing the problem posed by the three blind mice of higher education. However, the term academic or quality audit clearly evokes discomfort within the university community, likely because of its connotation of a financial investigation. So I would like to offer the modest proposal that we replace the terms 'an academic or quality audit' with 'a Neave,' as in 'doing a Neave.' That is, an external evaluation process that would encourage academic staff to actively discuss and debate the essentials of higher education would, in my view, simply institutionalise the role that Professor Neave has played with erudition, wit, and an obvious *joie de vivre* throughout his professional career.

References

- Ashby, E. (1963). 'Decision Making in the Academic World', In Halmos, P. (ed.), *Sociological Studies in British University Education*, Keele: University of Keele, pp. 93-100.
- Anderson, D., Johnson, R. and Saha, L. (2002). *Changes in Academic Work: Implications for Universities of the Changing Age Distribution and Work roles of Academic Staff*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/otherpub/academic_work.pdf

Policy Laboratories or Garbage Cans? State Policies for University Science and Technology in the United States

Roger L. Geiger

The fifty American states have been hailed as 'laboratories of democracy' for the fact that their uncoordinated efforts to address similar problems produce a multitude of approaches - experiments, if you will - from which it should be possible to compare and evaluate the results (Osborne 1990). This phenomenon became especially evident during the 1980s when, in the absence of a national industrial policy, a multitude of states implemented policies to stimulate economic growth and to counteract the secular decline of manufacturing industries. University research became the focus of many of these policies, as states sought to harness a comparative advantage - vigorous research universities - to generate innovation in local industry. These 'experiments,' however, failed to produce unambiguous results. Programs were abandoned or continued, downsized or reshaped, with little regard for the intrinsic effectiveness of any particular program or the experience of similar programs in other states (Feller 1992). Out of favour through most of the 1990s, this type of program was nevertheless revived with growing enthusiasm after the turn of the century, although again with little regard for past lessons. The trajectory of state S&T policies, rather than their specific contents, suggests a different model of public policy making.

The 'garbage can model of organisational choice,' as interpreted by John Kingdon, provides a framework for depicting the ambiguity underlying major policy decisions (2003). Organisations that resemble 'organised anarchies' are characterised by problematic preferences, unclear technologies, and fluid participation. Policy choices under these conditions result from unpredictable mixtures of problems, solutions, and participants - thrown together in no particular order, as in a garbage can. In this context, the garbage can model captures some of the uncertainties underlying state policies for universities and science and technology. This paper utilises the lens of the garbage can model to scrutinise policies for 'technology-based economic development' (TBED, pronounced tee-bed) that have been adopted by virtually every American state since 2000.

Problematic preferences

No state boasts of an analogue to the National Science Foundation. The NSF, despite occasional criticism, for more than half a century has been a highly effective agent for supporting scientific research and for shaping science policy. Three indispensable qualities have made this possible. First, rigorous adherence to peer review has enabled it to support the best science. Second, relative insulation from the political process has allowed the foundation to bend to political pressures when necessary without compromising the best-science standard. And third, internal subject-matter expertise has permitted foundation officers to shape and advance the development of scientific fields. Of course, states have not felt the need to build large and costly science bureaucracies precisely because the NSF and other federal agencies accomplish scientific choice for them. But for that same reason, they have difficulty implementing coherent and effective S&T policies that depend on these same qualities - identification of best science, insulation from politics, and internal expertise.

States have no constituency supporting the advancement of knowledge. Traditionally, they furthered knowledge growth indirectly, at best, by supporting their flagship universities. When they formulated separate S&T policies, motives became mixed. As Irwin Feller noted, 'these programs are economic development programs, not science and technology programs per se' (1992, p. 293). This fact introduces a bias at all levels of policy formation. For policymakers, these programs must be sold with promises of economic impact which, if not necessarily dishonest, are largely unknowable.

Lacking insulation from politics, state S&T policies are subject to gubernatorial hubris and the legislative pork barrel. Governors generally possess the authority to dominate both the formulation and execution of S&T policies. They seem to crave credit above all, as their state web sites readily attest. Legislators naturally enjoy recognition too, but this principally comes to them by bringing state money to their home districts. If there is a pattern, it would seem that governors have capitalised on the popularity of TBED to formulate new, comprehensive programs and have negotiated with legislators to authorise appropriations for them. Universities have benefited substantially from these TBED initiatives, but that does not necessarily make them good science policy.

What does constitute good science policy are investments that enable cutting-edge research, focus on strategic fields, emphasise comparative advantage, and build concentrations of expertise. Where economic development is also an objective, articulation between academic specialties and the absorptive capacity of the ambient economy are also crucial factors. However, political influence is conducive to what is referred to disdainfully in the foundation world as 'scatteration' - both functional and geographic. The aim to stimulate the gamut of

activities, from basic research to product development, can produce impressive sounding programs with few dollars behind them. Governors like to consolidate these programs under catchy titles and project them over many years in order to announce nine and ten figure investments, but the available spending for a particular goal may be far less. Large bets, like California's investment in CISI or stem cells (see below), are the exceptions in state S&T policies.

Scatteration across the state also occurs as political interests exert their power. New York, for example, has so many S&T programs that it can award research centers of some kind to campuses that otherwise perform little research (e.g., SUNY Binghamton, Clarkson, Alfred, and Niagara universities). South Dakota, where concentration might be desirable, distributed four University Research Centers across three campuses. Such patterns raise the suspicion of inefficiency at the least. From the state's viewpoint, though, the homes of flagship campuses are often economically vibrant, while the less populated locales of smaller institutions may badly need economic stimulation. In fact, states generally seem to have a fairly positive record in articulating S&T investments with regional specialties. Here political influence and special interests weigh on the side of good decisions for supporting at least the 'T' portion of S&T.

Unclear technologies

States have largely bought into the Schumpeter thesis that innovation is the key to economic growth. Never mind the current booms in hydrocarbons, mining, gambling, or fast food - the operating belief is that innovation is the key to endogenous growth and a competitive edge in the global economy. In fact, the wellsprings of economic growth have been endlessly debated by economists, and such wisdom as has been shed on this subject is probably too complex and nuanced to be translated into public policy. Yet, states must place bets on strategies that they believe will not only stimulate economic growth, but also retain the benefits within state boundaries.

State S&T policies (science + TBED) can for the purposes of discussion be separated into three levels: upstream policies aimed at strengthening research; midstream economic strategies that hypothesise linkages between university research and economic activity; and downstream policies aimed at commercialising innovations.

States for the most part have adopted conservative approaches to their upstream policies. They have invested mainly in infrastructure, physical and human, as means to stimulate top quality research and thus complement the science policies of the federal government. The distinctive feature of recent policies has been the targeting of these investments on specific science-based technologies. States have

also included provisions for collaborative research with industry to ensure the relevance and the transmissibility of these activities.

The current infatuation with clusters represents a best guess for an effective approach amid these uncertainties. The examples of existing clusters are certainly alluring, but how to replicate these dynamics is still elusive (Cf. Geiger 2007). Literature can be cited to corroborate the belief that university research gives rise to the formation of tech-based firms and increased employment (e.g. Kirchoff 2002). But it is also a fact that most innovations arise in industry and have no connection with universities (Baumol 2002). Nevertheless, most cluster strategies emphasise the founding and nurturing of new firms spawned by university research.

The large state investments that have flowed into biotechnology, broadly defined, represent a similar, perhaps safer, strategy. Biotechnology, when seen as encompassing humans, animals, and plants, affects enormous industries, and decentralised ones as well. State investments are almost certain to yield some commercial spin offs. How the resulting economic activity compares to the initial investment will probably never be known, but assuredly there will be some results to demonstrate the success of these policies.

Enhancing innovation in large corporations, especially in mature industries, requires a different economic strategy (Lester 2005). Essentially, policies that call for co-investment and research collaboration aim toward this goal. Only fairly large corporations with internal R&D labs can make the kind of investments required by California Institutes for Science and Innovation or the Georgia Research Alliance. Here the uncertainty is less in the nature of the investment - presumably the firms recognise value - but in capturing the economic benefit of resulting innovations. The research may be performed locally, but payoffs for multinational corporations can be widely diffused.

Downstream forms of state support for commercialisation of innovations represent an economic strategy as well. Since these programs are focused on small tech and start-up companies, they are central to endogenous growth strategies. Many of these programs address commercial risk - the perils of bringing innovations successfully to the market (Tassey 2001). These include provisions for seed or venture capital (or loans), business incubators, or assistance with management and marketing. Other provisions are aimed at helping to overcome technical risk, usually through access to technical assistance or university research. These last arrangements properly belong with S&T policies. In some ways, state programs supplement federal programs for subsidising research in fledgling firms. Although scarcely new, state programs have become far more proactive in recent years. However, they generally contain relatively

small outlays of state expenditures and often include onerous stipulations for record-keeping and reporting.

Finally, as the effectiveness of state S&T policies has come to depend increasingly on the identification and encouragement of top quality science, the limitations of state policy making have become more salient. States have a limited capacity to make good judgments about scientific quality, and here problematic preferences considerably outweigh quality considerations on balance: the political agendas of governors, the power of legislators to direct state spending to their home districts, the vested interests of economic development organisations, and the ability of local policy entrepreneurs to work the system to achieve their own goals.

Fluid participation

Technology-based economic development cuts across a large swath of the economy and the polity. If governors wield the greatest authority in policy choice, their decisions are shaped in large measure by who are recognised as participants, and what problems and solutions they bring to the policy process. Typically state governments have offices charged with economic development and additional units responsible for disbursing funds. They often work closely with local and regional economic development organisations, which themselves represent aggregates of special interests. Industry too gets a seat at this table, if and when it wishes. And, universities also can be influential participants when knowledge-based policies are at stake. In addition, a plethora of organisations - NGOs, associations, consultants - contribute to what Kingdon calls the 'policy primeval soup', the totality of available solutions seeking to attach themselves to unresolved problems (2003, pp. 116-144).

The spread of TBED policies across the states since 2000 undoubtedly owes something to the kind of organisations just mentioned. The National Governor's Association, for example, became an early and consistent advocate. Its direct line to sitting governors no doubt helped to establish the legitimacy, if not the inevitability, of such policies. Specific measures, nevertheless, were derived from other participants.

Georgia has perhaps the oldest and most effective upstream policy, but its continuation and amplification is owed to the leadership of the state's business community. Business and university leaders organised the Georgia Research Alliance in 1990, and secured continuing support from the governor's office. The GRA funds professorships and laboratories at Georgia universities that are specifically linked with economic development. This same approach was used to establish a similar, more focused program in 2000. Civic and business leaders conspired to create a consortium to support a research base for broadband

communications in the state. Eventually named the Electronic Design Center, and headquartered at Georgia Tech, this project also tapped state funds to establish chairs in key areas at Georgia's public universities. High tech firms of all sizes joined the consortium, creating an interactive research community. In both these programs, the business community acted as policy entrepreneurs in mobilising state resources to enhance university research capacity (Geiger 2004, pp. 210-213).

New York State has had a checkered history of state initiatives to mobilise academic science for TBED. Since the early 1980s a succession of programs has fertilised public and private universities with state subsidised centers. Governor George Pataki (1995-2007) consolidated and expanded such programs beginning in 1999. His signal success was the growth of a nanotechnology-electronics cluster in the Albany region. Successive investments turned SUNY Albany, a small and inconspicuous research university, into a nanotech complex with the country's first College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering. Research consortia with industry, also supported by the state, brought major semiconductor firms to the area. The state then secured commitments from these firms to build facilities in the region, in this case by offering fat, old-fashioned tax breaks and subsidies (what used to be known as 'smokestack chasing'). State investments in academic research provided the kernel on which this cluster grew, but this growth also required a massive state commitment, engineered by a determined governor.

California has two of the country's most prominent upstream TBED initiatives (Douglass 2006). The California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CISI) were established to advance collaborative university-industry research in several cutting-edge fields. Each of the four institutes is supported with \$100 million of state funding and at least twice that in matching funds, representing a huge investment in the advancement of bio-, info-, and nanotechnologies. This enlightened state initiative, however, was the brainchild of a scientist/entrepreneur in San Diego who had connections with governor Gray Davis. The details were largely worked out by the governor and the president of the University of California, and enacted into law as part of the governor's budget.

California's second audacious policy, the stem cell initiative, was a ballot initiative by which voters approved the sale of \$3 billion of state bonds to support the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (Proposition 71). The policy entrepreneur in this case was a real estate developer who had a personal interest in potential regenerative therapies. Given California's openness to ballot initiatives, he was able to mount a successful electoral campaign that resulted in a major commitment of state funds.

Pennsylvania presents a more highly bureaucratized structure in which organisations pursue their special interests. The state created four regional 'Ben

Franklin Partnerships' in the 1980s to further TBED. Now well-entrenched, they mediate between local economic development organisations, universities, and the governor's Department of Community and Economic Development, the principal source of discretionary state funding. Given this constellation of actors, the state has had a decided bias toward downstream policies that favoured small business development and promised to create jobs. Pennsylvania's public and private universities have nevertheless had success in obtaining funding for research partnerships with these local units. The result is a state TBED 'policy' that is largely shaped by the efforts of local policy entrepreneurs.

Learning from the Garbage Can

The state TBED policies that have proliferated since 2000 have not been entirely unmindful of the experiences of the preceding two decades. The giant non-profit corporation, Battelle Memorial Institute, has made this field one of its areas of consulting expertise. And, an offshoot, the State Science and Technology Institute, provides information and meetings for the 'TBED community.' Hence, policy analysts have digested and evaluated the results from the 'experiments' that the states have conducted (Plosila 2004). Thus, *unclear technologies* ought to be the most readily addressable of the three challenges of organised anarchies.

Indeed, if a problem can be fully specified, appropriate policies can most likely be identified. But this condition can only be met if the other two challenges are overcome - if *preferences* and *participants* can also be controlled. However, the technology cycle presents a succession of distinct problems at each stage of development - augmenting basic research, inducing commercially oriented research, shepherding inventions into development, arranging angel and venture capital, nurturing start-up technology firms, or stimulating R&D investments from established corporations. Each of these 'problems' is likely to be favoured by a different set of participants. The inherent complexity of the technology cycle is compounded by the variability of the political process. TBED requires, if anything, long time frames to produce effects, but political and economic fluctuations often truncate state commitments to these policies. Governor Pataki's successor, for example, announced on taking office that previous state policy had supported too much basic university research, and that henceforth the emphasis would be on applied research. Policy fluctuations, intentional or unintentional, bring new participants and preferences - and imply different technologies as well.

Despite these difficulties, recognition of the economic relevance of academic research has brought policy initiatives in virtually every state, and many of these efforts have contributed to the enhancement of university resources. Moreover, state policies for TBED may now be regarded as permanent weapons of the large, economic development arsenal. Recognising the peculiar dynamics of an

organised anarchy should serve to sharpen the legitimate claims of universities. Careful definition of the problems to be addressed and precise identification of proven means of resolution can only improve the chances of emerging unsullied from the public policy garbage can.

References

- Baumol, W.J. (2002). *The Free-Market Innovation Machine*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Douglass, J.A. (2006). 'Universities and the entrepreneurial state: Politics and policy and a wave of state-based economic initiatives', *CSHE Research and Occasional Paper Series No. 14.06*. Berkeley: University of California, Center for Studies in Higher Education.
- Feller, I. (1992). 'American State Governments as models for national science policy', *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 11, 2, 288-309.
- Geiger, R.L. (2004). *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geiger, R.L. (2007). 'The Riddle of the Valley', *Minerva*, 20, forthcoming.
- Kingdon, J.W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Longman.
- Kirchhoff, B.A., (2002). *The Influence of R&D Expenditures on New Firm Formation and Economic Growth*. A Research Report. Maplewood, NJ: BJK Associates. http://www.njit.edu/v2/News/Releases/finalreport_10-02-02.pdf
- Lester, R.K. (2005). 'Universities, Innovation, and the Competitiveness of Local Economies: a Summary Report from the Local Innovation Systems Project - Phase I'. *MIT Industrial Performance Center Working Paper*, Cambridge, MA.
- Osborne, D.E. (1990). *Laboratories of Democracy*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Plosila, W.H. (2004). 'State Science- and Technology-Based Economic Development Policy: History, Trends and Developments, and Future Directions', *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18, 2, 113-26.
- Tassey, G. (2001). 'R&D Policy Models and Data Needs', in Feldman, M.P. and Link, A.N. (eds.), *Innovation Policy in the Knowledge-Based Economy*. Boston: Kluwer, pp. 37-71.

On Governance, Accountability and the Evaluative State

Ben Jongbloed

Introduction

In the writings of Guy Neave, the issue of higher education's responsibility to society (Neave 2000) is a prominent one. This responsibility may be interpreted as a social contract between higher education and society (Guston and Keniston 1994). In an article for the ('his') journal *Higher Education Policy* Guy Neave (2006) traces the origins of the social contract to the classic contractualist philosophers Hobbes, Locke and Smith. His article is a fitting finale to a trilogy of classic articles spread across a period of some thirty years (Neave 1988, 1998, 2006) that treat the changing nature of the social contract over time and discuss the emergence of an 'evaluative state'.

Taking up the discussion on the revision of the social contract I would like to discuss the issues of social responsibility and contractualisation and tie these to current thinking about governance and accountability in the public sector. The message here is that the rise of the evaluative state as observed by Guy Neave has entered a new stage, with higher education institutions being challenged to invent new structures for their governance and accountability. These structures are based on notions of horizontal, networked governance.

Corporate social responsibility

Universities are undergoing a transformation from organisations that have their strategic direction mainly determined by government to organisations that to a large extent are 'set free' from government and expected to respond to a more market-like environment. Their character changes from a public to a more hybrid type of organisation. While still carrying out public tasks, their leadership is expected to make autonomous strategic decisions, to create support for these decisions and to render account of the results reached. Universities have undeniably become more business-like when it comes to the issues of management, control and strategy formulation. Quoting Neave (2004, p. 153, 154), 'The referential culture which shapes the university to an increasing degree is that of the world of business. ...most significant is the redefinition of higher education in terms of performance, delivery, quality, flexibility and adaptability.'

Universities, like other sectors that perform public tasks, are transforming into something similar to *social enterprises*. Social enterprises are organisations which link their production of goods and services to a social mission. Whereas conventional businesses distribute their profit among shareholders (i.e. owners), in social enterprises the surplus goes towards one or more social aims which the organisation has. The need to deliver on financial, social and environmental performance targets is often referred to as the 'triple bottom line' (Elkington 2004). The triple bottom line (TBL), also known as 'People, Planet, Profit', refers to the extent to which an organisation meets its societal responsibilities. TBL captures economic, environmental and social values and criteria in judging organisational success. It reflects the extent to which the organisation is engaging in legitimate socially responsible activities. The concept of TBL demands that an organisation's responsibility be to its 'stakeholders' rather than its shareholders. In this case, 'stakeholders' refers to anyone who is influenced, either directly or indirectly, by the actions of the organisation (Mitchell et al. 1997). The organisation is seen as a vehicle for coordinating stakeholder interests, instead of maximising shareholder profit.

The basic functions that universities perform (i.e. teaching, research and community services) are currently being reassessed with an eye upon the contribution they make to the social-economic well-being of their environment - be it the region, the nation or a collective of nations (e.g. Europe). Universities are not only supposed to deliver excellent education and research, but also have to deliver those outputs in ways, volumes and forms that are relevant to the economy and to shaping the knowledge society. Universities are expected to contribute to the solving of important problems facing society and to have their teaching and research play a more visible role in strengthening the innovative capacities of the economy. This attention to the wider contribution of universities to society is a kind of parallel to the triple bottom line accountability movement we see in private businesses. Ultimately it contributes to the revision of the social contract between higher education and society.

We intentionally speak of a *social* contract here to stress the ties between higher education and its multiple stakeholders - governments, students, employers, intermediary organisations, academic staff - not just the relationship between higher education and government. For the university, TBL accountability refers to the extent to which it engages in relationships with its regional communities, how much it generates in income through contract research and consultancies, how often its academics participate in public debates, etc. These are some examples of the ways in which universities reflect their *corporate social responsibility* (CSR).

Accountable governance

TBL and CSR relate to the ways in which universities fulfil their accountability requirements to the wider society - their stakeholders. Meeting accountability requirements is one element of governance. Accountability completes the circle of planning and control in public and private organisations. It deals with clarifying and explaining the organisation's successes and failures to those that are committed to the organisation - that is the organisation's stakeholders. The question of determining the legitimate stakeholders of the organisation is dependent on the character and setting of the organisation. In commercial businesses, the board will be accountable to its shareholders. In social enterprises or universities the accountability is towards a network of stakeholders.

Due to their ongoing privatisation and liberalisation, higher education institutions are becoming hybrid organisations. Combining public tasks with private undertakings, they get tied up in a dynamic network of stakeholders, all of them demanding their own version of accountability. The search for intelligent accountability systems is connected strongly to that for new governance arrangements. In his authoritative essays on the Rise of the Evaluative State, Guy Neave (1988, 1998) has analysed how that evaluative state is becoming grounded on principles of contractualisation. Currently, we can observe a need to invent governance mechanisms for higher education that are based on TBL-like principles. The accompanying accountability arrangements are broader in scope and directed to a wider audience - to more stakeholders, not just to government agencies - leading to what is known as *horizontal accountability*.

The new governance arrangements for higher education allow universities to meet their CSR obligations and organise their accountability requirements accordingly. Universities remain organisations that have a public mission. Mechanisms of vertical control - say, state supervision - always remain in place to help guarantee that the universities do not neglect their public tasks. However, from the 1980s onwards, the role of government in terms of financing and regulating higher education has been diminishing. This has meant that universities have to earn their social legitimacy through the ways in which their services are accepted and evaluated by the various communities in society that they serve. Universities ensure this through the ways and means of their quality assurance mechanisms, how they communicate with their stakeholders and how they demonstrate accountability towards their stakeholders. The university's stakeholders have to be confident that the university is aware of their demands and interests. This implies that the university has to build networks of trust with its stakeholders.

Academic excellence is no longer enough for universities. Universities will also have to show that they produce results that are relevant to their stakeholders -

they need to work on mechanisms of 'accountable governance' (Considine 2002). If universities wish to act in line with their wider social responsibilities, the mechanisms of vertical control have to be supplemented with mechanisms ensuring *horizontal accountability*. This is where the stakeholders of the universities enter the picture.

Horizontal accountability

Commitment to stakeholders is more than just maintaining contacts with clients. To the university it means using ways of engaging in a dialogue with stakeholders in order to learn about how its services are appreciated and where it can do better. Horizontal accountability includes mechanisms to ensure transparency about choices made and for communicating university performance. The word 'horizontal' stresses the fact that the university not just renders proof of its performance to an agent that is placed higher up in the hierarchy, but to all groups/bodies/agents that have an interest in the institution - that is: its stakeholders. There are various interest groups that may be mentioned: employees, clients, industry & business, local governments, civic organisations, intermediary bodies, etc. How the horizontal accountability is shaped will depend on the type of stakeholder in question, and each university may handle this matter differently.

Relationships with stakeholders can be manifested in the university's governance structure. An example is having representatives from external communities on governing boards. Another manifestation of horizontal accountability is through annual reporting by the university to its communities. A less common form is through organising debates between members of the university's internal communities and representatives of its external communities. More formal arrangements for accountability are through contracts and agreements with funding bodies and external communities. Contractualisation means organising stakeholder links in terms of customer-contractor relations. Another manifestation of horizontal accountability is the formation of platforms and advisory bodies that allow consultations with stakeholders. Yet another is agreeing on procedures for the handling of complaints and disputes.

For the university, the instrument of *peer review* is a familiar way of making university performance more transparent and thereby satisfying demands for accountability. In order to work on more horizontal forms of accountability, such peer reviews may need to be extended beyond the familiar evaluations that solely rely on academic peers to do the evaluation of the quality of teaching and research. An option is to extend the composition of the review teams and include representatives from other communities. Yet another is to have peer review teams/panels judge the quality of other parts of university activity and extend the

evaluation to the quality of community services, technology transfer services or student services.

These are examples of how universities in their management and primary processes are placing their stakeholders in a more central position. It transforms their governance into what is known as networked, or citizen-centred governance (Benington 2005). Citizen-centered governance seeks to avoid both the government failures and the market failures that accompany bureaucracies and markets respectively.

Conclusion

The social legitimation of universities depends to an important degree on the relationships they have with their environment. Their biggest challenge these days is therefore to create a balanced combination of external (vertical) supervision, internal control, and horizontal accountability. Universities need to listen carefully to their social environment and take the feedback they receive seriously, while internally they need to account for their way of working and their social achievements. As this system of accountability becomes increasingly effective, vertical supervision can be applied in a more focused and selective (proportional) way.

The reform of the evaluative state is a topic that will be on the political agenda, as well as on our research agendas for many years to come. Guy Neave, in that inimitable style of his, has taught us a great deal about its origins and its evolution. But, like history, the reconfiguration of higher education governance will never be fully completed. We will need sharp minds and pencils like Neave's to work on, in his words, 'more subtle and sophisticated systems of State surveillance'.

References

- Benington, J. (2005). 'Innovation and improvement in governance and public services'. *Paper for CIPFA annual conference*.
http://www.cipfa.org.uk/cipfa2005/conference/download/JohnBenington_WarwickUniWorkshop.ppt.
- Considine, M. (2002). 'The end of the line? Accountable governance in the age of networks, partnerships and joined-up services', *Governance*, 15, 1, January, 21-40.
- Elkington, J. (2004). 'Enter the Triple Bottom Line', in Henriques, A. and Richardson, J. (eds.), *The Triple Bottom Line: does it all add up*. London: EarthScan, pp. 1-16.

- Guston, D.H. and Keniston, K. (1994). *The Fragile Contract. University Science and the Federal Government*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R., and Wood, D.J. (1997). 'Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts', *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 4, 853-886.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe 1986-1988', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The evaluative state reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.
- Neave, G. (2000). *The universities' responsibilities to society*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'Higher education policy as orthodoxy', in Teixeira, P., Jongbloed, B., Dill, D. and Amaral, A. (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 127-160.
- Neave G. (2006). 'Redefining the social contract', *Higher Education Policy*, 19, 269-286.

The Evaluative State and Higher Education Policy in Germany

Barbara M. Kehm

Introduction: The Concept of the Evaluative State

When Guy Neave developed the concept of the 'rise of the evaluative state' in 1988 it was quickly taken up in the community of higher education researchers. Many experts in this field thought that the concept not only encapsulated a development in the relationship between higher education, the state and society that had been observed for some time, but found it useful in sharpening further analyses.

Neave described the thrust of the evaluative state as having been developed originally as a response to financial difficulties, i.e. for the purpose of system maintenance, but then having quickly acquired more long-term strategic purposes (Neave 1988, p. 7f). The characteristic feature of 'strategic evaluation' was that it triggered a shift from input and process control to output and product control and that it linked objectives with resources (Neave 1988, p. 9). Neave identified four rationales of the evaluative state:

- to develop an alternative to bureaucratic regulation in order to be able to deal with the growing complexity of mass higher education systems;
- to establish clear lines of accountability in order to better ensure that national priorities were met;
- to enable better strategic planning by the state;
- and - in the long run - to trigger a change of (public) mentality which would accept the notion that higher education was no longer a public good but (at least also) a private good (Neave 1988, p. 10f, p. 21f.).

The basic principle which the concept of the 'evaluative state' successfully attempted to describe was a shift from close state control of higher education to more remote forms of supervision and monitoring, thus supposedly giving universities more autonomy to regulate themselves. However, in exchange for this new degree of autonomy, a key element of which was and remains budgetary autonomy in the form of lump sum budgets, accountability was introduced. Accountability did not only entail more reporting duties to society ('the tax payer') and the state, but opened up a number of new dimensions in the framework of which universities were coerced to provide proof of their efficient and effective use of public money. A plethora of indicators has evolved to give

direction to what the state assumes to be efficient and effective. This has been described as the shift from input control to output control - based on quantitative measures and increasingly discounting what can't be measured. Contract management as well as goal and performance agreements determine not only the relationship between higher education and the state but also the relationships between the various levels within the institutions. All this happened under the premise that higher education institutions should do more with less (i.e. increase output with less money) while at the same time increase the quality of their 'products'. The economic discourse took the lead in the debates about, and the practices of, shaping this new relationship between higher education, state and society.

Ten years later, the concept was reconsidered and found to have become an almost global concept on which an increasingly wide spectrum of new control and governance activities and instruments were based. As Dill (1998) and Neave himself (1998) observed, the practices and theoretical groundings had acquired a 'technological' character in addition to their 'normative' features. This reflected the fact that in later analyses, i.e. in hindsight, the origin of the evaluative state was traced back to a financial crisis - many national governments felt that they were no longer able to properly fund their expanded systems of higher education - coupled with a crisis of trust in the performance of the higher education institutions themselves. This became most visible in the higher education policies of the Thatcher government in Great Britain. Henkel (1991) was able to show that cuts in public expenditure had also spread to other areas which had been considered for a long time as a 'public good', i.e. the health care sector and somewhat later the penitentiary system. Over time the policies which evolved from the various attempts at (financial) crisis management came to be based on a new form of contract management which did away with earlier 'enlightened' notions of a 'contract social' and consequently redefined higher education as more of a private good than a public one. This entailed the neo-liberal shift from the welfare state to the market economy in which students were seen as customers and universities as traders in educational services. It is to Guy Neave's credit that he analysed the historical roots and policy implications of these shifts at a very early point.

One further aspect needs to be pointed out in this context: what was sold to the universities as newly won autonomy from close state control was - if one can speak of increased autonomy at all - a form of conditional autonomy. The principle of accountability led to the establishment of an increasing number of bodies and agencies to which the institutions of higher education became accountable. Not only was control - now in the form of audits, monitoring, evaluation and accreditation, quality assessment and output control - shifted from previously state controlled domains into new areas in which no control had been exercised before, but the state also delegated these new forms of control to

newly established bodies and agencies which increasingly gained more power to define what should be considered as standard, as quality, as satisfactory output etc. In addition, universities had to accept the participation of external stakeholder groups in their institutional decision-making and policy formation. It has frequently been debated whether these developments have constituted less rather than more autonomy for the institutions of higher education. Certainly universities have to serve more masters than they did before.

The Evaluative State in Germany

Germany has always been characterised as having a higher education system closely controlled by the state. Only academic matters were decided by a strong academic oligarchy (Clark) and the decision-making power of university leadership was relatively weak. This was the basic configuration of actors in the Humboldtian model of the university.

In Germany too, tight public budgets led to a growing financial crisis which was made more severe in the face of continuous higher education expansion without the introduction of tuition fees. As in other European states, demands were voiced in the 1980s for more efficiency and for more and better outcomes with the same and subsequently less funding. As a result, the crisis of university funding became intertwined with a crisis of university legitimacy (Kehm 1999, p. 124). The Federal Government proposed legislative deregulation to stimulate institutional responses to changed environmental conditions. Although an amendment to the Federal Framework Act on Higher Education had already introduced competitive elements and promoted differentiation, the German States had hesitated to adapt their higher education laws to the amended Framework Law.

The first attempts to reform the German system of higher education were brought to a standstill with the collapse of the communist and socialist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe and German unification. In the entailing restructuring and renewal - as it was called - of the East German higher education and research system, the West German system was simply transferred to East Germany in an almost post-colonial mode including all of its weaknesses and without giving credit to the existing strengths of the East German system. German unification made the problem of public funding of higher education more severe. Once the process of restructuring and renewal was more or less completed, public pressure for reforms increased again. In particular, a shift was proposed from cameralist line item budgets to lump sum budgets with more institutional decision-making power on how to allocate resources internally. There was still no proper consensus between the Federal Government - responsible for the framework conditions - and the German States - responsible for all higher education institutions in their respective territories. Finally, in 1996, the German States re-

opened the reform debate which eventually led to another amendment of the Higher Education Framework Act in 1998. This amendment is generally considered as the beginning of a systematic reform of the relationship between higher education and the state in Germany. The then acting Federal Minister of Education and Research presented the amendment to Parliament with an introductory statement declaring Humboldt's University to be dead (cf. Kehm and Lanzendorf 2006, p. 147ff).

Political decision-makers expected that the new legal provisions would stimulate competition and differentiation in a university sector in which previously all institutions of the same type had been treated as equal. Furthermore, institutional funding was made dependent in part on performance agreements which had to be negotiated between each individual institution and the responsible state authorities. Although universities were increasingly pressured to introduce regular evaluations of teaching in order to increase quality control and improvement, nothing much resulted from these exercises. The negotiations around performance agreements were mostly based on quantitative output measures (e.g. number of students successfully completing their course of studies within the determined standard period of study; levels of externally acquired research funding, etc.). The expected increase in competition among higher education institutions did not really take off. However, with the increase in the budgetary autonomy and flexibility of the institutions of higher education themselves, competition increased among departments for the allocation of resources within institutions. Contractualisation, which has been described as one of the effects of the evaluative state became widespread. Contracts were not only negotiated between the state and the individual higher education institution but also within the institutions between the central level and the individual departments, and - though less often - between the dean and individual professors. These changes were accompanied by a debate about the necessary professionalisation of higher education management.

This account shows that in contrast to developments in many other European countries the reforms that accompanied or were an effect of the rise of the evaluative state were implemented in Germany without the state acquiring the function of the evaluative state. There were a variety of attempts to assess and evaluate teaching quality - research was excluded from these attempts because existing mechanisms of peer review were deemed to be sufficiently effective - as well as a number of commissions to evaluate and make recommendations with regard to the configuration of higher education institutions in various German states, but nothing much resulted from the former while the commissions were intended to be used as a basis for structural decisions on institutional types and the combinations of subjects and programmes within institutions. Apart from one case of an enforced merger of two institutions (Duisburg and Essen) and several instances of the privatisation of university hospitals to save money, change

management on the side of state authorities was very cautious. At the same time each state was taking great care not to weaken its own system to such an extent that other states could gain a competitive advantage. Actually, the implicit competition in the field of higher education in which the 16 German states found themselves had the effect of preventing too much differentiation and competition among higher education institutions. Overall Kehm and Lanzendorf (2006, p. 173ff) came to the conclusion that the German states provided more autonomy to higher education institutions only in those areas in which they hoped for efficiency gains but kept their control and regulative functions in other areas of planning and organisational structure.

Serious evaluation of study programmes was only introduced with the implementation of the Bologna reform agenda. Government authorities decided to establish a system of accreditation and evaluation for all study programmes which were developed according to the tiered system of programmes and degrees. Each new programme of study has to be accredited in order to get permission to introduce it from the state authorities and has to be re-accredited every five years. The system of accreditation and evaluation which was set up in Germany reflects the distribution of responsibilities in a federal state. The overarching body is the German Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes which is responsible for the accreditation of accreditation agencies and has to implement political decisions. Below that level are a variety of accreditation agencies which have to follow the standards and procedural guidelines set by the Foundation and compete on the German and increasingly European market. Altogether the Foundation has accredited six agencies, some of which were originally regional actors - accrediting study programmes at higher education institutions in a particular German region - while others are subject specific agencies - accrediting only engineering or health care study programmes but all over Germany. With this development evaluation has become an established practice in Germany (cf. Kehm 2006b for a detailed policy analysis of the German system of accreditation). Together with the German Initiative for Excellence in Research which was established in 2006, and the first attempts to design a comprehensive research policy, Germany has finally caught up with developments in other European countries.

Higher Education Policy in Germany and the Role of Evaluation

German higher education policy in recent years has been characterised by the successful attempt of the German states to re-appropriate full responsibility for the higher education sector and to reduce the Federal Government's influence. Soon the Higher Education Framework Law which was enacted for the first time in 1976 will be abolished. Until then the Federal Government was only involved in financial support for the construction of buildings for higher education

institutions, educational planning and research promotion. These were defined as the joint tasks of the Federal Government and the States but the States retained authority and responsibility for all matters of education and culture. The Framework Act was passed after long debates about the responsibility of the Federal Government to guarantee equal conditions, as well as mobility of students among the German states, in exchange for more financial support to the States to deal with higher education expansion. However, many regulative and reform initiatives by the Federal Government in the field of higher education continued to be seen by at least some of the German States as undue meddling in their own affairs. They wanted the additional funding which the Federal Ministry provided for the higher education sector but resented much of the policy making.

In 2004, a group of States governed by the Conservative Party applied to the Constitutional Court for a ruling that recent amendments to the Framework Law to which all higher education State Laws had to be adapted were unconstitutional. The first complaint was directed against the introduction of the so-called junior professorship as a fast track option to a chair with the intention to eventually abolish the *Habilitation* as a requirement for a professorship. The Constitutional Court came to the conclusion that the Federal Government had indeed exceeded its competences and declared the amendment invalid. The second complaint was directed against another amendment of the Framework Law which included the guarantee of free undergraduate study in Germany. Again the Constitutional Court ruled in favour of the States and this eventually led to the abandonment of the idea of a Framework Law altogether. Joint initiatives of the Federal Government and the States in the field of higher education are now regulated in detail by a contract. Although the last accepted version of the Framework Law is still in place, it is expected that it will be quietly buried in the near future (cf. Kehm 1999; Kehm and Lanzendorf 2006). Many experts fear that German higher education policy will become fragmented into the policies of 16 individual States.

These developments triggered an increased competition among the German States. In the face of increasingly popular global university rankings with no German university achieving a really good place in them, the Federal Minister for Education and Science came up with the idea of identifying the best universities in Germany, supporting them with large amounts of extra money and turning them into 'lighthouses'. Again the responsible ministers of the German States remonstrated immediately. On the one hand they were interested in getting the extra money, on the other hand they thought that the government initiative was just another attempt to meddle in their affairs. The States insisted on negotiations. Three months later a compromise was found which has been termed the German Initiative for Excellence.

A competitive bidding process for universities (*Fachhochschulen* were excluded) was set in motion in which they could apply for funding in three categories: graduate schools, clusters of excellence and institutional strategies. The future German elite universities were going to be derived from the last category in which up to ten universities could be selected. The selection process was complex because it involved not only national and international peers but also representatives of the German Research Association and the Science Council which were responsible for procedural aspects and the development of selection criteria, and political decision-makers. The result of the first round of decisions - a second one will follow in autumn 2007 - was surprising. Only three universities were selected in the third category of institutional strategies, among them two technical universities one of which nobody had until then perceived to be a potential elite university. In addition, all three institutions were located in the South of Germany. In the other categories (graduate schools and clusters of excellence) humanities and social sciences were scarcely taken into account, and universities in East Germany hardly won in any of the categories (Kehm 2006a).

This result has intensified competition among the German States as well as among German universities. For the German States it is a matter of prestige to have one of the future 'elite universities' located in their territory; for the universities it is not only a matter of considerable extra funding and prestige but those universities that did not participate or failed fear being reduced to 'second class' or teaching only institutions. The selection criteria have been heavily criticised as being too oriented towards engineering and natural sciences, concentrating too much on research output and not taking into account excellent performance in other areas (e.g. teaching, transfer, services). Experts expect that the initiative will trigger similar results in the German higher education and research landscape as has the Research Assessment Exercise in Britain.

What do these developments indicate in terms of German higher education policy and the role of evaluation? First of all we can observe that in Germany as in other countries a deregulation of detailed governmental control has occurred. However, due to the federal structure this deregulation has been rather ambivalent. The German States have been successful in weakening the influence of the Federal Ministry for Education and Research but this was not a result of policy decisions aiming at more autonomy for the universities, although managerial self-governance has been introduced in the institutions. Rather the States wanted to defend their own influence on and responsibility for the higher education sector. There is hardly a unified higher education policy in Germany any longer. The States themselves have so far refused to reduce their own regulative power vis-à-vis the universities in terms of structural planning and control. The responsible Ministries in all German States continue to appoint professors from a short list submitted by the institution and the presidents and rectors elected by the senate. They retain the right to approve all new study

programmes, to determine the structure of departments and subjects, and may intervene in the internal structures of universities.

Nevertheless, the States have subscribed to those aspects of deregulation which concern the internal allocation of resources and are expected to bring about efficiency gains. What continues to constitute an important limitation to institutional autonomy is the fact that the State Ministries still largely determine the personnel structure (cf. Kehm and Lanzendorf 2006, p. 155f.). However, five of the German States have included in their State Laws the option that universities may change their legal status from a corporation under public law to that of a foundation under public law. Such a changed status gives universities a higher degree of financial and organisational autonomy, although they continue to be bound to the public salary structure.

What then is the role of evaluation in such a rather fragmented system of policy making? Here again we find a certain degree of fragmentation. Evaluation and accreditation have been established in the realm of teaching, but accreditation is carried out by external agencies while the evaluation of teaching is carried out by the institutions themselves. All universities are obliged to establish a regular system of teaching evaluation but nothing much follows from the results. Only the fact that some kind of periodical teaching evaluation is in place is part of the performance agreement between the individual institution and the state. Currently negotiations are underway on how to spend part of the money which universities generate through the introduction of tuition fees. This income is supposed to be spent for the improvement of teaching quality and currently each university can decide for itself what measures should be taken.

In terms of research, the traditional peer review system is still largely in place, although it has been increasingly criticised in recent years. First attempts are currently being made to develop a more strongly indicator based system for the assessment of research quality but these attempts are still in a very early stage. The German Initiative for Excellence in Research has, however, triggered more changes in the German university landscape. It is expected that it will lead to a serious vertical differentiation of institutions which have been used to being treated equally and regarded as more or less equal. The gains in reputation (and funding) from which the winners will profit are expected to drastically change the German university landscape.

In sum, the late rise of the evaluative state in Germany is only to a limited extent linked to two of the four rationales which Neave identified in his groundbreaking article of 1988. Alternatives to bureaucratic regulation have been found and a change of mentality in accepting higher education no longer as exclusively a public good is currently underway. However, the definition of national

priorities has been more or less replaced by the definition of regional priorities by the German States and there is no proper and comprehensive strategic planning.

Conclusion: Germany as the Perpetual Latecomer?

In terms of the rise of the evaluative state, Germany can be characterised as a latecomer just as it has been in the implementation of new governance regimes within universities and in changing the relationship between higher education, the state and society. In contrast to Austria where the government triggered a 'managerial revolution' (Pechar 2003, p. 120) with its 2002 Universities Act which moved universities from being departments of the Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture to independent organisations with full legal rights, Germany has chosen a '*Sonderweg*' - compared to Austria and the main trends in other European countries. Not only are the shifts in the balance between higher education and the state rather hesitant but there is also continued mistrust in the higher education institutions taking a stronger role in their own governance. Parallel to the attempts to increase institutional autonomy we find similarly strong attempts to limit the expected misuse of newly won institutional decision-making powers. Therefore, a number of steering agencies have been established at the macro-societal level which have increased the complex interrelationship of policy development and decision-making between the Federal Government, the States, societal stakeholder groups, market elements, higher education management and representatives of funding and advisory bodies. These multi-level steering and governance structures make the German situation particularly complex, both within institutions of higher education as well as between higher education institutions and their environment (cf. Teichler et al. 2000, p. 14f.).

The story of the rise of the evaluative state is not finished yet. It has already led to a serious shift in the coordinating role of actors involved in shaping the relationships between higher education, the state and society. New governance regimes have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented in all European countries that shape these relationships according to competitive market principles and strengthen hierarchical governance at the expense of collegial governance. The definition of quality as academic excellence has been complemented by the notion of relevance which affects not only curricular content but also the focus of research. The organisational responses to pressures for cost effectiveness, demands for more interdisciplinarity, and increased research and teaching capacity imply a 'bifurcation of academic careers within the same institution (teaching versus research)' (Hazelkorn 2006, p. 8) or a new distribution of academic work among institutions (teaching versus research institutions - a new division of academic labour based on the differentiation of knowledge production versus knowledge dissemination). It still remains to be seen what the next years will bring in terms of changes and shifts in the idea and

the fabric of higher education. The community of higher education researchers certainly looks forward to Guy Neave's continued contributions and sharp analyses.

References

- Dill, D. (1998). 'Evaluating the 'Evaluative State': Implications for Research in Higher Education', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 361-377.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2006). 'Research Challenges and Issues', *IAU Horizons*, 12, 3-4, pp. 1-2 and p. 8.
- Henkel, M. (1991). 'The New 'Evaluative State'', *Public Administration*, 69, Spring, 121-136.
- Kehm, B.M. (1999). *Higher Education in Germany. Developments, Problems, and Perspectives*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES and Wittenberg: Institute for Higher Education Research.
- Kehm, B.M. (2006a). 'The German 'Initiative for Excellence' and Rankings', *International Higher Education*, 44, Summer, 20-22.
- Kehm, B.M. (2006b). *The German System of Accreditation*.
<http://www.unc.edu/ppaq/docs/GermanAccreditation.pdf>.
- Kehm, B.M. and Lanzendorf, U. (2006). *Reforming University Governance. Changing Conditions for Research in Four European Countries*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: An overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986-1988', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 1, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 1, 265-284.
- Pechar, H. (2003). 'In Search of a New Profession: Transformation of Academic Management in Austrian Universities', in Amaral, A., Meek, L.V. and Larsen I.M. (eds.), *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer, pp. 109-130.
- Teichler, U., Mayer, E. and Daniel, H.-D. (2000). 'Neuordnung des Verhältnisses von Staat, Gesellschaft und Hochschulen: ein deutscher 'Sonderweg'?', *hochschule innovativ*, 5, October, 14-15.

Steering from Without and Within: Mechanisms of (Self) Control in Higher Education

Gary Rhoades and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado

For decades Guy Neave has provided insightful, colourful analysis of changing higher education policies and governance structures in Europe. Our understanding of the nation state in relation to universities has been profoundly shaped by Neave's framing and naming of the 'remote steering' activities of the 'evaluative state' (Neave 1988, Neave and Van Vught 1991). Neave has directed attention to strengthened middle layers between ministries and university faculties that can be levers of control for the nation state. Working out of Clark's (1983) triangle model of power and coordination in higher education systems, Neave has identified new mechanisms and processes in Europe. With the characteristic attention of an historian to details that reveal essential features of the phenomena at hand, Neave offers us rich, well-told stories that make concrete the abstract patterns identified by social scientists. In the process, he provides a method and style for doing comparative higher education, attending to cross-national commonalities but not losing sight of particularities that are variations on the theme, reveal new themes, and are in their cultural specificity their own theme.

We pay homage to Neave by specifying, through a few stories, mechanisms of (self) control that exist above the level of the nation state (steering from without) and that are found within the nation state (steering from within). Our stories are from the U.S. and Mexico. They point to the significance of considering how the policies of non-governmental and governmental agencies, operating in national contexts and internationally, can be translated into and internalised in the beliefs and practices, the human agency (collective and individual), of local managers and professionals in universities, and in national policymakers. Our stories offer a 'glonacal agency heuristic' (Marginson and Rhoades 2002) for thinking about global, local, and national influences on higher education.

A Tale of Two U.S. University Presidents, Departments, and Managerial Professions

The contract of Arizona State University's president, Michael Crow, includes a \$60,000 performance bonus contingent on the institution improving its rankings in US News & World Report (Gabrielson 2007). Within the same state system, the new president of the University of Arizona, who like Crow is overseen by the

Arizona Board of Regents, declined having such a provision in his contract. Yet in his inaugural address to the university community Robert Shelton articulated the goal that 'We will be a top 10 public research university', referring to national rankings by research expenditures.

In the U.S., rankings matter. They are central not only in public relations, but in decisions about resource allocation. The rankings that people in the academy pay attention to are largely national in scope. And it is not only presidents who pay attention to this - rankings are part of the public face and private aspirations of academic institutions, and of colleges and departments within them.

Focusing only on ASU and the U of A, one can find many references to rankings on web pages that are a key part of the academy's public face. For the U of A, which is competitive with ASU, the 'About the UA' page features the university as a top twenty public research university and the only institution in the state that is one of 62 members of the Association of American Universities. Under 'Highlights and Rankings' is the US News & World Report ranking of the university as 'in the top tier of the nation's universities', along with department rankings in US News & World Report as well as in the National Research Council and by professional societies.

The 'Prospective Students' web page of ASU, under 'Why Choose ASU', refers to 'nationally ranked colleges and schools.' Going to the web sites of colleges and academic departments one finds further reference to rankings. The W.P. Carey School of Business has a section of its 'About us' web page devoted to rankings - including US News & World Report and the Financial Times. Department web pages at the UA similarly often reveal a reference to rankings. Geosciences has a list of its subfields' rankings in US News & World Report. Similarly, the home page of Anthropology refers to its being ranked 5th in the country (in National Research Council rankings).

Some dimension of some rankings are almost necessarily embedded within the strategic plans and initiatives of academic institutions, colleges, and units in the U.S. It is incumbent upon academic units and institutions to aspire to upward mobility (otherwise they are regarded as stagnant), and to strategically allocate faculty resources, develop new programs, and downsize other ones accordingly, according to possible competitive advantage. In the course of such activity, rankings become a part of the everyday discourse among academics, part of their own identity.

More than that, such evaluative and quality assurance processes have become the purview of rising numbers of support professionals. Rhoades and Sporn (2002) have called these 'managerial professionals,' and they are *the* growth area of employment in U.S. colleges and universities. Groups of these professions are

invested in quality assurance processes (and in entrepreneurial activity, as well as providing services to students) that involve shaping the public image of higher education institutions. This is their professional jurisdiction, and they have become an internal engine of self control in American universities, embedded in local institutions more than national ministries.

A Tale of a Ranked Mexican University, and of Many Higher Education Centers

Every year in Mexico, worldwide rankings are a major issue. Mexican newspapers address the 'PISA effect' - Programme for International Student Assessment, which means confronting the reality of seeing Mexico at the bottom of the PISA results. The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) conducts PISA, the largest and more prestigious educational assessment administered to 15-year-olds in schools in around forty countries. In 2005, Mexico was last among OECD countries and 37th among 40 developed and developing nations.

There are other public reactions to university rankings, especially regarding the flagship public university in Mexico. Every year Mexican mass media report the results of two of the current comprehensive international rankings, those conducted by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai, China) and the Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) (Marginson 1997). In October 2006, UNAM went from number 95 the year before to 74th. It was the best ranked university in Latin America, and more highly ranked than any university in Spain or Portugal.

In Mexico, such rankings have a political significance not found in the U.S. A senior specialist from the World Bank refers to these rankings as 'policy instruments' within the 'political economy of accountability in tertiary education' (Salmi and Saroyan 1997). In the Mexican case these results have been used to criticise current educational policies and as a way of empowering the institution. In regard to UNAM's ranking, the media emphasised three points: (1) no private institution in Mexico or Latin America appeared in the ranking; (2) UNAM ranked well despite being one of the largest higher education institutions in the world (UNAM has 290,000 students, whereas the highest ranked institutions have between 20,000 and 25,000 students); and (3) although UNAM has no tuition, it has been able to preserve its prestige among Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries. UNAM's rector spoke to the amazing way that UNAM emerged from an almost nine month student strike to recover its relevance worldwide. Finally, the UNAM rector has traditionally been an important political actor, and this ranking enhanced the rector's political position: more than one political party was considering him as a presidential candidate for the 2006 elections.

Related to the rankings, Mexico's federal and state governments, together with universities, have established a consolidated system of evaluation, especially compared to other developing countries. The major transformation in the Mexican educational system in the last two decades has been the transition from 'Planning State' to the Evaluative State. Some examples of the mechanisms that have been created are: in 1984, the SNI (Sistema Nacional de Investigadores [National Researchers System]), a peer review system that ranks academics nationally according to their achievement and provides a salary 'supplement' which can be double their institutional salary; in 1989 CONAEVA (Comisión Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación Superior) [National Commission on Higher Education Evaluation] was created, in charge of planning evaluation mechanisms; the CIIES (Comités Interinstitucionales para la Evaluación de la Educación Superior) [Inter-Institutional Committees on Higher Education] were created in 1991 to promote institutions' self-study/evaluation; and in 2004 CENVAL (Centro Nacional de Evaluación para la Educación Superior) was established, institutionalising national examinations in higher education and beginning the development of accreditation mechanisms. There is an even longer list of intermediate bodies, programs, and associations in charge of promoting evaluation in Mexico. The important point is that governmental and institutional efforts are steering the system towards the creation of a national evaluation culture. A key part of that culture is CONACYT, a national body that includes among its initiatives the Padrón Nacional de Posgrado [National Registry of Accredited Postgraduate Degree Programs] and the Programa Integral de Fortalecimiento del Posgrado [Integral Program for Postgraduate Education Strengthening]. These instruments recognise the quality of graduate programs. Based on the inclusion of graduate programs in these programs, the Federal government, through CONACYT provides economic assistance to institutions and scholarships to students. Graduate programs dedicate much effort to being included and publicise themselves as part of the registries - therefore, many of their initiatives are organised accordingly.

To explain the origins and promotion of such policies in a country like Mexico it is necessary to consider the intersection between national agents and global forces. Since the 1980s Mexican higher education institutions have been challenged by the neoliberal regimes established in the nation and internationally, policy regimes with regard to financing and accountability. Some of the clearest agents contributing to those regimes have been international organisations such as the World Bank and the OECD (World Bank 1994). International agencies have different forms of influencing policy agendas in developing countries, mostly by making loans and credits contingent on adoption of certain policies, or by influencing the loan criteria of other dominant donors. However, given the lack of transparency of negotiations between governments and international agencies, we know relatively little about the content of these conditions and terms.

Typically, scholars have analysed the influence of agencies such as the World Bank through the study of policy agendas and adoption. But another approach might be to study the international organisations' influence in empowering networks of national experts who contribute to disseminating and translating their agendas. In this regard, 'epistemic communities' is a useful concept that helps us understand the way these policies have been translated to Mexican higher education. Initially used in the study of the influence of experts in public policies on the control of nuclear weapons (Adler 1992; Haas 1989), Maldonado's study (2004) shows the ways these networks of experts have influenced Mexican higher education policies, helping to specify the reforms of the 1990s (Maldonado-Maldonado 2005). Conventional studies of policy often overlook the connections between individuals, networks, national institutions and international organisations and forces shaping policies; they do not consider such mechanisms as self control.

Concluding Remarks

As with Neave's work on Europe, our stories about higher education policy and universities in the U.S. and Mexico underscore the import of mechanisms above and below the level of the nation state that are guiding the governance of universities. Marginson (1997, 2007) and Vidovich (2002) have adapted Neave's ideas to the Australian context, detailing processes by which governments 'steer from (or at) a distance'; indeed, both argue that by building into the apparent autonomy of universities a self-inscribed set of controls according to metrics/norms connected to a competitive marketplace, neo-liberal patterns of governance involve 'controls over universities and academics have not lessened but have changed form' (Vidovich 2002, p. 391). Similarly, we describe mechanisms of self control in the U.S. and Mexico, at the level of universities, academic departments, managerial professions, epistemic communities, and of national policies.

In detailing the changing landscape of European higher education systems, Neave has featured new and newly strengthened middle layers of state oversight outside and below the national ministries that are in the interstices between the state, the academic oligarchy, and market forces of Clark's (1983) triangle model. We offer a somewhat different conceptualisation of human agency and agencies that specifies the forces of state, academe, and market, and embodies them in various practices. Individually and collectively, presidents and rectors, academic departments and colleges, support managerial professions, and epistemic communities enact self control in ways that are defined by metrics established in the marketplace within national systems (e.g., U.S. News & World Report), in federal agencies (The National Research Council, the National Science

Foundation, the National Council for Science and Technology and the National Researchers System), and internationally (e.g., the Shanghai rankings, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the World Bank). In adopting a glonocal agency heuristic (Marginson and Rhoades 2002) that focuses attention on the intersection between global, national, and local agencies and human agency, we offer insight into the ways in which neo-liberal patterns of control are inscribed in and enacted by key structures and players *within* academe.

The conventional perspective on the U.S. is that it lacks a strong nation state role in higher education. Similarly, with regard to Mexico, as in the case of many developing countries, a prominent view is that national policy is determined by international organisations such as the World Bank. But in our view, such prevailing perspectives overlook key mechanisms of self control, that operate at the national level. These mechanisms and metrics vary; but they are also similar. As the aphorism goes, we have met the enemy, and they are us. For in the academy we have so internalised the prevailing efficiency and revenue focused metrics of neo-liberalism (short-term productivity, efficiency, and quality assurance proxies), which narrow our role as a social institution, that we have come to norm, control, and steer ourselves more effectively than any nation state could have imagined doing directly.

References

- Adler, E. (1992). 'The emergence of cooperation: National epistemic communities and the international evolution of the idea of nuclear arms control', *International organization*, 46, 1, 101-145.
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gabrielson, R. (2007). 'Magazine ranking a key item in AS chief's bonus'. *East Valley/Scottsdale Tribune*, March 18.
- Haas, P.M. (1989). 'Do regimes matter? Epistemic communities and the Mediterranean pollution control', *International Organization*, 43, 3, 377-403.
- Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2004). *An epistemic community and its intellectual networks: The field of higher education in Mexico*. Doctoral dissertation, Boston College.
- Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2005). 'Comunidades epistémicas: Una propuesta para estudiar el papel de los expertos en la definición de políticas en educación superior en México', *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 34, 2, 134.
- Marginson, S. (1997). 'Steering from a distance: Power relations in Australian higher education', *Higher Education*, 34, 1, 63-80.
- Marginson, S. (2007). 'Global position and position taking: The case of Australia', *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 1, 5-32.

- Marginson, S. and Rhoades, G. (2002). 'Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic', *Higher Education*, 43, 3, 281-309.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency, and enterprise: An overview of recent trends in higher education', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 1-2, 7-24.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rhoades, G. and Sporn, B. (2002). 'New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 1, 3-28.
- Salmi, J. and Saroyan, A. (1997). 'League tables as policy instruments: The political economy of accountability in tertiary education', in Global University Network for Innovation, *Higher education in the world 2007. Accreditation for quality assurance: What is at stake?* New York: MacMillan, pp. 79-96.
- Vidovich, L. (2002). 'Quality assurance in Australian higher education: Globalisation and 'steering at a distance'', *Higher Education*, 43, 3, 391-408.
- World Bank. (1994). *Higher education: The lessons of experience*. Washington: World Bank.

III. European higher education and the nation state

A Tale of Two Reform Styles

Thierry Chevaillier and Jean-Jacques Paul

From the early 1980's Guy Neave has been the most attentive and the most astute observer of the French higher education system. His education as an historian and his impressive knowledge of the academic scene around the world make his analyses both wider and deeper than most contemporary thoughts on the subject. In a system that most foreign observers find bizarre, he was able to trace in history the origins of peculiar traditions and to draw enlightening parallels with features that could be found elsewhere, thus identifying what exactly was the exceptionalism of French Higher Education. His mastery of the French language enabled him to 'read between the lines' when exploiting the great variety of written sources he had access to.

His qualification of the 'French exceptionalism' in the domain of Education reduces the apparent complexity to a few central features: a stratification of the various sub-sectors of Higher education, with, on the one hand the 'Grandes Ecoles' an elite sub-sector, vocational in essence, composed of a large number of small highly selective institutions, mostly public but funded and controlled by various ministries and administrations; on the other hand, a number of large institutions, the universities, with open access into most programmes, resting on a concept of 'legal homogeneity' conferring equal value to all institutions, programmes and diplomas controlled by one single central administration, the ministry of education.

The different modes of control of the two main sub-sectors are the root of a striking contrast in what Guy Neave calls 'reform styles' (Neave 1999).

Reform styles

Well into the 1990's, the distinction between the two sub-sectors could be compared to the political divide that prevailed for a long time in French society: 'A sector of Order where radical policies were introduced largely as a desperate last recourse' and 'a sector of Movement where institutional incrementalism and a strong sense of vocational adaptability reigned' (Neave 1999, p. 37).

Since 1968 three wide-ranging reforms have been passed and several others planned and withdrawn abruptly under the pressure of the unions or 'of the street'. Almost every Education Minister lent his name to a new Act or to an

aborted bill concerning the structural reform of universities. These structural reforms, enacted (The 1968 'Faure' Act on Higher Education, the 1984 'Savary' Higher Education Framework Act) or aborted (bills promoted by Devaquet, Fillon, Allègre) were merely concerned with universities (Musselin 2001). They hardly touched the non-university institutions that were included in the general framework of higher education with their own specific structures and governance. One of the main purposes of these successive reforms was to better organise the universities that were seen as being very inefficient in producing graduates and, above all, employable graduates.

Vocational drive

After the economic crisis of 1974, a policy process started aiming at 'vocationnalising' second cycle programmes in universities. A sign of the new policy orientation can be noticed in the replacement in the 1984 Framework Act of 'teaching' by 'training' in the title of the university departments (UFR - training and research units - instead of UER - teaching and research units) and in the rebranding of the administrative title of the universities from EPSC (scientific and cultural public establishment) to EPSCP (scientific, cultural and vocational public establishment) in 1984.

At the same time as universities were successfully creating a large number of vocational programmes and producing graduates who increasingly competed with those of the grandes écoles (especially in the field of business and economics), institutions of the elite non-university sector started to build and expand a research capacity (Neave 1985). Were these changes the early signs of a convergence between the two sub-sectors?

Convergence

In the conclusion of a later study Guy Neave (1999) raised the issue of convergence in terms of adaptation process and reform style: will both sub-sectors, university and non-university, converge towards a similar incrementalism? He saw in the increased autonomy of universities and in their growing differentiation a chance that 'great reforms' might be abandoned for small alterations and constant adaptation of structures and practices. Another trend was also at work that he had analysed and publicised not only for France but for most of Europe, namely the rise of the 'Evaluative State'.

If the French edition of the Evaluative State did not exclude the notion of competition, it located it in a different sphere, external to the national system. In such a context, raising the quality of higher education as a public service -

the main priority of the Evaluative State *à la française* - had as its strategic purpose to raise the country's competitive stance in Europe, rather than pitting one establishment against another for the largesse of the Prince. The French version of the Evaluative State turned around the dual rhetoric of competition abroad and national co-operation and solidarity at home (Neave 2006).

One of the aspects of this evaluative state is the focus that it gave to accreditation.

Accreditation

Before the end of the 1990, one could hardly speak of accreditation in France where the ministry of education controlled the curriculum of programmes leading to 'state diplomas', mainly offered in universities.

Whilst universities were given the latitude to develop what essentially were university degrees, the ministry granted such diplomas national status, thus preserving outward appearances, falling in with students sensitivities and upholding tranquillity on the campuses (Neave 1993, p. 12).

In the élite sub-sector, the authorisation of institutions both public and private, had been delegated since the 1930's to a specific committee in the case of *grandes école* leading to engineering degrees, the 'committee for engineering title'. In the case of business schools, the ministry used to grant its approval to institutions and diplomas without any formal framework. When it was decided that, for all higher education institutions, authorisation, approval or '*habilitation*' was to be granted for a limited period of time and with similar criteria, a national system of accreditation started operating.

Impact of the Bologna Process

It should be stressed that this converging process was made possible by the Bologna process, in particular through the introduction of the new degree structure known in France as LMD (for *Licence, Master, Doctorat*). The speed at which the universities reorganised and renamed their programmes to fit into this structure was quite surprising giving the reluctance they had shown to implement earlier programme reforms. This was partly helped by the attitude of the ministry that for the first time gave only limited guidance to the universities and only outlined the principles on which accreditation would be granted, leaving them a large freedom in devising new programmes. This freedom was immediately condemned by students' and teachers' unions as an attack on legal

homogeneity and on the related status of State diplomas (*'diplômes nationaux'*) (Chevaillier 2004).

The elite institutions started becoming aware of the consequences of their exceptionalism. Some of them chose to align their curriculum to the new 'European' structure, in order to become 'visible' to foreign students and employers. This led them to apply for accreditation thus enabling the ministry to harmonise the accreditation procedures (Witte 2006). Many decided to ignore the Bologna process and to stick to their specific organisation of programmes.

In a way, these developments led to a reversal in the public perception of the two sub-sectors: the Universities that were previously seen as the stronghold of conservatism began to look flexible and adaptative. The 'party of order' had set in motion. *Grandes écoles*, on the contrary, being constrained by the defence of their own diplomas and the idiosyncratic structure of their curriculum¹ were seen as resisting to adaptation and had to fight off an image of conservatism.

The question Guy Neave asked in the late 1990's cannot be answered with certainty: the French exceptionalism has not yet been wiped out by the Bologna process and by the increased autonomy of the universities. Perhaps the difference in 'reform styles' has diminished or even vanished. There remain some obstacles to a transformation that would align the French universities to the status and role of their counterparts in large European countries.

Many believe that the most important of the obstacles is the open access to university programmes and demand the right for universities to choose their students. Others argue that excellence in education and training can be combined with free access, provided students are better oriented during the first years of their higher education. Guy Neave expressed a moderate point of view in this respect (Neave 1985, p. 36) since French undergraduate studies do accommodate to an extraordinary variety of student adjustment strategies.

The elite sector remains deeply rooted in the secondary education system, nearly as much as Guy Neave pointed out in 1985, even if opposite trends can be detected: the opening of 'Grandes écoles' to candidates from other tracks (IUT, STS, University) and the recent attempts to give access to 'classes préparatoire' to talented students from low social origin. The latter is seen by some as carrying the risk of further lowering the level of students entering universities and as an acknowledgment that universities play no part in the training of the national élite, at least at undergraduate level.

¹ Two years of preparation in GPGE plus three years in the institutions after a competitive entry examination, instead of three years for the licence degree and two for the master degree.

There is one point on which everyone seems to agree: the level of funding of universities has to rise and get closer to that of the non-university sector if they are to improve the quality of education and training they provide while maintaining open access.

References

- Chevallier, T. (2004). 'Accreditation and Evaluation in France', in Schwarz, S. and Westerheijden, D. (eds.), *Accreditation in the Framework of Evaluation Activities - a comparative study in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Musselin C. (2001). *La Longue marche des universités françaises*. Paris: PUF.
- Neave, G. (1985). 'France', in Clark, B.R. (ed.), *The School and the university: an international perspective*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, p. 34.
- Neave, G. (1993). 'Higher education policy in France', in Goedegebuure, L., Kaiser, F., Maassen, P., Meek, L., van Vught, F. and de Weert, E. (eds.), *Higher Education Policy: an international comparative perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 104 - 130.
- Neave, G. (1999). 'Utilitarianism by Increment: Disciplinary Differences and Higher Education Reform in France', in Gellert C. (ed.), *Innovation and adaptation in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Neave, G. (2006). 'The Evaluative State and Bologna: Old Wine in New Bottles or simply the Ancient Practice of 'Coupage'?', *Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE)*: Hiroshima University, 3, March, pp. 27-46.
- Witte, J. (2006). *Change of degrees and degrees of change. Comparing adaptations of european higher education systems in the context of the bologna process*. Doctoral dissertation, CHEPS/Universiteit Twente.

Historical legacies and New Modes of Governance in European Education Policy - the inception of the Open Method of Coordination*

Åse Gornitzka

The significance of seeing the past for understanding the present

A unique feature of higher education in post-war Europe is the emergence of a new layer of governance at a level above the nation state. Guy Neave was among the first to identify this change process and situate it in a historical context. He has kept a keen eye on the often unpredictable turns it has taken and critically commented on its implications (Neave 1984, 1988; 2001, 2003a, b). His work on the European dimension has both inspired the critical reappraisal of the history of European integration and higher education (Corbett 2005) as well as laid the groundwork for understanding current process in light of historical pathways of transformation. The latter is the concern of this chapter.

When the Lisbon European Council launched the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) to reach the ambition of becoming the world's most competitive knowledge-based economy before the year 2010, the effects were soon felt in European cooperation in education policy. Grounded in an institutional perspective (March and Olsen 1984, 1998, 2006; Olsen 2001, 2007) I argue here that it has represented a fundamental procedural change in how cooperation takes place with respect to education as a policy domain and that the past history and institutional characteristics of the European Community in this specific policy area are important factors for understanding the way in which the OMC has been turned into practice.

This paper does two things: first it identifies the OMC as part of a family of new modes of governance and places it in the practical political context of the EU's Lisbon Process. Second, it sketches out the main ingredients in how the OMC has been practiced in the field of education and the key factors that can account for how this principled method became practice.

* Based on Gornitzka 2006, 2007.

New modes of governance, ‘the Lisbon method’ and education policy

The European political institutions’ search for new, complementary and alternative modes of governance has a background in what was defined as crises or blind alleys in the EU’s decision-making processes. Prior to the Lisbon European Council in March 2000, Member States had been unwilling to transfer further legal competencies to the European level while at the same time there was an expectation for the Union to take common action and ‘deliver’ (NEWGOV 2005). The OMC - or ‘The Lisbon method’ - was a template that in principle could ensure more joint responsibility than found in regular state-to-state cooperation without conferring more legal competencies to the supranational level. The main elements of the OMC were branded by the Lisbon European Council and involve: 1) identifying and defining common goals for the Union with specific timetables for achieving them, 2) establishing indicators and benchmarks for assessing progress towards the goals, 3) translating common objectives to national and regional policies taking into account national and regional differences, and 4) engaging in periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review organised as mutual learning processes (Lisbon European Council 2000, § 37).

New modes of governance, such as the OMC, share their genealogy with new ideas of public governance also at other levels than the European. The general search for new ways of steering has been identified as a development from *government*, characterised by hierarchical decision-making dominated by public actors, to *governance* with non-hierarchical decision-making and participation from both public and private actors (Kohler-Koch and Rittberger 2005), relying on soft rather than hard law (Hodson and Maher 2001). Yet with the focus on the EU’s democratic and performance deficit, the governance debate at this level has been acute. Also since education is an area of national sensitivity and legitimate diversity the governance challenges for the European level rest in particular on the fact that Europe cannot operate with new modes of governance in ‘the shadow of law or hierarchy’ (Heritier 2002). While national governments with respect to education can experiment with and turn to networked governance and market oriented reforms, they can still have significant control over public spending on education and over its legal framework. If voluntariness and networking do not work at the European level, there is very little legal recourse.

OMC as practice - ‘Education & Training 2010’

With the Lisbon Process educational cooperation became subject to unparalleled political attention in the history of European integration. In the Lisbon European Council, the heads of states and government invited the Ministers of Education to formulate common future goals for European education systems. The Lisbon summit also provided a diagnosis of a Europe challenged by globalisation and

the new knowledge-driven economy: European education systems would have to adapt to the demands of the knowledge economy/society, in particular in terms of investments in human resources, increasing education attainment levels, new basic skills and mobility (Lisbon European Council 2000, § 25-27). The modernisation of European education became linked to an overhaul of Europe envisaged in the Lisbon strategy.

In 2001 three strategic objectives were adopted that concerned the improved quality and effectiveness of education, access to education, and the goal of opening up national education and training systems to society and 'the wider world' (Stockholm European Council 2000). This was turned into a 10 year work programme containing 13 specified objectives (European Commission 2002), to which 5 benchmarks for European performance were later added. Subsequently a 'work organisation' was set up around these objectives, and from early 2004 two other parallel processes, the intergovernmental process towards establishing the European Higher Education Area ('The Bologna Process') and EU's 'Copenhagen Process' for vocational education and training, were added in order to include the whole range and all forms of education. From then on the OMC process in education was referred to as 'Education and Training 2010'.

Alliances within sectors – collisions between sectors

The impact of applying the OMC in the area of education must be understood against the history, traditions, institutional arrangements and legal competencies of the EU in this area. For a long time education was an area where the question was not '*can* policies be coordinated' - but '*should* they be'. The latter question has moved closer to being answered in the affirmative within the framework of the OMC. This is a novel element compared to what has been the dominant view in the history of the European level's involvement in this policy area. Nonetheless, this should not be seen as mainly a story of a change in the political will of education ministers. The larger context of the Lisbon Summit had important repercussions for cooperation in the field of education. It identified a template for cooperation that in principle was seen to enable the combination of a common European approach with the subsidiarity principle. The Lisbon process and the application of the OMC have created a platform for profiling the sector in the wider context of the EU, and for legitimating its place in European integration. The existing institutions - especially the established administrative capacity at the European level - played a significant role by putting energy, attention and resources into establishing a new political space and providing the OMC concept with a 'work organisation'. With the pre-Lisbon story of European cooperation in education as a basis, core actors in this policy area used the OMC and the Lisbon strategy to establish a new framework for working at the European level. This cooperation was also spurred by the need to reclaim lifelong learning as an

education policy issue, especially from the employment policy domain that had moved very close to core education and training issue through the European Employment Strategy.

Partial institutionalisation of a new political space

Permanent staff within the Commission's DG Education and Culture has been assigned to keeping the OMC alive, over time reporting procedures have been established, and there is a budget item from which it is acceptable to finance OMC activities. The way the OMC has been practiced in this sector seems to have strengthened the DG Education and Culture as a hub for policy networks in European education. National Ministries send their staff to Brussels in order to participate in activities that are legitimised to themselves and to outsiders by reference to OMC. The political space organised under the label of OMC has opened up for the participation of non-governmental actors in the education sector - notably the social partners and associations that organise students, parents, and various other stakeholder interests. These types of actors are not unfamiliar with participating at the European level, yet their participation under the OMC has intensified.

The OMC process has also made a distinct imprint in the larger order of European and international policy cooperation in education - this is evident in the way it has attracted and been integrated with other parallel processes of coordination, in particular the Bologna and Copenhagen processes, and with respect to the international organisations and regimes that produce education statistics and indicators, especially the OECD.

Compared to OMC processes in other areas 'Education and Training 2010' has settled as a natural part of the European level cooperation in education - it is seen as having become the heart of it. That is a change compared to the 20 years during which the mobility programmes were the centrepiece of the EU's involvement in education. Actors within this policy domain have to some extent come to have shared rules of procedure for what it means to practice the OMC, what kind of actors are to be involved, and what kind of actions are acceptable and appropriate within this setting. It is one of the most established OMC processes at the European level compared to other Lisbon OMC processes (Laffan and Shaw 2005) and as an independent process it has 'survived' the EU's reform of the Lisbon Agenda ('The Lisbon Relaunch'). Yet it is also a complex process with several elements that to varying degree have become institutionalised practices. The political space that was created has been characterised to some extent by the non-routinised interaction and uncertainty of what the 'mandate' of the process is, and a search for a working organisational set-up. Quantification of education policy into targets and benchmarks is well established. On the other

hand, direct and short-term mutual policy learning and coordination through social sanctioning (naming-shaming-faming) seem in particular weakly developed and institutionalised so far. It has represented an opportunity for the actors involved to *experiment* with ways of interacting and with the organisation of political space, what has been termed 'risk free path finding in new political territory' (Laffan and Shaw 2005). In the OMC in education this path finding has taken place also within the working groups and as an opportunity for DG Education and Culture to test out what this new political space should look like. The core documents of the OMC in education go through the regular decision-making procedures of the EU, but for the rest the organisation of the OMC process seems to have been open and without many predetermined procedures and rules of participation. Modes of interaction can be changed without going through elaborate formal decision-making procedures. That makes the process flexible but also vulnerable to shifts in attention and commitment among those who participate.

Governance after Lisbon: the soft hands of Europe

Some parts of the OMC in education show signs of a remarkable level and speed of institutionalisation. First, the attention and agenda of the EU institutions involved in education policy have been coordinated over time through the routines established around the goals and objectives of the OMC process. Second, the use and development of indicators have become well established as one of the main components of European cooperation in this field. This can be ascribed to the introduction of the OMC. These elements have been organised as a new mainframe of European cooperation in education. In this policy domain governance after Lisbon has entailed a *procedural* novelty. Whether or how this translates into changes in national policy and in the practices of national educational systems depends on the transformative effects of 'soft law': ideational convergence, development of a numerical language through European statistical categories and standards, establishing a common pool of information, as well as common European agenda setting, timing and framing of education policy. Hard law and the power of the purse still rest with the nation-state.

References

- Corbett A. (2005). *Universities and the Europe of knowledge: ideas, institutions and policy entrepreneurship in European Union higher education policy, 1955-2005*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- European Commission (2002). *Detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.
http://www.aic.lv/ace/ace_disk/Bologna/contrib/EU/workprog.pdf
- Gornitzka Å. (2006). *The Open Method of Coordination as practice - A watershed in European education policy?* Arena Working Paper Series 16/06. Oslo: Arena Centre for European Studies.
- Gornitzka Å. (2007). 'The Lisbon Process: A Supranational Policy Perspective', in Maassen, P. and Olsen, J.P. (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 155-178.
- Heritier A. (2002). 'New Modes of Governance in Europe: Policy-Making without Legislating?', in Heritier, A. (ed.), *Common Goods: Reinventing European and International Governance*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 185-206.
- Hodson, D. and Maher I. (2001). 'The open method as a new mode of governance: The case of soft economic policy co-ordination', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39, 719-746.
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Rittberger, B. (2005). 'Review article: The 'governance turn' in EU studies', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44, 27-49.
- Laffan, B. and Shaw, C. (2005). *Classifying and Mapping OMC in Different Policy Areas*. NEWGOV reference number 02/D09. http://www.eu-newgov.org/database/DELIV/D02D09_Classifying_and_Mapping_OMC.pdf
- Lisbon European Council (2000). *Presidency conclusions*.
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/001100-r1.en0.htm
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1984). 'The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life', *American political science review*, 78, 734-749.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1998). 'The institutional dynamics of international political orders', *International Organization*, 52, 943-69.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (2006). 'Elaborating the 'New Institutionalism'', in Rhodes, R.A.W., Binder, S. and Rockman, b. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-20.
- Neave G. (1984). *The EEC and education*. Trentham: Trentham Books.
- Neave G. (1988). 'Policy and response: changing perceptions and priorities in the vocational training policy of the EC Commission', in *Vocationalising Education: an international perspective* (ed.), JLK Lillis. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Neave G. (2001). 'The European Dimension in higher education: an excursion into the modern use of Historical Analogues', in Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Elsevier Pergamon, pp. 13-73.

- Neave G. (2003a). 'Anything goes: or how the accommodation of Europe's universities to European integration integrates an inspiring number of contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 181-97.
- Neave G. (2003b). 'The Bologna Declaration: Some of the historic dilemmas posed by the reconstruction of the community in Europe's systems of higher education', *Educational Policy*, 17, 141-64.
- NEWGOV. (2005). *New Modes of Governance - first Annual Activity Report*. http://www.eu-newgov.org/database/PUBLIC/P11000-07-DESC07_Activity_Report_Y1_public_version.pdf
- Olsen, J.P. (2001). 'Organising European Institutions of Governance: A Prelude to an Institutional Account to European Integration', in Wallace, H. (ed.), *Interlocking Dimensions of European Integration*. Houndmills: Palgrave, pp. 323-53.
- Olsen, J.P. (2007). *Europe in Search of Political Order. An institutional perspective on unity/diversity, citizens/their helpers, democratic design/historical drift, and the co-existence of orders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stockholm European Council (2001). *Presidency conclusions*. http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/00100-r1.%20ann-r1.en1.html.

Some Legal Aspects relating to the Internationalisation of Higher Education Quality Assurance

Jan de Groof

This article is dependent on secondary sources that served as a bibliographical guide to the topic in question. In this respect I would like to acknowledge two articles written by Professor Guy Neave (Neave 1997, 2005). I am also grateful to have worked with him in writing the 1998 book *Democracy and Governance in Higher Education* in which he concentrated attention on the relationship and balance between *law and policy* from a comparative point of view. I have also valued his cooperation and interventions at meetings of the *European Law Association*.

Over the last few years the legislator has created a legislative overload with regard to the higher education in the Flemish Community. On several occasions and in many ways I have already criticised this expanding problem (Janssens and De Groof 2005). Some consequences of this juridification are mentioned in this article which primarily focuses on the governing, planning, structuring and regulation of the higher education institutions in the Flemish Community.

The Open Method of Coordination

The *Lisbon* strategy introduces a philosophy of governance that is new - certainly as far as education is concerned¹ - for Europe, i.e. the '*open method of coordination*'. This governance tool appears to be of particular relevance to the field of education policy, as articles 149 and 150 of the EC Treaty only provide Community institutions with the possibility of taking stimulative actions and making recommendations. What is essential is that the EU should contribute to the development of high-quality education by fostering cooperation between member states and, if necessary, by supporting or supplementing their actions. This is aimed at, among other aspects, improving student and teacher mobility, for example by stimulating the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study (art. 149 par. 2 EC treaty). However both articles also explicitly exclude harmonisation.

¹ Previously the Union had used this method for the Member States' social policy, specifically concerning employment policy and retirement issues.

The open method of coordination is based on *common objectives*, naturally with different timeframes, indicators and benchmarks, regarding the integration of the guidelines in nationally and regionally established action plans relating to regular monitoring and peer review. In addition, the method² - put in schematic terms - allows for (national) diversity instead of uniformity, for flexibility instead of enforceable legal follow-up, framework objectives instead of detailed requirements and freely determinable timeframes instead of binding entry dates. The regular consultation, performance screening, feedback and follow-up procedures reinforce both the governments' responsibility and accountability duties, without the threat of stringently interpreted procedures, which are seen as a nuisance. This last aspect may seem tempting, but contains an important drawback, as policy-measures depend on the goodwill of national governments and a common education area remains largely hypothetical or even haphazard when a party chooses to *opt out*. The '*Europe moving at different speeds*' is becoming more of a reality. On the other hand, a Europe of mobile students or scientists, or a Europe of 'citizens', if you will, is becoming less of a reality in certain respects.

The intention is to meet the *Lisbon* objectives through open coordination. The recent adjustment of the objectives by the European Council does not take anything away from this approach.³ The *Bologna* process also contains characteristics of this governance philosophy, taking into account that, *formally*, this process falls outside of community legislative powers (Verbruggen 2002, 2003; Zoontjens 2004).

Materially, however, the situation is much more complicated. '*Quality Assurance*' will be the key for taking further steps in the common European area of the various educational systems, without implying a restriction on the national authorities' competence. At least not in theory, as one of the explicit objectives contained in the *Bologna* Declaration is reinforcing the European dimension of quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies. As was mentioned above, article 149 of the EC Treaty allowed the Community Institutions to carry out stimulative actions and provide recommendations relating to quality assurance.⁴ As the Community Institutions (and specifically the European Commission) were granted a facilitating role in the *Bologna* process, albeit reluctantly, the distinction between the *Bologna* process and the general competences granted to the Community under article 149 of the EC treaty is fading. It is possible that, as a result of both mechanisms, legally speaking there is an 'open coordination', but that it does not appear anymore

² It is certainly worth looking into its compatibility with the subsidiarity principle, which is far from obvious. Cf. *infra*.

³ http://www.consilium.europa.eu/veDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/nl/educ/88635.pdf.

⁴ Cf. also the recommendation mentioned below. It dates back to 1998 and was therefore issued before the *Bologna* statement had been drafted.

from the *de facto* situation. If this view is correct, there is a conflict between the subsidiarity principle and the exclusion of harmonisation, as mentioned in article 149 of the EC Treaty, which only became possible as a result of the voluntary nature of the *Bologna* process. In addition, there may be a democratic deficit in the decision-making process regarding the fundamental choices that are thus made regarding the future of higher education in Europe.⁵ In conclusion, the convergence between the *Bologna* process and the competences granted to the Community under the EC Treaty lead to a (legal) balancing exercise on a tight-rope. It would be interesting to suggest that in the year 2006, higher education is in the '*post article 149*' era.⁶

It is important to note that there should be more debate surrounding, more research into and a clearer picture of the relationship between the *Bologna* process and EU legislation.⁷ In a joint, interim report from the Council and Commission regarding the Lisbon objectives, the relationship with the *Bologna* process is described (albeit covertly) under the heading '*Implement the process more effectively*' stating that this should be included in the *Lisbon* process.⁸ In a way, this position has also become obsolete: the process already appears to belong to the *acquis communautaire* and if there is no strict need for EU legislation, there are other ways to enforce *soft law*: 'no legally binding force' does not equal 'no legal effect at all'.

Level of Competence National-Supranational

It is sufficiently known that, as a result of the expansive interpretation by the Court of Justice of the concept '*Professional Training*', positively mentioned in the EC Treaty, '*education*' is part of the Community arena, as a consequence of the application of the non-discrimination principle of Member State subjects regarding access to education and of the principle of free movement. In a sense, articles 149 and 150 are the reflection of the series of European programmes that had been developed by the *Community* before the *Union* expressly included education, professional training and culture as a community objective - albeit

⁵ Cf. nr. 48.

⁶ Cf. *infra*.

⁷ For a similar plea cf.: *art. cit.*, SEW, 2006-6, p. 211.

⁸ In diplomatic terms: 'For the 31 countries involved in '*Education & Training 2010*', there should also be closer coordination with the *Bologna* process. Generally speaking, the case for non integrated parallel action will be increasingly weaker in the future, be it in higher education or in vocational training, unless it is manifestly more ambitious and more effective.' Cf. '*Education & Training 2010*' *The Success Of The Lisbon Strategy hinges on urgent reforms*, Joint interim report of the Council and the Commission implementation of the detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe, *PbEG* 2004, C 104/1, p. 12.

within the framework of an application of the subsidiarity principle (Lenaerts 1994; De Witte 1992-1993; De Groof 1994). The Union's sphere of action increased evermore, although it was the result of a voluntary system, of incentive measures and competition. While the original distrust that originally accompanied the creation of art. 1 of the second ECHR Protocol started to wane (cf. De Groof and Lauwers 2004), a sense grew that the European dimension had a positive influence on the national education system.

The *Bologna* process is also a paradox. On the one hand, it is part of the community momentum, particularly for topics related to quality assurance; in that sense Bologna belongs to the community actions and programmes, but on the other hand it goes beyond the treaty stipulations. The intergovernmental nature of the Bologna process has prevented a careful assessment of the criteria and procedures of the subsidiarity principle - as described in the Treaty- including the monitoring by national parliaments and the principle's influence on the central, regional and local level.⁹

The aforementioned articles 149 and 150 have become largely obsolete, certainly as far as higher education is concerned, also as a result of how the facts have changed, even though the Member States are refusing to admit to this in so many words. They refer to the lack of resistance when applying tools such as *benchmarking*, *good practices* and *open coordination*, even though they are the ones who determine the momentum of the (European) interpretation. 'Fewer' European norms and procedures can therefore lead to 'more Europe'. 'Harmonisation' is an explicit objective, but only if it falls outside of the standard procedures. Moreover, both the Lisbon and Bologna strategy are tied to specific dates. This tense relationship will have to be reconciled in time.

The focus on *diversity* depending on the national educational system and as a consequence of the Member States' *exclusive* competence - unlike in the field of 'research', which has become an area of shared competence - and the variety of language and culture, are continuously repeated as being the guiding principles, also in the field of quality assurance.¹⁰ However, the Commission is now granted a more important role than simply carrying out administrative duties and financing symposia. The Commission is expected to monitor the process and the European Council has integrated the Bologna process in its benchmarks and recommendations. In line with art. 149, the Economic and Social Committee is also given a role.

The fact that the member states and parties have no legal obligation under the Bologna process and therefore tend towards harmonisation, forces legal experts

⁹ cf. art. 9, 3 Part III Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

¹⁰ From Berlin to Bergen, l.c., p. 14.

not only to take a more modest view, but also to design innovative techniques. The expected update of the European Constitution will present the member states involved with this opportunity. The support of the Council of Europe, together with the implementation of art. 149, par. 3, offers an opportunity for opening up to other countries.¹¹

Another issue relating the Bologna process is the supposed or real *democratic deficit*. Here again, we see a paradox: there are grounds for criticism, but reference must be made to the decision-making process in each of the member states and the direct involvement of the institutions in the draft legislation. For the lack of debate, the universities and colleges are also partially to blame. However, unlike the *benchmarking* exercise and the Lisbon strategy, we notice that the academic community has indeed taken ownership of the restructuring of higher education. It cannot be repeated too often that the *ownership* of the Bologna process should be with the individual institutions and their stakeholders. We are immediately reminded that in the constitutional tradition of both Flanders and The Netherlands, the autonomy and accountability of institutes of higher learning are still of great importance (De Groof 1989, p. 223).

The completion of both the Lisbon strategy and the Bologna process also creates the opportunity to provide feedback to the policy-makers regarding proven or alleged progress. Educational users can only stake their claims if solid strategies and process are included in the legislation. The question of legal status therefore appears to be a decisive argument in favour of measuring the democratic deficit. Both the Flemish and the Dutch legislation should be analysed from this perspective, without hampering the European momentum nor the leading role that Flanders and The Netherlands are playing.

The Principle of Trust

Regardless of which procedures are used with respect to national and European legislation relating to diplomas, i.e. 'recognition', 'equivalence' and 'equality' or the procedure of 'harmonisation', all these various mechanisms in fact refer to the principle of 'mutual trust' - which, for that matter, is also an essential community principle.

Regardless of the quality assurance techniques that are provided by national legislation, international (quality) standards are converging into one general guideline, for both accreditation of programmes and of institutions. The *meta*

¹¹ Cf. also art. III. 225 of the Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

evaluation or *meta accreditation* examines the credibility of the national systems.¹² The national governments continue to exert a real influence on the formal accreditation system of the institutions relying on public funds or grants and whose diplomas and certificates are granted an official *effectus civilis*. In Europe, this is generally done by governmental recognition agencies or by a *meta accreditation* authority, such as the federal *Akkreditierungsrat* in Germany which gives its own accreditation to the country's accreditation agencies.

Most assessments and accreditations in Europe (still) take place at the national or regional level. It is expected that these assessments and accreditations will become ever more comparable, i.a., by using international standards, procedures and guidelines. However, there is also room for trans-national assessments and accreditations, for example for strongly internationally-oriented programmes such as business studies, medicine or technical training.

International professional organisations and institutions specialising in certain areas (engineering, animal medicine, tropical medicine, *business schools* ...) often issue their own authoritative accreditations based on strict, objective standards. It will therefore become essential for governments to reach an agreement with these internationally accepted, non-governmental bodies to allow them to present legally-binding recognitions.

The European Commission supports the introduction of trans-national assessments and accreditations of study programmes that may be organised jointly. One of the underlying ideas is that institutions for higher education in need of an accreditation that is also valid abroad would tend to look at US agencies, given the lack of a 'European accreditation' (COM 2004).

Sooner than expected, internationalising is becoming a guideline in the reform of national legislation. Not only the smaller member states will be forced to come up with trans-national formulas, as full transparency will become a new interpretation for the free movement of students, teachers and researchers.

Convergence

'*Convergence*' - i.e. focusing on a shared frame of reference - is becoming a reality for European higher education, and not just because of the Union's '*supporting, coordinating or supplementary actions*' and the '*Declarations*' or '*Agreements*' in this field. The integration of the labour market and professional training and lifelong learning systems are also a contributing factor. Europe's effect is felt less directly

¹² In that case, a *meta evaluation* may be considered a contribution towards a rationalisation of legislation.

on the organisation of compulsory education. However, the hope is that increased workers' mobility, and, as a result, an increasing mobility of parents, will have a 'mobilising' effect. The same can be expected from international benchmarks and comparative 'good practices'.

Even if the parties' or member states' educational systems continue to converge, partly under the influence of economic and monetary integration, no uniformity is to be expected in the 'organisation' or 'contents' across the various national education systems. The Bologna process focuses explicitly on structures and procedures and not, or at least not directly, on course content, curricula and the educational concept. Even the duration of training may differ. In light of the divergent preparatory trajectory (compulsory education) that is to be followed, this does not come as a surprise.

Having a more diversified educational content should eventually pave the way for a more competitive European Higher Education Area. The European Commission has concluded that 'detailed instructions for organisation, control and management' have led to too much uniformity within the member states. The Commission continues: 'This pressure for uniformity has led to generally good average performance, but has increased fragmentation of the sector into mostly small national systems and sub-systems. These render cooperation difficult at national, let alone European or international, level and impose conditions which prevent universities from diversifying and from focusing on quality' (COM 2006, p. 3).

However, a different type of convergence is materialising in Flanders and The Netherlands, between programmes and institutions (De Groof 2004). The three-fold system in Flanders and the distinction between the Dutch 'HBO' (Higher Professional Education) and 'WO' (Scientific Education) is fading. A greater uniformity in higher education is helped by the visitation and accreditation procedures.

Another form of convergence relates to the institutions. The *associations* between universities and colleges, certainly in Flanders, play a decisive role in the so-called 'academisation' of programmes (i.e. making professional training more 'academic' in nature). Their influence touches the very core of the programmes involved, but also human resource management, infrastructure etc. Associations introduce the perspective of a confederate or integrated institutional structure (cf. De Groof 2000-2001). The Dutch universities are also considering associations or mergers with the 'HBO institutions', partly to ensure a through-flow of HBO bachelors into master programmes, as is the case in Flanders. Reinforcing the scientific potential is an important motivation in both cases.

Brief Conclusion

Mobility from a Flemish-Dutch Perspective

Through accreditation, a different objective of the *Bologna* process is achieved, i.e. student and teacher mobility. This requires a guaranteed and transparent basic quality of the accredited programmes. Only if this requirement is met will the commitment to bring about growing *professional* and *academic* European mobility be in line with the national evaluation of diplomas, as is prescribed by law and custom. Education should become embedded in the cultural process and its mission therefore interlinked with historical, ideological or philosophical or language-specific identities and with other national characteristics. It is Europe's mission, together with equality and quality in education, to actively stimulate cultural diversity. This concern is part of the *Bologna* process.

Automatically recognising the equivalence of diplomas obtained by students and graduates in other EU member states and, by extension, in the other countries that have signed the *Bologna* declaration is, as yet, not a part of the formal, international legal system. That is why the comparability of diplomas and qualifications ('*readability*', '*comparability*', '*compatibility*') is essential for the implementation processes of the ministerial signatures under 'Sorbonne' and 'Bologna'. This is a unique opportunity for Flanders and The Netherlands to work together, not only in the field of quality assurance, but also of accreditation, recognition and validation of diplomas.

Those graduating from a Flemish NVAO-accredited training, for example, will be considered to have obtained a similar degree to those graduating from a corresponding Dutch NVAO-accredited training. The degree will be equivalent for the purposes of meeting the entry requirements, allowing the students to move on to a different Flemish or Dutch accredited higher education programme. The recognition procedure of individual diplomas could also be greatly simplified. Institutions will maintain their entry requirements, but Dutch diplomas will be treated in the same way as Flemish diplomas for the purposes of access and *vice versa*.

Despite all these Achievements: Critical Reflection is needed

From the start, various parties have taken a critical view of higher education accreditation. Unlike in Flanders, the debate surrounding the introduction of accreditation in The Netherlands focused largely on the constitutional bottlenecks that would result from the accreditation system (cf. De Groof and Hendriks 2005-2006). After the introduction, some institutions stated that the accreditation system had significantly increased the administrative burden (VSNU 2004).

Regardless of the validity of this criticism, Dutch legislators appear to be planning to carry out a number of substantial short- and long-term changes, both to the accreditation system and to the higher education system as a whole. In the Dutch parliament, a first item of debate is higher education funding. The intention is to change the WHW (Higher Education and Scientific Research Act) for the so-called 'WHOO' (New Higher Education and Scientific Research Act), which will facilitate the introduction of 'learning rights' in higher education.¹³ Secondly, despite some very critical opinions of the Educational Council (2005) and the Dutch Council of State,¹⁴ the 'WHOO', was recently sent to Parliament for approval. According to the explanatory documents, policy-makers assume that the act will already enter into force on September 1st, 2007. The accreditation system is also debated in this context. A seminal document for the debate is the '*Simplification of the Higher Education Accreditation System*' note, written by the Dutch minister and under-minister for Education, Culture and Science. In it, a number of problems with the accreditation system are mentioned, together with a number of far-reaching (possible accreditation for institutions) and less far-reaching (removing bureaucratic obstacles) measures.¹⁵ The possible accreditation for institutions is further elaborated in the note entitled '*Towards Full Educational Accreditation at an Institutional Level*'.¹⁶ Finally, international developments, as described above, have led to a reflection about the current accreditation system.

The debate in Flanders regarding the introduction of accreditation did not create such a stir, as was the case in other recent examples where fundamental reforms to higher education were carried out. The VLIR (Flemish Inter-University Council) hardly paid any attention to it. Some accepted the changes without protest, probably still baffled by the volume of legislation facing the educational arena; others did not find it worth debating, as they assumed that their institution would hardly be affected. It may also not be assumed that the academic community saw accreditation as something that was self-evident. Parliamentary debates devoted very little time to this milestone as well. For a long time, accreditation was a non-issue. Only a hand-full of *Notes* bothered with raising questions and instigating a debate (ICOR 2005a, 2005b).

Before the extent of the accreditation became known, no university or college found it necessary to put this issue on the management meeting's agenda. The resemblance to the signing of the *Bologna* Declaration, which passed almost without protest, is striking. The current situation is different, however. A shock

¹³ Parliamentary Records II 2005/06, 30387, nr. 2.

¹⁴ Parliamentary Records II 2005/06, 30588, nr. 4.

¹⁵ *Parliamentary Records II* 2005/06, 29853, nr. 25.

¹⁶ 'Op weg naar Volledige Onderwijs Accreditatie op instellingsniveau: voorbereiding van de volgende fase van accreditatie in het hoger onderwijs', annex to Parliamentary Records II 2005/06, 29853, nr. 29.

wave ran through the higher education system, which was felt down to the department and faculty level. The realisation that an unfavourable accreditation or opinion from the Recognition Commission could have financial and other implications, together with the proposed rationalisation will no doubt have contributed to this.

In Flanders, we also see a frenetic reflection regarding higher education funding and the related discussion about *input* and *output indicators*. There is also no consensus regarding the introduction of learning rights and the timing as imposed by the decree for the introduction of a new system is stringent.¹⁷ At the same time - as was already mentioned - a so-called *Basic decree* is envisaged, in an attempt to unify the very fragmented Flemish legislation (cf. De Groof 2005).

In light of the treaty signed between Flanders and The Netherlands, these developments will have to be closely monitored in both regions. A joint approach to this topic is becoming a necessity, given the mutual coherence of accreditation, quality assurance, macro-effectiveness, rationalisation and programming, funding and restructuring (in its associated, integrated, confederate, merged or other forms). However, until now no initiatives have been taken to this effect.

Upholding the Subsidiarity Principle

The afore-mentioned treaty does not bestow general competences, but only competences that are necessary and useful for carrying out the assignment and that need to respect national competences.¹⁸ Consequently, the assignments of the accreditation agency that are not clearly mentioned should be interpreted within the framework of the treaty, while observing the *subsidiarity principle*. This implies that (1) the assignment cannot be better performed at the national level; and (2) the objectives are better reached through supra-national initiatives (i.e. by the accreditation agency). What factors justify this intervention on a bilateral level?

The Treaty starts from the subsidiarity principle, on the one hand relating to responsibility of the institutions regarding organisation and quality of education and the recognition of the freedom of education, as enshrined in the constitution of both countries and, on the other hand, relating to the desirability of a joint accreditation of programmes and the recognition of new programmes, if this provides added value. Consequently, Flanders and The Netherlands are still responsible for a number of subjects, while at the same time respecting the

¹⁷ <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/beleid/financiering-nieuw-model.htm>.

¹⁸ *Preface*: 'This Accreditation Agency should be given the necessary competences under Dutch and Belgian law needed or useful to fulfil its mission, within the limits imposed by this Treaty and national legislation.' The *Explanatory Note*, point 3 states: 'The Treaty leaves the national competences in the field of higher education unimpeded.'

mutual constitutional freedom of education. Moreover, the treaty can only be interpreted within the afore-mentioned framework. The assignments to be carried out by the accreditation agency have to be interpreted on the basis of the treaty and must be in compliance with the subsidiarity principle. On the other hand, the national objectives are only achieved through the supra-national level, given the inherently international nature of quality assurance and the added value both parties attach to an Accreditation Agency created by a treaty.

The subsidiarity requirement will only be met if it is proven that accreditation is better organised at the Flemish-Dutch level than at the national level. There is no doubt that the Flemish-Dutch level offers clear added value. Quality requires accreditation; accreditation requires, in the Flemish-Dutch context at least, a supra-national tool. However, the question may be raised of which (additional, delegated) competences fall under the subsidiarity principle and which do not necessarily belong to the NVAO.¹⁹ Even more so, as certain matters are covered under the stipulation ‘the parties to this treaty will remain responsible for their own education.’ For example, is ‘maintaining an educational register’ not best performed by the national education administration, which, at the same time, is also able to control the exponential growth of programmes (and their requirements)? The institution is appointed via a simple decision from the Flemish government.²⁰ In addition, a link with the ‘central database’ should be an objective.²¹

Observing the *proportionality principle* raises the question of how far the responsibilities, procedures and actions of the NVAO can reach. A situation where the NVAO and, previously, the Recognition Commission, are led astray by their *opportunity* judgements under the guise of assessing generic quality guarantees, is to be avoided.

References

COM (2004). *Recommendation of the Council and of the European Parliament on further European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education*, Brussels, 642 final. http://www.ntua.gr/dep/old/International/Europe/com2004_0642en01.pdf?REQUEST=Seek-Deliver&COLLECTION=com&SERVICE=eur

¹⁹ Following art. 1, par. 2 of the *Treaty*.

²⁰ Art. 64, par. 2 of the *Structuurdecreet* (Structural Decree). Previously, the second sentence read: ‘This drafting and update should always be ratified by the department of Education.’

²¹ Art. 113*bis* of the same decree.

- COM (2006). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament., Delivering on the modernisation agenda for universities: Education, research and innovation*. Brussels, 208 final.
[http://ec.europa.eu/eracareers/pdf/COM\(2006\)_208.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/eracareers/pdf/COM(2006)_208.pdf)
- Educational Counsel (2005). *Waardering voor hoger onderwijs. Advies over het voorstel van wet op het hoger onderwijs en onderzoek* (Reference 20050432/837), The Hague. <http://www.minocw.nl/documenten/17662b.pdf>
- de Groof, J. (1989). *De Grondwetsherziening van 1988 en het Onderwijs. De Schoolvrede en zijn toepassing*. Brussel: Cepess.
- de Groof, J. (1994). 'The Scope of and Distinction between Art.126 and 127 of the Treaty on European Union and the Implementation of the Subsidiarity Principle', in de Groof, J. (ed.), *Subsidiarity and Education. Aspects of comparative Educational Law*. Leuven: Acco, pp. 77-114.
- de Groof, J. (2000-2001). 'Hoe confederaal worden universiteiten en hogescholen? Een toekomstverkenning over de structuur van het tertiair onderwijs: een relatie in de kering?', *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijsrecht en Onderwijsbeleid*, 2-3, 90-106.
- de Groof, J. (2004). 'Een gemeenschappelijke onderwijsruimte voor de Lage Landen? Onderwijs, kwaliteitszorg en accreditatie: bevoorrechte domeinen voor samenwerking tussen Vlaanderen en Nederland', in de Groof, J., Hagen A.M. and Schramme, A. (eds.), *Gedrag na verdrag: balans en toekomst van de samenwerking Nederland-Vlaanderen*. Louvain/Leuven: Davidsfonds, pp. 137-159.
- de Groof, J. (2005). 'Recht en beleid ten behoeve van een gemeenschappelijke (hoger) onderwijsruimte der Lage Landen?', in Zoontjens P. and Peters H. (eds.), *Getuigend Staatsrecht; liber amicorum A.K. Koekoek*. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers, pp. 387-430.
- de Groof, J. and Hendriks, F. (2005-2006). 'Accreditatie in het hoger onderwijs in Vlaanderen en Nederland', *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijsrecht en Onderwijsbeleid*, 4-5, 247-356.
- de Groof J. and Lauwers, G. (2004). *No Person Shall be Denied the Right to Education*. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- ICOR (2005a). *Het Lucas Effect. Een poging tot inleiding van een onafwendbaar debat omtrent nieuwe regelgeving voor hoger onderwijs in Vlaanderen en legistische opmerkingen bij het voorontwerp van basisdecreet hoger onderwijs*, Antwerpen. <http://www.onderwijsrecht.be/lucas/Lucas1.pdf>
- ICOR (2005b). *Het Lucas Effect 2. Bemerkingen bij de Montesquieu-nota*, Antwerpen. <http://www.onderwijsrecht.be/lucas/Lucas2.pdf>
- Janssens, Y. and de Groof, J. (2005). *De Universitaire Regelgeving, Coördinatie en Annotatie*. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Lenaerts, K. (1994). 'Subsidiarity and Community Competence in the Field of Education', in de Groof, J. (ed.), *Subsidiarity and Education. Aspects of comparative Educational Law*. Leuven: Acco, pp. 117-144.

- Neave, G. (1997). 'In quest of continuity: The European Dimension in the history of higher education', *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, Kluwer Law International, 1, 49-55.
- Neave, G. (2005). 'On Facing an Exciting Future Cogitations on the Theme Higher Education, Competition and Access', *International Journal for Education Law and Policy*, Wolf Legal Publishers, 1, 1-2, 66-72.
- Neave, G., de Groof, J. and Svec, J. (1998). *Democracy and Governance in higher education*. Den Haag: Kluwer Law International.
- Verbruggen, M.L.W. (2002). 'De Bologna-verklaring en het Europees onderwijsbeleid: enkele juridische kanttekeningen', *Het Europa van het hoger onderwijs*, The Hague, Educational Counsel, pp. 51-55.
- Verbruggen, M.L.W. (2003). 'De Bologna-verklaring kritisch getoetst aan het Europees onderwijsbeleid', *School en Wet*, 6, p. 211.
- VSNU (2004). 'Accreditatie. Minder kwaliteit voor meer geld?'. *Discussion paper*, Utrecht. <http://www.vsnul.nl/web/show/id=54023/langid=43/framenoid=41685/langid=43/secure=false>
- de Witte, B. (1992-1993). 'Equivalentie van studieperiodes en erkenning van diploma's', *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijsrecht en Onderwijsbeleid*, 5-6, 290.
- Zoontjens P.J.J. (2004). 'Europa' en ons onderwijsstelsel', *School en Wet*, 8, 316.

Travelling in time and space

Jeroen Huisman

Talking about generations

When Guy wrote his first books in 1975 and 1976 - on the sixth form and comprehensive education, I actually could have been an empirical subject of his investigations, were it not that I happened to be in the wrong country ... and born too late. When Guy was contemplating connections - 'mind the gap' - between secondary and higher education in Scotland, I was trying to take hurdles of a slightly different nature. I was dividing my attention between the lessons of the primary school headmaster - who, by the way, later became a well-respected local and regional historian - and the radio. For me, 1975 was not - and this probably does not surprise the reader - the year of scholarly attention to the relationship between secondary education and the university. Neither, to be honest, will I remember the year 1975 because of the headmaster's history lessons on how my hometown Coevorden was liberated by Carl von Rabenhaupt in 1672 (disaster year), how Michiel de Ruyter successfully fought the Brits and how (and why) Holland and England signed the Treaty of Westminster in 1674. Actually, confession time, 1975 for me was the year of Roger Glover's *Love is all*.

At that time musical events for me were largely unconnected: popular songs were literally singles and they were only connected to each other because they would appear on compilations under illustrious titles such as *20 Speed Top Hits*. I could not yet comprehend that events - like the song *Love is all* - had historical roots. I only learned later that *Love is all* was based on the 1973 picture book, which in its turn was loosely based on William Roscoe's 1806 poem *Butterfly's Ball and the Grasshopper's Feast*. Neither could I foresee that the same song would be used - or misused, as some would say - by the Dutch Christian-Democrats in their 2006 election campaign. If there is one thing I learned from Guy Neave, it would be to put things in a historical (time) and geographical (space) context.

Archaeology

I was curious to take another look at Guy's 1984 *The EEC and education*. Whereas the city I currently live in is well-known for Roman archaeology, particularly the ancient spas in the centre, there are other places in the city that remind visitors of archaeology. Indeed, visiting the library on a winter evening can be a true voyage of discovery, if only for the fact that the books are kept literally in the dark. Sensors will notice that visitors are approaching and will illuminate the way to

the source the visitor is looking for. I found *The EEC and education* squeezed, but - and this will be a relief to Guy - not squashed, between a series of the European Commission on new information technology.

As an archival exercise, it is interesting to see how often and when the book has been taken out by scholars at my university. On the one hand, I would not have been surprised to find a crisp copy of the book, given the ubiquitous lack of interest of UK scholars in European matters: British colleagues still talk about developments in Europe, excluding themselves from these developments. On the other hand, the university accommodates the European Research Institute and the university has many foreign scholars. Given that the copy I borrowed seemed well-read, I guess that quite a number of Bath scholars were interested in its contents. From the loan pattern, it was clear that shortly after its appearance it was probably not much read. The book was added to the library collection in 1986, the first loan was in 1988, the second loan in 1990. Neither has the book been borrowed recently: the loan before I took it out dates from May 1999. The latter is not so much a sign of disinterest in the particular book per se, but probably a sign that contemporary scholars interested in higher education and the European Community have numerous sources to rely on. But around 1992/1993 the book was often (eight times) released from its trapped position on the library shelves. An obvious explanation is that this period saw the completion of the European market (Treaty of Maastricht 1992) and the appearance of the *Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community* (1991); events that must have triggered scholars to study the involvement of the European Union in higher education.

You cannot judge a book by its cover

... but the cover, Lord Briggs' foreword and Guy's acknowledgements reveal a lot about the political context and the network from which the book project emerged. Let us start with the cover. Here the name of the institute Guy was a member of appears: The European Institute of Education and Social Policy. This institute was approved in 1974 and set up by the European Cultural Foundation (ECF), following a recommendation in the ECF's project *Plan Europe 2000*. This encompassing ECF project started in the latter half of the 1960s. The general idea behind the project and the evolving ECF network was that the Community should encourage innovation and cooperation in the area of education (Corbett 2005, p. 92). The particular role of the European Institute was policy-oriented and to carry out research and organise cooperation in the fields of education, employment and social policies. The *EEC and education* clearly fits the objective in its comprehensive overview of the action areas of the EEC and analysis of the developments in these areas, including helpful lists of primary, secondary and tertiary sources.

Asa Briggs' introductory words are rather 'straightforward', but it is interesting to note his background as a historian and vice-chancellor of the University of Sussex. At that university, Hywel Ceri Jones was his assistant. On the recommendation of Briggs, Jones moved to Brussels in 1973 (Corbett 2005, p. 82-83), as one of the first Brits after Britain joined the Community, to later become Director of Education and Vocational Training. In his acknowledgements, Guy thanks Jones for his encouragement and advice. The same Jones would later be acknowledged by Anne Corbett (2005) as one of the seven policy entrepreneurs that played a crucial role in EU higher education policy in the period 1955-1987. Guy also gave words of thanks to Alan Smith, who would lead the pilot actions preceding the Erasmus programme and to Ladislav Cerych, formerly with the OECD, and at the moment Guy prepared the book, director of the European Institute. And ... thanks to a certain Martine Herlant at the Office for Cooperation in Education in Brussels, who - two years later - would become Mme Neave.

The back cover is interesting as well, for here another seminal book is announced: *The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms* by Paul Sabatier and Ladislav Cerych, November 1985, although the main title changed into *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance*, the order of the authors was reversed and the book eventually appeared in 1986. The change of title, author order and publication date in a time span of a year may - with hindsight - be seen as a forerunner of the fact that comprehensive change in higher education and a fundamental change in the relationships between nation states and the supranational state were indeed possible.

A book of brilliant things

The reader may get the idea that so much time is spent on the context, as there may be nothing worthwhile to say about the content of the book. On the contrary! First of all, the book is unique in being the first book on education and the European Community. Suffice to repeat part of Lord Briggs' first sentence of the foreword: '... and as such it will be an invaluable work of reference'.

A second remark relates to the breadth of topics addressed, from the obvious attention to cooperation and the European dimension to - in retrospect - less obvious attention to education of migrants, equality of educational opportunities and education and training for disabled children and young people. The attention given to the latter topics must be seen in the context of the preceding decade (the 1970s) in which many EC activities started or were rooted. A period characterised by recovery from economic crises at the beginning of that decade and of expectations of education being able to solve or at least contribute to the solution of (youth) unemployment, social injustice and poverty.

Time warps and space travel: from EEC to EU and from Bologna to...

It would not be an understatement to say that Europe has changed significantly since *The EEC and education* appeared, considerably mixing up our understanding of the neat order of things (national sovereignty; cooperation, not harmonisation) in the preceding decades. There is no need to dwell upon the current policy dynamics, let alone their intended and unexpected effects, beyond elaborating on some of the points Guy made in the final chapter of the book. He correctly observed that most of the then actions of the EEC were on the 'interstitial' parts of the education system, i.e. linking points between different educational sectors: primary-secondary education; secondary-higher education, and education-work. How different that is from current EU policies that address the hearts of the matter either by policy papers such as the one focusing on the role of the university in the knowledge society (European Commission 2003) or concrete action (even if it was through the invisible hand, see Huisman and Van der Wende 2004): actively engaging in the Bologna process, actually trying to encapsulate this process in the context of the Lisbon process. Also, the client group has changed: from a focus on children and youngsters to a focus on nation states and higher education institutions. The attention at that time on research and evidence-based policies may have disappeared somewhat. Currently one would assess the role of research on higher education differently. It would require a separate research project to investigate the role of research on higher education in European policy-making through time, but I would doubt whether today this would fit the research-development-diffusion model set out in the final chapter. However worthwhile such a model would be, present-day political priorities often distort development and/or diffusion.

Let us, finally, not forget one of the most important messages of the book. Already in 1984, Guy determined the change in policy approach in the period 1976-1984 as developing from 'Europhoria' (the pursuit of ideological goals) to pragmatism (concrete actions to solve imminent problems, particular in the area of higher education). In many respects this change can be seen as the root of a continuous stress on pragmatism in past decades (e.g. in EC funding opportunities: Socrates, framework programmes, arrangements), albeit distorted by a considerable amount of bureaucracy and infused by a - not always appreciated - reliance on the economic role of higher education.

What the future will bring? Let us close the circle and quote the master himself: 'What the long term results will be, no-one can foresee. In policy, no less than in education, it is a hazardous business to predict the future of the mature man on the basis of the perceived potential of the younger self' (Neave 1984, p. 202).

References

- Corbett, A. (2005). *Universities and the Europe of Knowledge*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- European Commission. (1991). *Memorandum on Higher Education*, COM(91) 349 final. Brussels: EC.
- European Commission. (2003). *The role of universities in the Europe of knowledge*, COM(2003) 58 final. Brussels: EC.
- Huisman, J. and van der Wende, M. (2004). 'The EU and Bologna: are supra- and international initiatives threatening domestic agendas?' *European Journal of Education*, 39, 3, 349-357.
- Neave, G. (1984). *The EEC and education*. Trentham: Trentham Books.

Higher Education and Science Policy in Finland

Osmo Kivinen

When given the opportunity to contribute to the Festschrift of such an eminent scholar as Professor Guy Neave, one is inevitably faced with the problem of finding something worth writing about within the vast field of higher education that the protagonist of this book has not already discussed thoroughly. I consider myself lucky, since despite his own cosmopolitanism, Guy Neave has not published a great deal on Nordic Higher Education policies, and even less on Finland. Being almost painfully aware of Guy Neave's extraordinary ability to combine scholarly wit with solid research, I still dare to dedicate this article to Guy Neave.

Introduction

In the aftermath of World War II, Finland transformed from an agrarian society into a post-industrial one almost overnight, and, 'good old' schooling doctrines, which had drawn on the trinity between the home, religion and the fatherland, became outdated, to exaggerate a little. In the new brave information society it is topical to emphasise the development of human capital as a key force in the knowledge economy and as ensuring the competitiveness of the European Union in the global market. In the last decades, Finnish education policy has had two ideological ends in view, namely economic growth and equality of educational opportunity. The present education policy rhetoric draws on relevant European documents, which are fitted together with recommendations from the OECD.

For a long time Finnish education policy was planned and implemented on the strength of carefully prepared reports by numerous parliamentary committees. However, in recent decades policy-making has been seen to be better off without committees of any kind, as they were selected by political parties, and, as the price of representative democracy, their work was often ridden by internal disputes and unpredictable outcomes. It is quite obvious that various working groups of civil servants and experts are much easier to steer than committees if the anticipated end in view is compatibility with the supranational education policies endorsed by the EU or the OECD.

Sweden has come to be known as the model country for education policy, and for good reason. The Nordic welfare state set good conditions for practising progressive education policies that strived for the maximal equality of

educational opportunity. Nevertheless, in recent years it has become apparent that Finland, often seen as Sweden's poor relation, has passed Sweden in the quest for becoming the policy model for education. Besides being the EU's star pupil, Finland has also been more than dutiful in absorbing the OECD's science and higher education policies.

A brief history

Founded in Turku in 1640, the Finnish university system was for a long time mainly involved in educating the offspring of the minute educated elite. In the 1950s Finland, a country of some four million inhabitants, had five universities, six institutions of higher education and one university-level art college; there were around 15,000 university students at the time. Following the growth in the student intake facilitated by newly-founded universities in the following decades and the student grant system set up in the 1970s, the higher education sector began to open its doors to an expanding crowd. Where applicable, universities, which had traditionally emphasised their academic autonomy, were turned into vehicles for promoting the functions and objectives of the Nordic welfare state. Alongside research and teaching, universities were given what was then known as a third function. Having mainly served the upper classes, the elite university expanded and was dispersed geographically to become a mass higher education system. Following the equality of opportunity ideology, the doors began to be open for a broader spectrum of the population; the present goal of the Ministry of Education is to offer two thirds of each age group a place in higher education.

At present around 50 per cent of each age group can enrol at a university or AMK institution (polytechnic), and there are altogether over 300,000 HE-students in Finland. In 2007 there were ten multidisciplinary universities, three technical universities, three schools of economics and business administration, four arts universities, one defence university and 29 AMKs in a country of now five million inhabitants. The teaching resources and number of staff at Finnish universities have remained persistently at their former level in spite of the growing number of students. In 1990 there were 14 students per one teacher in Finnish universities, but by 2003 the ratio had risen to 22:1. The prolongation of studies and high drop-out rates are problems causing much grief in the Ministry of Education, but as the system is state run one cannot but ask why the state does not intervene more strongly. The massification of university education carries the risk that the best principles of meritocracy never become realised as the practices aimed at dealing with large crowds favour quantity over quality and mediocrity over eminence.

Research training in Finnish universities has been greatly enhanced in the last decade; following the graduate school system set up the Ministry of Education and the Academy of Finland, the numbers of completed doctoral degrees has

almost tripled from 500 in the early 1990s to around 1,400 annually. Along with the volume of research training, there is a clearly perceived need to improve the conditions for the advancement of research careers, namely a post-doc system with sufficient financial resources.

In the 1970s universities underwent a degree reform, with hindsight criticised of being modelled on the DDR, the result of which was the abolishment of bachelor's degrees. Now, in the beginning of the 21st century universities are undergoing another round of degree reforms, this time instigated by the EU and known as the Bologna process, which have seen the re-introduction of bachelor's degrees. Hopefully, should the Bologna process succeed, it could help universities to overcome certain threats caused by the quality problems that follow from the massification of higher education. A Finnish peculiarity is that university tuition is free for all, even though a recent hot topic has been whether to introduce fees for international students.

A programme by the name of the national innovation system was launched in the 1990s. Investments into research and development are anticipated to result in new innovations and productivity. Even though Finland exceeds the 3-per cent benchmark share of its GDP in its R&D investments as set in the Lisbon Strategy, these investments have not resulted in the expected new companies, innovations and growth in exports, not even according to the Ministry of Education. There is, in fact, much to do to improve the impact of investment and the focus of innovation policies. It is quite probable that the innovation system strategy in itself is not quite apt. There seems to be as little sense in launching a system to produce innovations as there is in believing that ministry-led policy programmes can result in original scientific inventions.

Under the banners of the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area various means are being sought to make research careers more attractive and to recruit enough talented young people as researchers. The creation of the ERA aims at the establishment of a functional internal research market within the EU. The pooling of Member States' R&D resources is seen to endorse productiveness, innovation and competitiveness. However, so far a relatively low proportion of EU funding has been allocated to basic scientific research, which ultimately is the stepping stone for significant scientific discoveries and inventions that can be utilised by R&D companies to produce groundbreaking innovations.

Education and Equality

In their own downplayed way, Finns have been an educated nation for a long time, if literacy is used as a measure; after all, the whole nation has been *de facto*

literate for over 100 years. Folk educators, the church, schools, universities and families alike have been successful in passing on a positive attitude towards education from generation to generation. Against this historical backdrop, it is by no means surprising that Finnish children have been ranked highly in international assessments. For instance, the 2003 PISA assessment comparing educational outcomes between 41 OECD countries placed Finnish youngsters at the very top in all areas of assessment: Finns came first in reading and scientific literacy, second in mathematics and third in problem solving. When it comes to school-level differences, in Finland they are among the smallest within the OECD. If Germans are ridden by a PISA shock caused by their relatively poor performance, Finns, having suddenly been drawn into the international spotlight, are close to suffering from PISA hubris, even though one never knows what the results of the next assessment will be like.

In spite of all its praises, the Finnish school system does not function in ways that satisfy all. Some see that schools in general and upper secondary schools in particular are neglecting their duties in the teaching of the natural sciences, which results in difficulties in recruiting students with sufficient mathematical aptitude to universities; moreover, some claim that Finnish school children study too many languages, whereas others think that language studies are not receiving enough attention or that the 'wrong' languages are given too much of it. On the other hand, university studies are said to take too many years and to be ineffective and alien to real life. Some think that AMK studies are not relevant enough in terms of labour market requirements, whereas others claim that they are not academic enough. AMKs are said to suffer from academic drift, whereas universities are allegedly undergoing a 'non-academic drift', and so on.

If one is to operationalise equality of opportunity as participation in university-level studies, in comparing the offspring of academic parents with the offspring of parents with only a basic level of education by calculating an odds ratio to depict the opportunities for young people from various backgrounds to participate in university studies, we can notice that the over-representation of youngsters from academic families in the student population has decreased from the odds value of 19 in 1970 to 11 in 1990 and 8 in 2000. The gap between students from academic and non-academic families has narrowed greatly, but social background-based inequality in educational opportunity has not disappeared. Regardless of heavily expansive education policies, young people whose parents went to university are still eight times as likely to participate in university-level studies as others.

In terms of gender equality in education, Finland has for long led the world. Women are awarded over 50 per cent of all degrees and qualifications, except for the very highest ones: a slight majority of doctoral candidates are still men. On the other hand, men still succeed better than women in the job market, if success

is measured by income and access to managerial positions and educational attainment is elaborated.

Education Policy and Beyond

In Finland a whole range of regional development policies have been implemented under the guise of higher education policy. Now a country of 5 million inhabitants has 50 institutions of higher education, their affiliated colleges, university centres and so on. Education policies have also been the vehicle for the promotion of various social policies, which can be seen in the way in which equality of educational opportunity has been reached between men and women and the inequalities between various social groups have diminished. Gender equality has been achieved at all levels of education – only the ranks of professors are still male dominated. As was already stated, Finland has made great investments in technology; after all, the share of R&D is 3.5% of the GDP, which comes second only to Sweden. Education policy has been used as a means to promote regional policies, social policies and even technology policies, but from the point of view of basic research it appears that science policy and its designers are nowhere to be seen.

At present 15 per cent of Finns have a university degree, which is not that much internationally speaking. Out of the 'baby boom generation' some seven per cent graduated from university and have held high-ranking positions within the public sector ever since. Their retirement will take place with a bang, not a whimper, which means plenty of opportunities for current students; the returns to university-level education also seem to remain at a relatively high level as does the profitability of education. This, of course, requires that the state and municipalities keep on offering employment opportunities in the same way as before without any major cuts. In the welfare state era it has become the norm that two thirds of master's degree holders find employment in the public sector, most commonly with the state or municipalities. However, as inspired by the OECD, European education policies call for cuts in the public sector, with the most radical proposals suggesting that two thirds of graduates should find employment in the private instead of the public sector. Although the baby boomers' retirement opens up plenty of opportunities for young graduates, it should be remembered that one cannot proceed from graduation ceremony to under-secretary of the state overnight. Should the public sector cuts materialise in foreseen ways, the number of posts in the public sector would naturally diminish, and universities, which have educated future civil servants for centuries, would face new, strange requirements.

From time to time it has been suggested that universities and AMKs should merge; it is, however, evident that this would not solve any real problems in the

Finnish context. AMKs should remain in their own specific role as the educator of a workforce with a high level of skills and expertise. They should not be forcefully turned into quasi-universities that mimic the practices of academia; there are, in fact, several prime European examples of the negative consequences of interventions that blur the boundaries between universities and polytechnics. Cooperation between different kinds of institutions should of course be by all means encouraged. On the other hand, resulting from the massification of higher education, the growing volume of graduates causes its own problems, as it is by no means self-evident that supply and demand will meet optimally on the job market. There are also signs that the quality of education will suffer unless universities' resources also grow along with the student population.

A few Finnish universities, Helsinki in particular and also Turku, have been placed relatively high in international university rankings when compared to other European universities. In certain fields of research Finnish universities, in fact, come close to the very top. That Finnish universities will maintain their position in the ever-toughening competition between the world's 8,000 universities in the future is by no means self-evident. The recently emerged goal of pushing all Finnish university departments towards the global top is so hard to reach that a nation of five million cannot possibly have enough resources to achieve this. Instead, a more achievable aim, at least in principle, would be to ensure that in every field of research there is at least one department or research unit that reaches the global or at least European top. The assumption that with their current student intake all Finnish universities would offer high-quality teaching at both bachelor's and master's levels and provide internationally acclaimed postgraduate training is not likely to prove a feasible goal.

Yet, no matter what future universities will look like, hopefully there will be a division of labour between universities and AMKs and furthermore within the university sector, so that in certain fields some universities would only concentrate on bachelor's-level teaching, whereas master's and doctoral level courses would only be provided by a few, better suited universities. This will, of course, only work under the condition that the stakeholders agree to find fruitful forms of cooperating and dividing their tasks; after all, in the world of academia one simply cannot reap good results through force or through false promises.

References

- Kivinen, O. and Ahola, S. (1999). 'Higher education as human risk capital. reflections on changing labour markets', *Higher Education*, 38, 2, 191–208.
- Kivinen, O. and Hedman, J. (2007). 'World-wide University Rankings - A Scandinavian approach', *Scientometric*, forthcoming.

- Kivinen, O., Hedman, J. and Kaipainen, P. (2007). 'From elite university to mass higher education. Educational expansion, equality of opportunity and returns to university education', *Acta Sociologica*, 50, forthcoming.
- Kivinen, O. and Poikus, P. (2006). 'Privileges of Universitas Magistrorum et Sclarium and their justification in charters of foundation from the 13th to the 21st centuries', *Higher Education*, 52, 2, 185-213.

Creativity as a Challenge for European Universities and Foundations

Wilhelm Krull

Changes and challenges

Change and talking about change and the challenges that go with it are as old as European thinking. The Greek philosopher Heraklitos once said: 'Change is the only thing in the world which is unchanging.' And yet, when we look back at the developments of the past ten to fifteen years, we cannot help but recognize that the speed of change has increased quite dramatically. Gradually, we have come to realise that we live in an increasingly interdependent, basically science and technology driven world which requires a thorough rethinking and subsequent re-alignment of our hitherto quite stable concepts and approaches.

During the next 20 years, Europe's economic paradigm will change fundamentally. While the manufacturing base will continuously shrink, future growth and social welfare will rely increasingly on knowledge-intensive products and services. And we can also observe that more or less in the whole of Europe, we are faced with a completely new challenge of how an ageing society can actually innovate. In this respect - as well as with respect to the overall financial situation - priority-setting will become even more important in the future.

Strengths and weaknesses

When we try to position Europe's performance on a global scale, it is interesting to see that the picture is not as bleak as it is often reported in the press. As you know, the EU countries have agreed on a goal of spending 3 % of GDP on research and development by 2010. It is an ambitious goal and thus far only the Nordic countries have reached the 3 % threshold or beyond it. With respect to the total number of graduates the figure for the EU is larger than for the United States. Also the number of PhD graduates is almost twice as large as the number in the US. When we look at the numbers of scientific papers published in different parts of the world, we also see that Europe has overtaken the United States in the mid-1990s and is currently the largest producer of scientific publications. But in the meantime we have to recognise that the Asia-Pacific region is catching up quite fast. This rapid growth of scientific output in Asia-Pacific nations is in stark contrast to slow growth in Europe and stagnation in the United States. If this trend continues, the Asia-Pacific nations will be the world's biggest research community in about ten years time from now.

With respect to elite institutions, Europe is not in such a good position. For example in a ranking of the best universities published by Shanghai Xiaotong University in 2005, only two of the top twenty universities were European, while 17 were American. On the other hand, in the top five hundred of the same ranking, Germany comes second with 46 universities compared with 38 British and 168 American universities. Of course, we could discuss the basis for these rankings and the explanations for these results at length. It seems to me that we have tried to develop good universities in the various parts of Germany, but over the last three decades we have not really focused on creating high-class internationally competitive universities, and the result is evident in these rankings as well as in many other benchmarking studies. Europe has also been losing ground in the field of basic scientific breakthroughs. Fifty years ago, European scientists dominated the lists of Nobel Prize winners. Today, Nobel Prizes and similarly prestigious awards are mainly won by scientists working in the US. Apart from a few research areas such as astrophysics, space research, nuclear physics and molecular biology, Europe suffers from an almost total lack of transnational support for basic research. In particular, risky, open-ended 'frontier research' is not supported sufficiently.

The role of foundations

European foundations are a very heterogeneous pool of institutions whose defining characteristics often depend on local factors and the regulatory environment. In comparison to the US, foundations in Europe have played a less prominent role until now, but in recent years their importance has grown significantly. According to the latest comparative statistics for Italy and Germany, around 50 % of registered foundations have emerged since 1990. Unlike publicly financed funding agencies which have to provide equal opportunities for all institutions, private foundations can act much more freely, flexibly and quickly. They can place objectives above rules and regulations, and they do not have to wait for political consensus. They can really encourage different ways of thinking and enable new lines of research very early on by supporting the first experiments, taking risks, and being frontrunners in institutional reform.

Their independence contributes to the inspiring effect that private funding has on the development of higher education and research, but it also increases the willingness of citizens and enterprises to spend their money on these purposes. However, there are also limitations to the contributions of foundations. Given the billions of Euros spent by public authorities and enterprises, the impact of comparatively small-scale foundations is dependent on spill-over effects. Foundations have to rely heavily on partnerships.

The way forward: Towards a culture of creativity

When it comes to establishing a culture of creativity, there are at least seven aspects which have to be considered (but I am sure that one could come up with many more): competence, courage, communication, diversity, persistence and perseverance, innovativeness, and serendipity.

Competence

The first precondition is to train the next generation of researchers. It is essential that we create a stimulating environment, but it also takes time, trust, and considerable investment. It starts with rethinking and subsequently reconfiguring our curricula at the undergraduate level.

Elite institutions such as Harvard University as well as experts in curriculum development from other institutions are deeply concerned about the challenges ahead of us. One quotation from a recently published report may suffice to demonstrate the scope and complexity of the issues at stake: 'We face the challenge of preparing our students to lead flourishing and productive lives in a world that is dramatically different from the world in which most of us grew up. The world today is interconnected to a degree almost inconceivable thirty to forty years ago (...), it is a deeply divided, unstable, and uncertain world.' (The President and Fellows of Harvard College 2007, p. 2f).

Very much in line with these observations and recommendations on undergraduate education, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has published a series of essays on doctoral education which clearly emphasises the need to reconfigure the balance between an indispensable degree of specialisation and a just as urgently needed ability to make informed judgements about complex societal issues. As George Walker puts it: 'The Ph.D. holder should be capable of generating new knowledge and defending knowledge claims against challenges and criticism; of conserving the most important ideas and findings that are a legacy of past and current work; and of transforming knowledge that has been generated and conserved into powerful pedagogies of engagement, understanding and application.' (Golde et al. 2006.)

After having trained as a doctoral student and completed two or three years of postdoctoral studies, it is important that in the next phase the young researcher can work independently and set up his or her own group. Young researchers should pursue their own ideas much earlier and more independently than is currently the case. And, of course, universities and research institutions also have to offer tenure track options or similarly reliable career structures if they want to make sure that the best people do not stay in mainstream areas, or even move out of research.

Courage

The second precondition for establishing a culture of creativity is courage - not only on the side of the researchers, but also on the side of funding agencies. Researchers and funders must both be courageous and adventurous. Only if you are prepared to share the risks, can you encourage people to enter new fields and leave the beaten track; you cannot expect people to take high risks in their research if you do not make attractive offers to reward them for taking such risks.

Communication

Thought-provoking discussions are essential for achieving progress in research, in particular cross-disciplinary and transcultural exchanges, but also interactions with the outside world. It is an important task of group leaders, professors, and funding institutions to foster interdisciplinary and intercultural exchanges, to strengthen the interaction between research centres and universities as well as to configure adequate research structures which help to establish the right kind of networks and exchange opportunities. But it is also necessary to address the scientists' role in society, and it is essential to ensure that researchers are capable of dealing with these issues.

Diversity

Also in academia, monocultures do not provide an adequate breeding ground for exceptional thought. Meanwhile, it even seems to have become more or less common wisdom that new knowledge is usually formed at the boundaries of established fields, so the interfaces between these areas of expertise must be activated. Apart from the usual difficulties in securing career prospects for researchers embarking upon new areas, interactively productive diversity is also limited by another factor: the size of an institution. As the American researcher J. Rogers Hollingsworth has shown, there is clearly a close connection between the degree of interaction and the degree of scientific diversity within an institution, while there is also the danger that an increase in size and diversity may create a decrease in the integration, productivity and flexibility of an institution (cf. Hollingsworth 2003).

Innovativeness

The fifth precondition for success in achieving breakthroughs is to foster innovativeness. We have to make sure that we initiate unconventional ways of thinking if we want to develop research that really sets a new agenda with radically new approaches: 'transformative research' as it has recently been called. For a funding agency as well as a private foundation it is important that we can

identify those researchers who are prepared to really think in new ways, to take a risk with unconventional approaches and go off the beaten track. Transformative research seldom originates on its own. The readiness to engage in ground-breaking research has to be encouraged and facilitated. The need for transformative approaches and for new funding opportunities for young researchers have to be tackled as two sides of the same coin.

Persistence and perseverance

To take new pathways in barely known territory requires much longer timescales than the usual pattern of two to three years of project funding. It is also important to recognise that mistakes can be made, and to ensure that pursuing other directions than originally planned is possible. Patience, persistence and perseverance are important factors for successfully establishing a culture of creativity. Critical in this respect is the establishment of mutual trust. Only if the relationship between the funder and the researcher is based on trust and long-term commitment, instead of brand-making and short-term financing, can we hope to be successful in the end.

Serendipity

Definitely, the decisive moment when a radically new idea emerges, or a major scientific discovery is made cannot be planned for. But there are numerous examples in the history of university-based research which prove that it is possible to establish a particularly stimulating environment which is clearly more conducive to achieving scientific breakthroughs than others. And although there is no one-size-fits-all kind of recipe we can apply, it is certainly worthwhile to try and try again. In research as well as in research funding it sometimes helps to remind ourselves of what the French writer Albert Camus once said: 'We must conceive of Sisyphos as a lucky man.' So there is nothing left but to start rolling the heavy stone of creative research once more up the hill.

Conclusion

Many challenges can only be met if we take the long view. We must be prepared to exercise judgement, and to make long-term commitments whilst maintaining the flexibility to respond to new challenges. The most important prerequisite for a successfully performing research institution is clearly a research-friendly governance and decision-making structure.

Research institutions have reacted to the increasing complexity of knowledge creation and research with an increase in size and diversity. This often creates an

increase in bureaucracy and hierarchic structures, but does not help to foster creativity. With respect to creativity the seven preconditions outlined are essential. Furthermore, it is important to focus on small research groups of five to seven researchers, to allow for more creative spaces within large grants, e.g. collaborative research units, centres, clusters, as well as to develop new modes of funding which support medium-, to long-term research projects and fellowships of between seven and ten years. Time and space for some thorough rethinking of common wisdom is urgently needed, e.g. research professorships and extra grants for the most creative senior researchers should be expanded.

Foundations can help to tackle the challenges of change by encouraging risk-taking, stimulating new developments, redressing imbalances, creating role models for an effective change of research strategies, helping to improve organisational structures, and contributing to the creation of a more research-friendly environment. Ultimately, we should not feel overwhelmed by the complex and quite complicated issues involved. Rather we should take an optimistic view just like Albert Einstein who once said: 'Amidst all the difficulties, there is also room for opportunities.'

References

- Golde, C.M. and Walker, G.E. (2006). *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline. Carnegie Essays on the Doctorate*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hollingsworth, J.R. (2003). 'Major Discoveries and Excellence in Research Organisations'. *Science Between Evaluation and Innovation: A Conference on Peer Review*, Munich: Max Planck Forum 6.
- The President and Fellows of Harvard College (2007). *Report of the Task Force on General Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

European integration and higher education: strong convictions, weak evidence

Peter Maassen

Introduction

In 1987, just a few years after its establishment, CHEPS organised the 9th annual EAIR Forum. This Forum was not only the first formal event taking place in Drienerburght, the new conference hotel of the University of Twente, it was also historical for another reason: it marked the beginning of the relationship between CHEPS and Guy Neave, a relationship that has flourished in many ways over the twenty years since. Related to one of its then PhD projects, CHEPS invited Guy to present a keynote paper at the EAIR Forum on the regional dimension of higher education.

Strikingly, a current PhD student at the University of Oslo examining the role of universities in regional development showed me recently 'an old article' that he had found by Guy Neave on education and regional development that was extremely useful to him (Neave 1979). This illustrates two remarkable characteristics of Guy Neave's long career: first, he was often ahead of his time, addressing topics before they became a central issue on higher education policy agendas. Second, many of his publications have an almost timeless relevance.

In addition, he contributed significantly to breaking through 'Teichler's paradox' formulated as follows:

Paradoxically, many politicians and administrators in this field as well as the academic profession itself, while trying to persuade society that systematic scholarship is superior to practitioners' experience, are most sceptical about the value of scholarship and research if it comes to their practical turf, i.e. higher education (Teichler 2000, p. 4).

Through his many publications Guy Neave strengthened the conceptual foundations of the field of higher education studies and showed the sceptics that this field definitely had a right of existence and deserved its own place in the academic arena. What is all the more remarkable is that as a trained historian his output includes many other disciplinary perspectives, such as policy analysis, sociology and political science, as well as a range of themes, in addition to the regional dimension themes such as quality of higher education (introducing 'the evaluative state'); the role of stakeholders in higher education ('stakeholder

society'); lifelong learning; teacher training; diversity and differentiation; the information society and higher education; and higher education governance.

One of the main - and throughout his career most enduring - themes addressed by Guy Neave is 'European integration and higher education'. He was one of the first, if not the first scholar to discuss the effects of European integration on higher education. Here I am not referring to Guy Neave's output on national higher education systems in Europe, but to his publications concerning the effects on higher education of the emergence of a new governance layer in Europe, and the supra-national and inter-governmental efforts to integrate European higher education.

European universities in a state of flux

Guy Neave's publications in this area are highly relevant for understanding the current-day situation of European higher education institutions,¹ and especially the traditional research universities. It can be argued that they are in a state of institutional confusion and search. The traditional pact between higher education and society is deemed to be no longer valid, and there is not yet a new pact (Maassen and Olsen 2007). This is to a large extent caused by far-reaching change processes in the environments of higher education institutions, including general reforms of the governance and organisation of the public sector, and European integration efforts (Neave 2003). As a consequence, there is a growing imbalance between demands from environmental actors on higher education institutions and the institutional capacity to satisfy these demands (Clark 1998). In addition, many changes taking place in higher education institutions are a result of processes and decisions from within the private, internal life of academia.

Making sense of these changes and interpreting their effects in a valid and meaningful way is not an easy endeavour. This is caused in the first place by the growing complexity of the governance mode with respect to higher education in Europe. Governmental steering of the European university takes place through a multi-level governance system in which the decisions at the European/supra-national, national, regional and institutional level have become so intertwined that it is in practice very difficult to identify at which level and by which actor which initiative or decision was taken and that has led to which result.

Further, the theoretical and empirical basis for understanding the institutional dynamics of European higher education institutions is relatively weak. Solid scientific comparative higher education studies are rare in Europe. This can be

¹ See, for example, Neave's seminal discussion of the history of the European dimension in higher education (Neave 2001).

attributed, amongst other things, to a lack of funding, a lack of research capacity, and a dominant national focus in higher education studies. In addition, there are a number of methodological issues that affect the validity of comparative higher education studies. First, the organisation and governance structure of higher education systems in Europe are still nationally determined. This implies, for example, that in the case of the use of indicators the same indicators might have a different meaning according to the country where the higher education institutions in question are located. A second methodological issue concerns the heterogeneity of individual universities and colleges. This includes structural features of national higher education systems, e.g. public versus private, and PhD and non-PhD awarding institutions, but also differences in the disciplinary and field mix of higher education institutions. Third there are specific data problems, for example, related to the different accounting systems across European countries (Lepori et al. 2005).

In addition, there are important gaps between the problems identified and the solutions advocated in European level policy debates, and the quality of the analyses and evidence reformers have forwarded. Higher education reform policies are to a considerable extent based on belief systems and a set of commitments where key assumptions are problematic and unverified by theoretically oriented, empirical research. This often leads to a deterministic approach that can be referred to as the TINA-syndrome ('There Is No Alternative'), with weak and ambiguous data being used to legitimise strong conclusions concerning the need for urgent and radical reforms (Olsen and Maassen 2007, p. 12). While the ultimate effects of the change processes on the governance and organisation of higher education in the EU Member States are not visible in all respects yet, the emerging new institutional contours show that the institutional governance structures, funding sources, the organisation of primary processes (teaching, research and services), and the general political, economic and social conditions under which universities and colleges operate are being altered. As a consequence the traditional underlying idea of the European university as a public, democratically run, social institution is clashing with the instrumental vision of the university as a professionally managed, autonomous 'enterprise', operating in various markets as a service industry.²

Two perspectives on institutional dynamics

The effects of these change processes have been interpreted differently by different scholars. Some suggest that the changes amount to a far-reaching global

² For a discussion of the tensions between the various underlying visions of university organisation and governance, see Olsen (2007), and with respect to the USA, Gumport (2000).

transformation of the university as an institution (for example, Marginson and Considine 2000). They suggest that the changes are rapid and comprehensive. Others have emphasised that the traditional institutional dynamics of universities and colleges in handling external and internal pressures, i.e. their evolutionary change capacity, also dominate in the current period. These scholars suggest that current changes are also stepwise and incremental (Birnbaum 2000; De Boer 2003).

This apparent disagreement raises a number of questions about the nature and the outcomes of the change processes: what is the extent of change and in what direction is it going? What is actually expected of the university in European knowledge societies and what is expected of other types of higher education institutions? How do processes of European integration affect the institutional dynamics of higher education institutions within their national context? Under what conditions are markets in higher education perfect enough (few frictions, perfect knowledge, easy entry, etc.), and oriented towards academic quality rather than low prices, so that competition rewards excellent research and teaching and eliminates low quality? How does the Europeanisation of higher education compare to the changes higher education institutions in other parts of the world are undergoing?

Addressing all these questions is beyond the realm of this chapter. However, they should be kept in mind when discussing the notion of 'modernisation' of European higher education, since they are an indication of the complexity of the change processes going on in European higher education at the moment. From this perspective the analyses and insights provided by Guy Neave, for example, when he points to the 'shocking diversity' of European higher education (Neave 2003, p. 151) are extremely valuable and relevant. They stand out like beacons in a policy arena characterised by a general lack of valid problem analyses and the 'simplicity' of proposed 'one size fits all solutions' by the Commission (Commission 2006; Figel 2006) and other stakeholders who claim that they know what needs to be done: 'The challenge for Europe is clear. But so is the solution' (Schleicher 2006, p. 2).

That this claim is to a large extent built on quicksand can be illustrated by a quote from one of Guy's latest publications addressing the complexity surrounding the inclusion of the notion of social cohesion in the Bologna process:

The real question the Bologna process poses is how far in advancing both an economic and social dimension a balance may be struck between the principles of individual opportunity and those of collective advantage. From the standpoint of political philosophy, this is a very old dilemma and one which, when extended beyond Europe, is no less evident in the relationship Europe seeks to have with the rest of the world. It is also explicit in the narrower terms

of 'social cohesion' as it applies to the different modes of financing those who study abroad. As we have argued, this particular instance is but one manifestation of a broader and deeper-seated dilemma. (Neave and Maassen 2007, p. 152).

References

- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- de Boer, H. (2003). *Institutionele verandering en professionele autonomie. Een empirisch-verklarende studie naar de doorwerking van de wet 'Modernisering Universitaire Bestuursorganisatie' (MUB)*. Enschede: Center for Higher Education Policy Studies/University of Twente.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Commission (2006). *Delivering on the modernization agenda for universities: Education, research and innovation*. Brussels: COM(2006) 208 final.
- Figel, J. (2006). 'International competitiveness in higher education - A European perspective'. *Association of Heads of University Administration, Annual Conference*, Oxford.
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/figel/speeches/docs/06_04_03_Oxford_en.pdf
- Gumpert, P.J. (2000). 'Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives', *Higher Education* 39, 67-91.
- Lepori, B., Benninghoff, M., Jongbloed, B., Salerno, C. and Slipersæter, S. (2005). *Changing Pattern of Higher Education Funding: Evidence from CHINC Countries Intermediate report from the CHINC project*. Sevilla: Joint Research Centre Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS).
- Maassen, P. and Olsen, J.P. (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Marginson S. and Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Governance and Reinvention in Australian Higher Education*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Neave, G. (1979). 'Education and Regional Development: an overview of a growing controversy', *European Journal of Education*, 14, 3, 207-232.
- Neave, G. (2001). The European dimension in higher education: an excursion into the modern use of historical analogues, in Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State: The Institutional Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 13-73.
- Neave, G. (2003). 'The Bologna Declaration: Some historical dilemmas posed by reconstruction of the Community in Europe's systems of higher education', *Educational Policy*, 17, 1, 141-164.

- Neave, G. and Maassen, P. (2007). 'The Bologna Process: An Inter-Governmental Policy Process', in Maassen, P. and Olsen, J.P. (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 135-154.
- Olsen, J.P. (2007). 'The Institutional Dynamics of the European University', in Maassen, P. and Olsen, J.P. (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 25-54.
- Olsen, J.P. and Maassen, P. (2007). 'European Debates on the Knowledge Institution: The Modernization of the University at the European level', in Maassen, P. and Olsen, J.P. (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 3-22.
- Schleicher, A. (2006). *The economics of knowledge: Why education is key for Europe's success*. The Lisbon Council (Policy Brief). Brussels: The Lisbon Council asbl.
www.lisboncouncil.net/media/initiativeseducation/economics_of_knowledge.pdf
- Teichler, U. (2000). 'The Relationships between Higher Education Research and Higher Education Policy and Practice: The Researchers' Perspective', in Teichler, U. and Sadlak, J. (eds.), *Higher Education Research. Its Relationship to Policy and Practice*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 3-37.

Revisiting the definitions of 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'

Simon Marginson

Introduction

The historian knows that we work in 'an unstable organisational universe' in which both the realities confronting us and the terms in which we understand them are constantly changing (Neave 1996, p. 27). All conditions are temporary and unstable (p. 39) and every problem can be located in context. No policy norms should ever be taken completely seriously; for normalisation is an attempt to stop time and such an effort is bound to be futile. Guy Neave is impatient with the despotic concept, with notions that want to stop time or make any other kind of claim to absolute authority whether statistical, political, rhetorical or philosophical. He has an unparalleled ability to interrogate key terms when they are the height of fashion and discover new perspectives and meanings which turn the emerging consensus on its head. This is a method that never exhausts its value.

This paper uses 'Neavian' technique in that it interrogates two terms that are almost wearisomely familiar and are subject to a range of uses and misuses: 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'. The paper criticises the use of these terms as ideological weapons or as norms for shaping action, discursive strategies which unwittingly foster much confusion in the field. It suggests we step back and examine international and global phenomena more dispassionately to better guide our thoughts and actions (and passions). It suggests that we use 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation' as neutral geo-spatial descriptors, freed of the heterogeneous baggage that has become attached.

One approach to 'international' and 'global' is to use them both as more or less equivalent to each other and as catch-alls for the whole range of phenomena beyond national territory. Teichler (2004, p. 23) remarks that this kind of usage is increasingly common. Within it 'global' is more likely to refer to something worldwide in scope but that is about as precise as it gets. One example in policy is a statement by the Australian education minister, *Engaging the World through Education* (2003), subtitled 'statement on the internationalisation of Australian education and training'. A careful reading in context suggests the minister is overwhelmingly conscious of one aspect of 'international education', the revenues generated by foreign students. Nevertheless the loose rhetoric allows

him to present his policy 'engagement' across borders as being all things to all people (Nelson 2003).

However most scholars, and some policy makers, attempt to do more with the words than this. Beerkens (2004) surveys the definitions. In relation to 'globalisation' the main distinction is between 'the notion of global as a geographical concept the one hand and as a power, cultural and institutional concept on the other' (Beerkens and Lub 2002, p. 3). In a geo-spatial approach 'international' is defined as between nations, literally inter-national, without any necessary change to the national dimension itself. 'Global' is defined as pertaining to the worldwide or supra-national regional dimensions, transcending national borders and more likely to be transformative. The geo-spatial approach is widely used outside higher education studies, for example Held et al. (1999) on global transformations.

But in our field the main mode of definition is political, cultural or institutional. Some geo-spatial elements are added, but eclectically and inconsistent with the other definitional elements. Scholars carve out meanings distinctive to the politics and practices of higher education, *sui generis* to the field rather than common with other social science and social theory. One effect has been to largely cut off higher education studies from the extraordinarily fecund discussion of globalisation.

Normative 'internationalisation' vs. normative 'globalisation'

Something happens in the lexical transition from adjective [international/global], to noun, verb and adverbial forms [internationalising/globalising, internationalisation/globalisation]. The adjectives often remain neutral descriptors. The adverbs and nouns, words that describe trends and doing, become more readily associated with policy agendas and interpretations and the conversation is politicised before it begins. But as George Orwell (1968) famously argued, when the terms themselves are hostage to symbolic contestation between advocates of different policy agendas, how can language describe trends and explain the new?

Two kinds of normative move are made. In the first strategy, 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation' are imagined as different and contradictory ideal types. They are treated dualistically, as embodying opposing political and philosophical agendas and human values, and for the most part as mutually exclusive. The contrast is drawn in reductionist fashion so as to elevate 'international' and to damn 'global'. For example Jones (1998) states that

In essence, globalisation is seen as economic integration, achieved in particular through the establishment of a global marketplace marked by free trade and a minimum of regulation. In contrast, internationalisation refers to the promotion of global peace and well-being through the development and application of international structures, primarily but not solely of an intergovernmental kind... the essentially pro-democratic logic of internationalisation stands in sharp contrast to the logic of globalisation (Jones 1998, p. 143).

'Globalisation' is imperial capitalist economics and 'internationalisation' is cultural democracy and respect for national sovereignty on the basis of mutual respect. Having defined 'globalisation' as largely outside politics Jones is forced to underplay the role of national governments in the constitution of markets and the trading regime. Later he wavers somewhat, stating that arguments for the primacy of the cultural cannot be overlooked, but he steps back from Stuart Hall's argument about globalisation from below (pp. 144-145), and later he explains globally-generated culture as a function of the economy without a suggestion of causal reciprocity from culture to economy (p. 149).

Welch (2002) develops a similar dualistic argument more fully. For him 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation' are both 'two countervailing processes', abstract forces manifest in the real world, and two different frames of interpretation for analysing international education in Australia. As he notes without irony, observing international education in one or the other framework produces two different pictures (p. 434). His definition of 'internationalisation' is congruent with Jones (1998) and taken from Knight (1995) who as discussed below provides the dominant definition in the field. On 'globalisation' he remarks that this can mean world systems, global culture, global society or global capitalism and the displacement of national political controls, but the last definition has 'the most to offer' in understanding contemporary developments. The result is that a careful and informative empirical survey is bedevilled with the need to untangle 'internationalisation' from 'globalisation', the light side from the dark, and then, having divided the universe down the middle in dualistic fashion, in putting the two 'halves' back together. Paradoxes abound. Both commodification and cultural sharing are taking place. Bad economic globalisation seems to be driving good internationalisation. University leaders are 'genuinely committed to internationalisation' yet caught in the grip of fiscal forces (p. 440). Finally, to secure closure Welch resorts to an in-the-last-analysis argument. The conclusion reasserts the initial claim that 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation' are pulling in two different directions and states that in future it will be increasingly difficult to reconcile them. Globalisation will probably 'engulf' genuine internationalisation (pp. 470-471).

This kind of dualistic reading of ‘internationalisation’ and ‘globalisation’ is very common. Van der Wende (2002) notes it dominated 1990s European responses. Perhaps scholars often reason in terms of light and dark, good and evil because Judaeo-Christian traditions are buried in our mindsets. Perhaps it is simply an outcome of the historical conjuncture, whereby the 1990s revolution in communication coincided with neo-liberal policy and the WTO, and advocates of neo-liberal ‘globalisation’, and their critics, took centre stage. But to understand global convergence and partial integration simply as a superstructure of world capitalism is to occlude the manner in which global flows interweave economic and cultural activity and more extensive and intensive cross-border encounters are transforming higher education, knowledge and identity, i.e. much of what is most interesting that falls under the heading ‘globalisation’. The neo-liberal project, which is to create a global free market for goods and services, is undoubtedly significant and it needs to be placed under critical scrutiny. Jones and Welch are right to focus on the downsides of student-as-consumer and unequal cross-border exchange. But such a critique is a different project to an analysis of ‘globalisation’ in higher education (though it contributes to the latter). Neo-liberal ‘globalisation’ is an effort to exploit the larger process of globalisation. It is not the whole of that process. Moreover, the critique of the commodity form cannot be secured by pre-rigging the terms of discussion. The argument becomes circular. It fails to convert the unconverted. It blurs the realities being examined.

‘Internationalisation’ as a defensive crusade

The second strategy is that of Knight (1995, 2003, 2004, 2005). It is ‘less ideological and more pragmatic’ (Harman 2005, p. 121). Knight uses a geo-spatial notion of ‘global’, understanding it as cross-border flows and ‘worldwide in scope and substance’ (2004, p. 8). However this is joined to a normative notion of ‘internationalisation’; most recently understood as

the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education. (Knight 2003, p. 2).

‘The term *process* is deliberately used to convey that internationalisation is an on-going and continuing effort’ (Knight 2004, p. 10). It is also a commitment, a set of values and attitudes and something of a crusade. Institutions and systems are held accountable by the degree to which they have internationalised. The normative element points to the origins of the definition in North American higher education where people in universities and organisations committed to enhanced cross-border activity (e.g. American Council on Education 2007) must push forward hard against marginalisation by insular domestic cultures, especially in the USA. Nevertheless Knight’s notion of ‘internationalisation’ has

become hegemonic, quoted everywhere by governments, rectors, marketing departments, faculty, service personnel and in cross-border forums (International Association of Universities et al., 2005). It is trumpeted by both advocates of the market, for whom it is a more saleable rationale than money, and their opponents who use it as the basis of critique.

In Knight's definition 'internationalisation' is imagined as the property of higher education. It is 'situated as both a response to and an agent of globalisation' (2005, p. 4) which is seen as an inevitable external force beyond the reach of higher education (see also Altbach 2004, pp. 5-6). Internationalisation is a strategy for dealing with the external global dimension while 'respecting' institutional and national identities (e.g. Knight 1997, p. 6). In other words the 'global' dimension is mediated by the 'international' so as to defend existing identity. This helps explain the ubiquity of Knight's definition: as Van der Wende (2002, p. 15) remarks most institutions 'would prefer to stay within the realm of internationalisation'. It is reassuring, promising to maintain conventional frameworks and protecting buried beliefs about the inherent superiority of Anglo-American or European institutions. The problem is that it is incoherent - it is impossible to engage effectively with the global dimension, still less to establish intercultural educational relations based on a genuine equality, while separating oneself from the global and minimising the transformation of one's own identity - and it underestimates the transformative impact of globalisation, the degree to which global systems and flows of research and publications, people mobility and policy imitation are changing institutional mindsets anyway. It also underestimates the degree to which research universities are themselves implicated in global transformation, particularly in knowledge, culture and communications (Teichler 2004, p. 23).

The successive Knight definitions focus on revisions to an exhaustive taxonomy of cross-border practices. But something is still missing. In short, a practice-driven normative strategy that sets out to guide action rather than critique ends up like the critiques in occluding part of the reality that it sets out to understand and manage.

Conclusion

In an interview just before his death Michel Foucault suggested that in the face of new phenomena we first of all 'step back' and 'problematise them as objects of thought'. This stepping back is different from 'the set of representations that underlies a certain behaviour' (Marshall 2007, pp. 105-107) such as the ideological and normative definitions discussed here. Good advice. We need a common, objective and non-pejorative language and this takes us back to neutral geo-spatial definitions (Marginson and Van der Wende, 2006). That move brings us

out of defensive shells and pre-emptive politics and allows us to draw on the many insights developed in other disciplines.

This does not obviate the potential for sharp-minded policy critique or institutional strategies. Rather, it grounds them more effectively because they no longer depend on category manipulation and its illusionary certainties.

References

- Altbach, P. (2004). 'Globalization and the university: myths and realities in an unequal world', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10, 3-25.
- American Council on Education, ACE (2007). *Comprehensive internationalization*. http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Advance_Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=21225
- Beerkens, H.J.J.G. (2004). *Global Opportunities and Institutional Embeddedness: Higher Education Consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia*. Doctoral dissertation, CHEPS/Universiteit Twente. <http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/documenten/thesisbeerkens.pdf>.
- Beerkens, H.J.J.G. and Lub, A. (2002). 'Globalisation and higher education research'. *Presented at the University of Twente Center for Higher Education Policy Studies summer school*, Barcelona.
- Harman, G. (2005). 'Internationalization of Australian higher education: a critical review of literature and research', in Ninnes, P. and Hellstén, M. (eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education: Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*. Hong Kong: Springer, in association with the Comparative Education Research centre, The University of Hong Kong, pp. 119-140.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- International Association of Universities (IAU), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2005). *Sharing quality education across borders*. http://www.unesco.org/iau/p_statements/index.html
- Jones, P. (1998). 'Globalisation and internationalism: democratic prospects for world education', *Comparative Education*, 34, 2, 143-155.
- Knight, J. (1995). 'A national study on internationalization at Canadian universities', in de Wit, H. (ed.), *Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education; A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the USA*. Amsterdam: Association for International Education in association with the Program on Institutional Management in Higher Education of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), pp. 99-120.

- Knight, J. (1997). 'Internationalization of higher education: a conceptual framework', in Knight, J. and de Wit, H. (eds.), *Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia-Pacific Countries*. Utrecht: European Association for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2003). 'Updating the definition of internationalization', *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2004). 'Internationalization remodelled: definition, approaches, and rationales', *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 1, 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2005). *Borderless, Offshore, Transnational and Cross-border Education: Definition and Data Dilemmas*. London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Marginson, S. and van der Wende, M. (2006). 'Higher Education and Globalisation'. *Draft report prepared for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/20/4/37552729.pdf>
- Marshall, J. (2007). 'Philosophy, polemics, education', *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, 26, 97-109.
- Neave, G. (1996). 'Homogenization, integration and convergence: the Cheshire Cats of higher education analysis', in Meek, V., Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen O. and Rinne, R. (eds.), *The Mockers and the Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 26-41.
- Nelson, B. (2003). *Engaging the World through Education. Ministerial Statement on the Internationalisation of Australian Education and Training*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Orwell, G. (1968). 'The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell' 4 Volumes, in Orwell, S. and Angus I. (eds.), London: Secker & Warburg
- Teichler, U. (2004). 'The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education', *Higher Education*, 48, 5-26.
- Welch, A. (2002). 'Going global: Internationalizing Australian universities in a time of global crisis', *Comparative Education Review*, 46, 4, 433-471.
- van der Wende, M. (2002). 'Higher education globally: towards new frameworks for research and policy', in *the CHEPS Inaugurals*. Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente, pp. 29-69.

‘But where is the beef?’¹: The Confrontation between *le Pays Politique* and *le Pays Réel* in the Implementation of the Bologna Process in Italy

Roberto Moscati

Speeding up the matter

Italy is the first country in which the Bologna process has been introduced by law. The fact that there is an obvious coincidence between the city in question its the nation-state is not the real explanation for this speed. Instead, the Bologna declaration (and the earlier Sorbonne declaration) came about when the Italian government had already started to feel the need for a reform of the higher education system. In fact, a ministerial commission (established by the Minister of University, Luigi Berlinguer²) was working towards that purpose.

The history of the Italian system of education (and of higher education) has been characterised by long periods of debate on the need for transformation followed by sudden decisions to introduce a reform. The rhythm has been always dictated by the political milieu (political parties and parliament). The world of education (schools and universities) has been involved only marginally through ‘experts’ playing a role in the engineering process of the new system. The opinion of teachers, professors and administrators has never been asked to verify their attitude toward the proposed change. Political time has been always in control of Academic time.

As far as the tertiary level of education is concerned, Italian universities faced a reform in 1980 (after ten years of political and parliamentary debate), another in 1986-90 (introduced by the late minister Antonio Ruberti), followed by another - parallel to the Bologna declaration - in 1998-99 under minister Luigi Berlinguer. This last law was passed by parliament under the umbrella of a general fiscal law without any real debate, and presented to the academic world at a unique

¹ A challenge by Walter F. Mondale, candidate for the Democratic Party during the US election campaign in 1984 to his opponent (Ronald Reagan, who eventually won the election!) to say something concrete. This also has some gastronomic references that Prof. Neave will certainly understand.

² Not by chance one of the four ministers who signed the Sorbonne declaration.

conference at the University of Rome II 'Tor Vergata'. The reform was intended to be implemented³ in a matter of a few months (from Spring to Autumn).

From the pays politique to the pays réel

The process of implementation of the reform (which has been called '3+2' and automatically identified with the Bologna process) underwent different stages. A debate has developed inside academia, although not as articulated as one could have envisaged. Discussions and complaints arose inside Faculty and Departments but not so strong as to produce examples of strong resistance.⁴ The reasons were surprising and suggested the need to investigate the entire process of reform implementation at the level of the '*pays réel*', namely at the level of institutions and of scientific disciplines. For this purpose a monitoring project was proposed to the ministry of the university under a special programme for the internationalisation of the Italian university.⁵ Unexpectedly, the project was approved and undertaken between 2003 and 2006. Within the project a survey using the CATI technique was conducted among the academic staff members of the six participating Italian universities.⁶ Four outcomes of the survey are noteworthy:

- First of all, some of the basic aims of the reform appeared not to be completely understood by the academic staff. The development of the curricula - according to the reform - was supposed to be correlated with their final objectives. Objectives were to be defined in advance, taking into account one or more ideal-typical goals somehow related to the world of professions: e.g. the employability of the degree-holders. The 'architects' of the new curricula were not prepared at all to undertake this task (which required a knowledge of the professions and of the labour market which most of them didn't have). Thus, curricula had a tendency to be developed as usual, according to internal logic and related to the competencies of the academic staff.

³ Basically reducing the length of the first level of courses from 4 or 5 to 3 years, introducing a second tier of two years, and adapting the number and content of courses to the new credit system.

⁴ Only one academic tribe (in Becher's words): the faculties of law, reacted very strongly maintaining their need to have a longer first tier and special second tier schools for training lawyers and judges. Eventually they were granted permission to have a 4+1 structure.

⁵ Six Italian universities contributed to the Project, named UNIMON. In addition six European universities agreed to join the Project and to be represented by higher education specialists.

⁶ Around 50% of the 5,000 academic staff members of the six universities participated in the survey, while a small sample of the technical and administrative staff of the same universities was interviewed.

- The lack of knowledge about the employability of university graduates emerged clearly when the interviewees were asked whether first level degrees could provide both the basis for progression to the second tier and the basic competences for professional activity.⁷ A majority in the hard science disciplines answered positively, while a negative attitude prevailed among the humanities. But the main collective fear was related to the expected decline of the scientific quality of curricula if they were to focus on early professionalisation. All these answers reveal a diffuse lack of knowledge about the world of the economy. Many members of academia are aware that this separation is negative and cannot be perpetuated (again the division between the hard and soft sciences is visible here), but a substantial majority simply don't know how this could be resolved without a decline in the quality of teaching and research.
- A majority of the academic staff is aware of the need for a profound revision of curricula related to the new articulation of courses, the module structure and the credit system. But, almost all admit that this issue simply has not been addressed yet.
- Regarding the evaluation of the impact of the reform on its three main goals, the most positive evaluation refers to the reduction of drop-out rates, while there was an unexpected negative impact on the international mobility of students because of the reduction of the length of first level courses which seems to have discouraged students from going abroad, fearing not being able to complete their programme on time. In fact, this pressure for finishing on time (which was one of the main aims of the reform) has been contradicted by the increasing number of modules, courses and related exams which characterise the architecture of the new programmes which represent a typical 'effet pervers' of the reform not taken into consideration.
- In the overall evaluation of the reform the majority of those interviewed is negative as far as its 'philosophical' approach is concerned, while slightly positive when it comes to the way the reform has been implemented in their own institution. Here, as in several other circumstances, the positive evaluation of the reform comes more from those in a position of responsibility at the academic level: deans, department heads, coordinators of courses of study, not to mention rectors whose association (CRUI) has supported the reform since the beginning. This result may be interpreted as an example both of the lack of initial involvement of the academic estate in the reform, which might have produced rejection as a matter of principle and/or as a fear of an unknown change process. But it also might confirm a top down process of reform easily accepted by leaders and those gaining extra power due to the responsibility of implementing the reform in their own institution (Veiga and Amaral 2006).

⁷ This was the declared double aim of first level courses as officially indicated in the law of reform.

Tout va bien, Madame la Marquise?

The survey confirmed that to evaluate the success of the Bologna process in one European country it is crucial to define the level of analysis. How is consensus in *le pays politique* (the national governments) reflected in *le pays réel* (institutions and their academic, administrative and student estates) (Neave 2002b). In Italy - as in other countries - the government had the inclination towards an optimistic evaluation of the results (especially at international conferences). The analysis at institution level provided quite another perspective vis-à-vis the '*tout va bien, madame la marquise*' self-presentation, with the peculiarity of being based on the direct involvement of actors operating in the field in the implementation of the reform.

The first 'discovery' coming from this kind of inquiry is a confirmation of the (negative) impact of political time on academic time (Neave 2005). The government wanted to have the reform law passed without debate and immediately implemented within the system of higher education. The reasons for this were less anti-democratic than they may appear since parliament and political parties had for decades for ideological and political reasons prevented the realisation of all kind of reforms. Both minister Ruberti in the '80s and minister Berlinguer in the '90s (both of them being members of the academic estate) tried to overcome the impasse, but failed to mobilise sufficient involvement of academia. The Bologna process with its schedule, and an awareness of having failed to introduce reforms in the higher education system when the wave of social demand had first started to exert its impact, contributed to increase the pressure. It may be surprising given all these reservations that the majority of the academic staff - not only those in positions of responsibility - agreed to implement the reform, at least from the 'engineering' point of view. What has been resisted has to do with curricula content and teaching methods. Certainly this is something more difficult to adapt without a convincing set of reasons for doing so and opportunities to reflect on possible alternatives. This is a crucial issue since it affects the core values and tasks of the academic profession which easily leads to a redefinition of the university's role in our society. In this regard, the question of 'how far should the Bologna Process extend beyond the 'public life' of higher education and infiltrate to its 'private life'' (Neave and Maassen 2006, p. 7) seem unavoidable. The impression of the present writer is that no matter whether it is the Bologna process or any individual Prince who is making such a request, it remains the academic estate that has to find its own way to provide a positive contribution to a society in which 'the watchword of continuity (has been) replaced by the imperative of change' (Neave 2002a, p. 19). Otherwise, that way will be imposed from the outside (as in the case in point), and it is hard to say who will benefit from the situation.

- The survey also confirmed the different impact the Bologna Process has had on individual institutions. While members of the same scientific discipline located in different universities reacted most of the time (but not always) in a similar way to the same issues, a sort of general attitude within a specific university influenced the answers of its academic staff members. Here geographic position seems to play a role from the economic point of view, since the two peripheral institutions (the Universities of Sassari and Urbino) in the survey had an overall pessimistic attitude vis-à-vis the Bologna Process for reasons in part related to the lack of financial support provided by the government to implement the reform. In this respect, it is worth remembering that financial support to implement what would become the Bologna process was explicitly mentioned in the French ministerial commission led by Jacques Attali and utilised as a background document for the Sorbonne Declaration (Attali 1998).
- Finally, the traditional isolation of the university from the outside world, and its dependence on the central State has made stakeholders rather marginal in the Italian scenario. All members of academia interviewed are aware of and somewhat worried by the weakness of external relationships and the need for a diversification of sources of financial support (and related problems). In practical terms, only a limited number of institutions (such as the few private universities like 'Bocconi' and the *Politecnici* of Milan and Turin) and a few faculties of hard applied sciences in central universities have started policies implying a relevant role for external (and to a less extent internal) stakeholders.

This aspect may be related to the interpretation of the role of the university prevailing among the academic estate (and in the political milieu as well). Belonging to the continental European 'Regulated Area' the Italian system of higher education traditionally interpreted its role as the provider of public servants and of the elite (the ruling class) of the country (Neave 2002a, p. 18, Neave 2001). The impact of mass social demand and the consequent need for a revision of those basic assumptions has been resisted for as long as possible and is gaining ground inside the academic estate at different speeds according to the degree of exposure to a changing society which varies across different scientific disciplines and individual institutions. The Bologna process, in this respect, may be considered to be playing a positive role as long as it puts some pressure on a system which needs to be rejuvenated and shaken up before facing the real problems of competition and social cohesion. The added problem is perhaps that once again there is no two-stage strategy available to be adopted, and all the challenges come at the same time. But that's Europe at the moment, isn't it?

References

- Attali, J. (1998). *Pour un modèle européen d'enseignement supérieur*. Paris: Stock.
- Neave, G. (2001). 'The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Excursion into the Modern Use of Historical Analogues', in Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 13-74.
- Neave, G. (2002a). *On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seers: Changing visions of the University*. Enschede: University of Twente.
- Neave, G. (2002b). 'Anything Goes: Or, How the accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3, 181-197.
- Neave, G. (2005). 'Euro-Philiacs, Euro-Sceptics and Europhobics: Higher Education Policy, Values and Institutional Research', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 2, 113-129.
- Neave, G. and Maassen, P. (2006). 'The Bologna Process: From cultural identity to social cohesion'. *Presented at the CIPES Duoro6 Seminar*, Pinhão.
- Veiga, A. and Amaral, A. (2006). 'The Open Method of Coordination and the Implementation of the Bologna Process', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 4, 283-295.

Internationalisation Strategies of German Universities

Ulrich Teichler

No Clear Dividing Lines

No matter whether we look at the policies of governments and umbrella organisations on the level of the whole country or the individual Länder in Germany or at the strategies of higher education institutions (HEIs), we do not note any clear dividing lines between internationalisation, globalisation and Europeanisation, but rather a gradually distinct emphasis:

- ‘Internationalisation’ is generally used to refer to a multitude of similar conditions and of border-crossing activities based on the assumption that borders and countries still play a substantial role in shaping higher education.
- ‘Globalisation’ more strongly underscores world-wide interrelationships in higher education thereby emphasising a gradual blurring of the roles of borders and nations as well as the role of market forces in the steering of higher education.
- With Europeanisation one refers to similar aspects as in internationalisation and globalisation, but in the framework of neighbouring countries and policies to make these neighbouring higher education systems more similar.

Therefore, we have to observe the whole bundle of strategies and activities pursued under these three labels.

Past and Recent Major Debates and Policies

As the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) has pointed out, more than half of the internationally mobile students all over the world before World War I went to German universities. This reflected their academic quality and reputation, but also the international scope and openness of the German university system. The universities were unable to sustain this position once the Nazi regime cut the size of higher education and severed international ties.

In the period from the 1960s to the 1980s, the Federal Republic of Germany had the second or third highest rate of foreign students, the first or second highest rate of students studying abroad, and the highest public expenditure on staff and student exchange among large economically advanced countries. However,

Germany did not put a strong emphasis on higher education in its development aid. Since the 1980s, we can observe a gradual change in climate and policies (Hahn and Teichler 2005).

- a. *Global competition in science and technology*: Concern spread that Germany might lag behind the U.S., Japan and a few very successful European countries as far as investment in research, research quality and the impact of research on economic development are concerned. The resultant campaigns and measures had some impact: for example, the proportion of publications in international reviewed journals written by German authors clearly rose.
- b. *Temporary student mobility in Europe*: With the inauguration of ERASMUS in 1987, student mobility was no longer seen as an exception but as a normal option; most universities enlarged international offices and made international activities a strategic priority area. Intra-European cross-border mobility and cooperation grew rapidly. In 2003, almost 11% of students in Germany were foreigners, of which more than two-thirds were citizens of other European countries, while about 4% of German students studied abroad, 80% in Europe (Kelo et al. 2006). The data do not provide a full picture; among other factors, many countries do not include temporarily mobile students in their statistics. In a survey undertaken in 2003, 15% of the students at German higher education institutions reported shortly before graduation that they had studied for a while abroad, and another 15% had undertaken other study-related activities abroad (DAAD 2005b) - more than twice as many as twelve years earlier. This development has been supported by the fact that students receiving a need-based scholarship can now use this for a year in another country.
- c. *Fitness for international challenges through new modes of governance*: The German higher education system moved during the 1990s towards similar changes of governmental steering, university management and the extension of evaluation activities as some other European countries had done earlier. The view spread among politicians, experts and university leaders that these changes would lead to higher quality, relevance and efficiency in higher education and would make German universities 'fit' to be successful international actors (cf. Stifterverband 1997).
- d. *Measures to make German higher education more attractive and export-minded*: In 1996, the German national government, the DAAD and the Higher Education Rectors' Conference (HRK) started a campaign for shifting the emphasis of the international strategies and activities of German HEIs: they should attract larger numbers of high quality foreign students and scholars. Moreover, financial incentives were provided for the 'export' of German study programmes or for joint and branch institutions or programmes in other parts of the world. Also on the agenda were efforts to increase the number of foreign doctoral students in Germany (currently about 10% of doctor degrees are awarded to foreigners), to reduce 'brain drain' to the U.S., to increase

- both the number of study programmes taught in English and provisions for German language learning, and to ‘foster a service culture’ at German universities (DAAD 2004). As a consequence of these measures, the proportion of foreign students in Germany is expected to rise to 20% by 2010.
- e. *Establishing a European Higher Education and Research Area:* Between 1998 and 2000, governments of various European countries agreed to take joint action for the purposes of changing higher education and research similarly in European countries, strengthening intra-European cooperation and mobility, and raising the world-wide attractiveness of European higher education and research in order to increase the quality and relevance of HE and research in Europe compared to other parts of the world. The Sorbonne Declaration in 1998 and the Bologna Declaration in 1999 of European ministers were most salient for study programmes and the Lisbon Declaration in 2000 of the European Council for research funding. Germany lags behind the European average in the process of transforming the structure of study programmes and degrees. In 2005, only about one quarter of the existing study programmes were new and only about 10% of students were enrolled in the new programmes (Alesi et al. 2005).
 - f. *Stratification:* Arguments in favour of strengthening top universities have gained momentum in Germany in recent years given the popularity of ranking lists of top world universities which reinforce the philosophy that only elite institutions can be ‘global players’ in the growing world wide competition. Currently, the institutional hierarchy in Germany is very flat: for example in 2005, the fifth decile of universities raised more than 60% of the external research income per academic of the top ten universities (DFG 2003; Teichler 2005). Competition was seen to take place between individual scholars, and the system facilitated student mobility within Germany. Eventually in 2005, German government agencies and other higher education policy actors agreed that somewhat more than one percent of total public higher education expenditure should be reserved over a period of five years for 30 excellent research ‘clusters’ between various universities, 10 top universities and a few dozen graduate schools in order to foster a sector of ‘excellence’.

Strategies of Individual Universities

In a comparative study on the impact of internationalisation and globalisation, five cases of German HEIs were analysed. Some institutions seemed to understand internationalisation to be a top priority in their institutional development strategies, but also those not sharing such a strong emphasis had similar growth rates of international activities (Hahn 2005).

- a. *Cooperation contracts*: The number of formalised cooperation agreements of German HEIs with universities in other countries has increased from about 1,400 in 1989 to more than 15,000 in 2003. As student and staff mobility over this period at most tripled, these figures indicate a growing inclination to sign contracts. As most contracts were traditionally initiated by individual scholars and departments and were widely spread, the number of institutional contracts remained small before the European Commission required universities to sign cooperation contracts with all universities to which mobile students go.
- b. *'National' policies with international and global reasoning*: All universities in Germany have moved towards looser ties of control between government and universities, stronger management and more evaluation activities. There are no signs, however, that a choice of the most radical solutions in these respects was linked to above-average interest in internationalisation and globalisation strategies. HEIs that are internationally very active seem to be quicker on average in implementing the new bachelor and master programmes.
- c. *Mobility*: The rate of foreign students at individual German universities ranges in most cases between 5% and 15%, with academically highly-reputed universities tending to have slightly above-average rates. Most prestigious research fellowships of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation concentrate on highly reputed universities. In contrast, doctoral and short-term fellowships awarded by the DAAD are awarded to universities in almost all reputation ranks.
- d. *Top-down policies*: Most financial resources for international cooperation and mobility continue to be channelled in Germany through national support agencies. Moreover, funding for international marketing is provided for networks of German universities rather than for individual universities. Thus, the funding system contributes to highly similar internationalisation strategies in all German universities.
- e. *International study programmes*: A survey showed that 2% of the new bachelor programmes and 21% of the master programmes established until 2003 had English as the language of instruction for the whole programme (Schwarz-Hahn and Rehburg 2004). The DAAD (2005a) published in 2005 a list of about 400 'international degree programmes in Germany' which are widely spread across institutions and disciplines.
- f. *Nationality and mobility of academic staff*: Obviously, the number of foreign scholars in Germany has increased in the last two decades, but we do not observe any major strategies in individual HEIs to increase their foreign staff other than announcing their vacancies in international journals and magazines. Labour force statistics show that the proportion of foreign researchers among all researchers employed in higher education, public research institutes and private R&D units in Germany has increased from 5.1% in 2000 to 6.4% in 2005. The figures are slightly higher than the EU

average (5.0% and 5.3%), but smaller than those for foreigners among the total labour force and the total population in Germany (almost 10%).

- g. *Trans-national education*: The interest of the German HEIs in establishing programmes or branch campuses abroad is not very strong. In 2000, the DAAD provided governmental funds for an export programme called 'Future Initiative for Higher Education'. 29 activities were sponsored until 2004, e.g. summer schools, off-shore campuses or centres, study modules and entire study programmes offered primarily in Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America (cf. DAAD and HRK 2005). In 2004, the DAAD called for the establishment of about 25 trans-national programmes by 2010 with a participation of at least 15,000 students. These are still moderate targets.

Concluding Observations

The terms globalisation, internationalisation and Europeanisation seem to have similar popularity across a large number of European countries, and a magnitude of related activities are undertaken everywhere. In Germany, very strong emphasis is placed on enlarging and improving cross border mobility and cooperation. As regards the establishment of convergent European structures of study programmes and degrees, the speed of implementation resembles the European average. The change of the steering and management system as well as activities to increase the stratification of the higher education system - both advocated in the name of globalisation - lags behind the European average. Involvement in 'trans-national education' is increasing, but remains small when compared to the leading countries involved. In sum, internationalisation is a strong force in debates and actions in German higher education, but the priorities and posteriorities are specific. This confirms the findings of a comparative study (Huisman and van der Wende 2004, 2005) that similar challenges are experienced across Europe but the policies vary strikingly across European countries. Even with respect to the international dimensions of higher education, the leeway for specific national policies and strategies remains impressively high.

References

- Alesi, B., Bürger, S., Kehm, B.M., and Teichler, U. (2005). *Bachelor and Master Courses in Selected Countries Compared with Germany*. Bonn: Federal Ministry of Education and Research.
- DAAD (2004). *Auf dem Weg zur internationalen Hochschule. Drittes Aktionsprogramm des DAAD 2004-2010*. Bonn: Mimeo.
- DAAD (2005a). *International Degree Programme in Germany 2005/2006*. Bonn: DAAD.
- DAAD (2005b). *Wissenschaft weltoffen*. Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann.

- DAAD and HRK (2005). *Cross-Border Education and Development Co-operation*. Bonn: DAAD (CD-ROM).
- DFG (2003). *Förder-Ranking 2003: Institutionen - Regionen - Netzwerke*. Bonn: DFG.
- Hahn, K. (2005). 'German universities in the process of globalisation, Europeanisation and internationalisation', in Huisman, J. and van der Wende, M. (eds.), *On Cooperation and Competition II*. Bonn: Lemmens, pp. 19-38.
- Hahn, K. and Teichler, U. (2005). 'Internationalisation mainstreaming in German higher education', in Arimoto, A., Huang, F. and Yokoyama, K. (eds.), *Globalisation and Higher Education*. Hiroshima: RIHE, Hiroshima University, pp. 39-66.
- Huisman, J. and van der Wende, M. (2004). *On Cooperation and Competition I*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Huisman, J. and van der Wende, M. (2005). *On Cooperation and Competition II*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Kelo, M., Teichler, U. and Wächter, B. (2006). *EURODATA: Student Mobility in European Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Schwarz-Hahn, S. and Rehburg, M. (2004). *Bachelor and Master in Deutschland - Empirische Befunde zur Studienstrukturreform*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft (ed.) (1997). *Hochschulstandort Deutschland: Sind die deutschen international wettbewerbsfähig?* Essen.
- Teichler, Ulrich (2005). *Hochschulsysteme und Hochschulpolitik*. Münster: Waxmann.

Corrosion of the Character and European Politics of Higher Learning

Voldemar Tomusk

Wer, wenn ich schrie, hörte mich denn aus der Engel Ordnungen?
Rainer Maria Rilke (2003) *Duineser Elegien*.

We are living, as Guy Neave has suggested on several occasions, in interesting times; perhaps the most interesting in the history of the European University. Some may, though, argue that much of what we experience today is not entirely new, that according to pre-internet era records called 'books', which some older people still remember, changes similar to those of our much lamented about days have also been seen before. There is certainly a benefit rising from the knowledge of history and the Great El Neave has taught us a lesson or two about that over the years. Reformation, the fall of the Holy Roman Empire and the rise of the European nation-state once radically changed the mission of the University, or so we think. What the globalisation commentators in higher education particularly tend to misjudge in their search for a radical discontinuity is the fact that despite the divided political map of the continent and the mission of the universities being driven by the legitimisation and reproduction needs of the nation states functioning within more or less arbitrary borders (unless they are, of course, islands), there has always been a universalistic ambition present in the university mission, based on the trust in the universality of knowledge, revealed or researched. As a matter of fact, the only reason why the university can assume the role of legitimising Power is its own assumed universality.

Once again, the changes we experience in our days raise the question on the balance between the universal and the particular in higher education and the point beyond which integrity of the academic souls would be dissolved under the corrosive pressures of power and money. If anything, it is the universal that has the potential of carrying us through also this time, and not the relativists' claims suggesting that the civilising mission of the university constitutes but another act of conspiracy by white heterosexual males. As Neave has conveyed to this author in private, it is the post-modern writing that constitutes the contemporary equivalent of the institutions such as the 18th century debtor's prison in the Cambridge Castle where academics unable to pay their debts were confined until a merciful benefactor redeemed them. Redemption by a generous benefactor was a hope one harboured back then, but life is more difficult now - once labelled as 'a truly progressive' no easy exit exists from the consuming fire of keynote and dinner speeches. Perhaps, as men of mind and integrity in similar situations over

the past nine centuries, Guy Neave and his brothers in pen wonder whether ours may be the time when the 'aristocracy of trained intellect' (Searl 1975) is finally to give in to the temptations of the 'Queen's shilling' (Neave 2004) or the position of an authorised or not so much Bologna promoter pose.

It is hard to count the number of occasions on which borders in Europe have been re-drawn over the past century. Since the European Common Market coming into completion in 1992, a new process - that of eliminating the borders has been set in progress. Various policies adopted by the European Commission are to assure that borders disappear with as little trace as possible. Several of such policies follow the principle of subsidiarity that Neave (2007) traces back to St. Thomas Aquinas and his *Summa Theologica*. The principle - that in simple language means that every decision is to be taken at the lowest effective level - carries an obvious goal of devolving certain powers to levels lower than the nation state while certain decisions are to be handed over to regions, including cross-border regions. And there are functions that for the sake of Europe as a totality can be effectively exercised only at the supranational level. In the latter case the lowest effective level actually means the highest possible. Over the past half a century such policy areas have been constantly expanding from those related to the coal mining and steel industry all the way to common agricultural policy that still consumes the largest part of the Union's budget, monetary policy, foreign policy and humble suggestions for a common defence policy. Controversies surrounding the issues related to modest but persistent attempts at eroding the perceived source of evil in Europe over the past three and a half centuries - the nation state, by disconnecting its brain from power and connecting the university to Europe as a political entity and to the market as a universal mechanism of regulation. This is something that has attracted Guy Neave's attention in the early years of the 21st century. It is too simplistic to see recent developments in Europe and its higher education as signs of globalisation only or even predominantly. Only a part of this has to do with that concept which, as Wallerstein (2004) has suggested, can be better seen as a part of the academic entrepreneurs' marketing strategy than a useful analytical device:

Academic buzz words are fickle and usually last but a decade or two. Development was suddenly out. Globalisation arrived in its wake. University professors, foundation executives, book publishers, and op-ed columnists all saw the light. (Wallerstein 2004).

An important element of changes in the relationship between the university, the nation state and the market relate to the political goal of re-configuring Europe. A significant limitation on the spectrum of possible policies rises, however, from the fact that Europe does not have the cash to move its higher learning in any direction it might just wish. Therefore, Europe despite its misgivings about capitalism and the longing for the *social*, is being forced by economic realities to

find an agreement with the market and achieve two goals at the same time - to switch the university from the nation-states to Federal Europe and to transform it from an item of spending to a source of revenue. That leads one to an 'Inspiring Number of Contradictions' (Neave 2002) that follow European integration in higher education. But it also tests the limits of the intellectual integrity of at least some of the European academics.

Kateb suggests 'There must be continuity between private and political morality if politics is not to be as virulent as many of its practitioners want it to be' (2006, p. 170). It seems to be the case in European higher education that the immorality of politics practiced on the level European extends over the ranks of activist-minded academics mobilised for the perceived higher political goal and ready to present the *pays politique* for the *pays real* (Neave 2002), that is - present the politically desirable as a description of institutional reality. Although in an unfaithful age as ours talking about sin is out of the question, corrosion of the character may still be an issue:

The world has long observed that small acts of immorality, if repeated, will destroy character. It is equally manifest, though, never said, that uttering nonsense and half-truth without cease ends by destroying Intellect (Barzun 2002, p. 50).

Arguing that corruption is the everyday reality of European politics may appear as somewhat far-fetched and requires further substantiation. It is, however, not difficult to demonstrate that uttering half-truth without cease constitutes one of the main ways by which the European Federal state is being created - Jean Monnet has explained it in his memoirs (e.g. Tomusk 2004). It was obvious from the beginning that the grand project of creating the United States of Europe, as the earlier generations of European federalists like Count Goudenhove Kalergi had proposed since the end of World War I, would never be accepted by the European public - a truth that referenda over the European Constitution fully confirm. The only way forward was therefore to proceed with the grand plan without telling the European public that there was a grand plan, while allowing those working towards that aim to do so while coming together to work on particular limited issues. Lord Patten of Barnes, the Chancellor of Oxford University and a former European Commissioner for foreign relations has for example explained to this author his understanding of the word *Federal* in the current agenda of building Europe 'As for me Europe is obviously Federal, but you cannot tell it in Great Britain'.¹ Such are the half-truths Neave too seems to be in pains with. However, as half-truths have been accepted as a normal part of the political discourse and also in some areas of the academic discourse, one no

¹ This conversation took place during a 21st Century Trust Fellowship Seminar 'Where is Europe Headed?' Commerzbank Tower, Frankfurt am Main, 24 March 2005.

longer knows how much the individuals who once used to signify truth by their very being can be trusted. And no longer one knows whether bridges have been built according to the calculations of mechanics of politics, as Hesse suggested, and if the latter - what happened in Chernobyl on April 26th 1986 may easily take place in any other country where the academic community finds all too easily an agreement with comrades like Michel Foucault, Karl Marx and Vladimir Ulyanov that all knowledge is necessarily ideological and having secured the classics' support find no fault in serving their own ideologies or those of their paymasters, which in the final stage will be reduced to mere *Interest*, ignoring entirely anything that may deserve to be called a truth:

Man weiß or ahnt: wenn das Denken nicht rein und wach und die Verehrung des Geistes nicht mehr gültig ist, dann gehen bald auch die Schiffe und Automobile nicht mehr richtig, dann wackelt für den Rechenschieber des Ingenieurs wie für die Mathematik der Bank und Börse alle Gültigkeit und Autorität, dann kommt das Chaos. (Hesse 1997, p. 38) .

That leads us to the final issue to be addressed in this short letter in honour of an old friend and teacher, a fellow *Morgenlandfahrer*, as Hesse would have said. The issue is about the connections between economy, politics and knowledge. Neave has suggested that higher education is moving away from the realm of the political to become a major factor in the economy:

This is the transition of higher education from being considered as a sub-set of the political system—the selection of, formation and enculturation of elites—to its redefinition as a sub-set of the economic system—the training of the mass for the private sector labour market (Neave 2004, p. 8).

This is for certain a part of the picture, but not the entire picture. It is also the case that the borders between the three domains are being blurred, particularly in our days in Europe. The situation is surprisingly similar to that experienced in Hungary under the rule of the communists who called themselves socialists and who, understanding the need for reforms but not ready to give up the power, decided that the Party Central Committee should be giving 'market signals' to guide the economy. In Europe too politics offers itself for knowledge if not the truth, while the economies suffer and the Lisbon goals are becoming too embarrassing even to mention, because politics can be sold as knowledge only in narrow political circles, far too limited to give a boost to the 'knowledge economy'. There are not too many actors on the marketplace ready to pay for knowledge but to walk away with political declarations. To the extent such customers exist, interestingly enough, many of them are located in one medium-sized town in Belgium.

Here our hope is that Guy Neave will continue for at least another half a century telling younger colleagues, but not only them, that learning has a purpose beyond what can be metaphorically described as Baron von Münchhausen' lifting exercises or even that of securing economic growth, that integrity is possible and that truth makes sense. Or, to follow Nelson Goodman, we need him to set limits on those who follow 'the perverse maxim that whatever you can get away with is right' (Goodman 1983, p. 32).

References

- Hesse, H. (1997). *Das Glasperlenspiel*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Barzun, J. (2002). *The House of Intellect*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Goodman, N. (1983). *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast*. Fourth Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Kateb, G. (2006). *Patriotism and Other Mistakes*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Neave, G. (2002). 'Anything Goes: Or, How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 3, 181-197.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'The Evaluative State and Bologna: Old Wine in New Bottles or Simply the Ancient Practice of 'Coupage?'. *Presented to the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Knowledge and Research. First Research Seminar of the Europe and North American Region 'Managerialism and Evaluation'*, Paris.
- Neave, G. (2007). 'The Long Quest for Legitimacy: An Extended Gaze from Europe's Western Parts' in Slantcheva, S. and Levy, D.C. (eds.), *Private Higher Education in Post-Communist Europe: In Search of Legitimacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 27-54.
- Rilke, R.M. (2003). *Prosa und Lyrik*. Düsseldorf: Albatros Verlag.
- Searl, J.R. (1975). 'Two Concepts of Academic Freedom', in Pincoffs, E.L. (ed.), *The Concept of Academic Freedom*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, pp. 86-86.
- Tomusk, V. (2004). 'Three Bolognas and a Pizza Pie: Notes on Institutionalization of the European Higher Education System', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 14, 1, 75-95.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). 'After Developmentalism and Globalization, What?'. *Keynote address at conference 'Development Challenges for the 21st Century'*, Cornell University.

Universities and the European Dimension

Frans van Vught

The higher education policy-domain has come only slowly on to the European Union's agenda. Although some initiatives in this domain were developed before the 1970s, it is very clear that until the 1990s Europe had not been given competence in the field of education by the Member States. As Guy Neave put it in one of his first analyses of European education policy, the education sector was 'taboo' for European policy-initiatives (Neave 1984, p. 6). But after the Maastricht Treaty (1992) things changed rapidly. This Treaty laid out the conditions under which education could be addressed and supported at the European level. The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) put these in the broader context of the knowledge society, concluding that the EU Member States were 'to promote the development of the highest possible level of knowledge for their peoples through a wide access to education and through its continuous updating'. The Treaty of Nice (2001) was even clearer on this issue. It was decided that the EU would be able to contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States through a wide range of actions such as promoting the mobility of citizens, designing joint study programmes, establishing networks, exchanging information or teaching languages for all citizens of the EU. The basic idea was that, although the competence for education in general and higher education in particular remains at the level of the Member States, the Union has a complementary role to play by adding a European dimension to education, by helping to develop quality education and by encouraging life-long learning.

Guy Neave has reflected frequently and thoroughly on what he calls the 'European Dimension' in general and on the role of universities in this dimension more specifically. It is this topic that I intend to discuss briefly as my contribution to this series of essays in his honour.

Europe and its universities

Europe and its universities have a strong and long-standing relationship. During many centuries the European universities have contributed significantly to the social, economic and cultural development of Europe. Perhaps even more distinctive for this intense relationship is the fact that the very existence of European universities reflects one of the most central dimensions of the 'idea of Europe'. Particularly from the age of the Enlightenment onwards European universities became the institutional homes of modernity and rationality. When,

as Kant said, Europe broke out of its 'self-imposed tutelage' during the Enlightenment, modernity became a fundamental European invention and modern science lay at the heart of that modernisation process. Rationality and the corresponding attitude to science and technology became essential and decisive elements of European identity. 'Since Europe became Europe in its own eyes, science has been held up as its image and its emblem' (Daston 2005, p. 30).

Through the centuries European universities have changed considerably. Yet they have also remained the central European institutions of reason, knowledge, criticism and learning. Plato's Academy was a center of dialogue and critical enquiry. The Medieval universities were open, self-governing communities of scholars. The 'liberal university' of cardinal John Newman was an institution for independent intellectual self-empowerment. And Wilhelm von Humboldt's proposals for the establishment of the University of Berlin were first of all aimed at preventing the search for knowledge being corrupted by social forces (Barnett 1990; De Ridder Symoens 1992, 1996; Nybom 2003).

Through the centuries the European universities have also regularly shown their 'Europeanness'. Although Plato's Academy was not the large community of students and teachers that we associate today with the concept of the university, it was an open institution accessible to scholars from all corners of the Greek empire. Similarly, the Medieval universities are known to have attracted scholars and 'Wanderstudenten' from all over Europe. Helped by the fact that lectures were normally delivered in Latin, students and teachers moved easily from one university to the other, from Coimbra to Vilnius or from Uppsala to Salerno (Burke 2006, p. 237). In the 16th and 17th centuries many universities provided temporary academic homes for European scholars without even thinking about national frontiers. Until the 18th century the European university was a European institution, reflecting the European values of intellectual freedom and of a borderless academic community.

The rise of territorial states largely brought an end to these European academic peregrinations. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the newly emerging national states fostered their unity along the lines of a strong and homogeneous cultural identity, forcing the universities into national frameworks (Huisman et al. 2001). The effect was a 'nationalisation' of science and (higher) education. The European universities received their core funding from the Nation States. It was assumed that they would train the cadres for the national civil services and contribute to the new national cultural identities, underpinning the nation-building processes. The Nation State came into Europe (and the world) after long and complex labour pains and remains a dominant part of the reality of Europe today. As Strömholm puts it: 'The Nation State, with its ambitions, its glories, its splendid political and cultural gifts, its constraints, its oppression of minorities, and ultimately its demand for the life and blood of its citizens cannot be dissociated from our image

of Europe today, and will in all likelihood remain for a very long time' (Strömholm 2005, p. 6). As a consequence, contemporary European universities are still first of all national, rather than European institutions. However, we may be on the verge of a new phase of academic 'Europeanness'.

It is exactly in this context that Guy Neave places his analyses. He shows that during the 19th century the ties between Nation States and universities intensified with increasing governmental controls over budgets, qualifications, access and the employment conditions of academics. However, as he also argues, the last decades of the 20th century show a new relationship between national policy-systems and universities. The autonomy of higher education institutions has increased while state interventionism has changed from detailed regulatory control to accountability and quality assurance policies (Neave 2001).

In this new set of relationships between Nation States and universities, the 'European dimension' appears to be growing once again in European higher education. As Neave puts it: 'Certainly, the Nation State is no longer the sole framework within which higher education in Europe operates. And since the Nation State has been the crucible of the modern university, ... this is no minor metamorphosis' (Neave 2003a, p. 16) and 'In place of the monolithic, territorially defined referential community - the nation state - that evolved over the past 190 years or more, the power ... of a superordinate community ... is growing. A further drift in influence away from the nation-state is possible ... Even so, how Europe will respond will not be completely divorced from the historical and cultural image it has of itself' (Neave 2003b, p. 161).

I argue that it is exactly this historical and cultural self-image of Europe that is a crucial responsibility of present-day European universities. Europe's universities need to understand that they, through the centuries, have carried the 'idea of Europe' as a central characteristic of their very existence. Now that universities increasingly appear to be the addressees of European level policies, they should remember that they are important symbols of 'the European Dimension'.

Let us be clear that the newly developing EU higher education policy is first and foremost an innovation policy. It addresses the European universities as important actors in the overall EU innovation strategy. As such, the EU policy is a larger-scale version of the university policies of many European (and other) Nation States. As in these national policies, the EU emphasises the instrumental and utilitarian functions of the university in present-day society. Universities are assumed to be able to contribute to the further development of the knowledge society by increasing and professionalising their provision of human capital and their production and transfer of knowledge. At the EU-level, the processes of stimulation, co-ordination and harmonisation of the Member States' policies for higher education and research create their own dynamics and effects. But the

main focus of the EU university policy remains the role European universities can play as the major providers of knowledge and knowledge-workers for the future of Europe.

Nevertheless, the EU university policy may well lead to a new phase of 'Europeanness' for European universities. The fact that they are increasingly being challenged to contribute to the European (rather than only the national) knowledge society may encourage European universities to once more reflect upon their historical role as truly European institutions. As history shows, this role has been broader than only the creation and transfer of knowledge. It contains crucial cultural dimensions which European universities have been major symbols of through the centuries. European universities are challenged by the EU university policy to act as European institutions. But these challenges are limited to only a part of their broader European role. It is now up to European universities themselves to further develop their historical role as one of the most important institutions guarding and carrying 'the idea of Europe' into the future.

Or, to let Guy Neave speak: 'The European Dimension has a long history, not as long as that of Europe's universities, but venerable, even so. Its importance has always remained for academia a symbol of the universality of knowledge. It has not always been at the forefront of the university's concerns or commitments, however. Today, the European Dimension has assumed a dynamic state. And for those universities which choose to commit themselves to it, it will prove a doughty challenge and a demanding testing ground' (Neave 2001, p. 67).

References

- Barnett, R. (1990). *The Idea of Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Burke, P. (2006). 'How to write a history of Europe, Europe's Eurasia', *European Review*, 14, 2, 233-239.
- Daston, L. (2005). *The History of Science as European Self-Portraiture*. Preamium Erasmanium Essay 2005. Amsterdam: Mart. Spruijt.
- Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Maastricht Treaty (1992). Provisions amending the Treaty establishing the European economic Community with a view to establishing the European Community.
<http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>
- Neave, G. (1984). *Education and the EEC*. London: Trentham Bootes.

- Neave, G. (2001). 'The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Excursion into the modern Use of Historical Analogues', in: Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd., pp. 13-74.
- Neave, G. (2003a) 'On Scholars, Hippopotami and Von Humboldt: Higher Education in Europe in Transition', *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 2, 135-140.
- Neave, G., (2003b). 'The Bologna Declaration: Some of the Historic Dilemmas Posed by the Reconstruction of the Community in Europe's Systems of Higher Education', *Educational Policy*, 17, 1, January and March, 141-164.
- Nybom, Th. (2003). 'The Humboldt Legacy: Reflections on the Past, Present and Future of the European University', *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 2, 141-160.
- de Ridder-Symoens, H. (1992). *A History of the University in Europe*. Volumes I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Ridder-Symoens, H. (1996). *A History of the University in Europe*. Volumes II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strömholm, St. (2005). 'Identity in Change - a European Dilemma? The Erasmus Lecture 2005', *European Review*, 13, 1, 3-14.
- Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). Amending the Treaty on European Union, the treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts.
<http://www.eurotreaties.com/amsterdamtreaty.pdf>
- Treaty of Nice (2001). Amending the Treaty on European Union, the treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts.
<http://www.eurotreaties.com/nicetreaty.pdf>

On Unity and Diversity; The EU, Bologna and higher education

Kurt de Wit

Introduction

Guy Neave was one of the pioneers who focussed on the higher education policy of the European Union. He described this policy when we were still speaking about 'European Communities' and when it was just 'not done' to describe the actions and programmes in the field of education as a genuine 'policy' of these Communities (Neave 1984). His interest in higher education policy in Europe, both within the EU and in terms of comparative national higher education policies, has continued throughout the years. For example, his editorials in the *European Journal of Education* provide us with a broad view on the general developments in European higher education (Neave 1985, 1995). In 1999, he asked Jef Verhoeven and me to make a 'sandwich' for him... He wanted to publish a book about higher education and its relationship with the nation state (Huisman et al. 2001). He wanted it to have a substantial introductory chapter on the European dimension in higher education, smaller chapters in between, and a substantial concluding chapter on the EU's higher education policy. We wrote that concluding chapter (De Wit and Verhoeven 2001). In this contribution, I will first recapitulate briefly the conclusions of that final chapter. I will then discuss the Bologna Process and its bearings on the higher education policy of the EU. To conclude, I will focus on the introduction of the bachelor-master structure to indicate that the achievements of the Bologna Process do not yet, in fact, reach far beyond the aims and policies of the EU.

The EU's higher education policy: with and against the Member States

The cooperation of the nation states of Europe in what is now called the European Union has as its main characteristic a permanent search for a balance between the sovereignty and autonomy of the nation states, on the one hand, and cooperation and loss of national autonomy, on the other. The balance reached is never definitive and always negotiable. However, more and more countries are agreeing to retain a decreasing amount of their national sovereignty, and European integration has increasingly become an accepted solution to common problems and challenges.

In higher education, too, a shift has gradually occurred. Guy Neave, for instance, has pointed out the increasing tendency in national politics to compare educational systems and policies (Neave 1995). One of the factors promoting a more 'European' or at least comparative way of thinking has been the EU's actions and programmes in the field of higher education since these actions and programmes have often focussed on mobility and networking. In these areas, the EU could act without infringing on the Member States' core education policies and responsibilities. It could, indeed, as laid down in the Treaty on European Union, complement the Member States' actions and policies.

These EU programmes promoting mobility and networking are based on voluntary co-operation between institutions of higher education and on a bottom-up approach, and the grants in these programmes come with strings and conditions attached. This means, in other words, that institutions of higher education can participate in European programmes at their own discretion and that the European Commission was able to develop incentive programmes without the assent of all Member States being required. Thus, one could say, convergence between national education systems would to some extent appear inevitable as regards mobility and networking,

However, the Member States still retain strategic control of their education, for which the educational policy of the EU is far from a substitute. Rather, the EU is concerned with regulation (Olsen 1996), that is, with building a competitive market and creating rules of fair competition between actors.

In the past and especially in the 1980s, the EU succeeded in adopting and implementing actions and programmes that were clearly (although only partly) supranational in nature. The *de facto* educational authority of the EU was extended considerably. The pro-European jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice, convergent with the European Commission proposals, extended the authority of the EU over every action that could be justified as leading to achieving the goals set in the treaties. Programmes grounded in voluntary co-operation and in mutual trust like ERASMUS emerged with EU funding as the incentive to establish initiatives on the national or institutional level.

With the Treaty on European Union there came an end to the reinterpretations of the treaties establishing the European Communities and the resulting expansion of the EU's authority. A European higher education policy based on the precarious grounds of reinterpreted treaty articles was no longer considered appropriate for the amounts of money and responsibilities involved. Therefore, the Treaty on European Union provided a firm legal basis for the EU's initiatives in higher education. The explicit mention of education and training in the Treaty on European Union consolidated the achievements of the programmes and actions developed in the 1980s. By voluntarily accepting the new treaty and thus

extending integration, the Member States indicated that they preferred joint problem-solving over national autonomy (Kohler-Koch 1996).

At the same time, the new treaty articles heavily stressed the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organisation of education. Likewise, the EU's fields of authority were strictly pegged out and defined. There still is some scope for reinterpretation (for instance, how far do initiatives regarding educational quality or the European dimension in education reach?) but the new generation of action programmes (in particular SOCRATES and LEONARDO) have been limited in scope to the framework as defined in the Treaty, thus ensuring the dominance of the Member States.

The EU and Bologna: competing and converging forces in higher education

The development of the EU's higher education policy clearly reflects the tensions or, stated positively, the dynamics between the national and the supranational levels. Cooperation in the field of education is strongly intergovernmental in nature, and the Member States retain the prime responsibility for education. However, as we have noted, there is an encroachment of the EU into areas that do not constitute the core of the education authority of the Member States, such as mobility and networking. Moreover, outside of the EU in the so-called Bologna Process, a rarely seen dynamic has developed from apparently similar developments in the different Member States.

The reforms taking place throughout Europe as a result of the declarations of Sorbonne (1998) and Bologna (1999) and the subsequent ministerial communiqués have as their goal the establishment of a European Higher Education Area. These declarations initiated a reform process that should make the educational systems in Europe more similar to the Anglo-American undergraduate-graduate structure as a starting point. This process started outside the framework of the EU. Moreover, references to the EU were carefully avoided in the texts. While the 1998 Sorbonne Declaration was an initiative of four ministers of education, the Bologna Declaration was signed on 19 June 1999 by all the EU Member States and the associated states. The university rectors also supported the text. The involvement of the EU is, however, growing. The EU is financing the follow-up of the process, that is, the biannual meetings of the ministers of education (Prague Communiqué 2001; Berlin Communiqué 2003; Bergen Communiqué 2005; London Communiqué 2007, the next meeting will take place in Leuven/Louvain-la-neuve in 2009). And since the Prague meeting, the European Commission has been represented in the Bologna Follow-Up Group.

This already shows that the Bologna Process cannot be seen completely apart from the EU, and these processes both have consequences for each other. The European Union is a 'strange' construction that cannot easily be restricted by formal limits, which was obvious already at the very beginning of cooperation in the field of education. The ministers of education did not meet as a Council of Ministers but as a diplomatic conference. This allowed them to have meetings and propose initiatives even though there was no formal framework (education was not part of the treaties). Something similar happened at Bologna. The call of four ministers of education in Sorbonne was adopted by the Member States and the associated states of the EU. Here we see that the links between the EU and the Bologna Process are more intense than may be apparent at first sight.

First, as noted, the EU finances the follow-up of the Bologna Process and since Prague has been part of the follow-up group monitoring the Bologna reforms. Moreover, although the cooperation in the area of education is intergovernmental and although the Bologna Process exceeds the borders of the EU, the European Commission is a strong supporter of this evolution and contributes to its implementation by funding transnational projects. The Commission speaks of 'synergies' between the Bologna Process and the Commission policy on higher education (Berlin Communiqué 2003).

Second, the EU provides the means that help realise the Bologna Process both in general (the method used to coordinate the process) and in particular (the instruments available to reach the goals).

In general, the method used to coordinate the Bologna Process resembles much the method of open coordination that was introduced in the employment policy of the EU. Open coordination means that the Member States commit themselves to striving for certain goals both individually and collectively and to reporting about the progress to the European Commission. This means there has to be some sort of preparedness to allow for convergence on the basis of 'best practices'. This resemblance between employment policy and developments in the field of higher education is not a coincidence. The European Council of Lisbon (March 2000) stressed the importance of education and training in the framework of the employment strategy of the EU, particularly for rendering the labour market more accessible and improving the adaptation capacities of employees. The Council of Ministers and the European Commission issued a 'report on the concrete future objectives of education systems'. The three main goals are to improve the quality and effectiveness of the education and training systems in the EU, to enhance the accessibility of these systems for everyone (in the framework of lifelong learning), and to open up these education and training systems to the 'outside world' (with reference to employment and research but, for example, also to foreign language instruction and more mobility and exchange).

More in particular, the instruments used to achieve the goals of the Bologna Declaration are provided by the EU (although they are not yet being used by the Member States to their full extent). In the area of the mobility of students and young researchers, these instruments are the mobility programmes, the diploma supplement, the ECTS, and the directives on the professional recognition of higher education diplomas. Regarding the relationship between higher education and employability, reference is made to the conclusions of the European Council of Lisbon (see above). Moreover, both mobility and European employment are viewed as being in line with national priorities and serve as a catalyst for planned or current national developments or policy plans.

Third, the goals of the Bologna Process such as strengthening the European dimension in higher education and stimulating student mobility are the same as the goals of the EU cooperation in higher education. The only aspect that does not fit within the EU framework is the introduction of a 'harmonised' educational system (the two-tier structure). This becomes clear when we compare the two key texts in the European higher education policy arena: the Bologna Declaration and the relevant EU Treaty articles. The comparison shows that the Bologna Process and the EU programmes in higher education are both closely linked but still worlds apart.

Although the wording is different, it is clear that the two texts are concerned largely with the same goals: the promotion of mobility, the development of a European dimension in education, the promotion of cooperation between institutions, and the introduction of a credit system. The system of easily readable and comparable degrees in the Bologna Declaration can also be compared to the recognition of diplomas mentioned by the EU Treaty: both want to increase the transparency of the educational qualifications students attain.

However, there is one important difference between the two texts (apart from the fact that only the Bologna Declaration mentions quality assurance and only the EU Treaty explicitly makes a case for distance education). The difference is, of course, that the Bologna Declaration argues for a two-cycle system to be introduced in all signatory countries. The EU Treaty does not and, in principle, cannot take this goal aboard. This has to do with the way in which the goals set out for the EU should or can be reached. The EU must 'support and complement' Member States' actions, with 'full respect' for the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of educational systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity. Moreover, the Treaty articles explicitly exclude any harmonisation.

The Bologna Declaration states that the signatories will 'engage in co-ordinating our policies' and will take 'full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages,

national education systems and of University autonomy', and to that end they 'will pursue the ways of intergovernmental co-operation'.

Both texts acknowledge the diversity in national education systems and stress the national responsibility for these systems. But the EU Treaty explicitly excludes any harmonisation, whereas the Bologna Declaration states that the signatory countries will coordinate their policies to reach certain objectives such as introducing a two-cycle structure and a credit transfer-system. Moreover, this coordination should have results within a limited time frame, that is, by the end of 2010.

Thus, the role of the European Union is to 'encourage' cooperation and the countries who have signed the Bologna Declaration agree to 'pursue' cooperation. In other words, there is no contradiction between the two texts. Both agree that the main responsibility for higher education lies with the Member States. But the Bologna Declaration goes beyond what is possible within the EU framework as it commits the signatory countries to 'coordinating' their policies, that is, to harmonising the organisation of their higher education systems in the areas intended by the Declaration.

Official and real: results regarding the bachelor-master structure

The formal framework of the EU does not allow for a harmonisation of the systems of higher education. But some saw a hidden agenda in the expansion of the EU education programmes in the 1980's to achieve just this (see above). And, in this sense, the Bologna Process and the goal of a European Higher Education Area would be on that agenda. Much depends, however, on the question of whether harmonisation is really taking place or if the apparently similar developments in the EU Member States conceal meaningful differences. In what follows, I take the introduction of the bachelor-master structure as an example, more in particular its introduction in Flanders and its neighbours: the French Community in Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands.

If we take official texts documenting the Bologna Process as a starting point, a picture emerges of a rather smooth, fast and clean introduction of the bachelor-master structure in those four regions. For instance, according to the stocktaking exercise, a two-cycle degree system was being implemented on a limited scale (Germany) or a wide scale (Flanders, French Community in Belgium, the Netherlands) in 2005. The conclusion of this report is that 'the collective and voluntary inter-governmental process is a success' (Stocktaking Report 2005, p. 5). The communiqués of the ministers for education, too, invariably speak of the 'substantial progress' that has been made. Without much differentiation, positive

reference is made to reaching the goals on time notwithstanding the different stages of implementation in different countries (BfuG report 2005, p. 17).

The stocktaking project took its data from Eurydice (2003) and national reports, while the BfuG report took its data from the stocktaking project. In other words, all these reports base their conclusions on the same information. Moreover, the information provided in these reports (and the basic information used to prepare them) gives only a general picture of the national implementation of the Bologna goals. We might well wonder about the extent to which the positive results claimed 'officially' are also 'real' results when we take a detailed look into the developments in participating countries. Although differences in implementation are not denied in the official texts and reports (e.g. also in the Trends Reports), the stress often is on the common goal that will be reached. The example of the bachelor-master structure makes clear, however, that, in reality, significant differences not only emerge but can even lead us to question the uniformity in the progress towards the common goal of a two-tier structure.

In the Netherlands, a bachelor programme can be academic (180 ECTS) or vocational (240 ECTS) when organised by universities or colleges (*hogescholen*), respectively. Students in an academic bachelor programme are prepared to enrol in a master programme. Students in a vocational bachelor programme are being prepared for entrance to the labour market. In Flanders, a similar distinction exists but all the bachelor programmes are 180 ECTS. The French Community in Belgium has allowed for university-level bachelor programmes of 180 ECTS, and short-type bachelor programmes of 180 or 240 ECTS. Finally, in Germany, there is no distinction between the academic and the vocational, and a bachelor programme requires between 180 and 240 ECTS.

Turning to the master level, a similar diversity emerges. In the four regions, master programmes require between 60 and 120 ECTS. The content of academic master programmes in the Netherlands can be oriented to society, research, or education. Colleges can also organise master programmes. In Germany, master programmes are organised in three varieties: professional, applied, or research. In the French Community in Belgium, there are five kinds of master programmes: vocational, research, or education-oriented masters at universities, and education- or specialisation-oriented masters at *hautes écoles*. In Flanders only academic master programmes are organised by universities or by colleges in cooperation with universities.

In short, a very diverse picture emerges that seems to be far removed from the starting point of the Bologna Declaration: the strength of European higher education does not come about by diversifying it but by uniting it. The only 'unity in diversity' that is clear from the example is the recurrence of the names 'bachelor' and 'master'. And our example does not even mention some of the

elements that make the complexity even greater: the parallel introduction of the bachelor master structure in Germany alongside the old structure, the pre-master programmes in Belgium and the Netherlands, and the bachelor-after-bachelor and master-after-master programmes in Flanders.

In our 2001 publication, Jef Verhoeven and I predicted that a build up in depth of higher education co-operation in the EU was not to be expected in the near future but that the balance between the EU and its constituent nation-states remained flexible and, hence, that Europe's higher education policies would continue to converge (De Wit and Verhoeven 2001). The Bologna Process, which took place outside the formal boundaries of the EU, seems to prove that point. However, not only convergence but also divergence has emerged in the new higher education structures. The new higher education structures in the European Higher Education Area are not as comparable as they might seem at first sight. Therefore, the goal of strengthening European higher education by clarifying its structure is not yet reached. There will still be work to do after 2010.

References

- Bergen Communiqué (2005). *The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals*. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Bergen.
- Berlin Communiqué (2003). *Realising the European Higher Education Area*. Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Higher Education in Berlin.
- BfuG Report (2005). *From Berlin to Bergen*. General Report of the Bologna Follow-up Group to the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education. Bergen and Oslo.
- Bologna Declaration (1999). *The European Higher Education Area*. Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Bologna.
- Eurydice (2003). *Focus on the Structure of Higher Education in Europe 2003/04. National Trends in the Bologna Process*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kohler-Koch, B. (1996). 'The Strength of Weakness: The Transformation of Governance in the EU', in Gustavsson, S. and Lewin, L. (eds.), *The future of the nation state: essays on cultural pluralism and political integration*. London: Routledge, pp. 169-210.
- London Communiqué (2007). *Towards the European Higher Education Area – Responding to challenges in a globalised world*. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, London.
- Neave, G. (1984). *The EEC and Education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

- Neave, G. (1985). 'Higher education in a period of consolidation 1975-1985', *European Journal of Education*, 20, 2-3, 109-124.
- Neave, G. (1995). 'On Living in Interesting Times: higher education in Western Europe 1985-1995', *European Journal of Education*, 30, 4, 377-393.
- Olsen, J.P. (1996). 'Europeanization and Nation-State Dynamics', in Gustavsson, S and Lewin, L. (eds.), *The future of the nation state: essays on cultural pluralism and political integration*. London: Routledge, pp. 245-285.
- Prague communiqué (2001). *Towards the European Higher Education Area*. Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education in Prague.
- Sorbonne Declaration (1998). *Joint declaration on harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education system* by the four Ministers in charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. Paris: the Sorbonne.
- Stocktaking Report (2005). *Bologna Process Stocktaking*. Report from a working group appointed by the Bologna Follow-up Group to the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education. Bergen and Oslo.
- Trend report 1 by Knudsen, I., Haug, G. and Kirstein, J. (1999). *Project Report: Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education*.
- Trend report 2 by Haug, G. and Tauch, C. (2001). *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education (II)*. Follow-up report prepared for the Salamanca and Prague Conferences.
- Trend report 3 by Reichert, S. and Tauch, C. (2003). *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education (III)*. *Bologna four years after: Steps toward sustainable reform of higher education in Europe*. Brussels: EUA.
- Trend report 4 by Reichert, S. and Tauch, C. (2005). *Trends IV: European Universities implementing Bologna*. Brussels: EUA.
- de Wit, K. and Verhoeven, J.C. (2001). 'The Higher Education Policy of the European Union. With or Against the Member States?', in Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 194-250.

IV. Comparative perspectives in higher education studies

The Disciplinary Characteristics of Comparative Higher Education: a Sociological Approach

Akira Arimoto

This paper attempts to identify the disciplinary characteristics of comparative higher education by focusing on a sociological approach, especially a knowledge-model, on the basis of the author's recent article related to this issue (Arimoto 2005a). In the early stage of the institutionalisation of this discipline, a philosophical approach prevailed (Altbach 1979). More recently a sociological approach has gradually come to dominate over other alternative approaches. In general, comparative higher education uses a methodology of broadly interacting vertical and horizontal approaches, although emphasising a horizontal approach in a narrow sense. This paper seeks to examine the characteristics of comparative higher education studies by a sociological approach that puts greater weight on the latter rather than the former. The sociological approach embraces research areas such as knowledge, the social condition and the social function of the university, and the social structure of the university.

Knowledge and the knowledge-model

In this context knowledge relates to the sociology of knowledge and the sociology of science itself in sociological methodology. In comparative higher education, this implies a study of comparative education on the basis of the knowledge on which university activity in connection with academic work is grounded. The philosophy and history of science are concerned with its knowledge content and epistemology; equally comparative higher education is concerned with the social context and characteristics of knowledge.

Robert Merton, who succeeded Emile Durkheim in developing the sociology of knowledge, is thought to be the first scholar to systematise the sociology of science. This methodology developed later into comparative higher education as a knowledge-model through linking the sociology of science and higher education research by consideration of the condition, function, and structure of science so as to initiate a number of theories and positive studies. Merton originally made a comparative and sociological study of the scientific world, identifying a competition for priority in scientific productivity among scientists, the scientific community, and nations. He also discussed kudos, ethos and the norm implicit in the development of a scientific community, which scientists internalise so as to control their role and behaviour (Merton 1973). With reference

to this norm, the reward system, which evaluates the products of discoveries in science in both the university and those academic communities that have established an effective science system, is apt to promote a level of scientific productivity that leads to scientific development (Arimoto 1987).

Some scholars, including Joseph Ben-David, Tony Becher and Morris Kogan, have studied higher education from a perspective of knowledge and knowledge productivity which provides an important concept for the sociology of science. Furthermore, Burton Clark adopted a similar approach in the early 1980s in his development of the comparative study of higher education systems (Ben-David 1977; Becher 1989; Kogan et al. 2000; Clark 1983). This trend has attracted attention in Japan as an excellent basis for establishing a perspective of achievement with regards to knowledge in the field of comparative higher education. The discipline, consisting of advanced knowledge as such, can be divided into groups including the various categories such as researchers, scholars, and scientists, and organisations such as chairs, departments, institutes, faculty, and university.

In addition, a national system has its own collective functions. The organisation can have its dynamic functions distributed between vertical and horizontal directions. Reflecting such dynamics, every system is inclined to adopt unique characteristics. Philip Altbach discusses a South-North problem on the basis of knowledge to the extent that competition for priority takes place between systems in the advanced and developing countries by which the systems of advanced countries gain from brain-drain from the developing countries (Altbach 1987; Arimoto 2005b).

Such theories and experimental research are based on the formation of knowledge societies in the academic community as well as in academia generally. For Merton, academic science - or university science - formed the main research object. Today, the relation between society and university is more borderless than in the past to the extent that society itself is beginning to become a knowledge society. Now it is natural to say that the production, dissemination and application of knowledge is generalised to the entire society just as in the past it was concentrated within the university (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotony et. al. 2001; Henkel 2007). The emergence of this kind of knowledge society means that the university and higher education as social phenomena have to be studied from a knowledge-model provided by the sociology of science as well as the sociology of knowledge.

Social condition of the university

The area relevant to social condition deals with problems such as social development (social structural conversion, internationalisation, globalisation, IT orientation, lifelong learning, knowledge society), the population, and social demands such as politics, economics, culture, and the government's higher education policy, planning, evaluation and reward systems (including mutual evaluation, and third-party evaluation). It is necessary to take into consideration the relationship between social development and the university from the perspective of the horizontal axis by focusing on the present social context in addition to the perspective of the vertical axis with its focus on the past social context.

Martin Trow discussed the relationship between social development and the university by using university enrolment population of the 18 year-old cohort as an indicator. He identified an elite stage in which the enrolment rate is less than 15%, a mass stage in which it is more than 15% but less than 50%, and a stage of universal access in which it is greater than 50% (Trow 1974). The Trow model is an historical-structural and comparative approach as it is basically constructed on an assumption that higher education systems worldwide follow a developmental trend similar to that in the USA. The model has profoundly influenced comparative higher education research in Japan since it was introduced in the 1970s. To a considerable extent it is useful and meaningful as a macro approach. However, the limitations of this linear model are evident in the increasing conflicts between quantitative and qualitative development at the mass stage and the difficulties encountered in shifting from a mass stage to a universal stage. Considering these facts, it is necessary to extend the model by introducing an approach containing a post-massification stage.

In this context, the author of this paper made an international comparison of six countries: Germany, Switzerland, USA, China, Singapore and Japan (Arimoto 2004). The results showed that universities in both the USA and China are confronted by similar problems because they both face similar environmental changes such as globalisation, marketisation, IT orientation, knowledge society orientation, a situation reconciled more readily with a knowledge-model than the Trow model (Arimoto 2006).

The condition of university development is defined by social development and especially by political and economic development. Politically, it is defined further by governmental higher education policy and planning. Burton Clark's triangle model allows a theoretical comparison of the characteristics of a system as defined by the relationship between the power and prestige exercised by the nation (policy), university, and society (market) (Clark 1983). It leads to a typology of a market type, as in the USA, a national concentration type, as in the

USSR and Sweden, and an academic guild type, as in Italy. In this international framework, Japan is shifting from a national concentration type to a market type. A study at the Center of Higher Education Policy Study at Twente University in the Netherlands made a comparison of the policies of national systems in OECD countries in proposing a policy for university reforms in Germany (Goedegebuure et al. 1994). As in the Clark model, its basic framework involves a comparison of the systems with regard to the relation between government, university and society (market).

Evaluation of actual higher education activities through these system level policies is made not only by self-evaluation within the university but also by external evaluation from outside the university. These evaluations also determine conditions for university development. As far as research trends are concerned, they are controlled by the evaluation and reward system identified by the sociology of science. Kells has compared the present trends of such evaluations in various systems and institutions from an international perspective (Kells 1999). An international comparison has also been conducted to compare the effects of social changes such as internationalisation and globalisation on universities and colleges (Enders and Fulton 2000; Ebuchi 1997).

The social function of the university

In the light of the characteristics of knowledge, functions such as research, teaching, and service occupy a core part of the social function of the university. Studies of 'research on research' - dealing with the discovery of knowledge - established a base for comparative research on academic productivity. For example, Ben-David analysed the systems and institutions that are responsible for promoting scientific development by making international comparisons of the centers of learning (Ben-David 1977). In Japan, Michiya Shinbori studied the sociology of science through comparison of systems worldwide by using the concepts of 'eponymy' and 'academic productivity' (Shinbori 1985; Arimoto 1994).

Productivity in teaching provides one of the central categories of academic productivity, but its study is largely undeveloped in contrast to research productivity, mainly because no adequate scale exists. Nevertheless, in surveying higher education systems from an international comparative perspective, identifying superior systems in terms of promoting teaching and learning will increasingly become important. Specifically, comparison is necessary with regard to those factors contributing to education such as teaching itself, the curriculum and syllabus, liberal education, awarding credits and degrees, the educational climate, and quality assurance. For example, in the field of comparative studies on curricula, a series of studies has already been conducted between Japan and

the USA - which is regarded as a benchmark as the dominant center of learning in the postwar period (Tachi 1997; Arimoto 2003).

The social structure of the university

Comparative studies on aspects of the university's social structure are focused on the university system, the institution, its organisation, and its groups. Its content covers diversified areas, which include the university's norm, ethos, and values; the university's organisation; its groups (*i.e.* its academic staff, non-academic staff, students, the president); its approach to relationships, administration and management; and its implementation of evaluation (*i.e.* self-evaluation, mutual evaluation, third-party evaluation). A comprehensive comparison of higher education systems, organisation and groups has been made by Burton Clark. He made a comparative analysis of the institutionalisation of the Humboldtian ideal of the German university into the individual national systems of the UK, France, the USA, and Japan. The study showed how these systems had shifted from a single structure, with only an undergraduate tier, to a multi-structure, with graduate courses, and an organisation from a place of unified teaching and research to systems of differentiated research, teaching, and learning. The importance of retaining places of inquiry was indicated by the international comparisons (Clark 1994, 1995).

Within the meaning of the concept of groups are academic staff, non-academic staff, students, and administrators. A number of researchers have studied the academic staff group from an early stage in the history of comparative higher education research, focusing on areas such as the academic career and academic nepotism (Shinbori and Arimoto 1969). In the field of international cooperative studies, the first worldwide large-scale study of the academic profession was conducted in 1992 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Altbach 1996). It identified both the similarities and differences of the systems in thirteen countries and one region in the world, including the USA, the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, Russia, Korea, Israel, and Hong Kong. Among its many findings, it is especially interesting that each individual system has a different characteristic with regard to its own academic staff's orientation to the academic work of research and teaching. Yet a number of typical patterns emerge. A German pattern, with a trait of research orientation, is seen in some countries: Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, Korea, Israel, and Sweden. A South American and Russian pattern, with a trait of teaching orientation, is seen in the South American group including Mexico, Chile, Argentina, and also in Russia. An Anglo-Saxon pattern, with a trait of orientation half on research and half on teaching, is seen in the UK, the USA, Australia and Hong Kong.

In Japan, a comparative study, based on an analysis of the original Carnegie data, indicated an emphasis on research rather than on teaching in an international perspective (Arimoto and Ehara 1996). This finding has influenced a paradigm change of higher education policies and reforms since the 1990s by initiating an era of 'teaching revolution' in Japan in accordance with the reconsideration of 'scholarship' as introduced by Ernest Boyer together with the institutionalisation of Faculty Development into academia (Boyer 1990; Arimoto 2007).

Concluding remarks

From a Japanese perspective, comparative higher education presents an absolutely inevitable area of research into the university and higher education. Yet so far its development has been gradual. At present, even the particularly powerful sociological approach still remains at a developmental stage, although it is full of potential in its application to the analysis of the critical issues that are becoming apparent in the changes that lie ahead.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (1979). *Comparative Higher Education: Research Trends and Bibliography*. London: Mansell.
- Altbach, P.G. (1987). *The Knowledge Context: Comparative Perspective on the Distribution of Knowledge*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Altbach, P.G. (1996). *The academic Profession from an International Perspective*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Arimoto, A. (1987). *Merton Kagaku Shakaigaku no Keisei to Tenkai: Sono Paradigum no Keisei to Tenkai (A study of Merton Sociology of Science: Formation and Development of its Paradigm)*. Tokyo: Fukumura Publishing Co.
- Arimoto, A. (1994). *Gakumon Chusinchi no Kenkyu: Gakumonteki Seisansei no Joken (A Study of Centers of Learning: Conditions of Centers of Learning)*. Tokyo: Toshindo Publishing Co.
- Arimoto, A. (2003). *Daigaku no Curriculum Kaikaku (Academic Reform of the Curriculum)*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
- Arimoto, A. (2004). 'Higher Education Reforms: Determinants and Directions', in McGinn, N.F. (ed.), *Learning through Collaborative Research: the Six Nation Education Research Project*. London: Routledge Falmer, pp. 147-172.
- Arimoto, A. (2005a). 'Hikaku Kotokyoiku ron (Comparative Higher Education Approach)', in Arimoto, A., Hata, T. and Yamanoi, A. (eds.), *Kotokyoiku Gairon (Introduction to Higher Education)*. Kyoto: Minerva Publishing Co.
- Arimoto, A. (2005b). 'National Research Policy and Higher Education', *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, New Delhi: National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, XIX, 2, 175-198.

- Arimoto, A. (2006). 'Viewpoints of the Trow- and Knowledge-models from an International Comparative Study of Higher Education', *Higher Education Research in Japan*, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, 3, 1-20.
- Arimoto, A. (2007). 'Reconstruction of Knowledge and Higher Education System', *Construction of 21st century-type Higher Education System and Quality Assurance*, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, Educational Group's Final Report, 17-31.
- Arimoto, A. and Ehara, T. (1996). *Daigaku Kyojushoku no Kokusai Hikaku (International Comparisons of the Academic Profession)*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
- Ben-David, J. (1977). *Centers of Learning*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories*. London: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *Higher Education Systems: Cross-National Perspective of Organization*, California: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1994). *Graduate Education*. California: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1995). *Places of Inquiry*. California: University of California Press.
- Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (2000). *Higher Education in a Globalising World*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ebuchi, K. (1997). *Daigaku Kokusaika no Kenkyu (Study of Internationalization of University)*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Goedegebuure, L., Kaiser, F., Maassen, P., Meek, L., van Vught, F. and de Weert, E. (1994). *Higher Education Policy: An International Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Henkel, M. (2007). 'Academic Boundaries: Are They Still Needed?', *Higher Education Forum*, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, 4, 33-45.
- Kells, H.R. (1999). 'National Higher Education Evaluation Systems: Methods for Analysis and Some Proportions for the Research and Policy Void', *Higher Education*, 38, 2, 209-232.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. and Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Merton, R.K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Shinbori, M. (1985). *Gakumon Gyoseki no Hyoka; Kagaku niokeru Eponymy Gensho* (Evaluation of Academic Achievement; Eponymy Phenomena in Science). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
- Shinbori, M. and Arimoto, A. (1969). *Daigaku Kyoju no Keirekigata no Kokusai Hikaku* (International Comparative Study of Academic Careers). Tokyo: Shakaigaku Hyoron (Sociological Review) No.75.
- Tachi, A. (1997). *Daigaku Kaikaku; Nippon to America* (Academic Reforms in Japan and USA). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
- Trow, M. (1974). 'Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education', *Policy for Higher Education*, OECD.

Dr. Prometheus visits Latin America

José Joaquín Brunner

He gave man speech, and speech created thought, which is the measure of the Universe *Prometheus Unbound* (Percy Bysshe Shelley, 1820).

When Guy Neave and some of his colleagues spent an academic term in Latin America almost twenty years ago, they soon lost track of one of their party, Mr. Prometheus. While he has been cited on various occasions, the distinguished author continues to be worried about his charge as he showed most recently in one of the Fulbright Brainstorms when he asked,

Whether today Mr. Prometheus is unbound, still shackled or merely released on parole from what is conceived by the canons of Ultra-liberalism as the dead hand of the state ... (Neave 2004, p. 1)¹

This question originated with changes in western European higher education in the 1980s, particularly between the university and the State. These changes can be seen as a series of shifts - almost personality changes: from a facilitator to an interventionist state; from the friendly to the evaluative state; from policies set by social needs to policies based on budget possibilities; from negotiated policy coordination to product and process control; from collegiate administration to managerial and entrepreneurial logic; from the internal needs of each institution to the needs of the labour market and firms; from block grants or guaranteed financing by the State to contracts that require universities to meet specific standards, objectives and performance measured by efficiency and impact indicators (Van Vught 1989; Neave and Van Vught 1991).

Paradoxically, in Western Europe at least, with the exception of the United Kingdom - the altered relations between the State and higher education did not result in greater direct intervention and control - but rather in a style of self regulation which the Dutch Ministry of Education and Sciences called, in the 1980s, 'steering at a distance'; that is, giving the universities and other higher education institutes more autonomy and responsibility.

¹ Which recalls the original question, 'Are we right to think of western higher education systems like poor Prometheus, chained to a rock with his guts exposed day after day for the eagles of cost cutting and intervention' (Neave and Van Vught 1991, p.397) [Author's translation from Spanish text].

So it is worth asking whether universities have been liberated? Has Prometheus's sacred knowledge improved the lot of Man - or is it just another way - subtler and more effective - to tie him to the rock. Neave's answer, although full of subtleties, seems to point to the second conclusion. According to him, writing with Van Vught, these shifts 'mean neither more nor less than a reworking of the traditional strategy of rational planning and control' (1991, p. 394).² In other words Prometheus is still chained.

This message - as well as those of other writers notably Burton Clark from the United States - arrived in a subcontinent where from the XVI Century, both the tradition and the trajectory of universities had developed in a very different way from Western Europe (Schwartzman 1992).

In Latin America most universities were almost completely autonomous while enjoying state support - Prometheus unbound in Macondo, and the state - a forceful Leviathan in other respects - acted as a kindly, if blinkered, local banker. How did these relations work? The state made direct contributions to each university, negotiated on the basis of past history and usually free of conditions, either about performance or efficiency. While they enjoyed preferential treatment from a benign (at least to them) State they received few if any stimuli to improve activities, or to innovate and respond to social and development demands (Brunner 1996). Indeed they were often discouraged from doing so.

The region continued to follow this pattern of higher education - reduced access, few graduates, little scientific technical research for most of the twentieth century - at least up to the time of Mr. Prometheus's holiday and apparent disappearance.

In fact, it was only in 1985 that Latin American higher education moved from an elite to a mass system (Trow 2006) with 15 percent of the relevant age group attending tertiary institutions. In contrast to Western Europe, two-thirds of Latin America's undergraduates were enrolled in public institutions while one-third or more (and growing) were enrolled in private institutions; this laid the basis, although passively at first, for greater heterogeneity and institutional differentiation. This 'Private Prometheus' (Altbach 1999; Neave and Van Vught 1994), it was then imagined, would have the potential to unleash the power of the market to restructure and improve higher education systems.

However there continued to be great differences between systems, not least in terms of internal efficiency. Using the ratio of graduates to enrolled students, by the mid 1980s the ratios for Latin America varied from 40 undergraduate students (Peru) to 7 (Brazil) per graduate; while that for Europe at that time,

² Author's translation from Spanish text.

examining systems as diverse as Belgium, Denmark, France, Finland, Ireland and Norway ranged between 3 and 6.³

So too, research results were disappointing. In 1981, the two largest countries - Brazil and Mexico - together produced around 3,000 articles in the principal journals, around the same number as Belgium or Denmark considered separately. Together Latin American countries produced fewer scientific-technical publications than Sweden and contributed less than 1.2 percent of the world total.⁴

With this as background, how was Neave's inquiry treated in Latin America?

Well, at one level the question was perplexing; and at another the response drew on Latin America's capacity for 'ideological utilitarianism'.

Perplexity, because Latin America has always expected grand thoughts from Europe about universities and higher education. The histories of Salamanca and Alcalá were as well known as the examples of Paris and Bologna and there was considerable interest and discussion around the 'idea of the university' of Kant, Humboldt, Cardinal Newman, Jaspers and Ortega y Gasset. But systematic research into the functions and structure of higher education systems really did not exist although there were individual exceptions.⁵ Only as recently as the beginning of the 1990s did a field of higher education studies emerge in Latin America, coinciding with the publication of Clark and Neave's *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education* (1992) which had a theoretical and empirical impact - as examples and policy suggestions - in this continent.

On the other hand, this new focus became an inevitable part of an ideological debate about higher educational policy. There is nothing uncommon about this occurrence - on the contrary, this always seems to happen when visitors arrive in Latin America bearing gifts. They become allies or enemies in the ongoing national polemics and eventually end up being little more than rhetorical ornaments in Latin America's own culture wars.

This new research focus however - based on authors as diverse as Neave, Van Vught, Clark, Teichler and Kogan among others - was adopted by both sides and used to support the two main positions that continue to influence higher education debate and policy design in Latin America. These positions - for want

³ Calculations based on UNESCO (1997).

⁴ Based on data from The Task Force on Higher Education (2000), Statistical Annex, Table F.

⁵ For example, Medina Echavarría (1967); CEPAL (1968); Solari (1968); Schertz (1968); Rama (1970, 1982, 1987), Schwartzman (1981) and Brunner (1985).

of anything better - might be called 'traditional' and 'modern' and both make their appeal to Prometheus.

For the traditionalists, the chained Prometheus justifies the university *status quo* as it demonstrates the risks to university autonomy from neo-liberal or Thatcherite policies. In this case, Europe is used as an example of perverse effects when a state instead of helping public universities, promotes self regulated coordination and uses public funds to manage the institutions from afar, but not hands off.

The modernists, on the other hand, use Europe as an example of a positive world wide trend, pointing out that, as in Europe the time has arrived for Latin American universities to re-evaluate and change the contract between themselves and the state. In this version, Prometheus neither robbed the gods nor is chained, but is alive and well, being paid for doing not too much. It follows that if things were better ordered the market would impose negotiations, the provision of a new job description, and a conversation in which young Prometheus is firmly told that the State may finance part of his education, but never all and always against agreed performance standards.

It has been over twenty years since Prometheus' visit and his happy friendship with traditionalists and modernists in Latin America. During this time higher education systems have been transformed, 'massified' and have grown more differentiated and complex. They are much more diversified, get funds from many different sources, have changed the way they are administered and sometimes how they are governed. Something the same seems to have happened in Europe, although in the context of greater resources, stronger institutional traditions, and greater potential regional unity under the European Union's commitment to the Bologna process.

Neave agrees that Prometheus's situation has changed (2004, p. 11).

His degrees of freedom, responsibility and answerability have certainly grown. At the same time, so too have the draw of reward and penalty of failure [...] The Gods, where-ever it is they sit, whether in Quality Assurance Agencies, National or Regional Evaluation Committees, have accepted his parole. They have also made very clear to him that the price of freedom is success as they - or their Masters - have for the moment, defined it.

In Latin America, by and large, the theory and policy analysis as well as the values and sentiments that underpin it - Gouldner's background and domain assumptions, (1971) - are now part of the common language and make up the analytic instruments of the growing group of higher education researchers. More remarkable, higher education institutions and governments have adopted the

same language as well as the idea of the Neavean notion of the 'evaluative state' (1988) as a key part of their discussions and strategies.

Universities now accept that they should be accountable and to do so they should develop self evaluation processes and external review procedures. Governments, from Mexico to Chile, use the language of evaluation and their common procedures - self-evaluation, peer review processes, performance indicators, effectiveness of academic programs, administrative decision making and planning systems, goal achievement, mission statements, evaluative reports, etc. Further, even if a bit timidly at first, there is an unmistakable tendency to discuss formula and performance based funding, conditional contracts, competitive funds, etc.

So it would seem that Prometheus was more helpful to the modernizers than the traditionalists who want to maintain the status-quo. But is this really so?

First, it must be admitted that the language in which higher education is discussed has undergone changes not only as a result of North American and European research and academic influence but also because of World Bank proposals and texts. Equally these messages did not fall on stony ground because the economies and societies that make up the region - Chavez notwithstanding - are more open and competitive with a more efficient and modern domestic production base than ten years ago. Globalisation is understood to be an educational challenge.

But when higher education is looked at in terms of actual performance and international indicators the changes are less dramatic than the language and the *status quo* far less vulnerable even though the relationship between the State and universities (public and private) has been defined without acrimony as in Western Europe.

So for the modernists it looks as if these new and potentially radical ideas have been less successful in kick starting change than in providing a new corporate and bureaucratic language - influential with organisations, institutions and governments - with which to discuss higher education. As always happens in Macondo, innovations are absorbed first by the ideologues before being neutralised in practice, showing the continued divide between words and deeds.

Take for example Guy Neave's 'evaluative ethic' which many of us talked about in the late 1980s. In Latin America this soon became an 'evaluative culture', which is blander and less demanding. It is as if puritan values (close to and part of the evaluative ethic and Weber's Spirit of Capitalism) were absorbed and changed internally by Latin American Catholic baroque culture, ending with a greater

ritual and liturgical meaning, but losing their force for innovation and change in the process.

And so Prometheus, having accompanied G. Neave on his visit, is still here - less protected and slightly disenchanted - but free of the Leviathan's heavy hand even if (living under an assumed name) he has to earn his keep with the modest wage of a public official supplemented, one can feel sure, by consultant fees at market rates. Dr. Prometheus is now something of a proselytiser - a free man, roaming without restraint through capital cities and towns. And this is much better than when he was beaten up and persecuted by dictators, even though there are times when he is nostalgic about not being treated as and living like a gentleman. Now his burden is that he has to earn a living for which improved higher education remains an absolute necessity.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (1999). *Private Prometheus: private higher education and development in the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Brunner, J.J. (1985). *Universidad y Sociedad en América Latina*. Caracas: CRESALC.
- Brunner, J.J. (1996). 'Educación en América Latina durante la década de 1980: la economía política de los sistemas', in Kent, R. (ed.), *Los Temas Críticos de la Educación Superior en América Latina. Estudios Comparativos*. México, DF.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, pp. 106-170.
- Clark, B.R. and Neave, G. (eds.) (1992). *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- CEPAL, Comisión Económica para América Latina (1968). *Educación, Recursos Humanos y Desarrollo en América Latina*. Nueva York: Naciones Unidas.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1971). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. London: Heinemann.
- Medina Echavarría, J. (1967). *Filosofía, Educación y Desarrollo*. México, D.F.: Siglo XX.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise. An overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe 1986 - 1988', *European Journal of Education*, 25, 2-3, 273-283.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometeo Encadenado. Estado y Educación Superior en Europa*. Barcelona: Gedisa Editorial.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents. The Winds of Change*. Oxford: Pergamon and IAU Press.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'Mr. Prometheus - unbound, shackled or released on parole?'. Presented at the Fulbright Brainstorms 2004 - New Trends in Higher Education, Lisbon. http://www.ccla.pt/brainstorms/release1.0/pdf/09_GuyNeave.pdf

- Rama, G. (1970). *El Sistema Universitario en Colombia*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Rama, G. (1982). *Universidad, Clases Sociales y Poder*. Caracas: Editorial Ateneo.
- Rama, G. (1987). *Desarrollo y Educación en América Latina y el Caribe*. Buenos Aires: CEPAL-UNESCO-PNUD y Kapelusz.
- Solari, A. (1968). *Estudiantes y Política en América Latina*. Caracas: Monte Avila Editores.
- Schertz, L. (1968). *El Camino de la Revolución Universitaria*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial del Pacífico.
- Schwartzman, S. (1981). *Ciencia, Universidade e ideología. A Política do Conhecimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
- Schwartzman, S. (1992). 'Non-western societies and higher education', in Clark, B.R. and Neave, G. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 969-975.
- The Task Force on Higher Education and Society (2000). *Higher Education in Developing Countries. Peril and Promise*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank
- Trow, M. (2006). 'Reflections on the Transition from Elite to Mass to Universal Access: Forms and Phases of Higher Education in Modern Societies since WWII', in Altbach P. and Forrest J.J.F (eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education, Vol 1*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 243-280.
- UNESCO (1997). *Statistical Yearbook 1997*. New York: UNESCO and Bernan Press.
- van Vught, F. (1989). *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kinsley Publishers.

Financial Austerity, Cost-Sharing, and Culture: Perspectives on Comparative Higher Education

D. Bruce Johnstone

I don't recall when I first began considering myself a higher educational comparativist. Insofar as I have any entitlement to that scholarly appellation, it came much later and considerably less deservedly than to our eminent colleague, Guy Neave, in whose honour these essays have been written and collected. But like Guy, my interest began with the idea of higher education and its scholarly study. Later came the realisation that other countries were at once so alike and so different in their institutions of, and policies toward, higher education and that, for one interested in policy, comparative higher education was a veritable stew of history, culture, and competing ideologies. Finally, as a special reward, I began to realise that my understanding of my own situation (I was then, in the mid 1980s, the president of an American public comprehensive college) could be profoundly enriched by these international comparative perspectives.

Because my first degree was in economics and my first serious scholarship a book on student finance and student loans, and because (for reasons unimportant to this essay) I found myself inhabiting the vice presidency of an eminent US private university at the relatively young age of 36, followed two years later by the presidency of a large public college in considerable financial stress, I have always viewed the overwhelming challenge to higher education - from the standpoints of institutional viability, student accessibility, and social policy - to be essentially *financial*. Whether in the so-called transitional countries emerging from the former Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe, or in the impoverished nations throughout Africa, most of Asia, and much of Latin America, or even in affluent Western Europe, I could observe university leaders and government officials grappling - just as I was - with trajectories of costs that seemed always to be rising faster than their trajectories of available revenue. Looking at institutions and policies through an international comparative lens, I saw the overwhelming worldwide challenge of financial austerity. At stake to the institutions of higher education was financial viability and quality. And at stake to nations and to the governments that are charged with their well being were the even more profound challenges of capacity, and equity.

Underlying this austerity were three forces. The first was the underlying trajectory of unit, or per-student, instructional costs, pressed ever upwards by the need for new programs, new academic specialties, the soaring costs of periodicals and scientific equipment, and a voracious technology that - quite unlike the

application of technology in the goods-producing sectors of the economy - tended only to increase unit costs (albeit presumably quality as well) rather than to decrease them. The culprits are not incompetent leaders or wasteful faculty (although there are examples of both throughout the world), but rather the very nature of higher education's underlying, labour-intensive, productivity-resistant production function. Simply put, there are not within most universities the kinds of continuous productivity enhancements typically associated with the goods-producing sectors of the industrialised economies, which substitute capital for labour, enhance their productivity, and make possible the real growth of the underlying economies. Higher education, on the other hand, faces a *default* per-student cost trajectory that generally exceeds whatever is the prevailing rate of inflation.

Accelerating and worsening the financial consequences of this rising instructional cost trajectory are the rapidly increasing worldwide enrolment pressures. Massification is fuelled first by rising birth rates (at least in most countries outside of Western Europe, Russia, and Japan), which are then accelerated by rising proportions of these increasing population cohorts being prepared for, and expecting, higher education. Both of these massifying forces, of course, are considerably more relentless in the less developed world, where birth rates continue to be high and where the participation rates at the secondary level, however low in absolute terms, are very often increasing rapidly, propelling more and more young people out of the schools expecting accommodation in the already overstrained universities.

Arrayed against these forces of expansion - and thus of the sharply and continuously increasing revenue requirements - is declining ability in almost all countries to keep up with this trajectory of needs through public revenues. This shortage of public revenue goes considerably beyond a mere unwillingness to tax. For most countries, taxation is as difficult technically as it is unpopular politically (and especially taxation that is at all progressive and also not detrimental to the economy). Globalisation and the nearly unlimited mobility of capital and productive facilities leads multi-national goods producers to seek a combination of political stability, low wages, and *low taxes* - limiting the ability of countries to maintain high taxes, and thus limiting the size of their public sectors, including publicly financed higher education. The formerly Communist, or *transitional*, countries, long dependent on relatively easy value-added taxes on state-owned producers, have had to devise new means of taxation, none of which have been particularly successful. The dependence of the low-income countries on donations from wealthier nations or credits from the international lending agencies has limited the use of deficit financing (that is, the printing of currency) as an alternative to taxes.

Finally, this shortage of public revenue also goes beyond the not inconsiderable waste from the corruption and misplaced priorities so prevalent in many poor countries. To the extent that most low- and even middle-income countries were able to tax more and to increase these taxes every year, other even more compelling public needs - elementary and secondary education, a social safety net, public health (including the AIDS pandemic), public infrastructure, and the restoration of the environment, to name just a few - would seriously compete with higher education for these precious limited revenues.

Throughout the world, one of the major policy responses to these diverging trajectories of rapidly and continuously increasing revenue needs and diminishing public revenue availability is *cost-sharing*. Cost-sharing is a term that I seem to have coined in my first international comparative scholarship in the mid 1980s (Johnstone 1986) and to which I have added much of the descriptive and theoretical literature in the eight years of my *International Comparative Higher Educational Finance and Accessibility Project* (Johnstone 2006).¹ Cost-sharing is both a statement of fact - that is, that the costs of higher education are *shared* among governments (or taxpayers), parents, students, and philanthropists - and also a reference to the policy shift of some of these costs from a predominate (sometimes a virtually exclusive) reliance on governments and taxpayers to being shared among parents and/or students in addition to taxpayers. In this latter policy meaning, cost-sharing can be seen throughout the world in the introduction of tuition fees where they did not previously exist, the sharp increases of tuition fees where they have long been accepted in principle, the rise in other fees to recover what may previously have been governmentally subsidised (e.g. food and lodging), the reduction, or at least the freezing, of what may once have been generous student maintenance grants, the more effective cost recovery on student loans, and a policy shift of some of the higher educational demand to tuition-dependent private institutions (Johnstone 2003, 2004b, 2006).

Cost sharing may add significant revenue to colleges and universities, and/or add capacity to a country's higher educational system, and/or bring some relief to the taxpayer, and/or allow some shift of public revenue to competing public priorities. Partly because of these indeterminate consequences, and also from combinations of ideology and self interest, cost-sharing also brings opposition from students, parents, and others who may continue to think of higher education as an entitlement, or who may resent not so much the fact of having to pay more for their or their children's higher education but rather resent the fact (or the perception) of getting nothing more in the way of higher educational quality or accessibility for the additional expense.

¹ See the website of the International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project: <http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/IntHigherEdFinance/>.

Most economists maintain that some element of cost-sharing - assuming some means-tested grants and/or generally available student loans to maintain accessibility - is actually more equitable than free higher education in that students everywhere are at least disproportionately from the middle and upper-middle classes, while the taxation required to support free higher education tends to be proportional or even regressive (thus falling disproportionately on those who benefit least). However, just as powerful a case for cost-sharing - and a far less ideologically contestable case - can be based on the two aforementioned challenges. The first is the difficulty of substantially increasing taxes in most countries (and especially of maintaining some progressivity in these additional taxes). Second is the very long and compelling queue in virtually all countries of pressing public needs competing with higher education for any limited additional tax revenues even if governments should be willing and able to raise taxes significantly.

In short, the theoretical case for at least some degree of cost-sharing is easily made. However, as Guy Neave, with his extraordinary appreciation of the juxtaposition of history, culture, politics, and ideology, knows well, what makes perfect sense to an American scholar of higher educational finance is not necessarily so clear to others. For the remainder of this essay, I wish to discuss three essentially cultural complications to what I, as a liberal, American, higher educational manager, scholar, and policy analyst had once thought to be the *easy and uncomplicated* case on behalf of cost sharing.

Parents or students?

The first of these is the question of to whom costs are to be shifted: that is to parents, to students, or to both? The economic rationale behind the case for *students* bearing a portion of the costs of their higher education is that there are substantial private benefits, both monetary and non-monetary, that accrue to the student from higher levels of education and that these benefits therefore justify a tuition fee - especially one that can be deferred and repaid through a loan or through some form of surtax upon future earnings. This case is generally accepted, at least in theory, by most analysts and even most politicians (other than those convinced that higher education can continue forever to be an entitlement provided free of all charges).

However, the case for *parents* bearing a share of the costs of their children's higher education (entailing an *up front* tuition) is based on two quite different rationales. The first is that parents, too, benefit from the higher education of their children - as demonstrated by the fact that so many parents throughout the world take great pride and pleasure in the higher education of their children and willingly buy them the best they can afford. The second is the cultural notion that parents (at

least those who are financially able) have a financial obligation to pay something for those students who can plausibly be thought of as *financially dependent children*. Thus, an officially expected parental contribution is the veritable bedrock of cost-sharing in the United States Canada, Japan, China, and increasing numbers of other countries (and a legally enforceable expectation, at least for the costs of student living) in Germany (Marcucci and Johnstone 2007).

But a parental contribution is not at all the expectation in the Nordic countries and is mainly voluntary in Australia and New Zealand. And it was opposition in Britain less to the principle of a tuition fee and more to the expectation that such fees should be paid up front by parents that lead to the virtual abandonment of up-front, parentally-borne tuition fees and their replacement by deferred, student-borne fees in the constituent countries of the once United Kingdom, which for a short while (from 1997 though until Scottish devolution in 1999) had been the only European country with a more than nominal tuition fee. It is true that much of the opposition to tuition fees in the UK was from the left of Labour, which had simply never accepted the end of free higher education. But equally or more damaging to Britain's short-lived, up-front tuition fee - even though it was means tested and not imposed on the poor - was this cultural opposition to thinking of university students as dependent children (Johnstone 2005, 2004a).

Whose money: the government's or the taxpayer's?

Public policy analysis in market economies contains three assumptions. First is that markets are valid signals of worth (assuming complete information and free competition). A second is that governments can only spend what they have taken from citizens, whether directly (e.g. taxes on income, sales, or property), indirectly (e.g. taxes on businesses or transactions), or through the confiscation not of money itself, but of its purchasing power through the inflationary printing and commensurate devaluation of the currency. A third assumption follows upon the second: that all governmental spending is (or should be) transparent and has opportunity costs in the form[s] of alternative benefits foregone. Thus, the opportunity cost of additional governmental spending on higher education is the forgoing of the additional benefit that might have come from the devotion of these additional resources instead to, e.g. health care, infrastructure, basic education, defence, transfer payments, pensions, or any other alternative public good or service.

This assumption was at least theoretically true as well in Marxist countries in which virtually all means of production were owned by the state. Taxes were in fact paid by these state-owned enterprises - in very large sums and allowing huge governmental expenditures for the ubiquitous public sectors. However, few citizens (e.g. of the former Soviet Union) felt *taxed* as such, even though they

might have wondered why there seemed to be so little remaining in the enterprise after the value added, or turnover, taxes were paid, for the enterprises to pay them a more decent wage. Citizens in state-owned, state-controlled economies, therefore, were more inclined to believe that their typically very large public sectors - embracing, for example, all of higher education, including the canteens and student lodgings - were free because the government had chosen to spend *the government's* money that way, not because the government chose to tax the people and spend *their* money in that fashion.

But the notion that '*it's the government's money*' can stem from more than legacies of Marxism. Countries combining small populations with huge extractive industries such as oil or other minerals (or even tourism or state protected bank accounts) can, at least while the export earnings flow, get by with taxing mainly these industries and whatever multinational corporations and individuals are implicated in their extraction without the need for many or even any taxes, direct or indirect, borne by the average citizen. Even many third world countries without such abundant natural resources may get most of the public revenues from taxing a wealthy minority, their civil servants, and the handful of multinational operating with the borders and not have to worry about taxing the average citizen. And it is these average citizens, therefore, who understandably believe - contrary to my own liberal, free-market perceptions - that the government has all of the money and ought properly to fund higher education (as it presumably used to do) without recourse to something as radical as the imposition of tuition fees.

What is equitable participation?

A final cultural complication to the policy intersection of cost-sharing and equity lies in the different, largely culturally-determined, notions of what properly constitutes *equitable access*. To most American academics, and even to most American politicians other than those on the far right, equitable participation in higher education (or the lack thereof) is revealed by statistical correlations between higher educational access, access to more prestigious institutions and programs, college completion, and going on to advanced levels of graduate or advanced professional study and such attributes as gender, socioeconomic class, and ethnic or linguistic minority status. Reliance only on traditional screens to higher educational participation - that is, on conventional measurements of academic preparedness and interest - are not considered sufficient indicators of equity because both academic preparedness and interest in higher education are themselves widely considered to be so culturally constructed. That is, achievement in high school and scores on school leaving or university entrance examinations are considered to be highly impacted by social class, peer group, the dominant childhood role models, the quality of the middle and secondary

schools, and the language of the home and the neighbourhood. Even such behaviours as interest in higher education, the ability to study with concentration, and the aspiration to achieve academically are believed (with considerable evidence) to be highly correlated with socio-economic status, race, and other socially- and politically-unacceptable correlates. Thus, the United States and Britain especially, but also other industrialised countries such as Australia and most of Continental Western Europe have generally accepted (although not without considerable political contention) the appropriateness of some degree of preferences and second chances to achieve more genuine equity in higher educational participation. Other countries with long histories of racial, ethnic, and linguistic divides - for example, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, China, and many others - also provide measures of preferences, frequently politically contested and of uncertain effectiveness.

However, I have observed many countries that seem far more accepting of a reliance on a conventional academic screen of *merit* in spite of what may be a continuing statistical association between higher educational participation and these supposedly unacceptable correlates of race, social class, and the like. However, to higher educational leaders and politicians in such countries, the presence of a handful of students from poor rural areas or from ethnic or linguistic minorities frequently seems to be sufficient proof that 'they can make it' - all continuing statistical correlations aside.

My quite unofficial and admittedly limited observation is that formerly Marxist countries seem especially accepting of what I term *exceptional* - as opposed to *statistical* - evidence to demonstrate the equitability of their higher educational participation. This may in part be a legacy of Marxism, which needed officially to deny any persisting social inequities and which thus needed to rationalise whatever social class, regional, or ethnic differences as might be observed as a consequence of such more politically acceptable criteria, such as insufficiency of intellect or of interest. And it is probably true that the very most pernicious social and economic correlates of a failure to complete school or to attend or complete college - correlates such as failing urban schools, cultures of drugs and violence, being children of single teen-age mothers, or being victims of racial discrimination - are tragically American (or British, or even French) and far less prevalent in most other societies, however poor or isolated, or otherwise marginalised.

I still believe higher educational cost-sharing - with appropriate policies for expanding participation and equity - to be an imperative for most countries in spite of the inevitable political opposition and in spite of the complexities of introducing financially viable means-tested grant and student loan programs. But culture matters, and I am still learning how and to what consequence.

References

- Johnstone, D.B. (1986). *Sharing the Costs of Higher Education: Student Financial Assistance in the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Sweden, and the United States*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2003). 'Cost-Sharing in Higher Education: Tuition, Financial Assistance, and Accessibility', *Czech Sociological Review*, 39, 3, 351-374.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2004a). 'The Economics and Politics of Cost Sharing in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives', *Economics of Education Review*, 20, 4, 403-410.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2004b). 'Cost-Sharing and Equity in Higher Education: Implications of Income Contingent Loans', in Teixeira, P., Jongbloed, B., Dill, D. and Amaral, A. (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 37-60.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2005). 'Fear and Loathing of Tuition Fees: an American Perspective on Higher education Finance in the UK', *Perspectives*, 9, 1, 12-16.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2006). *Financing Higher Education: Cost-sharing in International Perspective*. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education; and Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Marcucci, P.N. and Johnstone, D.B. (2007). 'Tuition Policies in a Comparative Perspective: Theoretical and Political Rationales', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29, 1, 25-40.

The Devil's in the Detail; Guy Neave and Comparative Higher Education

V. Lynn Meek and Leo Goedegebuure

Professor Guy Neave held the Chair of Comparative Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Twente and his most substantial contributions to the study of higher education arise from his comparative perspective. However, his approach to the comparative study of higher education is not one that unduly bothers with the niceties of methodological rigour. Rather, he is primarily concerned with the realities and importance of time and place. Context - historical, geo-political and cultural - makes all the difference.

Neave's great contribution to enhancing our understanding of higher education dynamics rests on his detailed appreciation of place, time and ideas. He rejects the notion that a better understanding of higher education can be achieved by stripping away context:

Comparative policy studies in higher education ... walked resolutely away from the historical paradigm and embraced the social and, more especially, the economic and administrative sciences. To be sure, the application and refinement of the latter fields have sharpened immeasurably our analytical purchase over higher education. But at the same time, they have also tended to reinforce what has sometimes been called the 'tyranny of the present'. The study of higher education policy is taken up with explaining and understanding what is, and with analysing the impact that policy-driven change and adjustment in selected dimensions of the enterprise have upon others closely related to them (Neave and Van Vught 1991, p. ix).

A decade later, his writing on the topic was more direct: 'there is a tendency in comparative higher education to concentrate on analysing the function of institutions and the mechanisms of educational and administrative procedures as if these processes may the more easily be grasped by stripping them away from their cultural, political and historic settings' (Neave 2001, p. 46).

Much of Neave's comparative analysis is an 'examination of the evolution, pervasiveness and variation of ideas and beliefs that are rooted in, and consequently shape, [higher education] systems and institutions' (Neave 2002a, p. 35). And he goes on to say that 'In this respect, comparative higher education resembles the oarsman who judges his progress by looking back as he moves forward'.

Neave's writing on West European higher education highlight three major historical trends or models: the Humboldtian, the Napoleonic, and the Anglo-Saxon. These major historical traditions of higher education and the ideas on which they rest have influenced the shape, or more accurately, the shapes, of higher education over the centuries. Neave provides extensive empirical evidence to illustrate the power of these different traditions, and has been a strong proponent of including the Napoleonic heritage in our analyses (Neave 2002b). But much of his comparative analysis is via symbolism and analogy rather than in reference to sterile empirical fact per se. In this respect, he often calls on his good friend Prometheus, particularly so when with another good friend and colleague, Frans van Vught, he addresses the question of transition from state control to state supervision of higher education in Western Europe:

Prometheus is a symbol of many dimensions: of Mankind's daring in the face of divine ordinance - Prometheus was punished, as you know, in a singularly nasty way for stealing the sacred flame from the gods. He is also the symbol of innovation and daring. As far as Western Europe was concerned, we [Neave and van Vught] concluded that indeed, Mr Prometheus - Higher Education made flesh - had been unchained. The question to which I wish to address myself follows on from this estimate. Is he still unshackled? Whether today Mr Prometheus is unbound, still shackled or merely released on parole from what is conceived by the canons of Ultra-liberalism as the dead hand of the state, how the relationship between government and institution has evolved in the meantime, is no small issue in itself. It is fraught with methodological niceties. How one assesses the degree of change, as Napoleon's Foreign Minister and regicide, M. de Talleyrand Périgord once remarked of treason itself, is largely a question of dates (Neave 2004, pp. 1-2).

Behind much of Neave's comparative thinking on higher education are questions of convergence and homogeneity and their opposites. We will devote the remainder of this necessarily too short a summary of Neave's comparative approach by examining its implications for research on diversity. In a post-massification era, characterised by strong common international processes, such as Bologna (which has become much more than a purely European phenomenon as highlighted by the so-called Brisbane Communiqué that opens the debate for an Asian-Pacific parallel process), the question of the degree, if at all, to which higher education systems are converging on a common theme or pattern looms large.

In examining questions of diversity and convergence of higher education systems, Neave, unlike some of his contemporaries, has not been seduced by a presumed Anglo-Saxon juggernaut of change:

There is a tendency in comparative higher education, and more particularly in that sub-set which is concerned with policy, implicitly to believe that beneath the triumph of the Anglo-Saxon language as a vehicle of exchange, there is also a convergence towards the norms and practices which that tongue carries with it. The best - or, depending on your ability to sustain a literally 'multi-cultural perspective', perhaps the worst - examples of this process are to be found in that burgeoning field of analysis of 'internationalisation' or 'globalisation'. Here convergence is explicit in the theory, and amazing efforts are made to prove its existence as an objective phenomenon. But convergence is also explicit in the application of the terms employed; the language itself rests on an implicit but unwarranted assumption that the models and practices contained in it are the normative points for the convergence (Neave 2002a, p. 18).

In examining diversity and convergence, Neave has been primarily concerned with the dynamics of systems and the direction of their movement. His is a systemic perspective, concentrating analysis at the national and supranational policy levels.

In examining the forces that work for and against homogenisation and integration within and across national systems, he presents the concepts as ideal types - they are never ultimately achieved in real life, nor are their opposites: differentiation and diversity. Moreover, neither set of concepts is linear, that is, no higher education institution or system moves inevitably towards either homogenisation or diversification. Rather, according to Neave (1996), it is a continual process of oscillation between the polar extremes.

Another proposition of fundamental analytical importance advanced by Neave is that the degree of dynamism of any higher education system is dependent on the level of aggregation at which observation occurs. He is conscious, for example, of the fact that our perception of the evidence of diversity or convergence depends largely on where we cast our eye. Once again, this is best illustrated by metaphor:

The situation is vaguely reminiscent of the episode in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* when Alice meets up with the Cheshire Cat. The Cat, like Higher Education itself, is a singular creature. From afar, its profile looks pretty solid. The nearer the analytic 'Alices' come to the university Cat, the less solid it seems so that, in the end, at the level of the individual establishment, often all that we have is a grin at best or a *rictus sardonicus* at worst (Neave 1996, p. 26).

Neave emphasises the importance of defining at what level questions of diversity and convergence are being investigated: discipline, institution or system. Researchers merely looking for diversification will always find it, as they will its opposite. For example, what may appear to be a stable and well-integrated system at the macro level, will most likely experience at least some degree of

change and innovation at the institutional or departmental level. Contrary patterns of activity can coexist at different levels of aggregation. As Neave notes, whether a particular system is 'diverging or converging is largely a function of where we focus our attention'. But, of course, this does not say anything about what may *cause* movement in one direction or the other.

At the systemic level, the degree of homogenisation or convergence has traditionally been a product of the relationship between higher education and particular national governments. But the advent of the European Community and subsequently the European Union has introduced a supranational dimension into the coordination of higher education for many Western European countries despite the fact that formally higher education remains the prerogative of the nation states - the principle of subsidiarity. According to Neave, strengthening the European dimension, particularly in terms of removing obstacles to student mobility between countries but also through the European Court of Law (Mdme Gravier also features frequently in Neave's writing), implies an increasing impact of supranational directives on national systems, aimed at establishing some form of standardisation and thus generating pressures for homogenisation. But once again, what appears at a superficial level to be the same or similar national response to external pressures, quickly becomes much more varied and complex with closer scrutiny. The Bologna Process is a case in point. The Bologna Process, rather than forcing national higher systems to conform to a common supranational initiative, provided them with a lever to do what they intended to do all along:

[Bologna] is built upon - and brings together - trends already present in different systems and presents them as part of the Bologna process. It does not create them. From a political perspective, this is useful indeed. By bringing existing developments, or those moving towards the implementation stage at the national level, under the shadow of Bologna's wing, it is possible to impart an unprecedented sense of achievement, apparent consensus and agreement, all in a miraculously short space of time. However, from the standpoint of the policy analyst, and very certainly the methodology buff, it is exceedingly difficult to draw a distinction between those lines of policy the origins of which are prior to Bologna and those which Bologna might reasonably claim to have initiated (Neave 2002c, pp. 186-187).

Neave's comparative approach to diversity and convergence of higher education systems and institutions also introduces the interesting concept of the 'law of anticipated results'. The law of anticipated results operates at the institutional level, giving the impression of autonomous institutional action to what is in fact an institutional reaction to actual or anticipated external forces, directives or events. Institutions interpret what is or will be required by government policy and act accordingly, making it considerably difficult to determine whether

change is bottom-up driven or top-down imposed. 'Thus', according to Neave (1996), 'the rhetoric of public policy is often at odds with the institutional behaviour it elicits. One has only to think of the strangely schizophrenic marriage between the centralising tendencies in contemporary British higher education and the government rhetoric of greater autonomy to appreciate the usefulness of the device'.

Neave in many of his writings notes that the traditional Continental European model of higher education coordination, based on the principles of the normalising state and legal homogeneity, served its purpose of ensuring equity and equality of higher education provision, at least in part. But the model's central tenet of legal homogeneity made it difficult to achieve large-scale change, because change had to be equally and systematically spread across the entire system. This is one reason why over several decades now most if not all European countries have been involved with deregulation of higher education where legal homogeneity has given way to performance conditionality. Under the so-called state supervisory model (see above), institutions are given more freedom to set their own mission, objectives and strategic plans. At the same time, institutions are held more accountable for use of their new freedom through such *ex post* devices as performance indicators, quality audits, and cost efficiency measures. An expectation of deregulation has been that it would provide institutions with more stimuli to innovate and find a particular niche in a more competitive higher education market. But Neave (1996) questions whether transferring more regulatory control from the centre to the institutions 'changes greatly the balance of power between the forces for convergence or for diversity'. *Posteriori* methods of control and quality assurance mechanisms apply minimal performance conditions across the system, and, at least potentially, are as powerful forces for uniformity as centralised state control, particularly when they bring reward or punishment in their train.

With the introduction of the dual (and potentially contradictory) policy initiatives of institutional self-regulation and enhanced accountability in many countries, along with various international processes that spread their influence across many systems, what has changed is the structure of the policy environment, and the rules that govern it. Within this new environment, change is a presumed constant. But Neave reminds us, change cannot be assumed within some sort of tautological theory that identifies from the outset that which it hopes to discover. And, as mentioned above, he cautions us against the 'tyranny of the present':

Paradoxically, the question of dates is, if anything, more important today than perhaps it has ever been, though it has to be said that higher education policy, conceived comparatively, rarely if ever concerns itself with chronology in that form. Rather, it is concerned - and is increasingly with a particular aspect of chronology - with the pace of change - with an ever accelerating present rather

than with the origins that have led up to the contemporary condition (Neave 2004, p. 1).

He might have also added that to 'ignore history is to repeat it'. And herein also lies an important message for today's higher education policy makers as well as for our research community. Policy borrowing may have become an increasing feature as demonstrated by research findings on the similarity of developments in different higher education systems. Yet, these cannot be isolated from context, historical or cultural. Indeed, the devil is in the detail and will remain there.

References

- Neave, G. (1996). 'Homogenisation, Integration and Convergence: The Cheshire Cats of Higher Education Analysis', in Meek, V.L. Meek, Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O. and Rinne, R. (eds.), *The Mockers and Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 26 - 41.
- Neave, G. (2001). 'The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Excursion into the Modern Use of Historical Analogues', in Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (eds.), *Higher Education and the Nation State: The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 13 - 75.
- Neave, G. (2002a). 'The Stakeholder Perspective Historically Explored', in Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalising World: International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 17 - 38.
- Neave, G. (2002b). *On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seers, Changing visions of the university*. The CHEPS Inaugurals 2002. Enschede: Universiteit Twente.
- Neave, G. (2002c). 'Anything Goes: Or How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 3, 181-197.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'Mr Prometheus - unbound, shackled or released on parole? Being certain Adumbrations on the Marvelously Changing Relationship between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe'. Presented at the Fulbright Brainstorms 2004 - *New Trends in Higher Education*, Lisbon. http://www.ccla.pt/brainstorms/release1.0/pdf/09_GuyNeave.pdf
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Comparative aspects in higher education: The value of learning from others

Barbara Sporn

The Importance of Comparative Research

Higher education research has been formed and influenced by comparative methods of empirical research and theory building (Clark 1983; Kogan 1996; Teichler 1996; Neave 1996; Altbach 2004). Over the years, a body of knowledge developed which resulted from this fruitful comparison. Different levels have been the subject of this investigation and have provided a rich pool for research. The state and system level has been a key departure point for many higher education researchers. Especially public policy experts, political scientists, and economists conducted research on related topics. The institutional level is the second layer which has drawn much attention over the years. Here, organisational theorists, management professors and leadership as well as governance experts have been active. A final level includes the individual as well as the academic units. Here, topics of productivity, satisfaction and evaluation are most important.

As we know well from Clark, a higher education system can be analysed from different perspectives (Clark 1983). Guy Neave has been able to contribute at all levels and in that way has influenced the discourse substantially. The role of the nation state, the problematic emergence of university management and the consequences for researchers and their academic units has been his major concern (Neave 1996, 1997, 2002). Neave was preoccupied with the notion of knowledge production in different environments and - at the same time - was worried about centers of learning (universities) in the age of globalisation, commodification and internationalisation. He closely observed the trends in Europe - from the Bologna Declaration to its implementation at different institutions (Neave 2005). The comparative aspect of his work focused - as a consequence - on Europe, the UK, Japan, the US and many more nations. He was eager to understand and bring into context different dynamics and idiosyncrasies in order to explain global phenomena. We, as a higher education researcher community, are immensely grateful for this curious mind.

Comparative higher education research has a long tradition. The comparative perspective was informative especially regarding the academic profession (Clark 1998, 1983; Neave and Rhoades 1987; Henkel, 2000), the organisation (Clark 1983), management (Peterson 1995; Williams 1995; Gumport and Sporn 1999) and the

social as well as the political role of higher education institutions (Neave 1995; Slaughter and Leslie 1997). Neave's work has been interested in the organisation and the social role of higher education. Especially the nation state and its changing role have an impact on all other areas.

The organisation of higher education institutions has shifted tremendously over the last decades in Europe and elsewhere. The complex tasks of modern universities made changes necessary in the direction of more integration of different functions, increased leadership and accountability and a revised relationship between the institution and the state. The state's role changed from a control to a supervisory function. Universities were asked to manage their enterprise with a more entrepreneurial approach (Clark 1998) and with a willingness to orient actions towards market mechanisms (Sporn 1999). Critics viewed this as capitalist behaviour (Slaughter and Leslie 1997) and warned us about the danger of 'doing more with less' and cutting resources. New centers and positions were created. Strategies began to define the institution, and the freedom and power of the faculty diminished. Many different countries, from the Netherlands to Spain and from Australia to the US, showed similar trends (De Boer 2001; Harman 1999; Dill 1997). The institutional autonomy of universities has been strengthened to the disadvantage of individual (professorial) autonomy.

The social role of institutions of higher education is a second important phenomenon in comparative higher education research. As Guy Neave once called it, 'The end of the Social Democratic relationship' (Neave 1995) coins a certain development. It is characterised by the emphasis on social equity, access to higher education and the common good idea of education. In many countries this has been replaced by neo-liberal policies, trickle-down economics and individualism. Higher education is not necessarily seen as a common good anymore. Individual choice, the privatisation of higher education (Trow 1998), and the rise of a managerial ideology (Slaughter and Leslie 1997) have been major issues. In short, higher education ideology has been moving away from a social institution to a market industry (Gumport 2000) which features pragmatism, professionalism, evaluation and the withdrawal of the state.

The Importance of Governance, Management, and Leadership

Recent developments in higher education have shown some interesting trends for the future of governance, management and leadership of modern colleges and universities. Neave has been well aware of these changes and commented on them in many publications. His major concern has been the changing balance of power in higher education, market mechanisms driving management, and the evaluative state (Neave 1991, 1997, 1998).

The governance of higher education has changed substantially. New leadership structures are accompanied by a new organisation of teaching and research (Tierney 1997; Marginson and Considine 2000). The state has delegated much of its power to the institutions of higher education (Neave and Van Vught 1991). Boards have been introduced to oversee university and college's activities including approving most budgetary and programmatic decisions as well as appointing the rector or dean. The composition of the board can be a contested issue as board members, especially at public institutions, represent state ownership and/or society at large.

Today's colleges and universities have an increased level of institutional leadership across the globe. With autonomy, deregulation and decentralisation, the power and accountability of rectors, presidents, and deans has increased. The senate's role has weakened in governance. A concentration on core issues of teaching and research and a change towards an advisory function has been the result. The challenge has been to reconcile administration and faculty. Some cases show the development of new executive boards which have dual representation of faculty and administration. Others try to involve faculty in management positions (e.g., deans, program directors).

Within the triangle of governance, management and leadership, administrators and professional managers emerged as new professionals. The professionalisation of higher education has meant the rise of 'professional managers' (Rhoades, 1998). Institutions have extended their mission to include technology transfer, new teaching methods based on new information technology, fundraising activities in response to decreasing public funding, as well as far-reaching student services to increase their customer-orientation. Professionals with an adequate training have been hired to provide these new areas of service. Examples of the establishment of professional support are teaching centers to should help professors improve their course development and teaching styles or technology transfer officers who advise faculty in translating their research into marketable products (Rhoades and Sporn 2002a).

The management of higher education has changed as well (Rhoades and Sporn 2002b; Shattock 2003). Different new instruments help to make colleges and universities more efficient and effective. These instruments range from management by objectives through contracts, goal setting and strategic planning as a basis for resource allocation, as well as output and ex-post control. Control is exercised through assessment and evaluation. In addition to this, goals with service level agreements and a customer focus are increasingly required.

From a comparative perspective, trends in governance, management and leadership point in a similar - but also contested - direction (Sporn 1999; Kogan et al. 2000). Institutions move towards more market-oriented and entrepreneurial

models, and governance is focused on top leadership. The balance between the authority of the faculty and the power of administration is at stake. Colleges and universities need to be flexible and strong enough to meet these challenges. Shared governance and professional administration could be possible success factors.

Neave's Importance in the Community of Higher Education Researchers

As a scholar, Guy Neave has provided us with a rich body of work which ranges across many topics. From a comparative perspective, he gave us insight into many systems and analysed these from a critical perspective. His push to investigate the role of the European Union in higher education reform has been especially influential (Neave 2002, 2005).

As a mentor, Guy Neave has been instrumental in helping young researchers across the globe to flourish. His thoughtful leadership has helped junior researchers to develop their ideas and he has assisted authors to structure their projects so that they become publishable.

As a president, Guy Neave helped the European Association for Institutional Research (EAIR) to develop further into an internationally recognised organisation. He helped to increase the focus on institutional research in higher education organisations and that way further grounded the organisation.

As an editor, Guy Neave has been successful in publishing some of the most important books of the century in higher education research. He has been able to choose the right topics from the right authors and in that way he has helped the community to evolve. Among those publications relevant for comparative higher education research are *Prometheus Bond* (Neave and Van Vught 1991) and *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* (Clark 1998).

As a speaker, Neave is unique. The community has long enjoyed speeches and keynotes by Guy Neave. He is an exquisite speaker with the ability to draw on his rich background in history, political science and international affairs. His language is colourful, witty and provocative at the same time. His thoughts and ideas have inspired many audiences.

Guy Neave has been a great member of the international community of higher education researchers. His retirement celebrations and this publication in his honour will undoubtedly demonstrate his influence and importance among us. I am personally grateful to have worked and interacted with Guy Neave over the last years and hope to do so in the future.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (2004). 'Globalisation and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10, 1, 3-25.
- de Boer, H. (2001). 'On Limitations and Consequences of Change: Dutch University Governance in Transition', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7, 2, 163-180.
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Dill, D.D. (1997). 'Higher Education Markets and Public Policy', *Higher Education Policy*, 10, 3/4, 167-186.
- Gumport, P.J. (2000). 'Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives', *Higher Education*, 39, 1, 67-91.
- Gumport, P.J. and Sporn, B. (1999). 'Institutional Adaptation: Demands for Management Reform and University Administration', in Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (Vol. XIV)*. New York: Agathon, pp. 103-145.
- Harman, G. (1999). 'Australian science and technology academics and university-industry research links', *Higher Education*, 38, 1, 83-103.
- Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education (Vol. 46)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Kogan, M. (1996). 'Comparing Higher Education Systems', *Higher Education*, 32, 395-402.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., and Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education - A Comparative Study (Vol. 57)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Kogan, M., and Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education (Vol. 50)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Marginson, S., and Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neave, G. (1995). 'The Stirring of the Prince and the Silence of the Lambs: The Changing Assumptions Beneath Higher Education Policy, Reform, and Society', in Dill, D.D. and Sporn, B. (eds.), *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 54-71.
- Neave, G. (1996). 'Higher education policy as an exercise in contemporary history', *Higher Education*, 32, 4, 403-415.
- Neave, G. (1997). 'Back to the Future: or, a View on Likely Brain Teasers with which University Management is Likely to be Faced in a Fin De Siecle World', *Tertiary Education And Management*, 3, 4, 275-283.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.

- Neave, G. (2002). 'Anything Goes: or, How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 3, 181-197.
- Neave, G. (2005). 'Euro-Philiacs, Euro-Sceptics and Europhobics: Higher Education Policy, Values and Institutional Research', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11, 2, 113-129.
- Neave, G. and Rhoades, G. (1987). 'The Academic Estate in Western Europe', in Clark, B.R. (ed.), *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 211-270.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F.A. (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Peterson, M.W. (1995). 'Images of University Structure, Governance, and Leadership: Adaptive Strategies for the New Environment', in Dill, D.D. and Sporn, B. (eds.), *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 140-158.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rhoades, G. and Sporn, B. (2002a). 'New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 1, 3-28.
- Rhoades, G. and Sporn, B. (2002b). 'Quality Assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and Political Economic Framing of Higher Education Policy', *Higher Education*, 43, 3, 355-390.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. London: Open University Press.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive University Structures: An Analysis of Adaptation to Socioeconomic Environments of US and European Universities*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Teichler, U. (1996). 'Comparative Higher Education: Potentials and Limits', *Higher Education*, 32, 4, 431-465.
- Tierney, W.G. (1998). *The Responsive University: Restructuring for High Performance*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trow, M. (1998). 'Governance in the University of California: The Transformation of Politics into Administration', in Müller-Böling, D., Mayer, E., MacLachlan, A.J. and Fedrowitz, J. (eds.), *University in Transition*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation, pp. 265-286.
- Williams, G.L. (1995). 'The 'Marketization' of Higher Education: Reforms and Potential Reforms in Higher Education Finance', in Dill, D.D. and Sporn, B. (eds.), *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 170-193.

V. Higher education studies: research and policy

Wisdom and Wit in the Study of Higher Education

Ronald Barnett

Introduction

What is it to study higher education? This matter is intimately bound up with what we take higher education to be. And so a further question lurks within our opening question: how do we understand higher education itself? And yet further questions could open, for instance as to differences between research *into* higher education and the scholarly understanding *of* higher education. The point though is perhaps made. Understanding the understanding of higher education is - to draw on an analogy that Guy Neave has offered us - akin to opening a Russian doll: opening one issue serves only to reveal yet another; and so on and so on. But the matter here is more complicated still: in opening our doll, we find inside twin dolls. For our opening questions gives rise to two parallel sets of inquiries: on the one hand, questions as to the nature of higher education; and, on the other hand, questions as to the appropriate means of elucidating higher education.

I want to pursue these two sets of matters together. I want to explore both the role of scholarly inquiry *and* the nature of higher education itself. And I shall do so with a few examples drawn from the work of Guy Neave.

Grand narratives; local stories

We have been told by the post moderns that large stories of ourselves, of humankind, are at an end. We only have the local, even the parochial, to serve as the context for our values, our hopes, our projects. Reason with a capital 'R', so to speak, is in difficulty. The world is broken open, and even broken up. It is a fluid world, a liquid world (Bauman 2005). Large categories can find no secure hold.

It seems to be thus, too, in higher education. The national systems vary; the institutions differ (prompted by national agendas towards 'diversity') and disciplines take on contrasting shapes. And, in a marketised age, it is better if we also note that students differ among themselves and look to be treated as 'individuals': if we do not do so, the students may accept the label that comes their way and take their 'custom' elsewhere. Accordingly, a sensitivity to micro-

structures springs up in the literature. Qualitative research in higher education prompts this focus, certainly; but so, as remarked, does the power of the student-as-consumer, real or imagined.

But large stories do not easily die. Guy Neave, for one, keeps giving us large stories. Four papers, culled at random from the internet, bear these titles:

- ‘Anything Goes: or, how the accommodation of Europe’s universities to European integration integrates an inspiring number of contradictions’ (Neave 2002);
- ‘Euro-philiacs, Euro-Sceptics and Europhobics: Higher Education Policy, Values and Institutional Research’ (Neave 2005a);
- ‘The Social Dimension and Social Cohesion. Or, On Reconciling Adam Smith with Thomas Hobbes’ (Neave 2005b);
- ‘The Temple and the Guardians: An Excursion into the Rhetoric of Evaluating Higher Education’ (Neave 2004).

The titles alone speak to large vistas, and grand categories, and diverse perspectives - of history and the analysis of higher education systems, of cross-national perspectives and of policy analysis and of value engagement. Here, we have wisdom *and* wit: far ranging views and an intriguing juxtaposition of ideas. And, within the papers, we find asides in different languages and references to Greek mythology. But, characteristically too, the analyses that come to us from the metaphorical pen of Guy Neave are anchored in examinations of specific policies and developments in particular countries. The grand narrative and the local story: we are tacitly reminded in these writings that the two levels of analysis need not be held apart; they may just inform each other.

Long quotations can be hard going; but perhaps, in a Festschrift, I might be indulged. Here is a paragraph by Guy Neave, taken from the last of the papers listed above (in which it forms a whole sub-section):

The Unholy Trinity of Euro-Politics

What is a Euro-philiac? A Euro-philiac is one for whom hope and enthusiasm transcend evidence or logic. The prime quality of Euro-philiacs, like the Saints of old, is Faith. They know the cost of nothing and the value of endowing everything with the adjective ‘Euro’, however remote the association - *Euro uitlaat* for instance! What contrast, the Euro-phobic. There, pessimism outstrips all pragmatic attempts to move at all, which makes him the unwavering celebrant of a glorious Stasis. The Euro-phobic dwells in the past, knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing. Last, we have the Euro-sceptic. The Euro-sceptic suspends belief. He or she forswears wild enthusiasm. The

Euro-phobic is not 'set around with dismal stories' - that *frisson d'horreur* the Euro-phobic delights in. The Euro-sceptic keeps his disbelief in check, too. Thus, the Euro-sceptic figures neither in the ranks of those for whom Europe looms as the post-modern equivalent of the Holy Grail. Nor does he figure amongst our present-day Ayatollahs who abjure Europe as the Great Satan of the hour together with all its Works - good, bad, indifferent, surreal, sublime or ridiculous' (Neave 2005a).

In the one paragraph, we have the large canvas, the landscape populated with figures that supply resonances with the Bible (and Christianity) and also with myths. And the movements and the figures invite both attraction and even repulsion. This is a rich tapestry. That landscape is nothing less than Europe (a theme to which we must return) with large stories being played out before us. And there is, surely, wit here, 'wit' at least in the earlier meaning of the term; for here, we see a playfulness in its use of terms, and associations of ideas, and references. Texts by Guy Neave call for wide knowledge and understanding of the culture and history of the different countries of Europe. This is a wit that at once lifts the 'study of higher education' from its conventional terminology and style *and*, at the same time, implies that those in higher education - especially perhaps those who study higher education - may just at times take themselves a little too seriously.

Serious matters

And yet, beneath the wit, present in the apparently easy flowing texts, are serious matters. Perhaps the most significant matter in Guy Neave's writings may be expressed in the form of a question: in the twenty-first century, can we speak of a European idea of higher education and, if so, in what might it be said to reside? By 'Europe', I mean here especially Western Europe, for it was there that we witnessed several of the dominant ideas of higher education taking shape. Indeed, not only is the term 'Europe' to be found frequently in Neave's writings but 'Western Europe' is no stranger either. Yes, we are continually treated to insights into differences across countries but they come across, surely, as players within a larger drama concerned with the fate of Western European higher education.

The drama has *not yet* become a tragedy. 'Bologna' is deployed as a largely pejorative term, conjuring for bodings of a new tyrant imposing its will upon academic peoples:

Constructing a European Higher Education Area without the Academic Estate seems very much in keeping with constructing a citizen's Europe without its citizens, though recent events show this is no joking matter and no longer a theoretical scenario (Neave 2005a, p. 116).

So there is a Europe of the bureaucrats and a Europe of the academics. But the forces with which the academic estate has to contend extend to include the state and the economic sphere. The playing out of the former set of relationships - academe and the state - has long been a point of fascination for anyone interested in higher education across Europe; an evolving set of relationships over some hundreds of years. The rapid evolution of state-directed or state-influenced evaluation systems in higher education has offered one marked site of such relationships; and significant differences can be observed across Western Europe:

If we look at the French interpretation of Evaluation, it ... may be seen as government building up the trust and ... the self-confidence of (the) academic Estate. Such an approach stood in marked contrast to what was happening beyond the Northern mists of the English Channel for the Prince in France was not seeking to assert his powers over academia, nor to bring it to heel (Neave 2004, p. 222).

The phrases 'assert his powers over academia' and 'bring to heel' are self-evidently indications as to where the readers' sympathies are expected to lie: the analysis leads to some clear value-judgements as to the locus of legitimacy in the contemporary shifts in state-higher education relationships. Some states have been effecting the changing relationships in acceptable ways - sustaining or even enhancing trust in, self-confidence among, and a collective spirit across higher education institutions, while some states (the UK most markedly, it seems) have been putting all of that in jeopardy.

And 'Bologna' has added a further layer of patterning for the discerning to unravel. It can be read, after all, precisely as a project to develop a European idea of the university. But, then, two questions arise: is this a new idea of the university? And how might we understand its playing out across Europe?

On the first issue, the idea of the university implicit in Bologna, we may see that the long-standing sense of the university as a particularly 'public' institution is in jeopardy:

The historic and identifying feature of the European university ... has been the close alignment of higher education with public service ... (Neave 2005b, p. 4).

For Bologna is associated with those wider shifts in the positioning of the university conjured by terms such as 'entrepreneurial', 'competition' and 'consumer', but:

Placing the emphasis upon the market as the prime condition of social coherence has had weighty consequences indeed for the European university ... (Neave 2005b, p. 6).

For all its modern positioning in terms of an agenda of inclusivity and social cohesion, the university is now associated with an agenda of individualism, as students have both to find the economic wherewithal to complete their programmes and to take responsibility for developing the skills to ensure their own 'employability' after gaining their qualifications. In the process, the idea of the European University as a site of 'culture' is being radically turned around. It is not that the University is no longer a site of culture; rather, it is a matter of the kind of culture for which the European University has come to stand. We are witnessing no less than:

... the re-sitting of the university as an expression of national culture and its [recasting] as a service and training institution the purpose of which is predominantly defined in terms of serving one particular interest within the Nation, namely the Firm and the development of one over-riding priority - the embedding of entrepreneurial culture ... (Neave 2005b, p. 8).

Coda

We may return to our opening questions: what is it to study higher education? And just how might we understand higher education? These few insights drawn from Guy Neave's work open, surely, the following dual set of observations:

Firstly, that, if those who seek to understand higher education do not exercise due diligence (*not* to be associated with Guy Neave), there lurks the prospect that the modern understanding of higher education may come unwittingly to mirror the movements it is trying to illuminate. The very language of higher education scholarship and research may come to be limited; and its concepts and its definitions of the problems may become those largely of the bureaucracies. In short, the study of higher education may come to form itself a kind of 'Eurospeak', tacitly serving those new 'Princes', that is the knowledge economy and the learning economy.

Secondly, however, and as we have seen here, it does not have to be like that. The study of higher education can itself hold onto large stories, traditional themes, and a sense of the longer historical role of universities. It can even ask if the idea of the university makes sense today; and, if so, just what sense? But, if it is to make inroads in such a somewhat subversive project, it had better not take itself too seriously. A little wit fed into its wisdom may be all to the good, if only to prick the pomposity of the bureaucratic trends and ideological forces with which this scholarship must contend.

References

- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid Life*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Neave, G. (2002). 'Anything goes: or, how the accommodation of Europe's universities to European integration integrates an inspiring number of contradictions', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 181-197.
- Neave, G. (2005a). 'Euro-philiacs, Euro-Sceptics and Europhobics: Higher Education Policy, Values and Institutional Research', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11, 113-129.
- Neave, G. (2005b). 'The Social Dimension and Social Cohesion. Or On Reconciling Adam Smith with Thomas Hobbes. Presented to the Seminar *The Social Dimension of the European Higher Education Area and worldwide Competition*. Paris.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'The Temple and its Guardians: An Excursion into the Rhetoric of Evaluating Higher Education', *The Journal of Finance and Management in Colleges and Universities*, 1, 211-227.

Research and Knowledge Transfer: New Goals, Old Dilemmas

Elaine El-Khawwas

Spurred by national and international trends, many nations have launched new initiatives to strengthen their educational systems to meet the demands of a knowledge economy. As part of these efforts, policy attention has turned to the importance of knowledge transfer and information dissemination. Questions are being raised about ways that universities and governments can enhance the linkages between producers and users of knowledge. This paper offers a critical perspective on these initiatives. Inspiration for these comments is found in writings by Guy Neave, a gifted scholar of higher education whose insights have consistently clarified - and modelled - the principles that undergird strong research, in whatever time and place (e.g., Neave 2004, 2006).

Knowledge transfer as a new policy arena

In the last decade, much attention has focused on the role of educational systems and universities in the knowledge economy, expected to face increasing competition from other countries, large and small. The future role of universities in China, India, South Korea and other emerging nations is increasingly given close attention, as demonstrated in a recent UNESCO Forum on Research (UNESCO 2006). Responding to new imperatives for educational quality and innovation, governments are pressing their traditional universities to be among the most competitive knowledge producers in the 21st century.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has played a leading role in international debates, with several projects that have explored the heightened need for better knowledge production. OECD publications, including *Knowledge Management in the Learning Society* (2000) and *Innovation in the Knowledge Economy* (2004), have argued that better knowledge bases and knowledge management are increasingly critical to innovation and success. A related OECD report, *New Challenges for Educational Research* (2003), considered the implications of these new demands for educational research, and a new report, *Evidence in Educational Policymaking: Linking Research to Policy*, examines recent actions to develop more effective linkages (OECD forthcoming). These reports have emphasised the need to develop more effective mechanisms for knowledge transfer and dissemination. i.e., assembling, interpreting and distributing knowledge to both practitioners and policymakers. Between 2004 and 2006, OECD organised four seminars on ways to improve evidence-based

policy research. A 2005 workshop in The Hague, for example, discussed the role of brokering agencies in mediating between research and policy or practice.

Recent debate has focused on weaknesses in the quality and relevance of educational research, and on actions to improve its scientific rigor and its evidentiary base. A number of countries have responded with new policy initiatives. In England, the educational R&D system was judged to be weak as a source of innovation, and several new projects got underway. A National Education Research Forum was established, bringing together various stakeholders to build partnerships for R&D. The Teaching and Learning Research Program (TLRP), established in 2004, has sponsored 60 teams of researchers working in different thematic areas. The EPPI Centre (Education Policy and Practice Information) has also given leadership. Established in 1993 and located at the Institute of Education, University of London, the EPPI-Centre develops systematic research syntheses on questions of education policy. These reviews, prepared by teams of scholars that closely examine the strength of the evidence on each topic, are available through REEL (Research Evidence in Education Library), its online 'library.'

In the United States, the National Academies of Science has made recommendations for strengthening the scientific basis of education research and for helping educators assess the relevance of research to education practice (Shavelson and Towne 2002). The U.S. Department of Education has called for strengthening the 'evidence-base' of education research and, especially, greater reliance on what they call the 'gold standard' for research, experimental or quasi-experimental research designs with randomly selected treatment groups. The Department reorganised its research office into a new Institute of Education Sciences and, in 2002, funded the What Works Clearinghouse, a new mechanism for information dissemination that shares with the EPPI Centre in the U.K. the overall objective of increasing reliance on evidence-based research. The activities of the What Works Clearinghouse are devoted principally to reviews of whether strong experimental or quasi-experimental design was employed on studies of the effectiveness of educational practices on student achievement (U.S. Department of Education 2003).

Several other countries have launched new efforts to strengthen education research, sometimes spurred by disappointing results documented by PISA and other international testing of student achievement. In 2004, Canada established the Canadian Council on Learning, which has projects underway to address knowledge gaps, promote information exchange and foster more effective use of evidence and research to support learning. Systematic reviews of research have been prepared, learning indicators developed, and assessment and monitoring tools have been produced. In New Zealand, the Ministry of Education organised a collaborative knowledge-building strategy, based on the development of Best

Evidence Syntheses that focus on learning outcomes and major influences on those outcomes.

New initiatives are underway in other countries. The Netherlands and Denmark, for example, have recently identified new mechanisms to link research and policy. These country-level efforts mirror a set of international initiatives to promote stronger research. The Campbell Collaboration is an international initiative that, since 2000, has sponsored systematic reviews of policy interventions in a variety of social and educational arenas. A major agenda of the Collaboration is to promote the use of randomly controlled trials to test causal relationships. This work has been modelled on the activities of the Cochrane Collaboration, established in 1993, which promotes strong research design in medicine and healthcare.

Knowledge production and distribution: some practical realities

Other initiatives could be cited but these examples illustrate some of the themes and directions of recent policy debate around the world. It is clear that current international debate addresses a broad objective, seeking ways that knowledge production can better serve national purposes. Obvious, too, is a new emphasis on more systematic synthesis of research and transfer of research knowledge to external audiences. Governments have shown a new readiness to sponsor formal channels for knowledge exchange. Not as clear is whether these initiatives will support, or instead challenge, the traditional autonomy of universities in formulating, conducting and reporting on research.

In most countries and in all areas of research, knowledge production traditionally has been a shared enterprise between university and government. Each had defined responsibilities, and university professors were accorded the prerogative to define their research problems and approaches. This freedom has always faced some tension with governmental pressures for practical guidance, especially in the many research areas that are relevant to public policy. This pressure has increased in the current climate, as governments seek to assertively promote and strengthen their research capacity as a key element in international competitiveness (cf. Edquist 1997). Traditional forms of knowledge production, relying on methodical scholarly work accumulated over many years, are seen as too slow, too undependable for new times. Traditional forms of knowledge transfer are also seen as problematic (cf. El-Khawas 2000, 2001). Professional journals and meetings, even when linked to websites, are criticised for being slow and directed primarily to other researchers.

If a more effective system for producing and sharing knowledge on education issues is to develop, a number of issues must be considered. Thus far, the debate

has been narrow, primarily focused on changing methods for disseminating research findings. A broader issue must be addressed: whether education research has the level of capacity to be successful. Many veteran observers have concluded that research capacity in education (e.g., Slavin 2002; Weiler 2006), and in higher education research (Teichler and Sadlak 2000) is woefully short of what is needed. OECD statistical studies support this view, demonstrating that the level of investment in education research is low.

In most countries, education research is funded by the same mechanisms as other fields of scholarly research, i.e., primarily through competitively awarded research grants from governmental agencies and, sometimes, from private foundations. Typically, education has been given low priority by such processes and, consequently, the structure of education research activity is limited. In most countries, only a small number of universities support organised research units devoted to education issues. Subject coverage is uneven, as repetitive small-scale studies are conducted on certain subjects while other issues are neglected. Certain methodologies are favoured, particularly those that are not costly.

These indicators and others argue for urgent attention to capacity and capacity-building with respect to research and the ability of universities to contribute to the burgeoning knowledge needs of today. The task for governments and universities, seen in this perspective, go well beyond that of building a better approach to dissemination. As Weiler outlined recently, strengthening research capacity calls for attention to many ingredients of capacity, among them a requirement for developing a cadre of capable researchers, including support for young scholars; adequate infrastructure; an appropriate and dependable level of funding; dialogue between universities and government; a critical understanding of how research plays a role in addressing policy problems; and a climate '...where research is valued, supported and autonomous' (Weiler 2006, p. 3).

Conclusion

As Guy Neave would suggest - although more elegantly - recent debates among policy makers seem to have put the cart before the horse. It makes limited sense to improve the tools for synthesising research results if the greatest need is, first, to improve the capacity for producing high-quality knowledge directed to important policy questions. The separate ingredients need to be aligned: build capacity, address important questions, and disseminate findings effectively. All are critical ingredients of successful innovation and improvement (Neave 2006).

The new policy attention to knowledge production and dissemination, launched initially with a focus on evidence-based research, may have significant long-term benefits for research on education policy. Even the narrow focus on research

synthesis and dissemination may offer a significant gain, compared to prior dissemination projects that limited themselves to cataloguing and categorising studies. Current efforts also are likely to influence the nature and methods of education research, in part by establishing new norms and definitions of good research. Because the debate has broadened, reflecting governmental concerns for the quality and relevance of education research, other gains might be expected and may lead to a strengthening of research capacity. Ideally, the debate will also exert pressure for increased funding of research, including support for the large-scale, robust studies that increasingly inform health practice and other areas of social policy.

References

- Edquist, C. (1997). *Systems of innovation: Technologies, institutions and organizations*. London: Pinter.
- El-Khawas, E. (2000). 'Research, policy and practice: Understanding the linkage mechanisms', in Teichler, U. and Sadlak, J. (eds.), *Higher education research: Its relationship to policy and practice*. Oxford: Pergamon/IAU, pp. 37-46.
- El-Khawas, E. (2001). 'Patterns of communication and miscommunication between research and policy, chapter', in Schwarz, S. and Teichler, U. (eds.), *The institutional basis of higher education research: Experiences and perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 45-56.
- Neave, G. (2006). 'Mapping Knowledge Society back into Higher Education', in *Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: Critical perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 13-22.
- Neave, G. (2004). 'Research and research-training systems: Towards a typology', *UNESCO Forum, Occasional Paper series, 1*, Paris: UNESCO.
- OECD (forthcoming). *Evidence in Educational Policymaking: Linking Research to Policy*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2000). *Knowledge Management in the Learning Society*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2004). *Innovation in the Knowledge Economy*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2003). *New Challenges for Educational Research*. Paris: OECD.
- Shavelson, R.J. and Towne, L. (2002). *Scientific Research in Education*. Washington DC: National Academies Press.
- Slavin, R.E. (2002). 'Evidence-based Education Policies: Transforming Educational Practice and Research', *Educational Researcher*, 31, 7, 15-21.
- Teichler, U. and Sadlak, J. (2000). *Higher Education Research: Its Relationship to Policy and Practice*. Oxford: Pergamon/IAU press.
- UNESCO, 2006. 'Universities as Centers of Research and Knowledge Creation: An Endangered Species?' *Papers from the Colloquium on Research and Higher Education Policy*. Paris: UNESCO.

- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (2003). *Identifying and implementing educational practices supported by rigorous evidence*. Washington, DC.
- Weiler, H.N. (2006). 'Summary Report, Universities as Centers of Research and Knowledge Creation: An Endangered Species?' *Colloquium on Research and Higher Education Policy*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 3.

Higher Education in the 21st Century: Seven Pairs of Contrasting Trends

Sarah Guri-Rosenblit

Higher education systems in the 21st century have been faced by most demanding challenges. Operating in a very complicated world, universities and other higher education institutions have to adjust themselves to handle concurrently contrasting trends (Weiler et al. 2006; Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007). They do not normally have the privilege of choosing either one or the other, but rather have to find a delicate and subtle balance between opposing policies. This paper presents briefly the intricate interrelations between seven pairs of contrasting trends in higher education: globalisation versus national needs, government steering versus greater institutional autonomy, harmonisation versus diversity, public versus private sectors, basic versus applied research, competition versus collaboration, and intellectual property versus intellectual philanthropy.

Globalisation versus National Needs

Universities are at present engaged in becoming partners in inter-institutional schemes and pushing forward in the drive towards globalisation. Students, academic staff and curricula are transferred and exchanged between institutions, and collaborative research projects are forged. Unquestionably, globalisation has become one of the defining features of higher education in the 21st century. It draws attention to the undeniable fact that boundaries of what were relatively closed national systems are increasingly being challenged by common international trends (Altbach and Teichler 2001; Enders and Fulton 2002; Enders 2004; Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007; Van der Wende 2002).

Transnational education is one of the potent manifestations of the impact of globalisation upon higher education. The number of transnational students world wide, that either study abroad towards academic degrees or study within extensions of foreign universities in their own national jurisdiction, has increased dramatically in the last decade, and according to OECD projections will include around seven million students in 2025 (Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007). The positive aspects of transnational education include: widening of learning opportunities at various higher education levels by providing more choice for citizens in any given national jurisdiction; challenging traditional education systems by introducing more competition and innovative programs and delivery methods; helping make higher education more competitive; assisting in diversifying the

financing of higher education; and benefiting through links with prestigious institutions, mainly for developing countries (UNESCO 2003). However, there are also negative aspects of transnational education. Currently many unregulated providers of higher education operate for-profit in many countries. They are not subject to external or internal audit/monitoring processes, and their operation remains outside official national quality assurance regimes. Many of these institutions constitute 'degree mills' that provide low level education.

In the wake of globalisation trends, there is also an emerging super model of productivity of world class universities, reflected in many league tables and a special sub-set of studies comparing different league tables, with some countries and some institutions already headhunting for Nobel Prize laureates in order to improve their standing in some of the rankings (Altbach 2004; European Commission 2004; Weiler et al. 2006).

Globalisation trends, while facilitating networking, collaboration, and flexibility between systems, also threaten the stability, security and identity of universities in some national settings (Ordorika 2006). Considering that we cannot eliminate globalisation trends, even if we do not like many of their results, we have to adjust to them and see what can be gained from them, while at the same time taking care of the national context (Weiler et al. 2006; Huisman et al. 2001; Neave, 2000). It is of tremendous importance to pay careful attention to the relevant roles of higher education in national settings. There are acute differences between developing and developed countries, and between different types of higher education institutions within any given country. Some universities are much more generously endowed and equipped to serve a broader range of functions in a global context, even beyond the needs of their particular environment and society, while many others need to concentrate first and foremost on the present and future knowledge needs of their own communities, and develop their special loci of expertise (Ordorika 2006; Weiler et al. 2006).

Government Steering versus Institutional Autonomy

The last decade witnessed a growing trend of providing more autonomy, especially in financial matters, for higher education institutions coupled with a demand for increased accountability. There is noticeable contradiction in the position which many governments are currently portraying in their relation to higher education institutions. On the one hand, they are retreating from their responsibility for sustaining universities and university research and give the universities more autonomy to be entrepreneurial and to define their own agenda and policy (Clark 1998; Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007; UNESCO 2003). On the other hand there is a great deal of pressure for greater accountability on the universities' performance, as reflected in an array of quality assurance and

'performance indicators' and in the emergence of new evaluation bureaucracies and steering mechanisms. New mechanisms of government steering and management have today a substantial impact on the structures of higher education systems and their operation (Bleiklie 2001, 2004). Higher education in many countries is increasingly shaped by mechanisms of incentives and sanctions imposed top-down.

As a reaction to severe cuts in funding in many national settings, higher education institutions have been forced to compete for public financial support against a wide range of other areas covered by public/government budgets. An emerging trend in many countries is the moving of many higher education systems to charging tuition fees combined with a system of appropriate cost recovery and the provision of student support systems. More and more universities have become entrepreneurial in their search for diverse funding sources, mobilising private resources and investing in areas of applied research which bear the potential to yield revenues through patents and collaborative ventures with industry and the corporate sector. A handful of universities have managed to take advantage of the opportunities presented to them by being given more degrees of freedom to define their priorities both in research and teaching, and set themselves as leading universities.

Harmonisation versus Diversity

The last decade has witnessed a growing tendency to harmonise higher education systems and make them more flexible, most noticeably in Europe through the Bologna Process. Since 1999, the Bologna Process has set up an intensive process which aims at establishing a harmonised joint Higher Education Area of Europe by 2010. Restructuring the academic degrees in many national jurisdictions has initiated profound changes in many countries (Guri-Rosenblit and Sebkova 2004). Each stage in advancing the Bologna Process requires greater commitment to the commonality of purpose and action in the field of higher education, so that, by 2010, higher education services will be able to flow freely from one side of the continent to the other, like material goods do today (Commission of the European Communities 2003; UNESCO 2003). Students of all ages will draw on the most convenient services, relevant in the terms of their intellectual interests, career development or social commitments. For learners, and administrators, the freedom of movement in a common European intellectual space will offer equal conditions of access to many providers and users of higher education, equal conditions of assessment and recognition of services, of skills and competencies, and equal conditions of work and employment. The tools given by the Bologna Declaration are intended to invent a European model of higher education sufficiently strong to establish its attractiveness vis-à-vis the rest of the world, and particularly vis-à-vis the American model.

Concurrently with decreasing the diversity between higher education systems at the macro level, the architects of the Bologna Process have stressed from the outset that it is of tremendous importance to acknowledge the legitimacy of institutional diversity and heterogeneity of academic cultures. They emphasised that diversity must be preserved, even if convergence and common issues of concern should be implemented and pushed forward (UNESCO 2003). In other words, the trend of convergence does not abolish the inherent diversity of higher education institutions in European countries. Various types of higher education institutions will continue to operate in all national settings, and they will portray both vertical differences (based on various hierarchical and ranking criteria) and horizontal differences (targeted to different student clienteles) (Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007; Neave 2003).

Public versus Private Sectors

The interrelations between public and private higher education institutions portray different academic cultures. In some countries, there is almost no private sector in the higher education system. In England, for example, except for Buckingham University which is a private small scale university, there are no private universities and colleges. The United States, on the other hand, has a very strong component of private higher education institutions, and it is particularly proud of its private research universities, that have established themselves as leading world class universities, and are models for imitation the envy of many nations. Japan, China, India and Germany have proclaimed in the last decade that they are opting to establish world class universities comparable to the American ones. However, the unique interrelations between academic institutions and the corporate world in the USA are non-existent in any other country. The generous donations and endowments of the business world and private alumni to American universities are the envy of all other countries, and are hard to imitate, because they are built on strong cultural roots that have been cultivated for centuries in American society. There are also other types of private institutions in the USA, like Phoenix University that constitutes the largest distance teaching university in the USA, many for-profit consortia, corporate universities that cater to various clienteles and expand access opportunities in American higher education (Guri-Rosenblit 2006).

The widening of access to higher education in Europe has been linked also to the development of many private higher education institutions. In some of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, which experienced enormous increases of students, the proportion of private institutions in the overall number of higher education institutions is remarkably high. For instance, in Slovenia the private institutions constitute 82% of the total number of higher education institutes; in Poland - 63%; in Romania - 60%, in Hungary - 52% (UNESCO 2003, p. 5). But a

prevailing number of these private universities and colleges are small, and provide mainly high demand subjects of study in business administration, economics and some other social science subjects. Unlike the well-established leading private universities in the USA, most of the private providers in European countries, as well as in many other countries worldwide, have weak infrastructures, relatively unstable full-time academic faculty, and operate mainly for profit. In order to ensure minimum standards of academic diplomas, it is of tremendous importance to set quality assurance measures. Nowadays, the Bologna Process aims at establishing accreditation agencies, both state agencies and self-regulatory bodies of academic institutions, in order to enhance a quality assurance culture, setting clear criteria for the evaluation of quality of higher education provided by both public and private higher education institutions. The introduction of the 'European Credit Transfer System' is viewed as a principle instrument in achieving transparency of the quality of academic programs (Bolog 2003; UNESCO 2003).

Basic versus Applied Research

Research is a key ingredient in the institutional identity of universities and an indispensable prerequisite for a successful program of teaching and public service. Good research does cost money, and often a great deal of money (Weiler et al. 2006). In order to mobilise large amounts of resources for costly research which requires expensive infrastructure, great attention is paid nowadays to applied research. Many scholars in the field tend to relate to the triple helix model which emphasises the importance of connections between industry, government and universities in order to provide adequate resources for fruitful research. Fifty per cent of research in China, for instance, is currently sponsored by industry and the corporate world, and unquestionably such a connection has an immense impact in defining the areas of research (Weiler et al. 2006). In a large scale colloquium which UNESCO held in December 2006 on 'Universities as Centers of Research and Knowledge Production', many presentations highlighted the importance of applied research. The presentation of Abdul Razak and Ramli Mohamed from Malaysia outlined five generations of research, over which the head of the traditional research pyramid was turned upside down. The first generation of 'ivory tower', or pure and basic research, has been defined as the first generation of research, and the innovative kind of research in which products are produced and money earned has been defined as the highest generation of research (Weiler 2006).

There is real danger that basic research which has led to so many breakthroughs in every domain in our lives will decrease significantly in the future. Already, throughout the world fewer students apply to study physics, maths and similar subjects. The majority of students are interested in business administration, law

and computer science. The leading research universities should stand as strong 'research citadels' and invest special efforts to maintain their contribution to basic research, while governments should allocate special resources to sustain and encourage vital basic research.

Competition versus Collaboration

Another pair of contrasting trends relates to the conflicting world in which higher education institutions are required to both compete and collaborate with their counterparts. On the one hand, they are told to thrive and develop through competition. On the other hand, they are being told to collaborate with one another. Each institution has to define concurrently its competing parties and its potential collaborators. It is inevitable that, in the world of higher education, as elsewhere, there is competition for scarce resources, be it research funding, good faculty or good students. At the same time, successful collaborative ventures hold great potential for generating additional resources and recruiting new student clienteles (Guri-Rosenblit et al. 2007). Many international bodies encourage, and even condition funding of research projects by forcing collaboration between several higher education institutions, preferably from different countries. In the research domain one influential form of cooperation is reflected in a growing trend of forming interdisciplinary teams within and across institutions. Research cooperation with the business sector also constitutes an influential trend, as aforementioned.

Intellectual Property versus Intellectual Philanthropy

Two contrasting trends are apparent in the field of knowledge generation and have been enhanced by the knowledge revolution through the emergence of digital technologies. Both so-called developed as well as developing countries have defined stringent copyright regulations and invested great efforts in registering patents in the last decade. A new 'cyber law' field has been born to deal with intellectual property issues.

At the same time an intriguing movement has started to evolve advocating open source policies, and this movement is gaining momentum at an accelerated pace. Clearly, more open access to sources of scholarly information, libraries, and software codes would tremendously benefit especially teaching and research in those countries that suffer from severe shortages in adequate academic manpower and research facilities. The 'MIT's Open Courseware Project' was one of the pioneers in promoting open source materials (Olsen 2002; Vest 2001). It demonstrates how a leading private university can practice intellectual philanthropy in the world of academic teaching. Higher education institutions all

over the world are able to adapt content and ideas from the MIT courses for their benefit. Many leading universities have followed suit.

Organisations like OECD, the World Bank and UNESCO, but also companies involved in producing the appropriate technology, have joined recently the effort to make their influence felt in the direction of making these vital resources for research and teaching more openly and equitably available, to the benefit of all, and particularly to developing countries.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (2004). 'The costs and benefits of world-class universities', *Academe*, 90, 1, 1-5.
- Altbach, P.G. and Teichler, U. (2001). 'Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university', *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 1, 5-25.
- Bleiklie, I. (2001). 'Towards European convergence of higher education policy?' *Higher Education Management*, 13, 3, 9-29.
- Bleiklie, I. (2004). 'Diversification of Higher Education Systems in Knowledge Society', *UNESCO Occasional Forum Series, Paper No. 6 - Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research*, Paris: UNESCO Forum of Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, pp. 16-39.
- Bolag, B. (2003). 'European higher education seeks a common currency', *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26 September, p. 52.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press & International Association of Universities.
- Commission of the European Communities (2003). *The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Enders, J. (2004). 'Higher education, internationalization, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory', *Higher Education*, 47, 361-382.
- Enders, J. and Fulton, O. (2002). *Higher Education in a Globalizing World: International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- European Commission (2004). 'The ingredients for building a world-class university', *CORDIS News*, 23 April.
- Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2006). *Access and Equity in Higher Education: Historical and Cultural Context*. An internal paper, Fulbright New Century Scholars Program.

- Guri-Rosenblit, S. and Sebkova, H. (2004). 'Diversification of Higher Education Systems: Patterns, Trends and Impacts', *UNESCO Occasional Forum Series, Paper No. 6 - Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research*, Paris: UNESCO Forum of Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, pp. 40-69.
- Guri-Rosenblit, S., Sebkova, H. and Teichler, U. (2007). 'Massification and Diversity of Higher Education Systems: Interplay of Complex Dimensions'. *Presented at the Research Seminar of Europe and North America Scientific Committee*, March 2007, Paris: UNESCO Forum of Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.
- Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State: The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press & International Association of Universities.
- Neave, G. (2000). *The Universities' Responsibilities to Society: International Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon Press & International Association of Universities.
- Neave, G. (2003). 'On the return from Babylon: A long voyage around history, ideology and systems change', in J. File and Goedegebuure, L. (eds.), *Real-Time Systems: Reflections on Higher Education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia*, Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente, pp. 15-40.
- Olsen, F. (2002). 'MIT's open window - putting course materials online, the university faces high expectations', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 6 December.
- Ordorika, I. (2006). 'Commitment to society: Contemporary challenges for public research universities'. *Presented at the UNESCO Colloquium on Research and Higher Education*, Paris.
- UNESCO (2003). *Report on Trends and Developments in Higher Education in Europe: 1998-2003*, Paris: European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES).
- Vest, C.M. (2001). *Disturbing the Educational Universe: Universities in the Digital Age- Dinosaurs or Prometheans?* Report of the President for the Academic Year 2000-1, MIT.
- Weiler, H., Guri-Rosenblit, S. and Sawyerr, A. (2006). 'Universities as Centers of Research and Knowledge Creation: An Endangered Species? - Summary Report'. *Presented at the UNESCO Colloquium on Research and Higher Education*, Paris.
- van der Wende, M.C. (2002). 'Internationalization policies; About new trends and contrasting paradigms', *Higher Education Policy*, 14, 249-259.

Social Scientists and Higher Education Policy Studies

Grant Harman

A distinctive feature of higher education policy studies over the past four decades has been the significant contributions made by distinguished scholars trained in social science fields other than education. These researchers, of whom Guy Neave is one, have enriched the field of higher education policy studies, identifying and exploring important new research agendas, introducing theoretical orientations new to higher education studies, organising large-scale team and comparative projects, and contributing significantly to conceptualising how higher education systems might operate more efficiently and effectively. Some of these scholars have remained in university social science departments while others have joined or linked themselves with specialised higher education policy centres or institutes.

This essay considers the contribution of this group of scholars over the past four decades, drawing examples selected mainly from North America and Europe. My examples also have been dependent on colleagues with whom I have interacted closely and cases where career information is readily available.

No suggestion is being made that the work of these scholars has been more significant or important than that of scholars trained in education studies. Rather, the argument is that the field of higher education policy studies has been enriched by the contributions of a considerable number of scholars trained in such disciplines as sociology, social psychology, economics, political science and history and that their contributions have significantly complemented and strengthened the insights and contributions of other scholars.

In Guy Neave's case, his first academic qualification was an honours bachelor's degree in history from Queen Mary College of the University of London. From there, he went on directly to undertake PhD research in French political history at University College London, graduating in 1967. His PhD thesis was on the topic of 'Agricultural Syndicates and Interest Groups in French Politics 1884-1910' and his supervisor was the distinguished medieval historian, A.B. Cobban. Presumably such as topic could have been equally well pursued in a politics department. Guy then spent two years as a lecturer in modern history at the University College of Wales in Bangor before being attracted to a Social Science Research Council Conversion Fellowship in the School of Education at the University of Leicester, where he spent almost three years from October 1969. His research interests from then on were concentrated on education topics - first school education, with publications mainly on comprehensive schools in the UK

and continental Europe, and then increasingly on higher education topics. Of his long list of publications produced from 1970, consisting of 28 books and monographs, 23 three official reports, 84 chapters in scholarly books and 127 journal articles, most were in the field of higher education.

Guy Neave thus should be thought of as being one of a distinguished group of 'outsiders' who fortunately were attracted to higher education studies. This group includes: sociologists such as Martin Trow, Bob (Burton R.) Clark, and Chelly (A.H.) Halsey and Christine Musselin; political scientists such as Seymour Martin Lipset, Maurice Kogan, Robert Berdahl and Frans van Vught; economists such as Gareth Williams, Maureen Woodhall and Bruce Williams; social psychologists such as Don Anderson and David Beswick; and historians such as Sheldon Rothblatt, Thorsten Nybom and Cicely Watson.

Attractions of the Study of Higher Education

Social scientists appear to have been attracted to the study of higher education in different ways with different motivations operating. Guy Neave came to higher education via a Social Science Research Council Conversion Fellowship, presumably based on a deliberate decision to change research directions. Other scholars came to higher education via their PhD thesis or dissertation topics, or by invitation to join multi-disciplinary research projects or units. Robert Berdahl developed his interests in the coordination of higher education systems through his Berkeley PhD study of the British University Grants Committee. Bob Clark wrote his PhD dissertation in sociology at UCLA on adult education. This led him on to study community colleges, with the results of his seminal case-study of San Jose Community College being published under the title of *The Open Door College: A Case Study* (1960). Following his appointment to the sociology department at Berkeley, Clark soon became involved with T.R. McConnell, Lyman Glenny, Martin Trow and others in the newly established Center for Higher Education Studies, leading to significant publications including his book, *The Distinctive College* (1970). This was based on a Center team project that studied in depth three different elite private liberal arts colleges - Reed, Antioch and Swarthmore. For a period, Clark continued to publish in sociology journals and remain in sociology departments, but from his move in the early 1980s to the education school at UCLA as Allen Cartter Professor of Higher Education he increasingly identified himself with the higher education community.

Martin Trow's career path was somewhat different. Trained initially as an engineer at Stevens Institute of Technology in New Jersey, Trow worked for a few years as an engineer prior to undertaking graduate work in sociology at Columbia that led to a doctorate in 1956. As a postgraduate student, he worked with Seymour Martin Lipset and James Coleman on a study of democracy and

trade unions, leading to publication of the classic study, *Union Democracy* (1956), exploring the internal politics of the international Typographic Union. Trow joined the sociology department at Berkeley in 1959 and soon was persuaded to become involved in the Center for Higher Education Studies. But for the rest of his career, he remained first a member of the Berkeley sociology department and then of the Graduate School of Public Policy. However, from his appointment in 1976 as Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education, he became organisationally linked to higher education studies. From the 1960s, his major research focus clearly moved to higher education studies. In 1973, he wrote a ground-breaking study for OECD that described the expansion of higher education in the United States, which had shot far ahead of other countries in providing broad access to universities and colleges (Trow 1973). This led him to speculate on the processes of transition that other countries would follow in moving from elite to mass higher education.

In contrast, Maurice Kogan came to higher education studies via the study of history at Cambridge where he achieved a 'first'. Thence followed fourteen years as a civil servant before moving to university research and teaching in the areas of social and public policy. His initial insights into higher education came through his work as a bureaucrat in the UK Department of Education and Science, and through the post of Private Secretary to Sir Edward Boyle (Secretary of State for Education) and as Secretary to the Plowden Committee that produced a detailed but controversial report on primary education. He left the civil service in 1967 to join a talented group of younger academics including the economist John Vaizey recruited to Brunel University, a college of advanced technology that has been granted university status. His first assignment was as director of Brunel's hospital reorganisation research unit but two years later he was appointed a professor of government and social administration. For some years, he continued broad teaching and research interests in public policy and health administration, but with the publication of *The Politics of Education* in 1971 and *Education Policy-Making: A study of interest groups and parliament* in 1975, his work increasingly concentrated on education, especially higher education.

Full or Partial Engagement

The commitment of social scientists attracted to higher education studies has varied from shorter-term involvement on particular topics or projects, to full-time commitment to the field of higher education studies. Guy Neave is one those who put most of their energies into higher education studies. In doing so he joined people like Bob Clark, Martin Trow and Gareth Williams, to name a few.

In contrast, Seymour Martin Lipset is an example of a distinguished social scientist who had a single burst of activity on the study of academics, particularly

their political orientations and beliefs, but whose interests continued on topics other than higher education. Lipset has been described as one of the most influential social scientists of the past half-century and he is the only person to have been president of both the American Sociological Association and the American Political Science Association. Educated at City College of New York and Columbia University, he was particularly interested in the connections between economic development and democracy, and how the core American values of equality and achievement keep class conflict in check. With Everett Ladd he became interested in the values and political behaviour of American academics. Together they published *The Divided Academy* (1975), as well as numerous journal articles dealing with the political orientations of particular disciplinary and academic groups.

Many scholars including Guy Neave developed an interest in higher education relatively early in their careers. In contrast there are some notable scholars who developed an interest in higher education relatively late in their careers, often following service as a university president or vice-chancellor. One example is the economist, Howard Bowen who, after distinguished service at the University of Iowa (including a long term as President), came to the Claremont Graduate School to a semi-retirement appointment. Here he developed a keen interest in the economics of higher education and then went on to do ground-breaking work with Jack Schuster on the academic profession (Bowen and Schuster 1986). Another example is the former University of California President, Clark Kerr, who developed his interest in higher education as a senior University administrator. For a decade following being sacked as UC President by California Governor Ronald Regan, Kerr led the Carnegie Council for Higher Education and became a leading expert on higher education policy both in America and internationally.

The Contributions of Social Scientists

The contributions of social scientists to higher education studies have been notable in several ways. In the first place, they brought to the notice of the higher education scholarly community important topics that had been little studied and in doing so introduced key explanatory concepts and theories from other disciplines. Guy Neave and Frans van Vught, for instance, became interested in the relations between governments and higher education institutions, identifying European changes in the late 1980s from tight bureaucratic control to 'steering from a distance'. Neave's two books with van Vught on government-higher education relations (Neave and Van Vught 1991, 1994) are among the most cited of his publications. Neave also developed and elaborated the concept of 'the evaluative state' (e.g. Neave 1998). Bob Clark applied the keen eye of a well trained sociologist to social relations in American community colleges and elite

liberal arts colleges, leading to elaboration and application of such concepts as 'the cooling out process' (with regard to community college students), 'academic culture' and 'organisational saga'. Maurice Kogan took up themes such as the role of Ministers, parliament and interest groups in UK education policy development, and 'the receptor function' whereby bureaucracies are able to absorb technical advice from academics and consultants.

Second, many leading social scientists interested in higher education studies have been particularly active in organising and leading large-scale team projects, often with an international, comparative focus. In the early 1990s, Guy Neave and Bob Clark brought together a large team of scholars with Pergamon Press to produce a comprehensive, four volume *Encyclopedia of Higher Education* (Clark and Neave 1992). Bob Clark also organised regular seminars in exotic locations where scholars presented the first drafts of chapters related to specific themes such as graduate education and the contributions of particular disciplines to higher education studies. In the 1970s, Martin Trow took on major responsibilities for the large-scale surveys of American academics as part of the comprehensive review of higher education undertaken by the Carnegie Commission.

Third, many social scientists including Guy Neave became involved with key national and international associations and contributed directly to policy development, evaluative studies and to thinking about national systems and how they relate internationally. The work of Guy Neave with the International Association of Universities is well known. Guy also undertook consultancies for a wide range of bodies, including the Commission of European Communities, the Council of Europe and the World Bank. Maurice Kogan, Gareth Williams and Ulrich Teichler worked extensively for the OECD. Kogan was involved in various national reviews of higher education policy in the United States, Finland, Greece, Sweden and Norway. For many years, he also edited the OECD journal, *Higher Education Policy and Management*.

The Future

With many leading higher education researchers coming to the end of their formal careers, an obvious question to raise is about the future of higher education studies and whether new groups of social scientists can be attracted to higher education studies. While the increasing number of graduate programs offering PhD training in higher education studies is producing considerable numbers of younger scholars well placed to undertake serious research, my hope is that their efforts will be supplemented by younger social scientists attracted to higher education studies.

References

- Bowen, H.R. and Schuster, J. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled, The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Clark B.R. (1960). *The Open Door College: A Case Study*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Clark B.R. (1970). *The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed & Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Clark, B.R. and Neave G. (1992). *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. Oxford. Pergamon.
- Kogan, M. (1971). *The Politics of Education*. London: Penguin.
- Kogan M. (1975). *Education Policy-Making: a Study of Interest Groups and Parliament*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Ladd, E.C. and Lipset, S.M. (1975). *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lipset, S.M. Coleman, J.S. and Trow, M.A. (1956). *Union Democracy: The Internal Politics of the International Typographical Union*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Countries*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Trow, M.A. (1973). *Reflections on the Transition from Elite to Mass to Universal Access*, Paris: OECD.

The Evaluative State: some contradictory consequences for the research-policy relationship

Mary Henkel

In the course of a study carried out in the late 1970s, a British bureaucrat was asked what he valued in social science research. This was the decade in which British governments were first expected to commission research within a customer-contractor relationship (Rothschild 1971). His reply reflected a rather different era, however, in which the knowledge on which policy makers drew was defined by producers rather than users: he valued it 'for the depth of theoretical and historical understanding that ... is brought to bear... and the critical but not unfriendly involvement in [government's] business' (Kogan et al. 2006).

In a different era again, I suspect that there remain plenty of bureaucrats across the world, who, if asked what they valued in Guy Neave's work, would reply in not dissimilar terms. They would do so, in full cognisance of the fact that among the debts owed to him by all those active in higher education research and policy are, first, the identification and conceptualisation and, second, the evolving analyses of 'the evaluative state', a political phenomenon that appears to leave little time or space for the theoretical and historical understanding that Guy persists in disseminating.

This chapter will concern itself with the significance of Guy's work for one line of higher education research and its contribution to policy, namely the socio-epistemological implications of the changes he delineates. Using just two examples, I shall suggest that, despite the degrees of restriction these changes might seem to impose upon policy-related research, including that in higher education studies, they have in practice only partly succeeded in resurrecting the linear, instrumental models of the research-policy relationship, discredited in the 1980s (Weiss 1989; Kogan and Henkel 2000). Rather, for researchers in our own and related fields, they have provided important research questions and a stimulus to pursue the illuminative and critical models, within which Guy's own work is located. For these changes impinge upon the heart of the academic enterprise: knowledge, the forms it takes and the conditions that shape them.

Both in his writing on the evaluative state and in a more recent overview of the changing relationship between research, the university and policy (Neave 2006), Guy charts major shifts in the structural framework within which universities operate and indicates the challenges they represent for the control of academic time and space, as well as for academic freedom within these dimensions, all of

which might in turn have major repercussions on knowledge structures and practices.

With the emergence of the evaluative state, Guy suggests (1988, 1998), higher education exchanged government within a stable framework of law and regulations for the more distant but at the same time more intrusive governance, a key instrument of which is evaluation, administered by 'intermediary bodies' that are often not so much intermediary as implementation agencies. The overriding national goals within which academic agendas are subsumed are major economic and social changes, goals so large that they must remain forever on the horizon. But the drive to define and redefine intermediate aims and to measure progress towards them is intense. Hence the development of increasingly elaborated but chronically 'renegotiable' and 'conditional' sets of performance indicators, ranking schemes and benchmarks. Academic time is, in consequence, being reconstructed in response to the rhythms of evaluation and the shifts in evaluative criteria.

As the market looks to supersede the state as 'the referential institution' for the university (Neave 2006), academics are expected to work not within the boundaries of their own established epistemic communities but in partnerships or contracts with business, public sector and not-for-profit organisations. The links between research and undergraduate teaching in academic practice are in many institutions deemed to be dispensable and less important than those between research and different forms of external knowledge transfer. Universities are no longer the taken-for-granted location for the generation of fundamental research or for higher education. As innovation becomes an increasingly dominant theme of academic agendas, new, and sometimes hybrid (Gibbons et al. 1994) epistemic communities are constructed round domains defined by social or economic problems rather than disciplines, while the academic work space has become more movable.

Within this context, then, it might be expected that the field of higher education studies would itself be reshaped and re-oriented towards short-term instrumentalism. To some extent it has been. For example, policy makers' interest in the field of scientometrics, and particularly bibliometric models, maps and citation analyses, has intensified with their perceived needs for more sophisticated techniques and measures for the evaluation of research.

However, the application of bibliometric methodologies has proved far from straightforward and they have attracted strong critique from sociologists of knowledge, even if by the end of the 1980s, it seemed that a sufficiently stable consensus had been reached about the levels of validity and reliability they could provide for them to be used substantially as decision-support tools for evaluation and resource allocation by national science policy makers (Rip 1988). For

example, while citation analysis was developed on the assumption that multiple citation is an unequivocal indicator of scientific merit or high impact, critics have attacked it on the grounds that it takes for granted the purposes of citation in academia. They argue that these are on the contrary problematic and multiple and that to regard citation as the basis for objective and reliable indicators of scientific importance is mistaken. Some point out that the citation of works may be made in order to disagree with or discredit them. More radical critics suggest that the primary roles of citation in scientific practice are ceremonial or rhetorical, a legitimating or persuasive strategy (Gilbert 1977; Rip 1988; Woolgar 1991).

This is one area in which policy needs have generated and reinforced epistemological debate and critique as much as technical, instrumental and linear advances. Another is the organisation of knowledge production and, in particular, the drive towards interdisciplinarity. In policy documents and, indeed, much university strategy, this is treated as an incontestable good, integrally linked with the drive towards innovation and the solution of 'real problems', and a counterforce to the internalist preoccupations of specialisation', frequently associated with disciplinary communities and modes of organisation. There is also an increasing tendency to value disciplines primarily as sources of control, rigour and reliability, as distinct from original and imaginative theories or lines of inquiry (Weingart 2000).

However, the growing influence of interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, too, in science policies has stimulated substantial scholarly debate about what they mean for the future of academic institutions and the setting of research agendas. Some argue that the production of knowledge will be organised largely according to mode 2 principles of openness and fluidity in mode 2 societies where traditional boundaries of all kinds are collapsing (Nowotny et al. 2001); that research agendas will be increasingly shaped by real world problems as opposed to those defined within the disciplines; and that there may be major change in the balance of power and control over knowledge production.

Against this, it is argued, first, that it is a mistake to see disciplinary and interdisciplinary organisation as mutually exclusive or even distinct from each other: many academics are, in practice, well able to combine strong commitment to their disciplines with interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research. Moreover, interdisciplinary borrowings and syntheses have always constituted an important form of disciplinary development. Secondly, it is said that such conclusions about the control of agendas are based on flawed assumptions about how 'real problems' and solutions to them are formulated and about the conditions for the creation of knowledge. Weingart, for example, suggests that 'real problems' are inevitably defined in the terms of existing knowledge and its (academic) gatekeepers and, moreover, that without the kinds of structures, boundaries and rules generated by disciplinary communities, 'there could be no

such thing as knowledge' (Weingart 2000, p. 38). He argues that while academics may increasingly be obliged publicly to define and present their research in terms of environmental, economic and social problems or 'the fashions of the political agenda' (ibid.), that does not necessarily mean a fundamental change in their modes of thought or research practices.

As yet we know too little about how far, in what ways and in what time spans the reframing of research agendas and the new levels of interaction between disciplines and between academics and non-academics in the production of knowledge will impact upon the nature of that knowledge, on the institutional contexts in which it is generated and, perhaps most important of all, on the educational experiences of the next generation of the academic profession.

Such knowledge-centred debates and research questions are, however, important sources of illumination and critique for policy makers and there is a case for them to be brought further into the centre of our studies of the impacts of policy changes on universities, the academic profession and graduate and undergraduate studies, drawing more extensively on the sociology of knowledge and on science studies. Having said that, one stream of research in which we are already gaining more detailed and relevant understanding is that established by Tony Becher's seminal work into disciplinary cultures. Recent contributions to the socio-epistemological studies of disciplines (e.g. Di Napoli 2003; Cownie 2004; Parry 2006; see also Becquet and Musselin 2004) not only demonstrate the continuing power of disciplines in academic lives and the diversity of cultures they represent but also highlight some of the complexities and ambiguities of the interplay between interdisciplinarity and disciplines.

References

- Becquet, V. and Musselin, C. (2004). *Variations autour du travail des universitaires*, Convention MENRT 20022007, ACI: «Travail», rapport CSO, Paris.
- Cownie, F. (2004). *Legal Academics: culture and identities*. Oxford: Hart.
- Di Napoli, R. (2003). *Modern Languages: Which Identities? Which Selves?* Doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Gilbert, N. (1977). 'Referencing as persuasion', *Social Studies of Science*, 7, 113-122.
- Kogan, M. and Henkel, M. (2000). 'Future directions for policy research. Getting inside: policy reception of research', in Teichler, U. and Schwartz, S. (eds.), *The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research: experiences and perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 25-43.

- Kogan, M., Henkel, M. and Hanney, S. (2006). *Government and Research: Thirty Years of Evolution (2nd edition)*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Neave, G. (1988). 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe', *European Journal of Education*, 23, 7-23.
- Neave, G. (1998) 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', *European Journal of Education*, 33, 3, 265-284.
- Neave, G. (2006). 'On time and fragmentation: sundry observations on research, the university and politics from a waveringly historical perspective', in Neave, G., Bluckert, K. and Nybom, T. (eds.). *The European Research University: An Historical Parenthesis?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 63-76.
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Parry, S. (2006). *Disciplines and Doctorates*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rip, A. (1988). 'Mapping of Science: possibilities and limitations', in Van Raan, A. (ed.). *Handbook of Quantitative Studies of Science and Technology*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Rothschild Report (1971). *The Organisation and Management of Government R and D*, Cmnd 4814. London: HMSO.
- Weingart, P. (2000). 'Interdisciplinarity: the paradoxical discourse', in Weingart, P. and Stehr, N. (eds.), *Practising Interdisciplinarity*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, pp. 25-41.
- Weiss, C. (1989). 'Congressional committees as users of analysis', *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 8, 3, 411-431.
- Woolgar, S. (1991). 'Beyond the citation debate: towards a sociology of measurement technologies and their use in science policy', *Science and Public Policy* 18, 5, 319-326.

On Guy Neave and Spider-Man: Reflections on Higher Education Research and Meaningful Metaphors

Glen A. Jones

I first met Guy Neave in Turku, Finland in 1990. I was a doctoral student attending my first truly international conference in the field of higher education, and the list of invited participants was a 'Who's Who' list of shining and rising stars in international/comparative higher education policy. That conference played a formative role in my development as a junior scholar because I obtained a glimpse of what can be learned through cross-national policy analysis. I also distinctly remember a very long, stimulating conversation with Guy on higher education as a field of study, and I have followed his work in this area ever since.

Higher education only emerged as a recognised field of study in the latter half of the twentieth century. It had long been an area of specialised interest within some of the more traditional disciplines. Historians had chronicled the story of individual institutions, the evolution of the university as an institutional form, and the biographies of great scholars. Philosophers had long debated the importance and structure of higher learning. Scholars within the field of psychology became very interested in understanding learning and intelligence. For the most part, however, studies of higher education emerged as attempts to address questions within the methodological and epistemological frames of the disciplines.

A different organisational arrangement for the study of higher education began to emerge as a function of the post-war expansion of postsecondary education in North America. Higher education had become an important sector of public policy, and there was a need for research on a wide range of questions that were directly related to issues that were emerging at every level of these systems. A number of universities moved to create research centres and academic programs focusing on the study of higher education. There was private foundation and government funding available for research, a need for specialised personnel to staff institutional and state-level research units, and increasing public interest in what had become a major area of government expenditure.

Higher education slowly emerged as an interdisciplinary field of scholarship within American and Canadian universities. The new research centres and academic programs brought together scholars who shared a common interest in studying and teaching about higher education, though they differed in discipline background and orientation. Most of these activities became located within faculties of education which had only recently expanded beyond their roots in

teacher training colleges and normal schools to house a range of new graduate degree programs and research initiatives. New interdisciplinary scholarly journals focusing on higher education emerged to complement the longstanding *Journal of Higher Education*. There were new scholarly associations and research conferences.

In Canada, the University of Toronto had appointed its first professor of higher education in 1964 and by the end of the decade there were graduate programs emerging from what became known as the Higher Education Group. Another small graduate program emerged in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, and a third program was created at the University of Alberta. McGill University created a specialised centre focusing on teaching and learning in higher education that was linked to its Educational Psychology programs. The Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education, a broadly-based organisation including university and government researchers, institutional leaders, and policy analysts, was founded at a meeting in Winnipeg in 1970. The *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, a peer-reviewed journal supported by the Society and individual subscriptions, emerged later that same year (Jones 1997).

Given the range and complexity of policy issues and research questions that accompanied the ongoing expansion of postsecondary education during this period, it is not surprising that higher education scholars tended to focus attention on the local higher education environment. The scholarship emerging from American higher education centres and programs focused on American higher education, and the theories and concepts that emerged from this literature were almost entirely grounded in the American experience.

Canadian scholars focused attention on the Canadian experience, but given the massive importance of changes taking place in the United States and the much larger body of American research literature, Canadian scholarship in the field tended to be more derivative and comparative. Given the country's colonial roots, Canadian scholars were also somewhat more interested in monitoring the changes that were taking place in the United Kingdom and France, and maintaining connections with the new parallel research centres and programs that had emerged in Australia. Canadian scholarship became somewhat international in perspective and scope simply because Canadian scholars could not ignore the rapidly growing body of American scholarship and they were interested in understanding how Canadian changes compared with those taking place in the 'old country' and the commonwealth. Even the international/comparative literature in the field had largely become dominated by the handful of American scholars, including Burton Clark, who were interested in understanding broader international trends and developing theoretical perspectives based on comparative analysis. So Canadian scholars studied and

wrote about Canadian higher education using concepts borrowed from the American literature and with a tendency to describe Canadian phenomena in relation to the American experience.

My understanding is that the Canadian situation was not dissimilar to the development and evolution of the field in Australia, the United Kingdom, and a number of countries within continental Europe and Southeast Asia. A relatively modest infrastructure for higher education research began to emerge focusing on the study of higher education in the specific jurisdiction. Given the much larger research infrastructure in the United States, including the rise of a number of influential journals and a number of major academic publishers in the field, there was a common tendency to link local (Canadian, or Australian) higher education research with the American academic research literature. A number of citation studies in the field of higher education noted a bifurcation of citation references between scholarship focusing on the local experience of the subject country (that is, research studies, government reports, etc.) and literature published in American journals or by American publishers (Jones 1994; White 1990).

Guy Neave has played a leading role in taking the field of international higher education scholarship to the next level. He did this in part as a member of a new network of leading European scholars who made enormous contributions to our understanding of the dramatic and complex transformations of higher education policy taking place in a large number of European jurisdictions during the 1980s and 1990s. This has been an extraordinary influential generation of leading higher education scholars that included such important authors as Maurice Kogan, Ulrich Teichler, Frans van Vught, and Marianne Bauer. This is the generation that founded the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers in 1988 as a major forum for a European conversation on higher education scholarship, published a range of foundational works on the evolution and massification of higher education in Europe, and initiated a range of new journals and publication series.

In addition to his contributions to original research in the field, Guy Neave has made two other extremely important contributions to the international study of higher education. The first, and perhaps the most obvious, has been the role he has played in defining and furthering the field. The *Encyclopedia of Higher Education* that he co-edited with Burton Clark (1992) stands as one of the most important reference works ever published in the field of higher education. It is comprehensive, truly international in scope and perspective, and brings together an extremely impressive team of scholars to define and discuss a very wide range of core issues in the study of higher education. Under his intellectual leadership, the journal *Higher Education Policy* quickly became an extremely important forum for the thoughtful discussion and analysis of higher education policy issues in every region on the planet. As editor, Neave encouraged and facilitated the

publication of thematic special issues that offered multiple perspectives on common policy issues. *Higher Education Policy* provided a forum for the publication of important research, but it also legitimised and reinforced the importance of policy analysis in the field of higher education. Finally, Neave has been a major contributor to the literature on higher education as a field of study and scholarship in Europe (for example, see Neave 1991; Neave and Teichler 1989).

The second important contribution is associated with Neave's rather unique ability to engage in higher education policy discussions on every continent and to link people and ideas to further the field of higher education scholarship in new and exciting ways. By definition, higher education policy, and the study of higher education policy, has tended to be national in scope and orientation, but Guy has been one of only a handful of international scholars who are able to build fluid connections between those working on similar questions in different jurisdictions, and between those operating from quite different discipline orientations at different levels of the higher education system. Higher Education is an enormous field of scholarship with a quite modest cadre of scholars, and Neave has created new web-like linkages within the broader higher education research community that have led to the emergence of new research pathways. Guy Neave has been a sort of higher education Spider-Man flying through this international field of study spinning webs to pull together new and innovative research linkages and connections through thematic publications and creative conversations.

Like some of the metaphors that one can find within his writings, this image of Guy Neave as Spider-Man may seem a little forced, but it also, somewhat stealthily, illustrates the other important form of linkage that has been systematically enabled through his writing, and that is the linkage of what may seem at first glance to be disparate ideas. There is a playfulness in his writing style that has sometimes led me to wonder whether he begins the writing process with a title, and then, somewhat later writes the text that legitimises the caption. Only Guy Neave could have written 'On Scholars, Hippopotami and von Humboldt' (2003) or 'M. de Talleyrand-Périgord's Qualities.'

I believe that one of Guy Neave's great contributions to the field of higher education scholarship has been this creative synthesis of complex understandings and this imaginative linkage of ideas to illustrate a point. The field of study has clearly been advanced by his scholarship and his enormous contributions as an international gatekeeper and editor, but I also think that he has challenged us to see relationships that would have otherwise been invisible, and to consider trends that have emerged from his insightful analysis.

References

- Clark, B.R. and Neave, G. (1992). *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Jones, G.A. (1997). 'Research on Higher Education in a Decentralized Academic System: The Case of Canada', in Sadlak, J. and Altbach, P.G. (eds.), *Higher Education Research at the Turn of the Century: Structures, Issues, and Trends*. New York: Garland, pp. 189-208.
- Jones, G.A. (1994). 'A Question of Parochialism: An Analysis of Educational Research Published in Two Canadian Journals', *Ontario Journal of Higher Education* 1994, 7-21.
- Neave, G. (2003). 'On Scholars, Hippopotami and von Humboldt', *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 2, 135-140.
- Neave, G. (1991). 'A Changing Europe: Challenges for Higher Education Research', *Higher Education in Europe*, 16, 3, 3-27.
- Neave, G. and Teichler, U. (1989). 'Research on Higher Education in Europe', *European Journal of Education*, 24, 3, 207-209.
- White, R.T. (1990). 'Internationalism Versus Parochialism in Educational Research', *Review of Higher Education*, 14, 1, 47-62.

Academic drift - a reinterpretation

Svein Kyvik

Introduction

The term *academic drift* was originally coined to describe the tendency of non-university institutions to orient their activities in ways that bring them closer to the university image (Burgess 1972). In his analysis of academic drift in Europe, Neave (1979) reserved this concept for processes taking place on the faculty and department levels in individual establishments and introduced the notion of 'institutional drift' to account for similar processes at the institutional level. In addition, he used the notion of 'policy drift' to describe the failure of the government and central administration to enforce policy and their reluctance to intervene in processes at the institutional level. Moreover, he introduced a fourth category - 'drift in curricular emphasis'- implying accentuation of abstract knowledge, a gradual reduction in the emphasis attached to practical work and a move away from a utilitarian approach in course curricula. Finally, Neave mentioned 'personnel drift', meaning that teaching staff in non-university institutions were more academically oriented than envisaged.

Neave's useful elaboration of the term academic drift seems to have been more or less neglected in the literature on this subject. This is a pity because he has offered a more advanced theoretical explanation of the dynamics of academisation processes than his predecessors and successors in this field. Inspired by Neave's analysis, and based on research undertaken over a quarter of a century, I will suggest an even more fine-grained typology and distinguish between six different, though related academisation processes which take place at student level (student drift), staff level (staff drift), programme level (programme drift), institutional level (institutional drift), sector level (sector drift), and governmental level (policy drift). Although academisation processes on the various levels are closely intertwined, nevertheless it is, for analytical purposes, important to distinguish between them to improve our understanding of the dynamics of these processes.

Student drift

The role of students in academic drift processes has largely been bypassed in the research literature. As long as students enrol in vocational programmes in the non-university sector in sufficient numbers and enter working life upon graduation, it is natural to omit them in explanatory models. However, if an

increasing number of young people prefer to enrol in university programmes, and if an increasing share of non-university graduates wants to extend their lower degree with a higher degree, we witness an academisation process on the student level (Jónasson 2004). A theoretical approach to student drift towards universities or higher degrees is *credentialism* as formulated by Collins (1979). According to this school of thought, students compete for credentials in order to enhance their competitive advantage in the labour market and their social and cultural capital. If academic degrees are perceived to contain a higher monetary, social and cultural value than vocational or short-cycle professional degrees, this may lead to student drift towards universities, not necessarily because they are particularly interested in obtaining the technical skills of such a degree, but because they want to improve their competitive advantage when applying for jobs, or because they like the idea of earning a higher degree as a means of enhancing their social status (Jónasson 2004). Consequently, non-university institutions will try to develop higher degrees, or to copy university programmes, in order to sustain or advance their position in the higher education market.

Staff drift

Educational institutions are populated by individual staff members, and experience shows that, at all times, some individuals (cosmopolitan staff) have been more oriented towards the national and international community of scholars than others (local staff). In the non-university sector this has been particularly noticeable with regard to research orientation. Cosmopolitan staff have higher aspirations and pursue their academic interests even though they work in pure teaching establishments and no time is supposed to be spent on such a purpose. The majority of those who are recruited to these institutions have been trained in universities or specialised university institutions, and many hold a doctoral degree and expect to have the possibility to pursue their research interests. They tend to refer to the standards of their discipline as to what constitutes a proper academic achievement rather than identifying with the expectations of their institution. A theoretical explanation for such individual drift processes can be deduced from reference group theory. The basic idea is that people frequently compare themselves with individuals within groups other than their own when assessing their own situation. When the higher education system is regarded as a hierarchy, staff members in programmes or institutions defined to be in the lower part of the ranking scale will be inclined to compare themselves with staff at higher ranked programmes and institutions and will subsequently try to copy the behaviour of these people to obtain the same status or income.

Programme drift

The non-university sector is constituted by a large number of vocational and professional programmes. They were developed to serve the needs of industry and the public sector, were strictly work-oriented and had few links to the universities. Most of these programmes were originally taught in independent schools, which were later merged into polytechnic colleges. A common trend for many programmes is a drift towards academic values and practices in relation to the curriculum, degree structure and research. The reason for this programme drift is basically found in professionalisation strategies by entrepreneurial leaders and professional associations. Elzinga (1990) argues that professionalisation is characterised by the scientification of the knowledge core through the establishment of a research capability, the introduction of Master's and PhD programmes, as well as new career patterns based on research and research training, while the role of tacit knowledge in the training process is downplayed. In addition, public professional bodies and accreditation agencies will often set minimum standards for different programmes which usually imply more emphasis on academic knowledge. Representatives of the academic community are often members of government committees, professional bodies and councils, as well as evaluation and accreditation committees where they have considerable influence on curricula and quality standards. Even though these university representatives might oppose academic drift in the non-university sector, their own academic standards can unintentionally enhance drift processes in the various programmes.

Institutional drift

According to Neave (1979) institutional drift involves the departure by an institution from publicly stated and agreed objectives ascribed to it by an authoritative government agency. This process is well documented internationally. There have been countless examples of vocational education institutions striving for college status, as well as colleges attempting to achieve university status. In many instances, these attempts have been successful. The basic mechanism behind institutional drift is similar to programme drift, but different. While programme drift is driven by professionalisation processes, institutional drift is driven by status competition. An adequate theoretical explanation for institutional drift can be drawn from organisation theory. There seems to be a universal tendency for organisational leaders to try to imitate other organisations they regard as more successful (DiMaggio and Powell 1983), and colleges are no exception in their drive to achieve university status. In addition, regional political and administrative authorities and industry may encourage, or even pressure, the local college to develop research activity, to introduce higher

degrees, or to seek university status as part of a policy effort to strengthen the region.

Sector drift

While the term institutional drift describes processes within individual non-university establishments, sector drift is related to the non-university institutions as a whole, basically driven by their joint associations and spokesmen to enhance their academic status. Sector drift can also take place when new rules and regulations pertaining to non-university institutions as a whole have an academic direction. Such changes have taken place in most countries through the upgrading of post-secondary schools to higher education colleges, and in the UK with the renaming of polytechnics as universities. But sector drift also takes place through minor reforms pointing in an academic direction like the introduction of academic career structures in the non-university sector and the introduction of financial incentive systems favouring academic practice. Such reforms are usually not deliberate efforts by public agencies to move the non-university sector closer to the universities. In conclusion, however, such efforts may contribute to drive the non-university sector closer to the values and practices of the academic system. A specific aspect of sector drift is the tendency of non-university institutions to apply the university label in international contexts. In various European countries, these institutions translate their national names into 'universities for professional education', 'university colleges', or 'universities of applied sciences'. This is a kind of symbolic drift that does not change their legal status, working conditions, or institutional reputation in the national environment. In an international context, however, the university label may be of great importance to market the institution to potential students from abroad and to providers of research funds. A theoretical explanation for symbolic drift processes can be deduced from institutional theory with its emphasis on values and symbols in the construction of organisational identity (Meyer and Rowan 1977).

Policy drift

Neave (1979) has argued that the concept of 'policy drift' as used in this context implies a departure from publicly stated objectives. Policy drift, thus, implies that state authorities gradually change their views on the purposes of non-university education, the rights and obligations of academic staff, and the status and role of non-university education within the higher education system. This policy change may be due to pressure from the non-university sector and important stakeholders, or to a shift in attitudes regarding the mission of these institutions

and the content of their programmes. On the one hand, the drift away from initial objectives may be regarded as a failure by state authorities to stick to their policy. On the other hand, change in policy goals may be regarded as a natural process. Implementation theory can help us to better understand the mechanisms involved in policy drift. In the view of Majone and Wildavsky (1978), implementation is evolution. They argue that during the implementation process, policy makers must cope with new circumstances that often imply the reformulation and re-design of original intentions and plans. Thus, goals often change over time, partly because of weaknesses in the ideas themselves, partly because of the fact that ideas change, and also because of new circumstances.

Academic drift as mutually reinforcing processes

Neave (1979) made the assumption that the various drift processes are hierarchically organised, such that policy drift will result in a chain reaction down through the different levels. But there will also be a reverse causality, beginning at the lowest level and eventually leading to policy drift. This is of course a plausible explanation for how these drift processes take place. I will, however, suggest an even more dynamic model for academic drift with less emphasis on vertical chain reactions and more weight on mutual interactions between the various levels. The underlying theoretical assumption is that entrepreneurial institutional leaders, programme leaders and their professional associations, cosmopolitan staff and academically oriented students, as well as non-university sector associations, state authorities and external stakeholders take part in mutually reinforcing academisation processes. Cosmopolitan staff may, for instance, want to raise their status and pay through copying the academic behaviour of their university colleagues. They put pressure on the institution to obtain better research conditions and to develop higher degrees. In turn, institutional leaders and programme leaders, inspired by academic achievements of cosmopolitan staff, may put pressure on all staff to become more academic. Another example is governmental reforms which may have far-reaching and unintended consequences for the behaviour of staff and students in the non-university sector. Thus, the introduction of institutional reward structures emphasising research and publishing may encourage academic drift at a staff level. Similarly, the improvement of transfer possibilities between non-university programmes and universities may encourage student drift and force these programmes to unintentionally move in an academic direction. In turn, programme drift may reinforce student drift. Accordingly, the essence of this theoretical assumption is that (a) academic drift may take place simultaneously on several levels, (b) academic drift on one level may lead to academic drift on another level, either through chain reactions or by by-passing levels, and (c) academic drift on one of the levels, which has been triggered by academic drift on

another level, may have a further effect on drift processes on the initial level, leading to mutually reinforcing and self-sustaining processes virtually impossible to stop in the long run.

In conclusion, Neave's elaboration of the notion of academic drift has proved to be very useful. Nearly thirty years have now passed since he published his paper, and much more empirical evidence for such drift processes is available. I have therefore suggested that his model could be further developed, both with regard to the various levels involved in academic drift processes and the dynamic relationship between such processes on the various levels.

References

- Burgess, T. (1972). *The shape of higher education*. London: Cornmarket Press.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1983). 'The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields', *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Elzinga, A. (1990). 'The knowledge aspect of professionalization: the case of science-based nursing education in Sweden', in Torstendahl, R. and Burrage, M. (eds.), *The Formation of Professions. Knowledge, State and Strategy*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 151-173.
- Jónasson, J.T. (2004). 'Can academic drift and credentialism be seen as contributing factors to the growth of higher education?' *Presented at the SRHE Conference*, Bristol.
- Majone, G. and Wildavsky, A. (1978). 'Implementation as evolution', *Policy Studies Review Annual*, 2, 103-117.
- Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. (1977). 'Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony', *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 340-63.
- Neave, G. (1979). 'Academic drift: some views from Europe', *Studies in Higher Education*, 4, 1979.

Scientific Neutrality and Objectivity 100 Years after Weber: Still Relevant in the Era of Big Science?

Jan-Erik Lane

Introduction

Higher education is of crucial importance for enhancing knowledge and the pursuit of truth as has been shown in the many investigations into the social functions of universities and colleges since the American Carnegie Commission in 1970. UNESCO as well as the International Association of Universities (IAU) arrive at the same conclusion in their comparative efforts at promoting higher education, defending its claim to autonomy. Few scholars have worked so much for this goal as Guy Neave. Yet, we must rethink the principles of university autonomy in the era of *Big Science* that we have entered today (Jongbloed et al. 1999; Neave 2000).

The problem can be described as follows: Higher education units have grown exponentially in size and have diversified into complexity since the Second World War. Their research operations are increasingly linked with the needs of huge organisations for applied knowledge, such as government, multi-national corporations and organised interests. So-called research parks mushroom where high-powered academic interests are to be combined with mundane and down to earth interests in quick applications and huge profits. Various so-called think tanks, whether funded by right-wing or left-wing interests, claim to deliver the same high profile research as old age universities. Scholars work with both private laboratories and university research centres and move easily from one to the other. University professors are often active within a political party or openly state their political preferences. Not only social science research is highly policy relevant, but so increasingly is natural science enquiry. Higher education is looked upon as the change engine of a country, harbouring its future, although the choice among alternative paths would be a democratic decision, to be resolved fundamentally by ordinary man and woman. Will, then, higher education become a MASTER instead of a SERVANT? Will academic research bend to the interests of powerful organisations, bypassing its pursuit of pure research and the dissemination of the truth? (Appignanesi and Horrocks 2002).

The problem of higher education autonomy has two sides that somehow contradict each other. On the one hand, higher education has become so large and so prestigious that it almost constitutes a system of its own in society, being able to challenge the state and powerful private interests. On the other hand, higher education has developed so many links with government and the private sector

that it is no longer clear what independent and neutral pursuit of truth represents. What, then, is the meaning of scientific objectivity and neutrality today? When suggesting an answer to this essential question, let me start from the position that Max Weber outlined in the early 20th century before the arrival of *Big Science* (Cruze 2006).

Weber's Theory of Science and Society

At a time when there was '*Little Science*', meaning it was concentrated in classical university research at centres of excellence of a modest size, Max Weber outlined a theory for the ethics of the scientific community. It has been much commented upon and also criticised, but it is worth restating here as a benchmark for a discussion of new scientific ethics in the period of *Big Science*.

Weber never presented a coherent presentation of his ideas concerning objectivity, neutrality and science as a vocation. They are to be found in various places, i.e. in articles written over a long time span, basically from 1904 to 1918, two years before his death. These papers have different aims, so that one has to extract from them a cogent theory of the relationship between science and society. It may be justified to mention the key papers (Weber 1949, 1968, 1978):

1. 'Science as Vocation' (1919)
2. 'The Meaning of Ethical Neutrality in Sociology and Economics' (1918)
3. 'Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy' (1904)
4. 'Critical Studies in the Logic of the Cultural Sciences' (1906)

These papers were edited together in volumes after his death in 1920, and they were translated into English rather late, i.e. after the Second World War. Although they deal with several topics, often in a polemical fashion against other contemporary scholars, one may chisel out a coherent position regarding academic research and the search for true knowledge in a society where politics and practical interests had begun to impact considerably upon the universities.

Weber aims to save the notion of science as the pursuit of true knowledge, although he had realised that all kinds of factors impinge upon science: values, biases, interests, pecuniary rewards, propaganda, politics, etc. His attempt to rescue the notion of the pure pursuit of true knowledge includes an argument based upon the following principles:

- a. Ultimate values guide human action and they cannot be verified by science
- b. Science is dependent upon these ultimate values, i.e. science has value premises

- c. Value premises influence the choice of scientific topics of interest and decide whether science is useful or not
- d. It is not proper for scholars to propagate their value premises
- e. Although value premises permeate science, a core of scientific beliefs exists that can be objective, neutral and true.

Weber's theory sets up a tension between his value premises which suggest what is interesting and useful on the one hand, and scientific beliefs that purportedly describe the world as it exists or may be conceived theoretically on the other hand. Lots of discussion has focussed upon whether this balance can be upheld. One argument states that value premises play such a major role in driving the scientific establishment that objectivity and neutrality must be sacrificed. The counter-argument points at the rationality of value premises, hinting at the possibility of rationally motivating ultimate values. Whether Weber's sharp distinction between science and values is defensible or not, it remains true that his theory suits *Little Science* but not *Big Science*. It is a philosophy of science and society for the period of the '*Privatdozent*', the German researcher who volunteers his career in the pursuit of knowledge facing all the time the temptation to engage in political discourse. If his/her call ('*Beruf*') is strong enough, the balance between scientific objectivity and neutrality on the one hand and the propagation of ultimate values could be upheld. With the arrival of *Big Science* after the Second World War and the enormous expansion of higher education, students as well as units, Weber's theory of scientific ethics appears outdated. Let me specify some of the reasons.

'Science as vocation' entails to Weber the question about the meaning or the purposes of science. He lists three such aims or functions:

1. technology of controlling life by calculating external objects as well as man's activities
2. methods of thinking, the tools and training for thought
3. to gain clarity (Weber 1978, pp. 220-225)

However, he downplays the importance of these three functions, because science cannot help resolve the great Tolstoy mystery of life: What is good conduct? Why do we live our lives as we do? Again, it is the sharp distinction between science and ultimate values that makes the difference. Even if science had the functions specified above, one could ask: Qui Bono? Science remains for Weber a means that cannot decide upon its ultimate value(s).

From Weber's theory of science and society and his ethics of science springs antimony that almost looks like a flat contradiction:

1. Science in itself carries an undeniable claim to objectivity and value neutrality. It is an activity with its own vocation that can never be compromised. Here, he elevates science to the ivory tower position.
2. Science cannot help resolve the most basic questions of human existence. Since it has no intrinsic value, he debases the relevance of science.

Perhaps these two ideas - both elevation of science and its debasement - were correct for the time of *Little Science*. In *Big Science*, one has seen a complete reversal of these two principles. Thus, it has become increasingly difficult to distinguish between science and any pursuit of information on the one hand, but science appears to be involved in almost every serious activity today, making it highly relevant to almost every aspect of life, on the other hand. With *Big Science*, almost all the parameters change: funding, organisation, governance and policy. Higher education institutions have become the largest organisation in society and they penetrate into all aspects of society, public or private, and they in turn are penetrated by society and state.

Big Science

Today science dominates society to an extent that would have surprised Weber, despite all his talk about '*Entzauberung de Welt*' or rationalisation of conduct in state and markets. It is not merely an incredible increase quantitatively in the size of universities and colleges. Science has experienced a qualitative leap, as it permeates almost all aspects of life. Thus, science is ubiquitous, applied, value ingrained and economically driven (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_science). *Big Science* amounts to a style of scientific research that emerged during and after World War II, characterised by large-scale instruments and facilities, funded from government or international agencies, in which research is conducted by teams of scientists and technicians. (Galison and Hevly 1992). Some of the best-known *Big Science* projects include the high-energy physics facility CERN, the Hubble Space Telescope, and the Apollo program. By and by *Big Science* has come to permeate all aspects of academia. '*Big Science*' first appeared in a 1961 article in *Science*: 'Impact of Large-Scale Science on the United States,' by A. Weinberg. *Big Science* is not only the huge separate projects funded in new institutes or laboratories and research parks, but it encompasses all of academia, universities as well as colleges (Weinberg 2004).

Ubiquity

Science no longer takes place mainly in one site, the academic site. The conduct of scientific activities occurs in private firms, separate research institutes, large government bureaucracies, civil society institutions, policy institutes, etc. And the

horizontal links between these scientific endeavours are stronger than the vertical borders between institutions. Thus, people move freely from one site to another, merely shifting their caps. The separation between academic research and non-academic research has become fluid, as is also true of the distinction between universities and colleges, the latter seeking the advantages of academic drift. Moreover, huge organisations fund their need for research with academia directly, commissioning research or funding huge research parks. Similarly, innovations in academia are easily transplanted into economically viable projects, as researchers try the role of the entrepreneur, often with success. In short, there is interpenetration between society and academia to an extent that provides science with the driver's seat in the 21st century. A sign of recognition of this paramount role for science is the setting up and funding of large national research boards, governing the direction of research towards vital needs, if this is indeed at all possible. Countries tend to have several such research funding boards, public as well as private, national as well as international.

Applied Emphasis or Practical Usefulness

Big Science is without any doubt driven by the promise of useful applications, meaning new knowledge leading to practically operating innovations of economic value in the market place. As a matter of fact, the separation between pure and applied research no longer has any clear-cut sense, as great insights in pure research take little time to be transplanted into useful applications. It almost seems to be the case that the more imaginative the pure research tends to be, the stronger would be its practical usefulness. Bio-medical research exemplifies this close connection between pure and applied research, with DNA research as the most obvious case including for instance GMP: (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genetically_modified_food). But it is also true of physics and chemistry research - e.g. the laser (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laser>).

The social sciences have hardly resisted the emphasis upon application. Much ongoing research has a normative focus, attempting to improve upon social practices. Thus, one researches the sources of inflation in order to overcome inflation. The same is true of research into unemployment or research into political instability. It comes as no surprise that consulting has taken on a huge dimension within both medicine and economics. It is not merely the straightforward application of already existing knowledge, but may also involve the pursuit of new information.

Value Ingrained

Not only is science orientated towards the solution of practical problems or towards the innovation of new useful products, materials and tools, but science also tends to include advocacy as a major component. Thus, science is often an argument about values, either for or against. This explains the rise of the think tanks in the social sciences. These research institutes often have a basic commitment to a set of values, on the basis of which research is conducted. Values play a major role in cementing connections among researchers, sharing certain basic commitments such as neo-liberalism, social democracy or Marxist values. This is not only true of the humanities and the social sciences, as advocacy occurs in major fashion also within the natural sciences. For instance, global warming is not a question for pure research but tends to lead to a basic value divide among physicists, chemists and biologists (<http://www.ipcc.ch/SPM2feb07.pdf>).

In search of a Post-Weberian Framework

In the era of *Big Science*, the question of the meaning of Weber's concepts - objectivity, neutrality, call - has to be addressed. When governments engage in science policy (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Science_policy), then what role is to be given to them? Interestingly with philosophy of science there have emerged two schools, one maintaining the ideals of *Little Science*, as with e.g. Karl Popper (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Popper), and another challenging the notions of verification, falsification, conceptual clarification and the logical growth of scientific knowledge as conjectures and refutations, as with Paul Feyerabend (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Feyerabend). I do not wish to argue that the Weberian concepts of scientific objectivity, neutrality and vocation should be redefined along relativistic or post-modern terms. *Big Science* just makes them less relevant.

Objectivity is Opaque

With a role for values that is so large in modern science, establishing what objectivity entails is not easy. This is no defence for the opposite, namely subjectivist theories of knowledge. Scientific objectivity could only be forthcoming from an open society where scientific criticism is allowed to play out completely.

Neutrality is Disguise

As scientific argument is so close to advocacy, the attempt to stay in between the battling opinions may be interpreted as pusillanimous at best, and a virtual disguise at worst. To argue for a balanced position may not guarantee attaining the truth, as there is no cosmological principle that states that reality in itself must be balanced. Often exaggerated arguments carry the day. And underneath neutrality there may be hidden values.

Call is not Incentive Compatible

Scientists may state on solemn occasions that it is unlikely that they are in the game because of the glory inherent in the pursuit of knowledge. However, they would try hard on a daily basis were it not the case that effort is rewarded mundanely. A scientific career is in many countries the only truly prestigious alternative to a career in politics or business.

Conclusion

It is no longer possible to maintain that academic research is somehow different from other kinds of research. *Big Science* entails a research society where the pursuit of new information permeates all aspects of organisation and behaviour. Values tend to be highly involved in the conduct of scientific research. No researcher can live only from his/her vocation. And to attempt to be scientifically neutral may merely be a strategy to push the values that lie underneath scientific work. The notion of scientific objectivity can only be salvaged if it is interpreted collectively as the requirement of respecting the scientific dialogue and its rules about scientific evidence, argument and critique. It belongs to all within the scientific community, but not to any single person.

Thus, university autonomy is hardly a necessary or sufficient condition for scientific objectivity, as only diversity and critique is conducive to that enigmatic objective, in order to return to the starting point of this paper. Yet, Weber was right about ultimate values. Science cannot provide them by deduction from its knowledge. But as the conduct of inquiry moves along, almost in a *Juggernaut* fashion, scientific objectivity emerges as an unintended and unrecognized by-product of the never ending battle between competing theories and models (Kaplan 1998). It is not, as Weber believed, a property of the individual researcher or the single text. *Big science* will promote this ideal, only if the *critique* is never suspended as the *Juggernaut* of modern science rolls along.

References

- Galison, P.L. and Hevly, B. (1992). *Big Science: The Growth of Large-Scale Research*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cruze, T. (2006) *Big Science*. Internet: Pedia Press.
<http://pediapress.com/showbook/pcfyaakskyfnqnic/>
- Appignanesi, R. and Horrocks, C. (2002). *Postmodernism and Big Science: Einstein, Dawkins, Kuhn, Hawking, Darwin*. London: Icon Books Ltd.
- Weinberg, A.W. (2004). *Reflections on Big Science*. Cambridge: MA: The MIT Press.
- Jongbloed, B.W., Maassen, P.A. and Neave, G. (1999). *From the Eye of the Storm: Higher Education's Changing Institution*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. AUTHORS' NAMES
- Kaplan, A. (1998) *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for the Behavioral Sciences*. Somerset, NY: Transaction.
- Neave, G. (2000). *The Universities' Responsibilities to Society: International Perspectives*. London: Pergamon.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Weber, M. (1949). *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). 'Selections in Translation', in Runciman, W.C. (ed.), *Politics as a Vocation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 212-225.

On story-telling, Frank Sinatra and scholarship in disguise

Bjørn Stensaker

Introduction

To contribute to a 'Festschrift' honouring Guy Neave is on the one hand a very easy task while on the other hand a very difficult one. The easy part is related to the many possibilities to comment on research that covers a wide area in the field of higher education. With such diverse research interests as history, policy, comparative studies and internationalisation to mention just a few, Guy covers a wide area of higher education studies. The difficult part is an implicit consequence of his wide scholarly achievements: how to select a single area and a topic that actually portrays Guy's many talents and contributions to the field? The approach taken in this tribute is to focus on his abilities and skills in addressing current issues in higher education in a way that attracts the interest of both researchers and policy-makers. A good example in this respect is the many editorial duties taken on by Guy over the years, not least as editor of the journal *Higher Education Policy* from 1988 to 2006. The argument advanced in this article is that an analysis of his editorials reveals Guy's methodological approach and his contributions to higher education studies more generally.

Working as an editor is essentially a two-dimensional task. The first, and more trivial, is related to the many administrative tasks that need to be conducted to publish a journal regularly. Sending manuscripts out for review, getting the peers to deliver, the follow-up of authors during the process, and the eye for detail needed when manuscripts are going into the printing process are all tasks that require patience, a constructive attitude and generosity - skills that all who have published in his journal over the years have appreciated. The second task is related to the role of 'gatekeeper', to set the agenda for research and policy, and to construct meaning in areas where policy and research issues meet, are confronted and contested. Needless to say, different editors perform these latter functions in very different ways.

His way

Although it is an understatement to claim that Frank Sinatra and Guy Neave did their thing in their own way, they both may be said to have mastered at least in a more abstract sense, the techniques of 'crooning' - the style that has its roots in the Bel Canto of Italian opera but with more subtle vocal nuances and jazz-

inspired phrasings as value-added elements. Hence, when reading articles, comments and editorials by Guy Neave the reader is introduced not only to the classic themes of higher education research, but the message is delivered in a form and style that create intriguing nuances and introduce phrasings that true 'crooners' would be proud of. My argument is that this way of writing is far more than just style, and that Guy through his writings and especially through his many duties as editor has made important contributions to higher education research and methodology which deserve closer attention. I will elaborate three dimensions in more detail:

- Texts as narratives
- History as sensemaking
- Metaphors as illumination

Texts as narratives

Within the social sciences one might argue that the last three decades have brought about a quiet methodological revolution (Denzin and Lincoln 1998, p. vii). We have witnessed the blurring of disciplinary boundaries in which the humanities and social sciences have been brought closer together developing a more interpretative and qualitative approach to research and theory (Czarniawska 1997). A plausible explanation for this cultural shift is the increasing institutional transformation witnessed in western societies over the last thirty years. Higher education is no exception to such transformations, but the field of higher education studies has in many ways been rather conservative with respect to the willingness to experiment and try out new approaches reflecting what many see as the narrative turn in the social sciences. Although one should be very careful in seeing Guy as someone who has adopted this approach and far from him being a post-modernist, one could argue that his writings *in practice* reflect some of the insights and benefits created by developing texts more along the lines of narratives. In a field often strongly influenced by the consultant, the reflective practitioner or the applied researcher (Teichler 2000), academic texts may as a result be quite descriptive, problem-focused and 'isolated' where the text is about a case, a single event or a specific problem. The advantages of using a narrative approach is that context and meaning are brought into play enabling learning across institutional, cultural or national borders. But this depends on how the 'story' is created and told, and how it breaths life into the message. As the storyteller *par excellence* in higher education research, Guy has shown how this can be done in practice. Good narratives produce definitions and concepts but also drama as illustrated by editorial titles such as 'The Marketeers and the Marketizing: The American Eagle and the Chinese Dragon' (Neave 2005) or 'On Bicycles, Sharks and Universities' (Neave 1994). These titles help to capture

processes of change as well as to identify the red thread in an edited issue of *Higher Education Policy*.

History as sensemaking

What narratives do is in essence to create meaning - a process of sensemaking. Karl Weick (1995, p. 25) has pointed out that sensemaking activities always are retrospective since people can only know what they are doing after they have done it. Guy, perhaps due to the fact that he is a historian by training, is one of those scholars who always use this insight to point out that contemporary events or fashionable concepts are perhaps neither as novel nor as important as may be believed. An historical approach creates a more balanced view on how recent events can best be described, and is also relevant in sketching out the possible long-term impact of new developments. Guy has used this technique in numerous articles, but especially in his editorials as a way to reduce the fascination of the 'latest new thing'. A typical example is his last editorial in *Higher Education Policy* in which a certain Monsieur de Talleyrand-Périgord is characterised as a man who constantly rose from the ashes led by the motto that treason is only a question of dates (Neave 2006, p. 401). With this as a starting point, Guy goes on to discuss the never-ending interest in the relevance of higher education, and the disappointing outcomes often experienced by those who are obsessed with making relevance the primary objective of higher education. However, history as a way of sensemaking can add more to higher education research. Weick (1995, p. 27) has pointed out that 'retrospective sensemaking also is an activity in which many possible meanings may need to be synthesised, because many different projects are under way at the same time'. Synthesising such projects may be said to be one of Guy's specialities, whether he addresses the needs of developing countries in a more globalised world (Neave 1994, p. 12) or the pressure on academic freedom in periods of reform or transformation of higher education (Neave 2002, p. 331). As such, history also becomes a tool for critical analyses of issues such as power, interest and conflict in academe.

Metaphors as illumination

A final characteristic worth mentioning is Guy's use of metaphors as a tool for comparison and illumination. Czarniawska (1997, p. 1) has stated that complex phenomena need complex metaphors that create meaning at the same time as nuance and diversity is maintained. Alvesson (1994, p. 364) has pointed out in a similar manner that good metaphors should not oversimplify reality, and that we should create metaphors that challenge the frame of reference used by those in power. To be able to do this requires an eye for challenging taken-for-granted

assumptions about how things are, and should be. This is exactly what Guy often does in his editorials, for example when calling for greater engagement in conceptual clarity and distinctiveness when analysing and studying the interest in stakeholder development in higher education (Neave 1998, p. 247). If we as researchers cannot describe who and what 'stakeholders', 'partners' or 'consumers' actually are, we will also lack tools to analyse and examine whether or not universities have 'responded' or not to community demands and to the myriad of interests the community contains. He goes on; 'As Napoleon the Pig observed in Orwell's satire *Animal Farm*, so with stakeholders and partners - some are indeed more equal than others'. Numerous examples could be added, such as his comparison of Hippos and academics (!) (Neave 2003, p. 135), or his reference to Kafka, Pharaohs, Anglican churchgoers and The Promised Land within a single paragraph in another of his editorials (Neave 1996, p. 87). While being thought-provoking, funny and often satirical, his use of words and concepts is always to the point. The effect is that problems, developments and challenges in higher education are opened up to both insiders and outsiders in the field.

Monsieur El-Neave's Qualities

Higher education research is a heterogeneous field both in terms of disciplinary focuses and research themes. Tight (2004, p. 12) has described the field as follows; 'higher education tends to be small-scale rather than large scale, cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, short-term rather than long-term, positivist rather than critical, seek solutions to problems rather than challenges, be instrumental rather than theoretical'. One way of avoiding this fragmentation, and to develop more long-term and critical research is to improve communication between higher education researchers (Teichler 2000, p. 23). As a scholar, but especially as an editor, Guy Neave has worked for a very long time to achieve this objective. But as emphasised in this small contribution, his work is far more than just 'editing' - it could perhaps better be described as a form of scholarship in disguise that 'translates' reform, change and sometimes chaos into order and meaning where maps are created for manoeuvring in both research and policy. If the world of higher education is becoming more complex, communication between those studying it will not be enough to guarantee us better understanding. We need translators as well. As Guy Neave steps down from his duties in this area he has left us all with a formidable challenge for the future.

References

- Alvesson, M. (1994). *Tolkning och reflection. Vetenskapsfilosofi och kvalitativ metod*. Lund: studentlitteratur.

- Czarniawska, B. (1997). *A narrative approach to organization studies*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1998). *The landscape of qualitative research. Theories and issues*. London: Sage.
- Neave, G. (1994). 'On bicycles, sharks and universities: The emergence of a higher education space in Europe', *Higher Education Policy*, 7, 3, 9-12.
- Neave, G. (1996). 'On consolidation, outcomes and their worth', *Higher Education Policy*, 9, 2, 87-88.
- Neave, G. (1998). 'On the naming of names', *Higher Education Policy*, 11, 3, 245-247.
- Neave, G. (2002). 'Academic freedom in an age of globalisation', *Higher Education Policy*, 15, 3, 331-335.
- Neave, G. (2003). 'On scholars, Hippopotami and von Humboldt: Higher Education in Europe in Transition', *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 2, 135-140.
- Neave, G. (2005). 'The marketeers and the marketizing: The American Eagle and the Chinese Dragon', *Higher Education Policy*, 18, 1, 83-86.
- Neave, G. (2006). 'Monsieur de Talleyrand-Pérogord's Qualities', *Higher Education Policy*, 19, 4, 401-409.
- Teichler, U. (2000). 'Higher education research and its institutional basis', in Schwarz, S. and Teichler, U. (eds.), *The institutional basis of higher education research. Experiences and perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 13-24.
- Tight, M. (2004). *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Higher Education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. London: Sage.

The Recusancy of Higher Education Research in the Age of Knowledge

James S. Taylor

Higher education represents one of the oldest institutions in the world. Throughout history academic institutions have sought to respond, with varying degrees of commitment and success, to the demands of endlessly changing and evolving environmental conditions. The global economy of today demands the development of management capabilities, innovation strategies and competitive advantages within the higher education enterprise. All institutions have to be prepared for the challenges of a highly competitive and ever increasing global market that is in a constant state of flux.

Enormous change has been occurring in higher education that has greatly complicated governance, as well as management and leadership. Institutions have grown in size and complexity over recent decades. The increasing demands of external stakeholders for knowledge production, wealth creation and social relevance have placed inordinate pressure on higher education institutions to maintain vigilance and be strategically positioned to seize opportunities and avert threats quickly and efficiently. More recent movements to publicly evaluate and criticise the higher education enterprise have diminished public trust. Finally, institutions themselves are becoming more diversified, serving different missions and clienteles. As a result, new governance cultures are surfacing to address these differences.

Higher education institutions are pushing or being pulled toward better strategic positioning in order to face emerging new social needs. Certainly, the research domain within higher education is an essential part of that formula. Unlike a rich man's sport that can be pursued selfishly and with little regard for its ultimate contribution to anyone or anything external to the pleasure it provides the participant, higher educational research is now being called upon to do more. It is no longer sufficient to engage in scholarly exercise for the sake of exercising, to pursue esoteric unknowns simply because they exist or, more succinctly, to embark upon research that makes no difference. Knowledge is now the coin of the realm. Our institutions of higher learning must respond to the clarion call to educate young people, preserve cultural heritage, create professionals, certify competencies, challenge mainstream thinking, stimulate change and conduct meaningful research for our societal well-being. More than any other social institution, higher education must orchestrate the journey to increased knowledge

creation, discovery and dissemination. As the health and robustness of our higher education enterprise goes, so goes the health of our knowledge society.

The conundrum I have suggested above is multifaceted and complicated. In this short space, I shall not dwell on issues surrounding the misguided governance structures that perpetuate and promote the 'publish or perish' mentality; and I will avoid the dilemma of the professors who have conceded defeat and resigned themselves to the reality that survival is measured in research quantity rather than quality. I will also avoid an opinionated and no doubt controversial diatribe about the societal value of professorial overspecialisation resulting in idiosyncratic work shared in semi-private conclaves of like-minded colleagues having an equally singular focus. I will instead offer thoughts on the conceptual focus much higher education research has and what I believe should change in that regard.

Within the academic triad of teaching, scholarly activity, and service and innovation, research has always played a major role. As market forces drive more and more higher education institutions into a competitive frenzy, interest has shifted away from the core curriculum of the first degree students to the doctoral programs. It is here that institutions hope to find their scholarly reputational advantage. Elevated international rankings and institutional prestige come from research output, not the quality of teaching at the undergraduate level. Unfortunately, this will leave us with winners and losers. The latter being, of course, those institutions that distinguish themselves through excellence in teaching. As noted by Neave (2005, p. 9), 'Competition may indeed secure brilliant students and lavish resources of revenue. But it cannot, by definition, do so for all...Competition discriminates...' As long as competitive success is measured this way, legitimate mission differentiation - and broader and better contributions to the society we serve - will be more difficult to achieve.

If for a moment we accept this competitive reality as a given, it is not hard to envision how it interfaces quite effectively with the exponential mutation occurring within the higher education environment. The present framework in which the world exists today encompasses a variety of challenges and educational trends that may impact higher education research and push it toward better strategic positioning in order to serve emerging new social needs. The arena of higher education will continue to become more and more global and international in its depth and breadth. Fewer and fewer will be the issues and solutions we find at the local and even national levels. Information technology and ease of travel have already made networking and research collaboration commonplace. This will continue to expand to the point where academic appointments will be jointly made based on these research endeavours. As humankind continues to endanger the Earth's sustainability, more research

alliances between multiple institutions and businesses will be formed to confront the issues of world health, poverty, the environment and global peace, among others. While at least the more notable institutions will persist in recognisable form, their functional boundaries will be blurred by the cross-fertilisation with other institutions, businesses and governments world-wide as humankind tries to come to grips with its own survival. In the last ten years, technological and scientific advancements grew more than in the rest of the years of the century combined. Governments are expecting that universities address tangible social and environmental priorities. It is suggested the university must be capable of maximising the relation between technological development and societal contributions. This relationship cannot simply be inferred. It will have to be accounted for by the research that emanates from the institutions.

It would seem to me that the gauntlet has been laid down for higher education research. It must continue the path many institutions have begun away from *sub rosa* and/or esoteric research and toward transparent and beneficial research that will contribute to the commonweal. For research to be deemed relevant and legitimate, it must meet the requirements set forth by many demanding criteria. Certainly among them are the constructs of validity and reliability. While their meaning is no doubt clear to the reader, I would like to relate them to the continuum of theory and practice as it applies to research. My point is to try to articulate a bit more robustly the path research must pursue and the importance of doing so.

Higher education research spans a broad continuum from theory and abstraction to application and practicality. A given study can find its rightful place anywhere on the continuum. The challenge is to bridge the great divide between theory and practice and ensure that the continuum does not become too much of a dichotomy. Sound research is buttressed by theory and tied to previous credible research. This grounds the research to existing knowledge and provides evidence that it is addressing and evolving from known propositions - that it has validity. Over time, research should prove to be replicable - to have reliability. However, since replications of original published research tend not to get published themselves, few replicative studies are pursued. Ideally, replication should expand to include differing circumstances and thus the original study's broader applicability - that it has generalisability. Studies of this type, with some degree of originality in their application, tend to appear in print more often. But ultimately, for research to be both valid and reliable, it must span the continuum in order to evidence legitimacy and relevance.

This same challenge must be extended to research training and the cultivation of new PhD students. They must be inculcated with the desire to make a meaningful difference through their research. Neave (2002) makes the point that higher

education still holds a monopoly on research training, at least in the advanced economies of the North. He further states (Neave 2002, p. 3), '...the research function...is moving very rapidly beyond the groves of academe....' Higher education's pre-eminence is not a given. We must earn our continuing dominance in research training through relevance.

Perhaps it is time for higher education research, especially in Europe, to move beyond the Humboltian tenet of a self-directed journey in search of personal perfection. Higher education institutions need to grapple more vigorously with their relationship to their real-world environment. Our research must contribute to the common good. The Knowledge Age is not a time when higher education can rest comfortably with the view that, by default, it is the hub of the wheel. Society is clamouring for us to assume a central role more aggressively, and we are clearly capable of doing so in stellar fashion. However, changes (and needs) in the world are advancing faster than the tradition-laden wheels of academe typically turn. Higher education research must embrace an entrepreneurial spirit of innovation, creativity, and collaboration with the external actors in its environment. To do less is to abandon one of the most promising opportunities higher education has to contribute to the Age of Knowledge.

References

- Neave, G. (2002). 'Research and Research-Training Systems: Towards a Typology'. *UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series*, Paper no. 1.
- Neave, G. (2005). 'The Social Dimension and Social Cohesion. Or, On Reconciling Adam Smith with Thomas Hobbes', *Presented at the Seminar on The Social Dimension of the European Higher Education Area and World Wide Competition*, Paris.

Education policy and research on higher education in Belgium

Jef C. Verhoeven

In 1988 Guy Neave wrote that ‘the educational ‘explosion’ in Western Europe was not simply a matter of economic interest or pragmatism. It also went hand-in-hand with what could be qualified *faute de mieux* as a ‘moral commitment’ enshrined in the notion of equality of educational opportunity’ (Neave 1988, p. 274). I can agree with that, but I have the feeling that economic interest is not always far away from policies promoting equal opportunities. Looking back over the results of research concerning higher education in Belgium, one can show that the selection of the topics of research was very close to the higher education policy issues of a particular period. Certainly in the post-war period, a moral commitment to equality of educational opportunities was defended by political parties and other pressure groups, but the universities were interested in having larger numbers of students not only for the sake of moral principles but also because their funding was based on their numbers of students. Moreover, the opposition between the two language and the two ideological groups (see below) made universities and their researchers more interested in the question of how to expand the number of students of their particular group. No doubt this had important moral consequences, but it did not diminish the economic benefits for the universities. Once the intellectual reserve seemed to have been exhausted, attention shifted to other topics of research than the social background of the students. This process was certainly also influenced by the autonomy given to the different language groups in the country as regards educational policies. I will clarify this process by briefly describing, first, the Belgian higher education policy in the years 1945-1980 and 1989-1999 and, second, the research concerning higher education in these periods.

Education policy

As in many other Western countries, after World War II, the first steps were taken in Belgium to attract a larger portion of the less well-off potential students to higher education and more particularly to universities. This development can be divided into three periods (Mortier and Verhoeven 1979).

During the first period (1945-1964), policymakers became aware that much talent was being wasted because of the strict rules governing entrance into the university. Therefore, they passed a law that enabled secondary school graduates

from different tracks to register at a university. In addition, they created a foundation to provide scholarships for students from less well-off families. At the same time, they realised that the then established universities did not have the capacity to deal with larger groups of students. Belgium then had four universities. To resolve this problem, two additional state university centres and two Catholic university centres were established, one of each type in Dutch-speaking Flanders and one in French-speaking Wallonia (1965-1969: the first university expansion). This was the natural consequence of a 'pacification' policy that had long governed Belgium (Verhoeven 1982). Indeed, three important cleavages marked political life in Belgium: the first cleavage was religious: the split between Roman Catholics and the anticlericals; the second was economic and social: the conflict between the working classes and the propertied classes; and the third was linguistic: the opposition between the Dutch-speaking Flemish and the French-speaking Walloons. In this complex system of oppositions, the prudent political elite was often compelled to resort to compromise, which was obvious when the decisions were made for the first university expansion and also during the second university expansion (1970-1980). The two language groups and the two ideological groups were enabled to establish more university institutions, spread out over the nine Belgian provinces of the time. In 1968, when the Flemish members of the Catholic University of Leuven/Louvain wanted to split the university into a French-language university to be established in the French-speaking part of Belgium (UCL) and a Dutch-language university remaining in Leuven (KU Leuven), the student revolutionaries in Europe and the USA were calling for a new, more open form of university governance and administration. Both processes profoundly influenced the Belgian university structures: more university centres were established in order to pacify the oppositions in Belgium, and new governance structures were devised for the universities themselves. The free universities established their governance structures in response to the demands of their members, while the state universities received their governance structure from Parliament, albeit after ample deliberation with the various stakeholders of the universities.

Already during the 1970s policymakers wanted a state structure in which the tensions between the different oppositions could be relieved (Verhoeven et al. 2002). One of the solutions put forward was to create a federal political structure. The result was that in 1989 the parliament of the French-speaking community became responsible for education in the French-speaking part of the country, and the Flemish Parliament for education in the Dutch-speaking part. This federal structure was, for the Flemish government, a starting point for changing the laws regulating universities (1991) and colleges of higher education (1994). These laws granted more freedom to the state universities and colleges but also made them more accountable for their policy. Quality assurance systems were established, and compulsory assessment of the staff was introduced. The colleges of education

underwent an even greater change. The 164 colleges that existed in 1991 were forced to merge in a very short time. At present, there are 22 colleges. This process was intended to contribute to the creation of a stronger basis for making all of the colleges valuable components of the higher education system, a process that, since 2004, has culminated in the recognition of the master's programmes of the colleges as university education.

Higher education research

During my career, I have had the occasion to work on two projects studying the link between education policy and education publications and research. The first project (covering 1945-1978) was based on the Belgian publications of both French-speaking and Dutch-speaking Belgian researchers; the second one (covering 1989-1999) was concerned with publications as well as descriptions of research projects in Flanders provided by project leaders. For the first period, I will refer to publications (n = 195), and for the second I will use research projects (n = 649).¹ I prefer the last method because it provides a better overview of the time and money actually spent on the research. Publications do not always give a clear picture of the motivations of the authors and the funding organisations.

Focusing on higher education, we found that about 53% of the publications on education in the 1945-1979 period were devoted to higher education but no more than 14.1% in 1989-1998. This is a remarkable difference that requires clarification.

In the post-war period, policymakers and other pressure groups were more interested in the participation of working-class children as an indicator of the level of democratisation of higher education than in answering the question of why working class children had fewer opportunities than did the others. Moreover, youngsters in Flanders (although they composed 62% of the Belgian youth in 1959) participated proportionally less in higher education than those in the French-speaking part. Among other reasons for this, it was suggested that because Flanders had only two universities and the French-speaking part of the country three, the participation ratio in Flanders was lower. Figures were important for policymakers and vice-chancellors in their efforts to acquire more money in order to serve a larger client system. In the 1990s, the idea was

¹ The big discrepancy between the number of publications in the first and the second period is due in part to the method of research and in part to the tremendous increase of education research funding and the number of education researchers in the 1990's. The data of the first period were collected from bibliographies (at that time not available as a digital database) from the six largest Belgian universities. For the second period bibliographies were also used but all of the authors were also invited to improve the publication list (n = 2,664).

widespread that working-class children could attend higher education if they wanted to, even when it was shown that the increase in attendance at universities was due much more to the growing numbers of middle class youngsters in universities. This lessened the interest of policymakers for collecting information about working-class children in higher education. Other groups, such as women and the children of immigrants, became more interesting as potential clients.

Higher education research in 1945-1979

The most important issue between 1945 and 1979 was the higher education participation of students of socio-economically weak families, mainly in universities. The number of university students was very small in comparison with the present: 55% of the 105 publications concerned the socio-professional category of the father (sometimes also the mother) of the students. Policymakers and universities were very interested in these figures because it gave them an idea of an unexploited segment of the market. Further, 20% of the studies investigated questions concerning the chances of succeeding at the university, and 10% discussed problems of the labour market for university graduates. The rest of the studies are very diverse. Worthy of note is that only one study was dedicated to the functioning of the decision-making councils at a university.

Related to the university expansion policy, we can discern different publication patterns:

1945-1964: The first period of democratisation

In this period 22 of the 27 publications were devoted to the study of the higher education participation of different social classes.

1965- 1969: The first period of university expansion

Seventeen of the 19 publications were concerned with the socio-professional background of the students in universities.

1970-1979: The second period of university expansion

Fifty-seven of the 105 publications on higher education between 1945-1979 date from this second period of university expansion and 33% provide information about the social background of the students. Other issues were the chances of the different students of succeeding at the university (25%) and the problems confronting graduates on the labour market (17%).

Researchers seemed to follow the demands of their universities and the policymakers. Almost every year, they reported on the position of the universities on the road to their targets. Some researchers also reported about student numbers in order to attract the attention of policymakers to the deficits of a

particular part of the country thereby delivering support to the various oppositions in the country (Dutch-speaking vs. French-speaking, Catholic vs. anticlericals).

Here it is also important to note that most of the research projects were then as now funded by the FKFO (Foundation for Collective Fundamental Research - where the initiative of researchers was the most important) and the universities. Moreover, most of the projects studied the situation in the university of the researcher. At that time as now, the universities were not eager to open their doors to outside researchers.

Higher education research in 1989-1999

In comparison with the former period, the attention of educationalists in 1989-1990 was proportionally less focused on higher education, even though more publications were produced than in the former period. Indeed, more funding was available than in the first period, and consequently the number of educational researchers grew. Nevertheless, only a small proportion (14.1%) of the education research projects was dedicated to higher education. There seems to have been a certain taboo among researchers about studying their own workplace. Education researchers seemed more interested in the educational problems of secondary and primary schools than those of higher education.

This is no different among the policymakers. The OBPWO², the main funding institution in Flanders for education research, provides funding for research planned by the Flemish Minister of Education, who is advised by senior civil servants and researchers. Of the 128 funded projects in this period, 20% were devoted to the study of secondary education, 11.4% to primary education, and 15.4% to higher education.

In comparison with the projects of the former period, there are more differences to report. First, more than in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, research on higher education was also concerned with the colleges of higher education. While in the first period the colleges of higher education had to struggle to be recognised as true higher education (not only legally), in the 1990s their position as part of the higher education constellation was widely accepted. However, because of that old, special position³, the government funded several research projects to collect information about the adaptation of the colleges to the new laws. For instance, research projects studied how the newly merged colleges had adapted to the new

² Policy Oriented and Practically Oriented Scientific Educational Research, Brussels.

³ Colleges of higher education provided education that before World War II was often considered to be secondary-school education level.

structures prescribed by law. Although the universities also came under a new law, no research was funded to study if and how they had implemented the new regulations. The universities, more than the colleges, were keen to maintain their independence.

Second, the topics of research varied more than in the first period. Some of the general categories of research concerned participation in international programs, information and communication technology, inequality of opportunity, the labour market, language teaching, learning, teaching methods, the organisation and management of institutions, the education policy of the government, study choices, students' progress, failure rates, methods of student assessment, student well-being, and effective ways of schooling. Although the researchers were still interested in the problem of inequality of opportunity and the labour market, the range of studies was much wider than it was in the years immediately after the Second World War.

The universities and researchers were still interested in participation of minorities in higher education. However, instead of focussing mainly on the participation of working-class children, they became interested in the presence of women, and, more recently, of immigrant children among higher education students.

Conclusion

In the wake of the work of Guy Neave, this overview shows beyond doubt that governmental and university policymakers used research on higher education to determine the distance that had to be bridged in order to attain the moral objective of 'equality of educational opportunity'. The figures concerning the participation of the less well-off classes in higher education were also used to encourage policymakers to grant more money to the universities, a policy that was supported by the political parties and pressure groups favouring the working class in Belgium. The high proportion of this kind of research between 1945 and 1970 confirms this standpoint. The data of the second period (1989-1998) shows that policymakers were less interested in research concerning these issues. There was a feeling of satisfaction - or perhaps more a conviction that 'we can't do better' - as regards the large proportion of secondary school graduates who registered at higher education institutions. This cleared the path for new research themes. More than before, researchers received the funding to investigate colleges of higher education, thereby reflecting the recognition of their legitimate position in the higher education system.

References

- Neave G. (1988). 'Education and social policy: demise of an ethic or change of values', *Oxford Review of Education*, 14, 3, 273-283.
- Mortier, J. and Verhoeven, J.C. (1979). *Onderwijssociologie in België*. Leuven: Sociologisch Onderzoeksinstituut.
- Verhoeven, J.C. (1982). 'Belgium: linguistic communalism, bureaucratisation and democratisation', in Daalder, H. and Shils, E. (eds.), *Universities, Politicians and Bureaucrats*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 125-171.
- Verhoeven, J.C., Vandenberghe, R. and Doms, K. (2002). *Het Vlaams onderwijsonderzoek verkend. Deel 3. Analyse*. Leuven: Department of Sociology XVIII + 320.

Reflections on Forty Years of Higher Education Policy Research

Gareth Williams

An historical sketch

Higher Education Policy as an academic field of study in Europe¹ is almost contemporaneous with the career of Guy Neave. Although there were antecedents in the 1960s, particularly in the work of the economists of education in the OECD and UNESCO, it was not until the 1970s that the study of higher education began to be considered a serious field of academic endeavour in its own right. Since then its rate of expansion has been at least as rapid as its raw material. One of the first academic journals that had higher education policy research as one of its main themes was *Higher Education: An International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* which first appeared in 1972 with 4 issues a year and about 25 articles. It now has eight issues a year with over 100 articles and the editor, apparently, still rejects a high percentage of the material submitted and has a backlog of accepted articles awaiting publication. There are now, in the London University Institute of Education library 38 academic and professional English language journals dealing entirely or largely with higher and/or tertiary education policy and related issues. They produce about 750 scholarly articles a year of which about 250 are concerned with higher education policy issues in one form or another. The Research in Higher Education Abstracts from the UK Society for Research into Higher Education, which was founded in 1967 to disseminate abstracts of scholarly articles on higher education research in the English language from outside the United States, included in its first year seven abstracts on topics that might be described as policy. In 1980 the number had expanded to 57 and in 1990 to 110. The most recent issue includes abstracts from about 150 journals three times a year and, out of a total of about 1000 abstracts a year, publishes about 200 abstracts of scholarly articles on higher education policy and related areas. There is a useful review of English language articles in higher education research in Tight (2006)

The websites of the research centres that are members of HEDDA, an association of research centres, institutes and groups in eight European countries list over 60 books and book length reports published in the past three years. This is only a small percentage of the books published on the subject in Europe.

¹ As in much of higher education policy during the period being considered, similar events occurred in the United States a few years earlier.

There has been a parallel growth in specialist higher education journalism, much of which is concerned with policy analysis, since the first appearance of the Times Higher Education supplement in 1972. Now many major newspapers across Europe contain periodical higher education supplements, often weekly.

However, this attempt at quantification highlights a taxonomic problem in identifying higher education policy research. It overlaps with psychology, sociology, economics, history, political science and policy studies, comparative education, management studies, research into teaching and learning and journalism. Journals in many social science disciplines and subjects regularly publish scholarly articles on higher education policy. In addition there is not a clear distinction between policy research and policy practice. Higher education policy research is an archetypical mode 2 research area, in that its validity arises in large part from attempts to find solutions, often multidisciplinary, to real world problems. A Venn diagram in which each article is attributed to one or more parent disciplines leaves little space left that can be called higher education policy research *sui generis*. There are philosophers of higher education who attempt to derive prescriptions from first principles, but even Barnett, one of the leading exponents of this discipline, draws heavily on broader philosophical schools of thought, such as postmodernism. The question remains of whether there is really a field of study that can be called higher education policy research or whether it consists of the application, by historians, psychologists, philosophers, economists of their disciplinary skills to higher education issues. There are and have been during the past forty years some brilliant scholars of one or more of these disciplines, of whom the person we are honouring in this festschrift is one, who have devoted most of their research to higher education issues. But is Guy Neave a higher education policy researcher or is he a brilliant historian who has chosen to apply historians' ways of thinking and writing to higher education issues?

So where does higher education policy research belong? Some major centres are located in universities, some are close to government and a few are self-standing. In the United Kingdom, where the Research Assessment Exercise requires all university research to be evaluated by designated subject panels it is classified along with Educational research. In Norway too the main centre works alongside other educational researchers. In the Netherlands one of the leading European higher education research centres, CHEPS, is now located in a Public Policy and Business Studies faculty. Of two leading centres in France, one is housed with Sociology at the Sciences-Po and one with is linked with Economics at the University of Dijon. In Germany too, Sociology has been prominent in the INCHER (International Centre for Higher Education Research) centre.

The establishment of CHE in Germany in 1994 and of CIPES in Portugal in 1998 are examples of a shift towards self-standing higher education policy research centres. However, the fact that CHE was founded by the German Rectors Conference and CIPES by the Portuguese Council of Rectors highlights another intrinsic difficulty in placing higher education researchers. Is much of their research really anything more than a sophisticated lobby for higher education interests? Even when governments sponsor the research it is usually through Ministries of Education and the research is an aspect of the internal competition within government for resources. The intrinsic preconceptions inherent in most social science research may also be accentuated by the fact that most researchers are personally involved in, or closely associated with the subject of their research.

Interactions with policy

Higher education policy researchers, in the past forty years, have related to policy in four main ways.

1. undertaking research that drives or influences policy making paradigms.
2. writing interpretative descriptions, analyses and evaluations of policy-making and policy-implementation processes.
3. applying research findings to specific problems of policy implementation.
4. becoming policy makers or senior managers.

There are obvious overlaps between them and some of the most distinguished higher education policy researchers have moved easily between the four metiers. However, there are clear analytical and practical differences between them.

Proactive Research

The major policy transformations of higher education in the past forty years have been the results of changes in political ideology, expansion, new financial management, globalisation and information technology. Compared with the 1960s, European higher education systems are no longer explicitly public-service activities, they are much larger, they are more financially and managerially autonomous, they are more international in scope and outlook, and they are making very considerable use of new electronic based forms of information creation, analysis, storage and dissemination. There have been organisational and management changes associated with all of them. The only one of these developments that was preceded by higher education related policy research or analysis was expansion in the earlier years of the period.

Possibly the most influential research based proactive policy analyses were the studies of human capital by economists of education in the 1960s and the work of

sociologists in the 1960s and 1970s exploring the role of higher education in promoting upward social mobility and its effects on social equity. Human capital theory instigated and legitimated the massive increase of public funding on higher education that occurred in that decade. When it was shown that higher education was an investment with rates of return higher than physical capital it was not difficult to persuade Ministries of Finance to find cash for expansion. This research was particularly sponsored by the OECD, which became one of the major direct and indirect employers of higher education policy researchers in the 1960s and 1970s.

Economists of higher education also played a role in the backlash against publicly funded expansion of higher education in the 1980s when World Bank analyses showed that - in developing countries at least - rates of return to primary education were larger than those for higher education and brought about a major reversal of Bank policy.

Such findings also played a significant part in more recent changes in the financing of higher education by showing that returns to individual graduates were higher than those to society as a whole. Sociological analyses confirmed that much of the public expenditure on higher education was in practice benefiting people from relatively wealthy households. The growth of private higher education and the shift towards tuition fee payment in several countries owes much to such research.

Since the 1980s research has been a much less powerful driver of higher education policy. This is in part a result of the success of expansion policies. Much larger and more costly higher education systems have inevitably become more salient in the broader policy agendas of governments. One important contemporary driver of European higher education policy is the economic policy concern that only by keeping ahead in the race to create and transfer economically and socially useful knowledge can European economies keep abreast of those of North America and Asia. Higher education policy has become much more a constituent of broader social and public service policies. Policy analyses of new public management, globalisation and information technology reach far wider than higher education. Higher education policy research has become much more reactive to broader policy agendas. To paraphrase von Clausewitz, 'higher education policy is too important to be left to higher education policy researchers'.

Reactive research

Fifteen of the journals in the Institute of Education library referred to in the opening paragraph are available on line. Of the policy related articles in these

during the past two years nearly three-quarters can be categorised as descriptive, evaluative or interpretative studies of policy-making and policy implementation processes. The great expansion of higher education policy research in the past quarter of a century has been almost entirely of this type. The reactivity is hardly surprising. A very high proportion of the research depends on contractual funding from policy-making bodies and their interests are naturally concerned primarily with evaluation in areas of current policy interest

The majority of the articles that can be described as policy related research attempt to explain how particular policies have come about and why they have had particular, often unintended, outcomes. Rather than promoting research-driven policy we are engaging in policy-driven research. We are seeing historical, political science, sociological, economic and many other interpretations of higher education policies. They certainly improve our understanding of policy processes but whether they make any difference to the policies themselves is doubtful.

Applied research and consultancy

However, research does impact on policy in a different way. Accompanying the shift towards policy reactive research in academic publications there has been a huge increase in the number of researchers engaging in applied research and consultancy that results in small changes in policy implementation. A glance at the curricula vitae of ten leading higher education policy researchers available on line shows that all of have spent some of their time on consultancy work for local and national governments and international organisations. This is certainly in part because on line CV's are intended in part to catch the eye of potential sponsors but there are few senior HE policy researchers who have not succumbed to the temptations, and often the necessity, of consultancy income.

The nature of such activities, and the fact that they appears in a variety of forms, sometimes indirect, makes it very difficult to even begin to quantify them, but there can be little doubt that this is the main way in which higher education policy research now has at least marginal proactive impacts on policy itself.

However, to underline the previous questions about the contributing disciplines it is also clear that many of those engaged in higher education consultancy activities have come directly into it from other disciplinary areas without undergoing training in higher education policy research itself.

Interaction of research and policy careers

There are now several leading system and institutional managers who were higher education researchers earlier in their careers and are in a position to put their research knowledge into practice. More often, however, the movement is the other way. University heads and other leaders in the area of higher education policy move into research towards the end of their careers. Although there is some tendency for much of their published work to be, in effect, personal memoirs these are not epistemologically very different from the reactive research outlined above and their writings do bear the authority of experience.

In conclusion higher education research is a multi-disciplinary domain and is likely to remain so. Higher education has become and will remain a very fertile field for young scholars to embed their doctoral theses but they should remember that higher education policy research is not an island of intellectual endeavour. To properly understand or to influence what happens in higher education policy it is essential to maintain close contact with broader intellectual and political currents.

Reference

Tight, M. (2004). 'Higher Education Research: an atheoretical community of practice?', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 23, 4, 395-411.

VI. Postscript

In Honour of Neave the Unique

Bob Clark

As his forty-page curriculum vita attests - in its length, depth, and width - Guy Neave laboured much in the vineyards and begot many titles. The realm of his mind seems limitless and untamed. While he has an historian's eye for factual detail and is clearly attracted to traditional structures, he also has a flexible mind - an intuitive mind - and probes alternative futures with great glee, beyond the reaches of day-to-day social science.

What I have come to admire most is his stubborn pursuit of brute realities not presented in the written file. Three examples, in unconnected ways, point to Guy's uniqueness in facing down unanticipated realities in the life of a wandering scholar.

First was Guy's sustained effort in a trip to Brazil, an extended visit to universities, north and south, east and west, arranged by Professor Amaral from Portugal. The mettle of the visiting group of eight to ten people was first tested by the visits to universities in the Belem ground level heat and humidity in the Amazon region, made all the more difficult by a 'social' weekend up the river to a buffalo farm where, among other pleasures, we slept three to a room. David Dill and I were then treated to Guy's sturdy capacity to find rest in the midst of chaos. The next morning Guy happily rode a buffalo, followed soon thereafter by an unintended dip in the brown Amazon, when a collapsing walkway thrust the two Amarals, David, and Guy - all four fully dressed - head over heels beneath the surface of the river. Guy's head was the first to reappear, whereby he went to work to get everybody into the small river canoe that was our only means of transportation back to urban civilisation. Guy was soon in fine humour, cracking jokes and looking out for others despite a soaking that put passport, money, watch, and everything in his pockets at risk.

This unplanned episode served to separate the men from the boys. By the end of the first week I was on my way home. Together with the Amaral staff, and one or two colleagues, Guy put the sustained visiting of other Brazilian universities on his back, climbing on and off airplanes to march yet again onto another speaker's platform. In-the-field stubborn leadership, I would call it.

Second was Guy's work far beyond the call of duty that saved the four volume encyclopedia (he and I were acting as co-senior editors, with a dozen sub-editors) when it came closest to breaking down. Guy took responsibility for volume one

dedicated to developmental accounts of about 130 national systems of higher education, from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe. He had to increasingly intervene to spur this effort along. Five promised papers never did appear, despite much dogged urging. The easy decision would be to simply drop those countries. I voted for this simple answer but that was not Guy's way. Instead he roamed the data sources available in Paris and, one by one, sat down and wrote the missing chapters, doing a better job than the original named country experts could do. The Contributors Index in volume four reveals in recorded history that Guy became an on-the-spot African and Middle Eastern expert, in the preparation of essays on Congo, Jordan, Kuwait, Tunisia and Uganda. When you want dedicated persistence, on top of endless learning, to finish the job, Guy Neave is your scholar.

Third, Guy was President of The European Higher Education Society (EAIR), as I remember, at the time of that association's meeting a few years ago in Barcelona. The meeting veered towards total collective disaster when, at the celebratory main dinner, all who were assembled were served, as the main course, a plate of salted cod. Various diners, in horror, began to edge toward the door, dialling up taxis and restaurants as they went, a sensible individual response, given the circumstances. But not Guy Neave. With great gusto he ate the cod on his plate down to the last frozen crumb. All who witnessed this example of persisting collegial leadership did not dare to get up and head for the safety of escape. Instead, we stayed, to be rewarded with Guy's final benediction: 'In Cod We Trust.'

No use our moaning about it. It is not possible to clone Neave The Unique. In the study of higher education around the globe, Guy has been for several decades THE spirited intellectual commentator on the odd ways of universities in your countries and mine. We will not be able to fully replace him. He has been a prince for all seasons and settings. Here's to his continued presence in our midst. He surely has a few more uniqueness's up his sleeve.

The publications of Guy Neave¹

Books

- How They Fared: the impact of the comprehensive school upon the University**, London, 1975, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 215 pp
- Co - author, **An Improper Sixth: a sociological evaluation of sixth year studies and the changing relationship between school and university in Scotland**, Windsor (England) 1976, National Foundation for Educational Research, 129 pp.
- Patterns of Equality: the influence of new structures in European higher education upon the equality of educational opportunity**, Windsor (England) 1976, National Foundation for Educational Research, 135 pp.
- (French edition) Nouveaux modèles d'enseignement supérieur et égalité des chances: perspectives internationales**, Luxembourg, 1978 Commission des Communautés Européennes, série Education No. 6, 120. pp.
- (German edition) Neue Hochschulmodelle und Chancengleichheit Prospektive Untersuchungen auf internationaler Ebene**, Luxembourg, 1978, Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften, Bildungsreihe Nr. 6, 120 pp.
- (editor) 'Recession and retrenchment: new trends in European higher education', Special issue of **Paedagogica Europaea**, vol. xiii, 1978, No. 1, Braunschweig, Westermann Verlag, 182 pp.
- (editor) **Research Perspectives on the transition from school to work: transactions of the Council of Europe research workshop held at Brugge, Belgium**, Amsterdam/Lisse, 1978, Swets en Zeitlinger, 112 pp.
- (editor) 'The articulation between secondary and higher education in Europe', **European Journal of Education**, Vol 16, No.2, 1981, 112 pp.
- (editor) 'The State and higher education', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 17, No. 3, 1983, 103 pp.
- Co-author **Higher Education research in Sweden: an analysis and an evaluation**, Stockholm, 1983, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 106 pp.
- The EEC and Education**, Stoke on Trent (England) 1984, Trentham Books, 203. . (2nd printing 1988)
- with A. Bienaymé & L. Cerych, **La Professionnalisation de l'enseignement supérieur**, Paris / Amsterdam, 1986 Fondation Européenne de la Culture, 103 pp.

¹ This list includes Guy Neave's publications in the form of (edited) books, reports, occasional papers, book contributions and journal articles. In addition to this impressive list, Guy has produced many other scholarly outputs including 27 technical reports and 148 conference papers and well-received keynote speeches.

- La Comunidad Europea y la Educación**, (updated and revised for Spanish market) Madrid, 1987, Fundación Universidad Empresa 213 pp.
- with Frans van Vught, **Prometheus Bound: the changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe**, Oxford, 1991, Pergamon Press. 253 pp.
- The Teaching Nation: Prospects for Teachers in the European Community**, Oxford, 1992, Pergamon Press, 170 pp.
- with Burton R. Clark, [Joint Editor in Chief] **The Encyclopedia of Higher Education** [4 vols] 1992, Oxford, Pergamon Press. 2,600 pp.
- with Frans van Vught, **Government and Higher Education Relationships across Three Continents: the Winds of Change**, 1994 Oxford, Elsevier-Pergamon. 319 pp.
- with Frans van Vught, **Prometeo Encadenado: estado y educación superior en Europa**, 1994, Barcelona, Gedisa, [expanded Spanish language edition of Prometheus Bound] 399. pp
- with Roel in 't Veld & Hans-Peter Füssel, **The Relations between State and higher education**, vol. 1 in the Council of Europe series **Legislating for higher education in Europe**, 1996, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 298 pp + Appendices.
- with Jan de Groof & Juraj Svec, **Governance and Democracy in Higher Education**, vol. 2, in the Council of Europe series **Legislating for higher education in Europe**, 1998, Dordrecht, Kluwer. 392 pp.
- with Torsten Husén, T. Neville Postlethwaite & Burton R Clark [Joint Editors in Chief] **Education: The Complete Encyclopedia** (update edition) [CD ROM] 1998, Oxford, Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Οι Εκπαιδευτικοί: προοπτικές για το Εκπαιδευτικό επάγγελμα στην Ευρώπη** Greek Translation of **The Teaching Nation**), 1998.
- with Ben Jongbloed & Peter Maassen, **From the Eye of the Storm: higher education's changing institution**, 1999, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic, 340. pp.
- (editor) **The Universities' Responsibilities to Society: international perspectives**, Oxford, 2000, Pergamon Press for IAU, 282 pp.
- (editor) **Abiding Issues, changing perspectives: Visions of the University across a half-century**, Paris, 2000, IAU Press 320 pp.
- Educación Superior: historia y política. Estudios comparativos sobre la universidad contemporánea**, Barcelona, 2001, Gedisa 366 pp.
- with Jeroen Huisman & Peter Maassen (eds) **Higher Education and the Nation State**, Oxford, 2001, Elsevier-Pergamon for IAU 267 pp.
- With Thorsten Nybom & Kjell Blücker [Eds] **The European Research University: an historical parenthesis?** New York, 2006, Palgrave Academic Publications, pp. 181.

[editor] **Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: critical perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society**, Paris, 2006, UNESCO. 370pp.*

Reports to Governments / Governmental agencies

'The Impact of demographic change upon education systems of the European Community', **Background document for the Meeting of the Ministers of Education of the Member States of the European Community**, Bruxelles, September 1981 EURYDICE, [pamphlet translated into all official languages of the EC] 17 pp.

'The Quality of Education: the role of Central Inspectorates in its definition, assessment and reporting - an overview', **OECD / CERI Seminar for General Inspectorates of selected Western European countries**, Oxford, [England] September 1987 [mimeo] 21 pp.

'Science and Engineering Workforce Policies: France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom', **Report to the Office of Technology Assessment [Contract H3-4040.0]** Washington DC, September 1987, [mimeo] Department of International and Comparative Education, 105 pp.

With International Council for Educational Development [New York] 1987, **La Reforma Universitaria española: evaluación e informe**, Madrid, Consejo de Universidades. 140 pp [Report to the Spanish Minister of Education]

Final Report of Project AIDA (Assessment of Individual Diplomas and Awards) Presented to Directorate General IX, Recruitment and Personnel, of the Commission of the European Communities, London, April 1988, [mimeo] Department of International and Comparative Education, 320 pp.

'The Conditions of Service of the Teaching Profession in the European Community', Report **presented to Directorate General Vc of the Commission of the European Communities, [Contract No. 3057-87-10-EDU-CO-UK]** London, October 1988, [mimeo] Department of International and Comparative Education, 209 pp.

'The Institutional Management of Higher Education: trends, needs and strategies for cooperation', **Report to Higher Education Division, Unesco [Contract no. 106. 012.3]** March 1992, pp. 169 plus appendix.

'France: reflection on structure, authority and higher education policy on institutional governance and management', **Report to the Bertelsmann Stiftung**, Gütersloh [Germany] April 1992, [mimeo] pp. 19

co- author 'Evaluation of NORDPLUS - the Nordic programme for the Mobility of University Students and Teachers', **Nordiske Seminar - og Arbejdsrapporter 1992: 552**, Copenhagen, Nordisk Ministerråd, 63 pp.

- 'Les CEGEPS: Développement et défis - une perspective Européenne', **Presentation to the Commission parlementaire sur la réforme des CEGEPs, Assemblée Nationale du Québec**, Québec, le 18 novembre 1992 [xerox] pp. 7.
- with Frans van Vught, **The Winds of Change: Government and higher education relationships across three Continents - Report to the World Bank**, July, 1993, pp. 246 [mimeo]
- 'La Lutte finale: certification finale, système de notation et idéologies de l'acquisition du savoir dans les universités britanniques', **Rapport au Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche présenté dans le cadre de la Cellule de Prospective de la politique universitaire**, Paris, October 1994, [mimeo] pp. 17.
- 'On the Timing of Evaluation and the Timeliness of Quality', **Report presented to the Spanish Consejo de Universidades**, [Spanish equivalent to the British University Grants Committee] Madrid, October 1994, pp. 19.
- 'On Perspectives and Visions: the role of the CCPU in the higher education policies of Europe: 1986 - 1993' **Report to the Division of Higher Education and Educational Research of the Council of Europe**, Strasbourg, February 1995, pp. 76.
- 'The Core Functions of Government: six European perspectives on a shifting educational landscape' **Report to the Adviesraad voor het Onderwijs**, (Dutch Advisory Council on Education) Utrecht, Netherlands, April 1995, pp. 45.
- 'On Looking through the Wrong End of the Telescope: being sundry observations on the State of Academia in the 21st century from an historical perspective', in de Boer, Harry et al **Academia in the 21st Century: an analysis of trends and perspectives in higher education and research, AWT Achtergrondstudies No. 28**, Den Haag, 2002, Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps-en Technologiebeleid, pp. 55 - 83.
- with Mary Henkel, Ernie House & Bente Kristensen. 'National Reviews of Swedish Higher Education: Third Report', **Report of the International Advisory Board to the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities**, Stockholm, September 17th 2003, 14 pp.
- 'Sundry Reflections on Changes in the Higher Education Landscape that accompany the Knowledge Revolution', **Presentation to the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge First Global Scientific Committee Meeting**, Paris, October 16th - 17th 2003, 6 pp.
- 'Research and Research-Training Systems: Towards a Typology,' **UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series Paper No. 1 [ED-2004/WS/9]** Paris April 2004, UNESCO Division of Higher Education, 25 pp.
- 'Forum System Analysis: Research Systems and National Knowledge Systems', **Report to Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge Society**, Paris September 2004, UNESCO. 14p

'On Looking Forward to Innovation, Consolidation and Progress: a short saga of organizational anticipation'. **Annex to the Final Report of the International Advisory Board Rapport 20005:38R The Evaluation Activities of the National Agency for Higher Education in Sweden. Final report by the International Advisory Board**, Stockholm, Högskoleverket (xerox) 10 pp. *

Contributions to multi-author collections

- 'Free schools: education at the crossroads', in Douglas Holly (ed) **Education or Domination**, London, 1974, Hutchinson.
- 'Foreign student mobility in France' in Barbara B. Burn (ed) **Higher Education reforms: implications for student mobility**, New York, 1978, International Institute for Educational Exchange.
- 'Structural change and occupational choice', in Anders Dunér (ed) **Personal and Occupational Choice**, Amsterdam/ Lisse, 1978, Swets & Zeitlinger.
- 'Research into equality of educational opportunity in Europe', in D. Carelli & R. G. Morris (eds) **Equality of opportunity: values in education for tomorrow**, Amsterdam /Lisse, 1979, Swets & Zeitlinger.
- 'Some lessons from Europe', in David Rubinstein (ed) **Education and Equality**, Harmondsworth [Mddx] 1979, Penguin Books.
- 'Developments in Western Europe', in Elizabeth Adams & Tyrrell Burgess (eds) **Outcomes in Education**, London, 1980, Macmillan.
- 'Accountability and control', in L. Cerych (ed) Review of new trends in European higher education, **European Journal of Education**, vol. 15, No. 1, 1980.
- 'New trends in education policy in Western Europe', in Colin Brock, Patricia Broadfoot & Witold Tulasiewicz (eds) **Politics and educational change**, London, 1981, Croom Helm.
- 'Integrationsmomente in den nicht integrierten Hochschulsysteme Westeuropas', in Harry Herrmanns, Ulrich Teichler & Henry Wasser (eds) **Integrierte Hochschulmodelle: Erfahrungen aus drei Ländern**, Frankfurt am Main/ New York, 1982, Campus Verlag 13 pp.
- 'The relationship between secondary and higher education', in Oskar Anweiler & Arthur Hearnden (eds) **Sekundarschulbildung und Hochschule: Bildung und Erziehung Band I**, Köln/ Wien, 1982, Bohlau Verlag, 12 pp.
- 'Sixteen to nineteen in Europe: demographic change and perspectives on the links between school and work', in Oliver Boyd Barrett, Tony Bush, Jane Goodey, Ian McNay & Margaret Preedy (eds) **Approaches to post school management**, London, 1983, Harper & Row for The Open University.

- 'The dynamics of integration in non-integrated systems of higher education', in Harry Herrmanns, Ulrich Teichler & Henry Wasser (eds) **The Compleat University**, New York, 1983, Schenkman Publishing Co.
- 'The regional dimension: some considerations from a European perspective', in Michael Shattock (ed) **The Structure and governance of higher education**, Guildford [England] 1983, Society for Research into Higher Education monograph No. 9, 16 pp.
- 'Accountability in education' in Torsten Husén & T Neville Postlethwaite (eds) **International Encyclopedia for Education, Research and Studies**, Oxford, 1984, Pergamon Press.
- 'Demography, Demagogy and Decline: or, how the universities in France and Britain are neither grinning nor bearing it', in Henry Wasser (ed) **The Functions and Problems of the Urban University: a comparative perspective**, New York, 1984, Graduate School and University Centre, City University of New York, 13 pp.
- 'France' in Burton R. Clark (ed) **The School and the university: an international perspective**, Berkeley/ Los Angeles, 1985, University of California Press, 34 pp.
- 'The University and the State in Western Europe', in David Jacques & John T.E. Richardson (eds) **The Future of Higher Education**, Guildford, 1985, SRHE & NFER Nelson, 13 pp.
- 'Review of Research' in **Teaching and Research in Education at the University of Sussex: two independent appraisals**, Falmer, 1986, University of Sussex, 19 pp.
- 'Les nouvelles technologies d'information et le changement social', Henk vandaele & Marc Vansteenkiste (eds) **The Impact of Technology on Society and Education: a comparative perspective**, Brussel (Belgium) 1986, CESE. pp. 44-54.
- co-author, 'The academic estate in Western Europe', in Burton R. Clark (ed) **The Academic Profession: national, disciplinary & institutional settings**, Berkeley/ Los Angeles, 1987, University of California Press, pp. 211 - 270.
- 'La Cuerda de seda: vision excentrica de la reciente evolución de la Educación Superior Britannica', in **La Universidad Hoy en un contexto internacional: actas del III Congreso Nacional de Educación Comparada**, Malagá (Spain) 1987, Universidad de Malagá, 15 pp.
- 'Challenges met: trends in teacher education 1975 - 1985' in **Council of Europe Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education: fifteenth session, Helsinki May 5-7th 1987 - New Challenges for Teachers and their Education**, Strasbourg, 1987, Council of Europe, 20 pp.
- 'A variable Utopia: changing views on the mission of the University', in **International Student Research Centre Yearbook 1986**, Prague, 1987, ISRC, 11 pp.

- 'The all-seeing eye of the Prince: monitoring and validating quality in higher education - some perspectives from Western Europe', in Grahame Moodie (Ed) **Quality in higher education**, Guildford/ London, 1987, SRHE Nelson.
- 'Degrees of openness: developments in validation arrangements in open access systems of higher education', Proceedings **of the IIIrd International Conference of Higher Education International**, London, 1987, HEI.
- 'Policy and response: changing perceptions and priorities in the vocational training policy of the EC Commission', in Jon Lauglo & Kevin Lillis (Eds) **Vocationalising Education: an international perspective**, Oxford, 1988, Pergamon Press, 16 pp.
- 'On being economical with university autonomy: being an account of the retrospective joys of a written constitution' in Malcolm Tight (Ed) **Academic Freedom and Responsibility**, Guildford/ Milton Keynes, 1988, Open University Press for SRHE, 17 pp.
- 'Ave fenix o locomotora: algunas reflexiones extradas de 'La Reforma Universitaria Española: evolución e informe' ' in Ricardo Diez Hochleitner (Ed) **La Educación postsecundaria: ante la sociedad del conocimiento y de las comunicaciones. Documentos de un debate**, Madrid, 1989, Fundación Santillana, 12 pp.
- 'Coopération et compétition dans l'enseignement supérieur', in Pierre Tabatoni & Roger Talpaert (Eds) **Innovations dans les Universités: rapport de synthèse**, Bruxelles, 1989, European Centre for the Strategic Management of Universities, 27 pp.
- 'Student access: from social justice to job market ' in Oscar Soria Nicastro (Ed) **New Directions of higher education in Europe**, Guadalajara [Mexico] 1989, International Association of University Presidents, pp. 32-36
- 'From the other end of the telescope', in Richard Abel & P.S.C. Lewis, (Eds) **Lawyers in Society vol. iii, Comparative Theories**, Berkeley / Los Angeles, 1989, University of California Press, 41 pp.
- 'Evaluation of higher education in Sweden', V. Chinapah [Ed] **Evaluation of Higher Education in a Changing Europe: report from the Unesco Seminar Stockholm**, May 1990, Stockholm, 1991, Institute of International Education, pp. 97-102.
- 'The University of the Peoples of Europe: a feasibility study' in Denis Kallen & Guy Neave **The Open Door: pan European academic cooperation**, Bucharest, 1991, CEPES, pp. 85-150.
- 'Sweden and the challenge to higher education of 1992', in David Ottosen [Red] **Higher Education in Sweden in a European Perspective**, Stockholm, 1991, Kommentus Förlag, pp. 26 - 34.

- 'Sobre el desarrollo de la calidad, la eficiencia y la iniciativa: un resumen de las tendencias recientes de la Enseñanza Superior en Europa Occidental, 1986 - 1988', in Mario de Miguel, José-Ginés Mora & Sebastián Rodríguez [red] **La Evaluación de las Instituciones universitarias**, Madrid, 1991, Consejo de Universidades, pp. 17- 38.
- 'On Hares and Constituencies' in **The Role of Higher Education in Society: Quality and Pertinence New Papers on Higher Education No. 1.**, Paris, 1991, Unesco, pp. 111-121.
- 'On Preparing for the market: Higher Education in Western Europe - changes in system management', **Educational Policies and Management Unit Reports S 145, Paris**, 1991, Unesco, pp. 1-14.
- 'Elite y masas en la educación superior británica: ¿Un modelo regresivo?' in Angel González Hernández [Ed] [1991] **Lecturas de Educación Comparada**, Barcelona, Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, pp. 305 - 322.
- 'Forces of change: forces of continuity. The structural dynamic of higher education in the European Community', **L'Europe des Etudes: actes du Colloque International organisé par l'Université Catholique de Lille**, Lille, 1991, Fédération Universitaire et Polytechnique de Lille, pp. 31-40.
- 'Bringing the regions back in: European perspectives on the role of regional administration in education', in **Conferencia Internacional i les Regions a l'Europa de 1993**, Barcelona, 1992, Generalitat de Catalunya Departament d'Ensenyament, pp. 57- 67.
- 'La Dimension internationale des formations' in **Actes du colloque 'Les Migrations des Compétences et des Talents: la mobilité des ingénieurs et scientifiques en Europe'**, Paris, 1992, Comité d'Etudes sur les Formations d'Ingénieurs, pp. 95 - 99.
- 'War and educational reconstruction in Belgium, France and the Netherlands, 1940-1947' in Roy Lowe [Ed] **Education and the Second World War**, London, 1992, Falmer Press, pp. 84 - 127.
- 'Introduction', **Proceedings of the Ninth General Assembly of the International Association of Universities**, Paris, 1992, IAU, pp. 6.
- 'Régime d'exception? L'Enseignement supérieur britannique sous le règne de Margaret Première d'Angleterre' in Erhard Friedberg & Christine Musselin (réds) **Le Gouvernement des Universités: perspectives comparatives**, Paris, 1992, L'Harmattan, pp. 283 - 313.
- 'France', in Burton R. Clark [Ed] **The Research Foundations of Graduate Education: Germany, Britain, France, United States, Japan Berkeley/Los Angeles/ London**, 1993, University of California Press, pp. 159 - 220.
- 'On the Preservation of an endangered species: Europe's teachers' in F.A.J. Korthagen, L.C.Don & S. den Heuvel [reds] **Stilstaan bij onderwijs in Beweging: opleiden binnen veranderende kaders**, Utrecht, 1993, Interfacultair Instituut voor Leraropleiding, pp. 13 - 20.

- 'Recrutement et formation', in *L'Enseignement en Europe, l'enseignement en Belgique: analyse, bilan et perspectives*, Bruxelles, 1993, Université Libre de Bruxelles Collection Education, pp. 53- 59.
- With F. Kaiser 'Hochschulpolitik in Frankreich', in Leo Goedegebuure et al [Eds] *Hochschulpolitik im internationalen Vergleich*, Gütersloh, 1993, Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung, pp. 130 - 161.
- 'On the Contemplation of Circumstances and Cases: issues for higher education in the management of international cooperation', in **The Management of International Cooperation in Higher Education Proceedings of the 3rd Unesco-NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education**, Paris, 1993, Unesco, pp. 83 - 89.
- 'Higher education policy in France', in Leo Goedegebuure et al. **Higher Education Policy: an international comparative perspective**, Oxford, 1993, Pergamon, pp. 104 - 130.
- 'The Future Shape of the University in Europe', in Eugene de Facq [Ed] **European Unification and the Social Sciences**, Ghent, 1993, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, [mimeo] pp. 95 - 107.
- 'The Stirring of the Prince and the Silence of the Lambs: the changing assumptions beneath higher education policy, reform and society,' in David Dill & Barbara Sporn [Eds], **Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: through a glass darkly**, Oxford, 1996, Pergamon Press, pp. 54 - 71.
- 'Academic Autonomy: Working Myth or Ark of Covenant?' **De Zelfstandige Universiteit**, Rotterdam, 1996, The Rectors' College of the Netherlands Universities, pp. 6 - 11.
- 'Inspiration of the Muse or management of the Art? Issues in training for academic posts and teaching in France,' in Arnold Burgen [Ed] **Goals and Purposes of higher education in the 21st century**, London, 1996, Jessica Kingsley Higher Education Policy Series 32, pp. 146 - 154.
- 'The Evaluation of the higher education system in France,' in Robert Cowen [Ed] **World Yearbook of Education 1996 The Evaluation of Systems of Higher Education**, London, 1996, Kogan Page, pp. 66 - 81.
- 'On flies in amber: some eccentric thoughts on universities and regions from an international perspective', in Urban Dahllöf & Staffan Selander (Eds) **Expanding Colleges and New Universities**, Uppsala, 1996, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis 66, pp. 175 - 184.
- 'Global Civilisation and Cultural Values: an apocryphal or a millennial vision?' **Proceedings of the Tenth General Assembly of the International Association of Universities**, New Delhi, February 1995, Paris, IAU, pp. 17 - 29.

- 'Homogenization, Integration and Convergence: the Cheshire Cats of Higher Education analysis' in V. Lynn Meek, Leo Goedegebuure, Osmo Kivinen and Risto Rinne [Eds] **The Mockers and Mocked: Comparative perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education**, Oxford, 1996, Pergamon, pp. 26 - 41.
- 'On Looking at both Ways at Once: scrutinies on the private life of higher education', in Peter A.M. Maassen & Frans van Vught [Eds] **Inside Academia: new challenges for the academic profession**, Utrecht (Netherlands), 1996, de Tijdstroom, pp. 305 - 321.
- 'Universities and regional development' in Ian McAllister [Ed] **Working with the region**, Halifax (Nova Scotia) 1997, Dalhousie University, pp. 53 - 65.
- 'To be continued... From a historian's perspective' in Jacob P. Scheele, Peter A.M. Maassen & Don F Westerheijden [Eds] **To Be Continued...follow up of Quality Assurance in Higher Education**, The Hague, 1998, Elsevier/De Tijdstroom, pp. 71 - 76.
- 'Utilitarianism by increment: Disciplinary differences and higher education reform in France', in Claudius Gellert [Ed] **Innovation and adaptation in higher education: the changing conditions of advanced teaching and learning in Europe**, London, 1999, Jessica Kingsley, pp. 31 - 65.
- 'Apocalypse now: the changing role of the university in the emerging information society' in A. Tuijnman & T Schuller [Eds] **Lifelong Learning Policy and Research**, Stockholm, 1999, Wenner Gren International Series volume 75, pp. 189 - 196.
- 'Universities' Responsibility to Society: an historical exploration of an enduring issue' in Guy Neave [Ed] **The Universities' Responsibilities to Society: international perspectives**, Oxford, 2000 Pergamon Press pp. 1-28.
- 'Research and the making of frames', in Ragnvald Kalleberg et al. [Ed] **Comparative Perspectives on Universities: Comparative Social Research**, vol. 19, Stamford CT, JAI publishers, 2000, pp. 257-271.
- 'Voices of Constancy, Voices of Change: Higher Education discussed across a turbulent half-century', in Guy Neave [ed] **Abiding Issues, changing perspectives: Visions of the University across a half-century**, Paris, 2000, IAU Press, pp. 9 - 36.
- 'On Fate and Intelligence: The Institutional Base of Higher Education Research,' in Stefanie Schwarz & Ulrich Teichler [Eds] **The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research: experiences and perspectives**, Dordrecht, 2000, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 57- 74.
- 'Governance, Change and the Universities in Western Europe', in Werner Z. Hirsch & Luc E. Weber, [Eds] **Governance in Higher Education: the University in a State of Flux**, London/Paris/ Geneva, 2001 Economica, pp. 52 - 67.

- 'The European Dimension in higher education: an excursion into the modern use of Historical Analogues,' In Huisman, Maassen & Neave (Eds) **Higher Education and the Nation State**, Oxford, 2001, Elsevier Pergamon, pp. 13- 73.
- 'On Walking Delicately: an Outlandish View of Higher Education in the Netherlands,' in Fons van Wieringen (Ed) **Jaarsverslag 2000**, The Hague, 2001, Onderwijsraad. pp. 22-32.
- 'The Stakeholder perspective historically explored' in Jürgen Enders & Oliver Fulton [Eds] **Higher Education in a Globalising World: international trends and mutual observations**, Dordrecht, 2002, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 17 - 38.
- 'On the Uncertain Consequences of taking advice from Procrustes', in Yoshiko Yonezawa & Frans Kaiser [Eds] **System-level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century**, Bucharest, Roumania, 2003, CEPES, pp. 63 - 74.
- 'On the Return from Babylon: a Long Voyage around History, Ideology and Systems Change', in Jon File & Leo Goedegebuure [Eds] **Real-Time Systems: reflections on Higher education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia**, Brno (Czech Republic) 2003, Vuilin Publishers, pp. 15 - 37.
- 'Institutional Research: from Case-study to Strategic Instrument' in R. Begg [Ed] **The Dialogue between Higher Education Research and Practice**, Dordrecht, 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 3 - 14.
- 'Higher Education Policy as Orthodoxy: being one Tale of Doxological Drift, Political Intention and Changing Circumstances' in David Dill, Ben Jongbloed, Alberto Amaral & Pedro Teixeira [Eds] **Markets in Higher Education: rhetoric or reality?** Dordrecht, 2004, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.
- 'The Evaluative State and Bologna: Old Wine in New Bottles. Or, simply the Ancient Practice of 'Coupage'?' in **Higher Education Forum**, vol.3 March 2006, Hiroshima, Research Institute for Higher Education, pp. 27 – 46.
- 'On Time and Fragmentation: sundry observations on Research, the University and Politics from a waveringly historical perspective', in Bluchert, Kjell, Neave, Guy & Nybom, Thorsten [Eds] **The European Research University- a historical parenthesis?**, New York, 2006, Palgrave Academic, pp. 63 – 76.
- 'Mapping Knowledge Society back onto Higher Education' in Guy Neave [Ed] **Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society**, Paris, 2006, UNESCO publishing pp. 13 -22.

- 'Comment: the Song, not the Singer', in Guy Neave [Ed] **Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society**, Paris, 2006, UNESCO publishing pp. 203-208.
- (Submitted) 'Patterns' Chapter 2 in Walter Ruegg and Hilda de Ridder Simoens (Eds)
- A History of the University in Europe**, vol. 4 1945 – 1990. Cambridge University Press.
- 'On Prophets and Metaphors: Devices for Coping in Times of Change' in Jurgen Enders, Ben Jongbloed and Jon File (Eds) **The European Higher Education and Research Landscape 2020**, Brno, 2005 Vuilin Publishers, pp.
- (Submitted) 'The Long Quest for Legitimacy; an extended Gaze from Europe's Western Parts' in Dan Levy and Snejana Slancheva [Eds] **Private Higher Education in East and Central Europe: the Quest for Legitimacy**, New York, Palgrave Academic Publishers *
- 'Mass Higher Education and the Research University: a post-modern revival of Ockham's Razor', in Zehev Tadmar (Ed) **'Transition to Mass Higher Education Systems: international comparisons and perspectives'**, Haifa (Israel) 2006, The Technion Israel Institute of Technology, The S. Neaman Press, pp. 241- 264.
- 'Social dimension och social sammanhallning i Bolognaprocessen: Eller, att forlika Adam Smith med Thomas Hobbes' in Kjell Blückert & Eva Österberg [Eds] **Gränslöst i Sverige och i världen**, Stockholm, 2006, Natur och Kultur., pp. 382 -403.
- with Peter Maassen (forthcoming) 'The Bologna Process: an intergovernmental policy perspective' in P. Maassen and J.P. Olsen (Eds) **University Dynamics and European Integration**, Dordrecht, Springer Verlag.
- 'The Academic Estate Revisited: or, Reflections on Academia's Progress from the Capitoline Hill to the Tarpeian Rock' in Juergen Enders and Egbert de Weerts (Eds) **The Academic Profession**, Basingstoke (England) Palgrave (forthcoming)

Journal Articles

- 'The sixth form jungle and the London comprehensives', **Forum for the Discussion of New Trends in Education**, vol. 12, no. 3, Summer 1970, pp. 97-100.
- 'Comprehensive schools in Europe', **Secondary Education**, vol. 2, No.2, Summer 1972.
- 'Research into comprehensive schools and higher education', **Social Science Research Council Newsletter**, (London, England) April 1973.

- 'R&D for education: Britain compared with Sweden', **Political Quarterly**, vol. 44, No.3 July-September, 1973.
- 'The swing to science', **Universities Quarterly**, vol. 27, No.4, Autumn 1973, pp. 420 - 430.
- 'Open or closed sixth form: some concomitants of structural change', **Educational Research**, (National Foundation for Educational Research, England) vol. 16, No. 1, Autumn 1973. pp. 12 - 16.
- 'Schools and science achievement', **Forum for the Discussion of New Trends in Education**, vol. 16, no. 2, Spring 1974, pp. 53 - 56.
- 'The reform of secondary education in France', **Forum for the Discussion of New Trends in Education**, vol. 17, no. 2, Spring 1975, pp. 58 - 61.
- 'Urban education in Europe', **Secondary Education**, vol. 5, No. 2, Summer 1975.
- 'Developments in Scottish education 1958 - 1972', **Comparative Education**, vol. 11, No. 2, Summer 1976.
- co-author 'Working class students from comprehensive schools at university', **Open University Statistics of Education Course Unit D 291**, Milton Keynes, 1976, The Open University.
- co-author 'Innovation and organisation of knowledge', **Higher Education Review**, vol. 8, No. 3, Summer 1976.
- 'The University of Stirling and the Central Region of Scotland', **Paedagogica Europaea**, vol. 11, No. 2, 1976, pp. 15 - 39.
- 'Between growth and change: the influence of external constraints upon the development of higher education in Europe', **Paedagogica Europaea**, vol. 12, No. 2, 1977, 8 pp.
- 'On wolves and crises: review of new trends in higher education in Europe', **Paedagogica Europaea**, vol. 13, No. 1, 1978.
- 'Regional development and higher education', **Higher Education Review**, vol. 11, No. 3, Summer 1979, 17 pp.
- co-author 'Less reported systems of higher education: Scotland', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 14, No. 1, 1979.
- 'Higher education and regional development: an overview of a growing controversy', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 14, No. 3, 1979, 23 pp.
- 'Academic drift: some views from Europe', **Studies in Higher Education**, vol. 6, No. 2, Autumn 1979.
- 'The changing balance of power in the 16 to 19 age range in Europe', **Comparative Education**, vol. 16, No. 2, 1980.
- co-author 'Government and technology: the Finniston Report as an enquiry into a profession in transition', **Higher Education Review**, vol. 12, No. 3, Summer 1980.
- 'The articulation between secondary and higher education in Europe: an overview', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 16, No. 2, 1981 11 pp.

- 'La notion de limites comme modèle des liens existants entre l'Université et l'Etat', **CRE Information Bulletin de la Conférence permanente des Recteurs, Présidents et Vice Chancelliers des Universités Européennes**, No. 58, 1982
- 'Cuts and constraints in higher education in Europe', **Higher Education Review**, vol. 14, No. 1, Autumn 1982.
- 'Community policy and teacher education', **European Journal of Teacher Education**, vol. 5, Nos. 1-2, 1982 10 pp.
- 'On the edge of the abyss: an overview of recent developments in European Higher Education 1980 - 1982', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 17, No. 2, 1982.
- 'The boundary between the State and higher education', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 17, No. 3, 1982.
- 'Education under pressure: the planning response of certain Western European countries to the demographic and economic crisis', **Educational Administration**, vol. 11, No. 2, 1983 11 pp.
- 'On the perils and rewards of boldness', **CRE Information**, No. 62, 2nd Quarter 1983.
- 'The changing face of the academic profession in Western Europe', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 18, No. 3, 1983 10 pp.
- 'On the road to Silicon Valley: the changing relationship between higher education and government in Western Europe 1982 - 1984', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 19, No. 2, 1984, pp. 111 - 131.
- 'Le moins est-il corollaire du pire?' **Actes du VIII^è Assemblée Générale de la Conférence permanente des Recteurs, Présidents et Vice Chancelliers des Universités Européennes**, Genève, 1984, CRE, 19pp.
- 'Scholars and administrators: the rise of the Swedish higher education research community', **Journal of Higher Education** [Columbus, Ohio] vol. 56, No. 1, January- February 1985.
- 'Elite and mass higher education: Britain, a regressive model', **Comparative Education Review**, vol. 29, No. 3, 1985.
- 'A few questions the Sphinx might have posed unwary travelers had she been interested in higher education', **Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of Higher Education International 'Forward from U 2000**, London, 1985, Higher Education International, 5 pp.
- 'Strategic Planning, reform and governance in French higher education', **Studies in Higher Education**, vol. 10, No. 1, 1985.
- 'Higher education in a period of consolidation 1975 - 1985', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 20, Nos. 2-3, 1985
- 'The non-state sector in educational provision: a conceptual and an historical analysis', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 20, No. 4, 1985, 19 pp.

- 'On shifting sands: changing priorities and perspectives in European higher Education 1984 - 1986', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 21, No. 1, 1986, 16 pp.
- 'The role of education in European integration', **Quaderni della Revista Il Politico, (Università di Pavia)** Anno li, No. 2, 1986, 7 pp.
- 'Visions of mortality: some views on entrances and exists from higher education in Western Europe', **Compare**, vol. 16, No. 2, 1986, 6 pp.
- 'Policy, ideology and equality: perspectives on the field of education from an Historical viewpoint', **History of European Ideas**, vol. 8. No. 2, 1987.
- 'Educational standards: an international perspective', National Union of Teachers [Britain] **Education Review**, vol. 1. No. 1, Spring 1987, pp. 72 - 75.
- 'External reforms vs. internal continuity: the links between secondary and higher education in certain Western European countries', **Higher Education in Europe**, vol. xii. No. 2 1987 pp. 5 - 19.
- 'Challenges Met: trends in teacher education', **Faits Nouveaux du Conseil de l'Europe**, 4/ 87, Strasbourg, 1987, 19 pp.
- 'Cross national collaboration in higher education: new initiatives in European Community policy', **Compare**, vol. 18. No. 1, 1988, pp. 53 - 61.
- 'From a far-flung field: European perspectives on Robbins', **Oxford Review of Education**, vol. 14. No. 1, 1988, pp. 69 - 80.
- 'On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe 1986 - 1988', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 23. Nos. 2-3, 1988, pp. 7 - 23.
- 'Education and Social Policy: demise of an ethic or change of values?' **Oxford Review of Education**, vol. 14. No. 3, 1988, pp. 273 - 283.
- 'The making of the Executive Head: the process of defining institutional leaders in certain Western European countries', **Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education** (OECD) vol. 12. No. 1, 1988, 10 pp.
- 'The role of education in European integration', **Quaderni della Revista 'Il Politico'**, n. xxiv, 1988, Facoltà di Scienze Politiche dell' Università di Pavia, pp. 111- 117.
- 'Rywalizacja i współpraca, Zachodnio europejskie uniwersytety wobec konfliktów między zmianami w etyce a rozwojem ekonomicznym (czesc i)', **Zycze Szkoły Zyszej**, No. 5, 1988, pp. 49 - 65.
- 'Rywalizacja i współpraca, Zachodnio europejskie uniwersytety wobec konfliktów między zmianami w etyce a rozwojem ekonomicznym (czesc ii)', **Zycze Szkoły Zyszej**, No. 6, 1988, pp. 43 - 60.
- 'Los retos afrontados: tendencias en la formación del profesorado 1975 - 1985', **Revista de Educacion** (Spanish Ministry of Education) No. 287 Mayo-Agosto 1988, 19 pp.
- 'The reform of French higher education, or the Ox and the Toad: a fabulous Tale', **Higher Education Quarterly**, vol. 42, no. 4 Autumn 1988, pp. 354 - 369.

- 'La Educación superior en el periodo de consolidación: 1975-1985', **Docencia post secundaria**, (Guadalajara, Mexico) vol. 17 Enero-abril 1989, No. 1, pp. 73-94.
- 'Foundation or roof? the qualitative, structural and institutional dimensions in the study of Higher Education', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 24. No. 3, 1989, 11 pp.
- 'On articulating secondary school, higher education and 1992', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 24. No. 4, 1989 14 pp.
- 'Access to higher education: summary of the Rapporteur General', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 2. No. 1, 1989 3 pp.
- 'On preparing for the market: trends in European higher education 1988-1990', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 25, no. 2, 1990. pp. 105-122.
- 'Lliçons a aprendre', **Crònica d'Ensenyament**, Num 24, Abril 1990 (Generalitat de Catalunya, Departament d'Ensenyament,) pp. 30-31.
- 'Tortoise or Hare? The role of Higher Education in the Construction of Europe', **Quaderni della Revista 'Il Politico'**, N. xxix, 1990, pp. 187-198.
- 'Fundament czy dach? Iloseiowy, strukturalny i instytucjonalny wymiar badan nad szkolnictwem wyzszy', **Zycie Szkoły Wyzszej**, vol. 38, no. 4, 1990, pp. 3-20.
- 'La educación superior bajo la evaluación estatal: tendencias en Europa Occidental 1986 - 1988', **Universidad Futura [Mexico]** vol. 2, num. 5 octoño 1990, pp. 5 - 16.
- 'On visions of the Market Place', **Higher Education Quarterly**, vol. 45, no. 1. Winter 1990, pp. 25-40
- 'On the procedures of Elevation: or, how the mantle of Elijah falls upon the shoulders of Elisha', in special issue 'Organisation und Management von Universitäten Verhältnis von Staat und Universität, **Plenum** 1/1991 [Vienna] pp. 44-49.
- 'Into the Charmed Circle: or, how to expand the non-university sector of higher education in Western Europe', **European Education**, [Winter 1991/92] vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 45- 67.
- 'La dimension educational en la Integration European: ulna allude mess Ella dells programs', **Bulletin dells Mistress** [Department d'Ensaynament, Generalitat de Catalunya] Núm 228, Juny 1991, pp. 5-11.
- 'On preparing for the market: Higher Education in Western Europe - changes in system management', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 4, no. 3, 1991, pp. 20-25.
- 'A changing Europe: challenges for higher education research' in **Higher Education in Europe**, vol. XVI, no. 3, 1991, pp. 3-27.
- 'On Programmes, Universities and Jacobins: or, 1992, Vision and Reality for European Higher Education', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 4, no. 4, 1991.

- co-author with Martine Herlant 'Qualitätssicherung im Hochschulwesen Europas', **Pädagogik und Schule in Ost und West**, IV Quartal - Heft 4 / 1991, pp. 209-218.
- 'Finite Resources', **Higher Education in Europe**, vol. xvii. no. 1, 1992, pp. 2 - 6.
- 'Ressources limitées', **L'Enseignement Supérieur en Europe**, vol. xvii, no. 1. (French edition) 1992, pp. 2 - 6.
- 'On the Casting of Bread upon the Waters: higher education and Western European integration', **Compare**, vol. 22, no. 1, 1992, pp. 5 - 15.
- 'On instantly consumable knowledge and snake oil', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 27, nos. 1-2, 1992 pp. 5 - 29.
- 'On bodies vile and bodies beautiful: the role of 'buffer' institutions between university and state', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 5, no. 3, 1992, pp. 10 - 14.
- 'Conocimiento relevante: ¿Balsamo para la migraña educativa?' **Universidad Futura**, (Mexico, Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana) vol. 4, no. 12, Fall 1993, pp. 3 - 19.
- 'The Politics of Quality: developments in higher education in Western Europe 1992 - 1994', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 29, no. 2, June 1994, pp. 115 - 134.
- 'Significación actual del vocacionalismo', **Pensamiento Universitario**, [Buenos Aires, Argentina] vol. 2, no. 2, Agosto de 1994, pp. 42 - 63.
- 'O wiedzy do natychmiastowego spozycia i lekarstwie na wszystko', **Nauka in szkolnictwo wyzsze**, vol. 4, 1994 (Warsaw, Poland) pp. 5 - 15.
- 'Appunti su una contraddizione' **Universitas 56 Studi e documentazione di vita universitaria**, anno xvi, numero 2 aprile-guigno 1995, pp. 28.
- 'On Living in Interesting Times: Higher Education in Western Europe 1985 - 1995', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 30, no. 4, December 1995, pp. 377 - 393.
- 'Las Políticas de Calidad: desarrollos en Enseñanza superior en Europa Occidental', **Revista de Educación**, No. 308 septiembre-diciembre 1995, pp. 7 - 29. (Spanish translation of article in **European Journal of Education**, vol. 29, no. 2, 1994)
- 'On Courtiers, Panders and other bodies intermediary', **Notiziario**, [Università degli Studi di Torino] Numero speciale 1995, pp 49 - 54.
- 'Sobre la Reconstrucción de la Educación Superior en Europa. Una Mirada selectiva a una Década 1985 - 1995', **Revista española de Pedagogía**, [Madrid] año liv, núm. 204, mayo-agosto, 1996, pp. 293-318.
- 'Higher Education in Transition: twenty-five years on', **Higher Education Management**, vol. 8, no. 3, 1996. pp. 15 - 24.
- 'L'Enseignement Supérieur en transition: 25 ans d'expérience', **Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur (OCDE)** vol. 8, No. 3, 1996, pp.
- 'Higher education policy as an exercise in contemporary history', **Higher Education**, vol. 32, no.4, December 1996 pp. 403 - 415.

- 'Cywilizacja globalna i wartości kulturowe: wiozja powszechnej szczęśliwości czy apokryf?', **Nauka i Szkolnictwo Wyzsze**, 8/96, (Warsaw, Poland) pp. 29 - 40.
- 'Nachäffen der Nachbarn oder überzeugt sein von der eigenen Weisheit?' **Das Hochschulwesen: Forum für Hochschulforschung, - praxis und -politik**, 3. 97, July 1997, pp. 139 - 145.
- 'On looking at both ways at once: scrutinies on the private life of higher education', **European Review**, no. 5, 1997, pp. 289 - 303.
- 'On Courtiers, Panders and other bodies intermediary', **Tertiary Education and Management**, vol. 3, no. 3, 1997, pp. 189 - 197.
- 'Back to the Future: or, a few brainteasers with which university management is likely to be faced in a fin de siècle world', **Tertiary Education and Management**, vol. 3, No. 4, 1997, pp. 275 - 283.
- 'Growing Pains: the Dearing Report from a European perspective', **Higher Education Quarterly**, vol. 52, no. 1, January 1998, pp. 118 - 136.
- 'The Evaluative State Reconsidered', **European Journal of Education**, vol. 33, no. 3. September 1998, pp. 265 - 284.
- 'Quatre modèles pour l'Université', **Courrier de l'UNESCO**, septembre 1998. (also in English, Spanish, Finnish, Japanese, Hindi)
- 'CRE and the universities in European institutional saga', **CREaction No.115 - Supplement 40 Years of History**, Geneva, 1999, pp. 21 - 26.
- 'Diversity, Differentiation and the Market: the Debate we never had but which we ought to have done', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 13, No. 1, March 2,000, pp. 7 - 22.
- 'Developments in graduate education: or the premature death of Wilhelm von Humboldt', **Educación Global: Asociación Mexicana para la Educación Internacional**, vol. 4, Abril de 2000, pp. 159 - 165.
- 'The Changing Frontiers of Autonomy and Accountability', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 14, no. 1, 2001 pp. 1-6.
- 'Diversidad y fragmentación; ¿una nueva arquitectura para la educación superior europea?' **Estudios del Hombre**, número 12, 2000, (Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico) pp. 61 - 81.
- 'Diversidad y fragmentación; ¿una nueva arquitectura para la educación superior europea?' **Educación Global, Asociación Mexicana para la Educación Internacional**, 5, 2001, pp. 123 - 134.
- 'Universidad y Comunidad ¿Relaciones peligrosas?' **Encrucijadas: Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires**, No. 12, octubre de 2001. pp. 8- 21.
- 'Vale Tudo - ou como a adaptação das universidades à integração europeia encerra contradições afinal inspiradoras,' **Boletim universidade do Porto**, No. 35 maio 2002, pp. 9 - 18.

- 'Anything Goes: Or, How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions,' **Tertiary Education and Management**, vol. 8 no. 3, 2002, pp. 181 - 197.
- 'On the Management of Research and Research Management', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 15, No. 3., September 2002, pp. 217 - 224.
- with Richard Braddock 'Regional perspectives on the management of Research', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 15, No. 3. September 2002, pp. 313 - 330.
- 'The Future of the City of Intellect', **European Education: issues and studies**, vol. 34, no. 3, Fall 2002, pp. 20 - 41.
- 'Ówspolzainteresowanych, kontaktach z Cheshire i wrozbitych. Zmieniajace sie wyobrazenia o uniwersytecie' **Ekonomia, runek, gospadarka, spoleczenstwo**, Kwartalnik 7, (Warsaw, Poland) 2002 pp. 146-161.
- 'Academic Freedom in an Age of Globalisation', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 15, No .4, December 2002, pp. 331 -336.
- 'The Bologna Declaration: Some of the Historic Dilemmas posed by the Reconstruction of the Community in Europe's systems of Higher Education', **Educational Policy**, vol. 17, No. 1, January & March 2003, pp. 141 - 164.
- 'On Scholars, Hippopotami and von Humboldt', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 16. No. 2 June 2003. pp.
- 'Les Etudes supérieures dans l'Université de la Société d'aujourd'hui,' **Revue des Sciences de l'Éducation**, vol. xxix, [Montréal, Canada] 2003,
- 'Internationalisation, regionalisation and choosing the community to serve; or, In the Ballet of the Knowledge Economy should the University attempt the Grand Ecart?' **Das Hochschulwesen: Forum für Hochschulforschung, -praxis und -politik**, 4, 2003, pp. 130 -134.
- 'Perspektywa ubteresariuszy w ejiu historycznym', **Nauka I Szkolnictwo wyssze** 1/21. 2003, [Warsaw, Poland] pp. 19 -39.
- 'The Temple and its Guardians: an excursion into the rhetoric of evaluating higher education', **The Journal of Finance and Management in Colleges and Universities**, vol. 1, No. 1, (Tokyo) 2004. pp. 212 - 227.
- 'The Supermarketed University: Reform, Vision and Ambiguity in British Higher Education', **Perspectives: policy and practice in higher education**, vol. 9, No. 1, March 2005, pp. 17 - 22.
- 'Europhiliacs, Euro-sceptics and Europhobics: higher education policy, values and institutional research', **Tertiary Education and Management**, vol. 11, June 2005, pp. 113 -149.
- 'The Marketeers and the Marketing: the American Eagle and the Chinese Dragon', **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 18, No. 2 June 2005 pp. 1 - 4.
- 'Le culture del mondo accademico', **Universitas**, Anno xxv, numero 96 Giugno 2005 (Fondazione Rui, Rome) pp. 22-23.

- 'On Facing and Exciting Future: cogitations on the Theme Higher Education, Competition and Access' **International Journal of Education, Law and Policy**, Vol.1 Issue 1-2, 2005 pp. 66 -72.*
- 'Times, Measures and the Man: the Future of British Higher Education treated historically and comparatively', **Higher Education Quarterly**, Volume 60, No. 2, April 2006, pp. 115 – 128.
- 'The Evaluative State and Bologna: Old Wine in New Bottles or simply the Ancient Practice of 'Coupage'? **Higher Education Forum**, vol.3, March 2006, Hiroshima (Japan) Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, pp. 27 - 46.
- 'On Incorporating the University' **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 19, No.2, June 2006, pp. 129 -134.
- 'Re-defining the Social Contract' **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 19, No.3, September 2006, pp. 269 – 289
- 'M. de Talleyrand-Périgord's Qualities' **Higher Education Policy**, vol. 19, No.4 December 2006, pp.