

Organisation and Governance of Universities

Kogan, M. and I. Bleiklie

*Presented at the Regional Seminar “Globalizing Knowledge:
European and North American Regions and Policies addressing
the Priority Issues of other UNESCO Regions”*

5-6 March 2007
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris



Organisation and Governance of Universities

By Maurice Kogan and Ivar Bleiklie 2007

Introduction

The dominant ideals about the organisation and governance of universities have changed greatly over the last two decades. How organisational and decision making structures within Universities are organized may vary according to two broad set of ideas about university governance that we may call the university as a *republic of scholars* and as a *stakeholder organization*. In the former case institutional autonomy and academic freedom are seen as two sides of the same coin – which means that leadership and decision making are based on collegial decisions made by independent scholars. In the latter case institutional autonomy is considered as a basis for strategic decision making by leaders who see it as their primary task to satisfy the interests of major stakeholders and where the voice of academics within the institutions is but one among several stakeholders. Academic freedom is therefore circumscribed by the interests of other stakeholders, and decision making is taking place within more hierarchical structures designed to provide leaders authority to make and enforce strategic decisions within the organization.

The last decades have undoubtedly been characterised by a move from the “republic of scholars” ideal toward the “stakeholder organisation” ideal and has been observed and commented upon by a number of observers (Becher & Kogan, 1992; Bleiklie, 1998; Clark, 1998; Dill & Sporn, 1995; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorf, 1997; Keller, 1980; Neave, 1998; Neave & Van Vught, 1991, 1994; Olsen, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Teichler, 1988). However, two questions need to be addressed in this connection: First it is relatively easy to demonstrate that the notion of a move is valid if one looks at ideologies, beliefs and values as they are expressed by policymakers, higher education leaders and other interested parties. Changing beliefs and ideals do not necessarily lead to new practices. In order to understand the extent of change beyond the initial ideological shift, one must observe actual structures and behaviour at various levels within higher education institutions (Kogan et al., 2006). Second, in a period where notions of globalisation are in vogue the move is often seen as a globalizing process that leads to the establishment of “stakeholder universities” across the globe, which in turn means that universities in different locations and countries are

converging towards a common type of organisational structure. Again there are reasons to ask whether these assumptions hold true against evidence from various nation states (Hood et al., 2004; Musselin, 1999; Neave & Van Vught, 1991; Teichler, 1988).

Within different national regimes different components of the internal structures may be balanced in different ways, articulation between teaching and research may vary as may the subdivision of universities in departments, schools and curricula. These have been described and analyzed in increasing breadth and detail: The main structural changes that have been noted are as follows:

- A far stronger role for central authorities in the determination of university objectives and modes of working. This is true of universities which used to be under detailed central controls and those that used to enjoy large degrees of autonomy, such as the anglo-phone universities (Kogan et al., 2006; Musselin, 1999, 2004; Neave, 1998).
- The creation of powerful managerial infra-structures which now parallel and to some extent replace the academic structures of deans, heads of departments and professors. In the latter case the implication is that government by professionals or academics which used to be based on collegial decision making bodies have been become integrated in the administrative line of the organization and thus become part of top-down decision making structures. This reverses the basis of legitimacy and the movement of decision making premises. Whereas decision making used to be based on collegiate bodies that at each level of the organisation were composed of representatives from the organisational level below, decisions are now often trusted with leaders who are appointed by and supposed to implement the policies of leaders on the organisational level above their own so that department chairs are appointed by deans and deans by rectors. The creation of directorates concerned with the economic development, marketing, quality assurance, international connections of the university.

- In many countries the power of academically dominated senates has been paralleled or replaced by councils, boards or trustees who incorporate representation from the world of business, public services and politics. These and their chairpersons in particular reinforce the corporate nature of the reformed university. The power of the academic had already been substantially modified from the 1960s onwards by the admission of junior academics and students to senates and other decision-making bodies.
- A movement of power so that institutional leaders - rectors, presidents or vice-chancellors - who used to act as *primi inter pares* are now nearer the position of chief executives running a corporate institution. This means less detailed interference from central authorities through laws and regulations in day to day operations and budgetary decisions and more focus on goals management by objectives and result.

These movements add up to a situation in which working conditions of the institutions are becoming standardized at the political level, institutional leadership strengthened, new managerial structures established, and collegial structures weakened and replaced by stakeholder boards and a stronger bureaucratic line organisation with a firmer top down grip on internal organisational processes.

A powerful force lending aid to the growth of managerialism has been the assertion of quite penetrative quality assurance procedures which replace the hitherto 'trustful' relationships between academics and their institutions as the belief in "transparency" has replaced trust in expert and professional knowledge. Both research and teaching and learning are assessed by a variety of measures including peer review, benchmarking, performance indicators which shift judgments from the academic profession towards that of external bodies and institutional management.

These changes all add up to regimes appropriate to a stakeholder organisation. Independently of, but may be interacting with the different national higher education regimes, there are several current drivers for change in different university systems

such as introduction of new degrees, changing funding criteria, direct regulation or competition.

From the organisational perspective outlined here, it may seem somewhat paradoxical that the call for change has been justified in terms of an organisational ideal that emphasises efficiency as a general organisational quality and the organisation as an instrument rather than some set of institutional values. This fact should not, however, be exaggerated without closer scrutiny of empirical evidence. Initially it is important to be aware of the fact that organisational ideals come in packages where more than one set of values are bundled together. Secondly, one cannot necessarily deduce actual practices in specific instances from general trends or ideals in policy documents or organisational plans.

As already indicated, the organisational ideals that we find in academia based on principles – such as *professional self regulation* under which academics independently run their research and teaching operations, *representative democracy* that grants participatory rights to staff and students in institutional decision making processes, *bureaucratic steering* by which the state regulates publicly funded educational institutions and *corporate management* as a means to render higher education institutions efficient and accountable – are not mutually exclusive, but the degree to which they are emphasised and dominate vary over time and across institutions and educational systems. Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s it shifted from professorial self regulation towards some form of representative model although still dominated by academics, the emphasis since the late 1980s has (at least ostensibly) shifted towards a business model, whilst the representative model has been under attack as a prime example of “weak” leadership. In addition bureaucratic steering has always been an aspect of the way in which public and private universities have been managed.

In European public systems the extent to which rhetoric based on the corporate management ideal has been followed up in practice varies and exists in a sometimes uneasy relationship with bureaucratic steering and the social responsibilities of universities as civil service institutions. One may also ask to what extent one is likely to find additional variation in African, Asian and Latin-American countries. These

observations lead towards three kinds of empirical questions. First, how has the value base for institutional organisation varied over time? Secondly, how does the value base for institutional organisation vary across nations? Thirdly, to what extent have national differences diminished over time, as supporters of the globalisation thesis argue, or conversely, to what extent do national differences persist in the face of global processes of economic and ideological change?¹ This paper concentrates on some selected European experiences with occasional reference to the US.

There are two major issues in the academic literature as well as in public debates about the changing governance of universities and higher education institutions not only in Europe and North America, but in many other parts of the world. First there is a normative debate regarding the pros and cons of the changes; as to whether they are good or bad, and who benefits and who loses from them. The second debate is empirical-analytical, and here the question is to what extent the changes actually take place, how drastic they are, to what extent they are uniform across countries and global regions, and to what extent universities and university systems are converging on the same organisational model and thereby becoming more similar than previously.

International Trends and National Variation

The rising influence of the business enterprise model as an organisational ideal has in most countries constituted an increasing institutional contextual pressure for change over the last decades. Few doubt that the expectations that face universities and their performance are changing. A number of processes have been identified as drivers behind the changing ideals or values that institutional leaders are supposed to sustain (Bleiklie & Byrkjeflot, 2002). The rise of mass education during the 1980s and 1990s has made higher education and its costs more visible and contributed to a more intense focus on how higher education institutions are organised and managed. New ideas about university management and funding have altered the political rhetoric and

¹ The globalisation thesis applied to our topic would imply that we are headed for a global model of higher education. It is often based on an underlying presumption that there are standardising forces at work, whether they are based on a Weberian notion of the bureaucratisation of the world (Weber, 1978), on emergence of world systems of education (Frank & Meyer, 2007; Meyer & Ramírez, 2000; Meyer & Schofer, 2007) or on notions about globalisation (Berger & Dore, 1996) and European integration. These theories make an argument that at face value seems convincing and important because they deal with some forceful processes that contribute to shaping our world. This may be seen in contrast to an alternative perspective that we find in historically oriented studies of state formation where the focus is on how specific national settings shape political processes (Evans et al., 1985).

discourse about higher education issues (Neave, 1998, 2002). The idea that universities ought to be organised and managed as business enterprises and become “entrepreneurial” universities (Clark, 1998) has deeply influenced the debate about organisation and leadership in higher education. Thus enthusiasts who envisage new alliances and forms of cooperation between economic enterprise, public authority and knowledge institutions as necessary and with desirable consequences for academic institutions and knowledge production have had a strong influence on the public debate on these issues (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Gibbons et al., 1994). Sceptics of these trends have, on the other hand, suggested that stronger external influence over academic institutions, symbolised by the rise of ‘academic capitalism’ (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997) and the ‘ruin’ of the university as the cultural institution (Readings, 1996), leads to the breakdown of internal value systems that sustain academic freedom and independent, critical scholarship. However, enthusiasts and sceptics alike tend to share the assumption that a radical change has taken place and focus on how new ideals and policies based on those ideals change the operating conditions for universities. The implications of such changing expectations are, however, contested issues. At least two questions may be raised in this connection.

The first question turns on the nature of ideological change. Much of the literature on change in higher education focuses on how traditional ideals are replaced by new ones, under the assumption that new ideals almost instantly leads to changed behaviour by organisation members so as to represent the ideals adequately. If this is true then universities have undergone a process of radical change. Alternatively one may assume that new ideals are layered on top of existing ones in a process of sedimentation. Institutions are therefore faced with a number of expectations, based partly on traditional and partly on more recently adopted ideals.

The answer to the first question, therefore, whether it is based on the assumption of replacement of established ideals by new ones, i.e. *radical change*, or on the assumption of sedimentation or *organic growth* (Becher and Kogan, 1992: 176). has implications for the second question. What are the organisational implications of ideological change? If organisational ideals develop in a goal replacement process one may hypothesise that organisational forms develop through structural redesign processes. This kind of process gives the impression of well integrated organisations in which activities and changes in one part of the organisation have clear consequences for what goes on in the rest of the organisation. This is the prevailing

notion about organisation in much of the management literature and among administration practitioners. If organisational ideals develop in a sedimentation process, then this might also be true for how organisational forms are affected by such ideals – i.e. through a process of gradual change in which new structures are added to existing ones. This second process gives the impression of a more complex, loosely coupled organisation in which activities and changes in one part of the organisation have no or only diffuse implications for activities in the rest of the organisation. Traditionally organisation theorists have conceptualised universities as complex (Damrosch, 1995), multifunctional (Kerr, 1995; Parsons and Platt, 1973) and loosely coupled organisations (Weick, 1976). Indeed, the very ideas of loose coupling and corresponding processes were developed by students of decision making in universities (Cohen et al., 1972). The new trends that face universities may be regarded as attempts at changing the organisational characteristics that used to be regarded as essential to universities. The two perspectives sketched above produce highly divergent expectations as to the likely outcome of such attempts.

Reforms are often presented as radical changes introduced as the outcome of thorough and well-planned structural redesign, and based on the assumption that human behaviour easily lends itself to steering by changes in formal structures. Actual reform processes, however, tend to depart from this ideal. More often than not the gradual and organic processes of change, which means that reforms, for better or worse, tend to accomplish less than originally announced. Yet, in order to make choices among political alternatives sometimes one needs models that clearly represent the principles on which the alternatives are based.

Although academic institutions develop gradually and the introduction of new social values adds to their complexity rather than change them radically, this does not mean that change cannot take place abruptly and be radical. But it does mean that the circumstances under which rapid change takes place are relatively unusual and specific. Both external pressure and internal dynamics are important in accounting for the conditions for rapid organisational change (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996).

The most influential account of the processes that have affected the discourse about academic organisation during the last decades is found in contributions such as those by Gibbons et al. (1994), and Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (1997). Starting with the process of transformation from elite to mass higher education, it runs more or less like this: Starting in the 1960s, and with the until now last wave of expansion during

the 1990s, the transformation was an international process that affected educational systems and societies, at least in Europe, North America and Austral-Asia, in a uniform way with respect to a number of general characteristics (Ramírez, 2003). Increased participation rates made higher education and research important to much larger population groups than before and this, in turn, made them less exclusive and less associated with elevated social status. At the same time the number of higher education faculty grew, and university professors in particular have felt considerably less exclusive than before, as they have experienced a declining income in relative terms and a loss of power and influence inside academic institutions in absolute terms. From the 1980s globalisation and neo-liberalism have put increasingly strong pressures on universities to behave like businesses. It is argued that this will make them more efficient in providing education and research services in large quantities, more competitive on the international market place, and better able to secure outside funding, and so to reduce their dependence on public support. In order to enable universities to meet these challenges university reformers have set out to integrate universities, tightening the links between the different parts of the university organisation in order to make them more efficient, manageable and accountable.

Correct as this argument may be, it is important to keep in mind that universities, no less than previously, are pursuing multiple goals, serving various constituencies and interest groups. They are embedded in different and powerful national settings (Krücken et al., 2007). The replacement of goals or addition of new goals, such as efficiency, manageability, accountability and profitability, does not necessarily have any direct implications for leadership and organisational behaviour. Teichler (1988) has demonstrated how the exact implications of the transition to mass higher education systems has varied across countries depending on what institutional and organisational patterns that were developed in order to deal with higher education expansion. Comparative evidence from countries such as Australia, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and the United States suggests that the solutions have been contested and shaped by established institutional structures (Hood et al., 2004; Kogan et al., 2006; Musselin, 1999). The evidence demonstrates how reforms, apparently justified in terms of common ideals such as autonomy, accountability, efficiency and quality, were not only introduced in institutional settings that were quite different, but also followed different paths.

One common characteristic that applies particularly to European countries is that higher education, because of its sharply increasing size and budgetary significance, has become more politically salient over the last decades. Accordingly central government authorities, whatever their leaning, have become more concerned about the cost of higher education and more interested in affecting its product in terms of candidates and research than previously. This means that although governments might steer in a more decentralised manner than previously, they are interested in steering a wider array of affairs. In this latter sense power has become centralised rather than decentralised.

The comparative evidence indicates that the general ideological pressure in individual countries is mediated through specific national policies based on experiences and issues that constitute powerful political, legal and financial operating conditions. These national influences have moulded and given shape to the general trends that affect systems internationally. This means that although the values that justify the policies are quite similar, the countries that are affected by them started out from different positions characterised by considerable variation as to the extent of institutional autonomy, and have since moved in quite different directions. For example did English universities enjoy considerable autonomy until about 1980 and have since experienced stronger government control and less autonomy, Swedish universities experienced a move toward more autonomy, whereas Norway until recently found herself in a middle position characterised by less drastic and more mixed combination of reform measures (Kogan et al., 2006).

Considering organisational change from a leadership perspective, one might say that formerly, the ideal university leader claimed authority in his or her capacity as a member of an egalitarian and autonomous disciplinary community. Now, institutional leadership is seen as a task that is radically different from research and teaching where leaders no longer are *primi inter pares* but directors who formulate strategies and give directions to their academic staff. The conflict is well illustrated by the following formulation by Kogan and Hanney (2000:195): "One of the genuine challenges for any head of institution is to ensure there is a balance between managerial accountability and giving a say to the academic community." Although national trajectories vary regarding the development of institutional autonomy, current developments seem to challenge the link between academic autonomy at the institutional level and individual autonomy of academics within the institutions.

Compared to the European reform experience, the situation in the USA looks somewhat different. Overall, the pattern of higher education organisation and leadership seems to be more settled and stable. Among the reasons for this may be the fact that the US system expanded earlier under different economic and social conditions before higher education became “a mature industry” (Levine, 2001). It is also the case that institutions and their leadership structures have evolved over time in the US and not as part of a master plan (excepting some systems at state level such as the famous California Master Plan); and that higher education today is regarded as a model for others to emulate rather than a system that needs to learn from others. Finally one may ask whether the size and diversity of the US higher education system make it uniquely capable of absorbing growth and change while keeping its basic structural features.

A study comparing changes in government regulation of higher education in eight countries – Australia, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom and the United States – during almost the same period (late 1980s and 1990s), found a number of differences that are relevant in this context (Hood et al., 2004).² It focused on the use of four types of government regulation in higher education that correspond roughly to what might be called direct regulation, professional control (by collegiate bodies), competition and random control or inspections.³ The study revealed the following pattern: the US stood out from the other countries by being less exposed to direct regulation. The UK stood out as the only country where random control plays a certain role.⁴ Autonomous collegial decision making still plays an essential role in all university systems, but enjoys a stronger position in continental Europe than in the Anglo-American countries and Japan. Conversely competition plays a stronger role in systems with many and influential private institutions (Japan, the US) and countries that have pursued more radical New Public Management policies (Australia).

I shall conclude this discussion by pointing out that the business enterprise ideal has influenced the university systems analysed above only to a limited extent. The

2 For the comparison and the eight country studies included, see Bleiklie (2004), Derlien (2004), Hirose (2004), Huisman & Toonen (2004), Montricher (2004), Peters (2004), Scott (2004a, 2004b), Scott & Hood (2004).

3 In Scott et al. 2004 the four control types are conceptualised as: ‘oversight’ (bureaucratic control), ‘mutuality’ (collegial structures), ‘competition’ and ‘contrived randomness’ (random inspections). Here we have chosen the more traditional concepts for easier recognition.

4 No use is made of unannounced audits or inspections. Most of the uncertainty comes from the difficulty of predicting payoffs for good or bad performance in research and teaching (Scott, 2004b).

research has demonstrated that being affected by common external forces that push all systems in the same direction does not necessarily mean that they are becoming more similar to one another. National distinctive features still exert a heavy influence on the formulation of current reform policies. The findings reported above indicate that national peculiarities have survived and that some of the oft cited differences between regions such as the Anglo-Saxon world and continental Europe still persist.

Furthermore, we may draw two conclusions about current organisational characteristics for universities in Europe and North America. Universities still enjoy considerable institutional autonomy. However, the connection between institutional and individual autonomy has been seriously weakened, if not severed, in many countries. If one wishes to sustain some measure of individual academic freedom as an essential part of university teaching and research, then the question arise: What are the values on which such autonomy might be based? In the next section I shall look at how regional and national organisational configurations may shed further light on the future of university organisation and governance, and the forms of regulation on which it is based.

University Governance and Emerging Knowledge Regimes

The previous discussion has emphasised how changes in the organisation of higher education institutions must be understood against the backdrop of higher education expansion and the need to control costs, linked to a more visible and politically salient higher education system. The developments analysed may be seen as nationally distinct outcomes of the struggle to define the true nature of knowledge between actors such as states and politicians, institutional leaders and students, researchers and intellectuals, consultants and business leaders. The key question here is how actors with different interests struggle for their interests in a broad sense, how they form coalitions or alliances, devise strategies and form regimes, characterised by preference for certain forms of government regulation and internal organisation and leadership. In order to understand the different trajectories higher education systems have followed I shall distinguish between a few ideal typical constellations of knowledge regimes and the actor constellations and interests on which they are based.

Modern universities and higher education systems are influenced by a number of developments that have created a thrust towards an extended concept of knowledge

comprising both its theoretical and the practical aspects, and with a stronger emphasis on utility and social demand (Bleiklie & Byrkjeflot, 2002). In the following I shall argue that the emerging knowledge regimes may be divided into at the least two main groups. On the one hand there is *an academic capitalist regime*, driven by university-industry alliances, economic interests and a commercial logic. In spite of its huge influence on the discourse about higher education and as a symbol of current changes in higher education institutions, the notion of “academic capitalism” (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) or “entrepreneurial universities” (Clark, 1998), industry funding is an important source for relatively few top research universities, particularly in the US (Powell & Owen-Smith, 1998; Turk-Bicakci & Brint, 2004). In fact the dominant pattern is that most higher education institutions are publicly funded and owned by national or regional governments. This might be taken as an argument to the effect that stability prevails in the face of all rhetoric about fundamental change. Stakeholder leadership, according to the business enterprise ideal, however, may support the spread of ‘capitalism’ and be supported by a combination of public austerity policies and stronger influence by other outside interests financially and through university board positions.

Although universities still are predominantly public in most countries, the way in which public authorities run them has changed fundamentally, and this has been heavily influenced by notions of “academic capitalism” and “entrepreneurial universities”. It manifests itself in the notion of universities as business enterprises and the introduction of quasi-market mechanisms in order to promote competition and cost effectiveness. Furthermore, in many countries public universities have introduced student fees and they are playing an increasingly important part in funding higher education. Such *public managerialist regimes* are driven by university-state alliances, political-administrative interests and a semi-competitive logic based on incentive policies where public support depends partly on teaching and/or research performance. They come, however, in different versions that may be understood against the backdrop of the previous public regimes from which they have developed. Comparative studies of national systems have demonstrated how public regimes that dominated the European systems until the 1980s or 1990s were different in important respects. Although all in principle were public, different actor constellations, alliances and interests characterised the regimes (Kogan et al., 2000; Musselin 1999).

In countries like the England, Norway and Sweden (Kogan et al., 2006), France and Germany (Musselin, 1999) one finds different institutional environments that distribute actors differently from country to country. Although English reforms in the 1980s and 1990s were radical, important features at systems as well as the institutional level were preserved. The former may be illustrated by the continuous important role played by co-opted academic elites in designing system wide regulation, such as the Research Assessment Exercises, and the status and role of the vice-chancellors at the institutional level. In Sweden reform processes have been characterised by the early politicisation and corporatist features with a strong role of the unions in higher education policies. Swedish reforms have tended to be relatively radical but susceptible to change as the political balance shifts back and forth between the political left and right. These features are quite different from the reform pattern of neighbouring Norway. Traditionally reform policies have been a matter handled within a rather close relationship between the institutions and the ministry and policies have developed gradually in a consensual way in which established relationships are sustained. The radical organisational reforms introduced with the Quality Reform of 2003 have affected the organisational landscape profoundly, but at the same time institutions have been given the opportunity to adopt the reforms to the extent and at the speed they prefer. Similarly in France Musselin (1999) demonstrated how French reforms for a very long time has been moulded by the “disciplinary logic” that has characterised the French higher education system since the Napoleonic university reforms as opposed to a logic by “organisation” that characterises German reforms.

Thus within the same main regime type, university systems may vary considerably with regard to important characteristics on key dimensions such as role and strength of academic elites (cf. England), corporatist features (cf. Sweden), state structures (cf. Norway), academic institutions (cf. Germany) and academic disciplines (cf. France). As we saw, the five countries mentioned were characterised by the prominent position of one of these characteristics which in turn shaped national policy processes as well as organisation and leadership structures at the institutional level.

Conclusion

These observations suggest first of all that when new knowledge regimes arise, their impact may be partial and vary depending on the conditions with which they are faced. The emerging capitalist and managerialist regimes may be viewed as different responses to a number of general trends such as higher education expansion, the rise of “knowledge society”, and a different understanding of the purpose of higher education and research. What I have called an academic capitalist regime has in many ways become a global yardstick, despised by some, but espoused by many others. It has until now had a stronger impact on ideology and discourse than on the way in which universities are operated and funded. It may therefore express standardised norms with a global ideological impact that are far from always backed up by organisational arrangements and practical realities (Frank & Meyer, 2007; Meyer & Schofer, 2007). The practical impact of a commercial logic on Western university systems is still limited and concerns mainly a relatively small number of major research universities. In many public systems in Europe a semi-competitive logic between institutions has been introduced in which they are supposed to compete for students and research funding. This semi-competitive logic may provide an important rationale for organisational reforms whereby corporate structures are introduced. However, the way in which this might develop depends on the extent to which corporate enterprise ideals are counterbalanced by existing institutionalised systemic features shaped by academic elites, corporative structures, state structures, academic institutions and disciplines. It is an open question what implications these processes will have for institutional arrangements sustaining academic individual as well as institutional autonomy as fundamental characteristics of academic research and teaching. It is still early to determine to how and to what extent the competitive or semi-competitive drive based on ideas of production efficiency will affect academic institutions internationally, and until recently the extent to which it had gained a foothold varied considerably, weakened by still apparently quite resilient alternative values.

REFERENCES

- Amaral, A., G.A. Jones & B. Karseth (eds.) (2002). *Governing Higher Education: Nacional Perspectives on Institucional Governance*. Dordrecht/Boston/ London: Kluwer.
- Amaral, A., V.L. Meek & I.M. Larsen (eds.) (2003). *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht/Boston/London : Kluwer.
- Askling, B. & Henkel, M. (2000). "Higher Education Institutions". In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Berger, S. & Dore, R. (eds.) (1996). *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Bleiklie, I. (1994). "Norwegian and Swedish graduate reform policy". *Higher Education Policy*, 7(1), 18-24.
- Bleiklie, I. (1998). "Justifying the Evaluative State. New Public Management Ideals in Higher Education." *European Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 299-316.
- Bleiklie, I. (2004). "Norway: holding back competition?" In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*, London: Edward Elgar.
- Bleiklie, I., (2005) "Academic Leadership and Emerging Knowledge Regimes" in I. Bleiklie & M. Henkel (eds.) *Governing Knowledge: a study of continuity and change in higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bleiklie, I. & Byrkjeflot, H. (2002). "Changing Knowledge Regimes – Universities in a New Research Environment". *Higher Education*, 44 (2-3), 1-14.
- Bleiklie, I. & Kogan, M. (2000). "Comparison and Theories" in Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (eds.). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bleiklie, I., R. Høstaker & A. Vabø (2000). *Policy and Practice in Higher Education. Reforming Norwegian Universities*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Christensen, T. (1991). *Virksomhetsplanlegging. Myteskaping eller reell problemløsning?* Oslo: Tano.
- Clark, B.R. (ed.) (1987). *The Academic Profession. National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways to Transformation*. Oxford, New York, Tokyo: IAU Press/Pergamon.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1972). "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.
- Daalder, H. & Shils, E. (eds.) (1982). *Universities, Politicians and Bureaucrats*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Damrosch, D. (1995). *We Scholars. Changing the Culture of the Universities*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Derlien, H.-U. (2004). "Germany: growing competition at the expense of mutuality". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*, London: Edward Elgar.

- Dill, D. & B. Sporn (1995). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: IAU Press/Pergamon.
- Enders, J. (ed.) (2001). *Academic Staff in Europe. Changing Contexts and Conditions*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Greenwood Press.
- Enders, J. & O. Fulton (eds.) (2002). *Higher education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer.
- Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (1997) (eds.) *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations*. London: Cassell.
- Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D. & Skocpol, T. (eds.) (1985). *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frank, D.J. & J.W. Meyer (2007), "Worldwide Expansion and Change in the University", in G.A. Krücken, A. Kosmützky & M. Torca (eds.). *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Society*. London - Thousand Oaks – New Dehli: Sage.
- Gornitzka, Å., M. Kogan & A. Amaral (eds.) (2005). *Reform and Change in Higher Education. Analysing Policy Implementation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C. R. (1996). "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism". *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (4), 1022-1054.
- Gumport & D.B. Johnstone (eds.) (2001). *In Defense of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hellström, T. (2004). "Between a rock and a hard place: Academic institutional change and the problem of collective action." *Higher Education* 48: 511-528.
- Hirose, K. (2004). "Japan: adapting the American model to centralized oversight". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*, London: Edward Elgar.
- Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.) (2004). *Controlling Modern Government*, London: Edward Elgar.
- Huisman, J. & Toonen, T. (2004). "The Netherlands: a mixed pattern of control". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*, London: Edward Elgar.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1995). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kogan, M. & S. Hanney (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*, London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kogan, M., M. Bauer, I. Bleiklie & M. Henkel (eds.) (2006). *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. 2nd edition. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Krücken, G., A. Kosmützky & M. Torca (eds.) (2007). *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Lægred, P. (red.) (1991). *Målstyring og virksomhetsplanlegging i offentlig sektor*. Bergen: Alma Mater.

- Levine, A. (2001). "Higher Education as a Mature Industry". In Altbach, P., Gumport, P.J. & Johnstone, D. B. (eds.) *In Defense of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Meyer, J.W. & F. Ramírez (2000). "The World Institutionalization of Education". In Schriver, J. (ed.) *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers, 111-132.
- Meyer, J.W. & E. Schofer (2007), "The University in Europe and the World: Twentieth Century Expansion" in G.A. Krücken, A. Kosmützky & M. Torke (eds.). *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Montricher, N. (2004). "France: mutuality and oversight in tension?" In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Musselin, C. (1999). "State/University Relations and How to Change Them: The Case of France and Germany". In Henkel, M. & Little, B. (eds.). *Changing Relationships Between Higher Education and the State*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Musselin, C. (2004). *The Long March of French Universities*. London-New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Neave, G. (1998). "The Evaluative State Reconsidered". *European Journal of Education*, 33(3), 265 - 284.
- Neave, G. (2002). "The Stakeholder Perspective Historically Explored", in J. Enders and O. Fulton (eds.) *Higher Education in a Globalizing World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Neave, G. & F.A. Van Vught (eds.) (1991). *Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Neave, G. & F.A. Van Vught (eds.) (1994). *Government and Higher education Relationships Across Three Continents. Winds of Change*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Neave, G. & Rhoades, G. (1987). "The Academic Estate in Western Europe". In Clark, B. R. (eds.). *The Academic Profession*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nybohm, T. (2001). "Europa mellan själåtåg och pånyttfödelse. En humanistisk plaidoyer för kontinentens kulturella själ." *Tvärrensitt*, 4/2001.
- Olsen, J.P. (1993). "Et statsvitenskapelig perspektiv på offentlig sektor". In Lægroid, P. & Olsen, J. P. (eds.). *Organisering av offentlig sektor*. Oslo: Tano.
- Olsen, J.P. (2005). "The institutional dynamics of the (European) University." *Arena Working Paper No. 15*. University of Oslo: Arena.
- Paradise, C. (2007). "Institutional Diversity as a Challenge for European Policy Making." Paper presented at the PRIME-conference, Pisa.
- Parsons, T. & Platt, G. (1973). *The American University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Peters, B.G. (2004). "The USA: little oversight, no explosion". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the Public Services. The Anglo-American Experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Powell, W.W. and Owen-Smith, J. (1998). "Universities and the Market for Intellectual Property in the Life Sciences". *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17 (2), 253-277.
- Powell, W.W., and DiMaggio, P. (eds.) (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ramírez, F. (2003). "World Society and the Socially Embedded University". School of Education: Stanford University. (Unpublished paper.).
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Røvik, K.A. (1992). *Den "syke" stat. Myter og moter i omstillingsarbeidet*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Scott, C. (2004a). "Australia: linking oversight to mutuality and competition". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Scott, C. (2004b). "The UK: hyper-regulation and regulatory reform". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Scott, C. & Hood, C. (2004). "Overview". In Hood, C., James, O., Peters, B. G. & Scott, C. (eds.). *Controlling Modern Government*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Selznick, P (1984) [1957]. *Leadership in Administration. A Sociological Interpretation*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Teichler, U. (1988). *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System. The Experience of Three Decades*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Teixeira, P., B. Jongbloed, D. Dill & A. Amaral (eds.) (2004). *Markets in Higher Education. Rhetoric or Reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Thelen, K. & Steinmo, S. (1995). "Historical institutionalism in comparative politics". In Steinmo, S. et al. *Structuring Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turk-Bicacki, L. & Brint, S. (2005). "University-Industry Collaboration. Patterns of Growth for Low and Middle-Level Performers". *Higher Education*, 49 (1-2): 61-89.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Weick, K.E. (1976). "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 1-19.