



## Conference Booklet

Higher Education and Social Change (EuroHESC) Final Conference  
29-31 August 2012, Berlin



# Contents

Programme.....	3
Abstracts.....	7
List of participants.....	14

With special thanks to the Conference Committee:

Professor Ivar Bleiklie

Professor John Brennan

Dr Gaele Goastellec

Dr David Hoffmann

# Programme

## Wednesday 29 August

11.00-13.15     *Registration*

12.00-13.15     *Buffet lunch*

### Welcome and introduction

13.30 – 13.50     Welcome from European Science Foundation

**Sarah Moore**

13.50 – 14.10     The EuroHESC programme – origins and evolution

**Jürgen Enders**

14.10 – 15.10     Keynote speech:

The modern university in its historical contexts: rethinking three transformations

**Björn Wittrock**

15.10 – 15.40     *Coffee break*

### Key problems, findings and implications of the Collaborative Research Projects

15.40 – 16.10     Re-structuring Higher Education and Scientific Innovation: The consequences of changes in authority relations for the direction and organisation of research (RHESI)

**Uwe Schimank**

16.10 – 16.40     The Academic Profession in Europe: Responses to societal challenges (EUROAC)

**Ulrich Teichler**

16.40 – 17.10     Change in Networks, Higher Education and Knowledge Societies (CINHEKS)

**Jussi Välimaa**

17.10 – 17.40     Transforming Universities in Europe (TRUE)

**Ivar Bleiklie**

17.40 – 18.00     A bird's-eye view – key problems, findings and implications of the EuroHESC programme

**Barbara Kehm**

*End of Day 1*

19.30 – 21.30     *Dinner at Seminaris*

## Thursday 30 August, Track A

### Session A1 (Morning): Organisation

**Chair: Georg Krücken**

**Discussant: Stéphanie Mignot-Gerard**

- 9.00-9.45      Lead talk: Organisational forms and reforms in European higher education systems – consequences for higher education and society  
**Kerstin Sahlin**
- 9.45-10.15      1. European universities as complete organisations? Understanding identity, hierarchy and rationality in higher education  
**Marco Seeber and Benedetto Lepori (TRUE)**
- 10.15-10.45      2. Institutional and disciplinary conditions vs. innovation: Corpus linguistics in Sweden and Switzerland  
**Lars Engwall, Tina Hedmo and Raphaël Ramuz (RHESI)**
- 10.45-11.15      *Coffee break*
- 11.15-11.45      3. Governance reform and actors' perceptions of drivers and changes impacting on university strategies  
**António Magalhães and Amélia Veiga (TRUE)**
- 11.45-12.30      Discussion
- 12.30-14.00      *Lunch*

### Session A2 (Afternoon): Networks

**Chair: Timo Aarrevaara**

**Discussants: Thierry Chevaillier, Teresa Patricio**

- 14.00-14.45      Lead talk: Changing conditions and geographical contexts of academic knowledge production: concentration in a few big cities or heterarchical networks?  
**Michel Grossetti**
- 14.45-15.15      1. Networks, boundaries and social change  
**Brenda Little, Andrea Abbas and Vassiliki Papatsiba (CINHEKS)**
- 15.15-15.45      2. Between international institutionalisation and national authority relations: Evolutionary developmental biology research in Swiss and Swedish universities  
**Martin Benninghoff and Elias Hakansson (RHESI)**
- 15.45-16.15      *Coffee break*
- 16.15-16.45      3. Academic labour transformations: A social network approach  
**Aurelia Kollasch and Blanca Torres-Olave (CINHEKS)**
- 16.45-17.30      Discussion  
*End of Day 2*
- 19.00              *Bus to restaurant for dinner*
- 22.00              *Return bus to Seminaris*

## Thursday 30 August, Track B

### Session B1 (Morning): The academic profession

**Chair:** Pavel Zgaga

**Discussant:** Michele Rostan, Sarah Guri-Rosenblit

- 9.00-9.45      Lead talk: The changing status and role of the academic profession: from cultural elite to alienated labour?  
**Catherine Paradeise**
- 9.45-10.15      1. Predictors of research productivity: Comparisons of academics in the European higher education system  
**Jonathan Drennan, Marie Clarke, Abby Hyde, Yurgos Politis (EUROAC)**
- 10.15-10.45      2. Influences on academic job satisfaction - a comparison in 12 European countries  
**Ester Ava Hoehle (EUROAC)**
- 10.45-11.15      *Coffee break*
- 11.15-12.30      Discussion
- 12.30-14.00      *Lunch*

### Session B2 (Afternoon): Authority relations

**Chair:** Jan de Groof

**Discussants:** Anne-Marie de Jonghe, Sverker Lindblad

- 14.00-14.45      Lead talk: Authority lost and gained: the changing coordination and control of academic work  
**Peter Scott**
- 14.45-15.15      1. Institutional change, authority shifts and scientific innovations: the mediating roles of protected space and flexibility  
**Richard Whitley (RHESI)**
- 15.15-15.45      2. New university governance: From academic self-governance to executive university management/the evaluation of teaching and research  
**David Campbell and Elke Park (EUROAC)**
- 15.45-16.15      *Coffee break*
- 16.15-16.45      3. Steered through evaluation? The transformative power of accountability instruments  
**Emanuela Reale and Giulio Marini (TRUE)**
- 16.45-17.30      Discussion  
*End of Day 2*
- 19.00              *Bus to restaurant for dinner*
- 22.00              *Return bus to Seminaris*

## Friday 31 August

### Higher education research in a broader perspective

- 10.00-10.45      **Chair: Richard Whitley**  
Higher education in the European Research Area  
**Stefaan Hermans**
- 10.45-11.15      *Coffee break*
- 11.15-12.30      *Round-table: Still looking forward? The future of higher education and higher education research*  
Moderator: **Matthew Reisz**  
Panel: **Catherine Paradeise, Peter Scott, John Smith, Björn Wittrock**
- 12.30-13.00      Summing up  
**John Brennan**
- 13.00-14.00      *Lunch*  
*Departure*
- 14.00-17.00      Review Panel meeting (closed meeting)

# Abstracts

Thursday 30 August, Session A1: Organisation

## **Organisational forms and reforms in European higher education systems – consequences for higher education and society**

**Kerstin Sahlin**

*Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University*

European universities have recently been subject to extensive governance and management reforms. This has co-evolved with a global proliferation of rankings. In this talk I reflect upon how these two themes have evolved and proliferated and I discuss their implication for the governing, further development of universities.

With the two interrelated global themes, universities are going through institutional transformation. The field is being restructured with more marketised relations and a more densely organised landscape. Universities have become organised actors, less seen as unique social formations, but increasingly discussed and assessed as a variant of a more generic organisational type. With this development, universities have become increasingly receptive to globally diffused management ideas so that their restructuring has evolved in self-sustaining spirals.

However, at the same time these global themes and the institutional transition of the university field are characterised by ambiguity and ambivalence. I point to three dynamics behind this institutional ambiguity. First, each individual theme is characterised by ambiguity as ideas are circulated and edited. Second, the interplay of the two themes displays ambiguity. Third, even if the described global themes clearly dominate recent reform agendas, the field is still characterised by multiple institutions, each with different implications regarding how to organise and govern and indeed what universities are and what they are for.

## **European universities as complete organisations? Understanding identity, hierarchy and rationality in higher education**

**Marco Seeber, Benedetto Lepori, Martina Montauti**

*Centre for Organisational Research, University of Lugano*

It has been argued that reforms of the public sector of the last decades can be conceived as attempts to transform public entities into more complete organisations. There is an intense theoretical debate on the form of organisations and the extent to which reforms can change them. This article analyses universities, which have been represented for a long time as peculiar organisations, loosely coupled and fragmented, whose features are well adapted to their activities. The work aims at assessing to what extent universities resemble the characteristics of a complete organisation, in terms of identity, hierarchy and rationalization, as empirical evidence on this issue is still small and fragmented. The project uses a large and original dataset of 687 questionnaires filled by several organisational roles of 26 HEIs in six different European countries. The main goal is to understand the extent to which variation in organisation development can be explained by differences in policy, country context and institutional features.

## **Institutional and disciplinary conditions vs. innovation: Corpus linguistics in Switzerland and Sweden**

**Lars Engwall, Tina Hedmo**

*Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University*

**Raphaël Ramuz**

*Institute for Political and International Studies, University of Lausanne*

The development of computer technology some fifty years ago paved the way for new approaches in linguistic research through the opportunities to analyse large corpora of written and spoken language. At the same time Noam Chomsky introduced his ideas of generative grammar, a theoretical approach which was in stark contrast to empirical approach of corpus linguistics. Against this background the paper provides an analysis of the development of corpus linguistics in two European countries, Sweden and Switzerland, by applying a model which focuses on the institutional and disciplinary conditions for innovation. It is found that Swedish researchers were much earlier in their adoption of corpus linguistics than their Swiss colleagues. This difference appears to be a result of a greater diversity of funding in Sweden and the fact that Sweden has one dominant language while Switzerland has several. Moreover,

it seems that English language studies are more developed in Sweden than in Switzerland and that Swedish scholars have therefore been more deeply connected to the international emergence of corpus linguistics, which firstly occurred in English language.

### **Governance reform and actors' perceptions of drivers and factors affecting university strategies**

**António Magalhães, Amélia Veiga**

*Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies (CIPES), University of Porto*

European higher education governance reforms stem from the assumption that increasing autonomy enhances the efficiency of decision-making processes and the capacity of institutions to

respond more actively and effectively to changes occurring in their organisational environment. The spreading of New Public Management from Anglo-Saxon countries to other parts of Europe is contributing to fixing the meaning of governance. This paper analyses the perceptions of Rectors, Senate members and Board Members of the importance of governance and steering drivers and factors affecting universities' strategies. On the basis of a survey sampling 28 higher education institutions in eight European countries (Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and France) in the framework of the Transforming Universities in Europe (TRUE) project, the paper argues that governance reform has been influenced by a mix of developments related to New Public Management, counterbalanced with network governance, new governance and other governance narratives.

## **Thursday 30 August, Session A2: Networks**

### **Changing conditions and geographical contexts of academic knowledge production: Concentration in big cities or heterarchical networks?**

**Michel Grossetti**

*LISST - Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Solidarités, Sociétés, Territoires, CNRS, University of Toulouse*

The geographical dimension of scientific activity is nowadays at the heart of many science policies. For example, several governments enforce policies designed to concentrate resources on larger centres. These policies are based on a series of assumptions concerning the geography of science: the existence of a trend towards the globalisation of scientific activities; the weakening of the state level; the concentration of activities in "global" cities (e.g. New York, London, Tokyo, Berlin, Paris); the existence of a specific effect of the mass of researchers gathered in a city on their productivity; etc.

With a group of researchers from France and Québec, we have undertaken to better understand the spatial organisation of scientific activity and its evolution, mainly by geocoding cities that appear in the signatures of the Science Citation Index items and grouping them into urban areas. Although this work is not yet finished, it is sufficiently advanced to let us use its data to discuss some of the assumptions mentioned above. Analysing the growth of publications with international co-authorship, the globalisation of science can hardly be denied; however the weakening of the state level is not obvious. According to our data, the so-called

"global" cities tend to actually lose their hegemony and we are instead seeing a de-concentration process, both internationally and within countries. Finally, there is currently no empirical evidence of a specific effect of the mass of researchers gathered in a city on productivity. Publications seem to follow a linear function of the number of researchers working in a given area. So, beyond the savings due to the sharing of infrastructure, there is no clear reason to seek to concentrate resources in a few major cities. It's not so much the geographic concentration that matters, but the researchers' integration into networks of collaboration and exchange.

### **Networks, boundaries and social change**

**Brenda Little**

*Centre for Higher Education Research and Information, the Open University UK*

**Andrea Abbas**

*Social Futures Institute, University of Teesside*

**Vassiliki Papatsiba**

*Centre for the Study of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Sheffield*

The main aim of the Changes in Networks, Higher Education and Knowledge Societies (CINHEKS) project was to analyse how higher education institutions are networked within and between distinct knowledge societies, the roles they play in such societies and how the changing features of the societies impact upon the higher education



institutions. This paper draws on one of the empirical strands of CINHEKS, whereby we aimed to investigate, through a series of institutional profiles and case studies, the extent to which universities in different regional settings are changing, reflecting expectations and conditions associated with the development of knowledge societies.

Our comparative analysis of the profiles (produced in Finland, Germany, Portugal, the US and the UK) is still very much work-in-progress. We will explore the thinking behind the development of a grid of 'key' dimensions against which the profiles have been mapped; discuss patterns/clusters emerging from the mapping exercise, and the issues raised by the systematic, thematic grid analysis. We will explore how Bernstein's (2000) conceptual framework regarding pedagogic practices, when applied to a higher education context, can be used to analyse the changing process of knowledge production (research), knowledge transmission (teaching) and knowledge transfer, and the influence of this on society. Drawing on Bernstein's concepts of 'classification' and 'framing' we will re-consider some of our emerging findings from the comparative analysis of institutional profiles in relation to networks and boundaries; such re-consideration raises important questions about knowledge in society – how knowledge is valued, who is valuing it, and why it is valued.

**Between international institutionalisation and national authority relations: Evolutionary developmental biology research in Swiss and Swedish universities**

**Martin Benninghoff**

*Observatoire Science, Politique et Société, University of Lausanne*

**Elias Håkansson**

*Department of Economic History, Uppsala University*

The transformation of governance regimes (new public management, network governance, etc.) has impacted on the authority of actors to intervene in the definition of new research domains, or in evaluation and funding criteria. New organisations are created in order to improve the quality of research and teaching activities. Related to these new governance regimes, the structure of authority relations in national public science systems has changed too. The problem that we address is how small national science systems can support new and unconventional research (e.g. evo-devo), and create environments – protected space and flexibility – for such research to grow, where the problems of limits of strategic funding and resources are occurring. In order to answer this question, we will compare the ways researchers switch from an earlier domain to

evolutionary developmental biology (evo-devo) in two public science systems: Switzerland and Sweden.

**Networks as vehicles for collaborations: Analysing collaboration network dynamics of institutional and individual academic ties with external actors**

**Aurelia Kollasch, Blanca Torres-Olave**

*Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona*

Higher education has changed dramatically in the last few decades. Faced with growing enrolments and decreasing state support, there is a call for institutions to become increasingly entrepreneurial, that is, to diversify sources of funding to maintain institutional independence. Entrepreneurial activity often entails a greater degree of interaction with external partners, such as industry and government, to maximize efficiency. Despite recent interest in such collaborations in the literature, significant gaps still remain in our understanding of the complex relationships between higher education institutions, faculty, and their external partners. The present study applied social network analysis (SNA) to capture the types and characteristics of the relationships between university actors and their external partners. Conceptually, the study highlights how institutions and individuals as major social forces provide the basis for collaborative actions and consequently, transactions with external actors.

Our findings reveal that the institutional collaboration network structures are widely different across sectoral scopes. Depending on the institutional type, the patterns of collaborations change, for instance, for research-oriented institutions. The findings show well-connected patterns with relations that closely resemble the "ideal" pattern we would expect based on the Triple Helix model of university-industry-government connections. Analysis of faculty-level data, however, reveals that academics do not widely collaborate with non-university actors, and that collaboration patterns vary significantly by academic rank. Professors and associate professors tend to collaborate more with government agencies and industry in addition to collaborating with other institutions. However, few individuals in more junior ranks collaborated with non-governmental entities. Assistant professors or post-docs did not declare any collaboration relationship with industry.

Our findings highlight the importance and utility of examining multiple levels through a network perspective, therefore providing a more detailed picture of the relationships between universities, academics, and external actors.

**The changing status and role of the academic profession: From cultural elite to alienated labour?**

**Catherine Paradeise**

*LATTS – Department of Sociology, Université de Marne-la-Vallée*

Much has been written on the changing status of the academic profession as a consequence of new rationalisations of university governance patterns. Critical visions of academic capitalism and NPM interpret new accountability norms as producing destructive impacts on universities as organisations and collegiality as a mode of regulation of the academic profession. Most pessimistic views analyse the changing status and role of the academic profession as a move from cultural elite to alienated labour. This cognitive frame is not specific to the academic profession. The thesis of "deprofessionalisation" or "proletarianisation of professions" in fields such as law and medicine was on the agenda of the sociology of professions in the 1960s and again since the turn of the millennium with the rise of big professional service firms.

The first part of the paper sets the issue of the changing status of the academic profession in the theoretical perspective of sociology of professions. It recalls the rationale, benefits and limits of professional autonomy and collegiality as a "third logic", in situations where markets and hierarchies prove unable to afford a satisfactory provision of services because of the very nature of these services. It stresses the shortcomings of the "deprofessionalisation" argument, when asserting in macro-deterministic terms that new rationalisations mechanically convey a shift of power over knowledge creation, sharing and use from professionals to managers. The second part of the paper first provides an overview of how little we empirically know about changes in the academic profession. Then, based on meso-level contextualized observations, it suggests some on-going redistribution processes of power within the profession as much as between managers and professionals. It concludes with some remarks on the institutional conditions that preserve professional powers within academic organisations.

**Predictors of research productivity: Comparisons of academics in the European higher education system**

**Jonathan Drennan, Abbey Hyde**

*School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin*

**Marie Clarke, Yurgos Politis**

*School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University College Dublin*

The centrality of research within the role of academics working in the higher education sector is without question. Since the 1980s there has been increasing interest in the research productivity of academics. Indicators of research productivity, such as publication rates, are a determining factor in decisions related to promotion, tenure and the granting of research funding (Ramsden 1994). Research outputs also impact on the reputation of universities as well as affecting the career trajectories of academics. The impact of research at a reputational level is evident in the impetus from management in universities to increase the global standing of their institutions through research outputs and the acquisition of research funding. Furthermore the investment in research has been aligned to the economic goals of countries and is explicitly stated in policy documents at European Union (EU) level. There is worldwide evidence that faculty research productivity is a central component in a number of areas of ascertaining the quality of higher education institutions (Teodorescu 2000).

A predictive model was developed to identify factors associated with research productivity amongst academics working full-time in the university sector in Europe. Research productivity has been defined as: 'the totality of research performed by academics in universities and related contexts within a given time period' (Print & Hattie 1997: 454). A number of models of determinants of publications have been previously developed. The predictive model measured a number of variables that were grouped under three headings: demographic predictors, academic predictors and institutional predictors. Following on from Shin and Cummings (2010), it was hypothesised that research outputs were related to the extent to which academics preferred research over teaching, time spent on research and teaching, research collaboration, research training, rank, time since completion of PhD, gender, number of children and discipline. This paper reports on the results of the predictive model that provides comparative data on predictors of research productivity for academics across the European higher education sector.

## **Academic job satisfaction – an international comparison**

**Ester Ava Höhle**

*International Centre for Higher Education Research  
Kassel (INCHER), University of Kassel*

Satisfaction through one's professional life can contribute to professional success and personal well-being and is one of the key factors to make a profession attractive. The academic profession (professors, researchers and lecturers) is said to be intrinsically highly motivated and that it is first of all the "love for the matter" that satisfies them. However, recent challenges and new steering devices such as evaluations and output measurement are said to endanger intrinsic motivation. These developments have taken place with different degrees of intensity throughout higher education systems in European countries. Therefore, the academic profession has recently been discussed in terms of its working conditions and career opportunities, as well as in terms of academic freedom, institutional influence and whether the attractiveness of the profession has changed.

This presentation will be based on the survey "EUROAC – Responses to Societal Challenges" that was conducted in 2010/2011 on universities and other higher education institutions in 12 European countries. Selected results about university academics' overall job satisfaction and the factors that contribute to it will be presented. The international comparison shows that although all academics surveyed are satisfied in a national average, there are large cross-national differences.

## **Anatomy of a blind spot: A self-ethnography of international research team dynamics and ICT-based research team 'collaboration'**

**David Hoffman, Terhi Nokkala**

*Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä*

**Cecilia Aguilar-Rios**

*School of Educational Studies, Claremont Graduate University*

**Brígida Blasi, Hugo Horta**

*Centre for Innovation, Technology and Policy Research (IN+), Instituto Superior Técnico*

**Zarko Dragsic, Amy Ewen, Anna Kosmützky**

*International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel*

International comparative higher education studies are flourishing, yet despite the promising intellectual dividends, the results are often perceived to 'fall on their face'. We spotlight a set of insights which underlie several challenges in comparative higher education research.

A focal point that empirically illuminates our argument, cutting across categories of nation-state, supra-national region, system, organisation, sub-unit or individual, is the topic-centred international research team. This article presents a self-ethnography (Alvesson 2003), focused on the relationship between information and communication technology (ICT) and research team collaboration.

We argue that an ironic casualty of the powerful, global phenomena we earnestly study is a remarkable lack of insight into what happens to generic research team dynamics, when teams conducting these studies are 'stretched' in terms of geographical distance, generations, cultural beliefs, values and norms and disciplinary/specialist traditions and modes of inquiry.

The only option to collaborate, within the short time-frames tied to most funding schemes, in many instances, is increasingly constrained by ICT. And there are no beliefs, values, norms – and practices – linked to ICT that hold across the current territory, generations, cultures, organisations and individuals leading and conducting comparative studies – and even less reflection on the implications of this fact. Therefore, it should come as no surprise if some scholars and teams feel 'flat on their face', while others detect nothing amiss. Becher and Trowler (2002), like Bourdieu (2004) were at pains to emphasize that it is not only 'what' we study, but the 'way' which we study that ultimately determines 'who' we are and our potential as scholars. Our study is based on the efforts of members of three international research teams, whose purpose is to conceptually and empirically illuminate the most salient issues, the potential and pitfalls awaiting those who enter the blind spot where ICT simultaneously amplifies, aggravates and ameliorates our potentials – as research teams and individual scholars.

**Authority lost and gained: The changing conditions of coordination and control of academic work**

**Peter Scott**

*Institute of Education, University of London*

The standard account of changes in the pattern of academic work tends to focus on loss, an inevitable (if deplorable) erosion of the authority (personal and collective) and professional freedom once enjoyed by teachers and researchers in higher education. There is a considerable body of evidence to support this account – the more intrusive management of academic work, extra-academic interventions in the design of the university curriculum, increasing surveillance of learning and teaching and more formal systems of research assessment. Overarching, and legitimising, these changes has been the advance of neo-liberal market ideology.

However, a more nuanced account of the changing conditions of academic work is also possible. According to this second account many of the intrusions and interventions complained of have a long history; the real change is from tacit (and incontestable) systems of control to more formal (and therefore transparent) systems. Moreover some of these changes have strengthened rather than weakening academic authority, even empowering more junior staff and non-elite institutions. The fundamental changes brought about by the shift towards mass higher education systems, which inevitably are more deeply embedded in society, and new conceptions of knowledge production, which also emphasise its wider social distribution, have also created a new environment within which traditional conceptions of academic and professional authority need to be renegotiated. As a result it is important to strike a careful balance between losses and gains in such authority in contemporary higher education systems.

**Institutional change, authority shifts and scientific innovations: The mediating roles of protected space and flexibility**

**Richard Whitley**

*Manchester Business School, University of Manchester*

Over the past few decades, the funding and governance of academic research has changed substantially and affected the authority of different groups and organisations over research priorities and careers. Such changes in authority relationships are likely to affect both the variety of problems researched and approaches adopted and the level of investment scientists make in learning new skills and obtaining resources to study difficult problems with highly uncertain outcomes. However, these changes in governance and authority relationships can have contradictory effects on scientific innovation in different kinds of public science systems (PSS). Key features of PSS that affect the impact of governance and authority changes on scientific development can be summarised in terms of the degree of “protected space” allowed to researchers in selecting problems, deciding on approaches to be used and how to interpret results, on the one hand, and the “flexibility” of standards and decisions governing research priorities, resource allocation and assessment of reputations for intellectual contributions, on the other hand. Different levels of protected space and flexibility are involved in the development of four innovations: realising Bose-Einstein condensates, conducting and using large scale assessments of student performance, integrating developmental with evolutionary biology, and constructing and using computerised linguistic corpora.

In general, increasing researcher dependence on external project-based funding, state steering, central managerial authority and legitimacy of commercial interests seem likely to reduce the level of protected space afforded to senior scientists. However, this depends on the degree of concentration of control over key resources in a PSS and diversity of funding agencies. Similarly, although some of these changes may increase the flexibility of standards where there are a variety of different peer review groups and career paths available to researchers, this would not be the case in less pluralistic environments. Additionally, sciences where problems can be decomposed into distinct modules, do not usually require long periods of uninterrupted research time and do not rely greatly on personal interpretations of problems and

evidence are less likely to be affected by reductions in protected space and flexibility.

### **New university governance: From academic self-governance to executive university management/the evaluation of teaching and research**

**David Campbell, Elke Park**

*Institute for Science Communication and Higher Education Research, University of Klagenfurt*

The contribution by Campbell and Park focuses on the presentation and subsequent analysis of the results of the CAP/EUROAC survey carried out in 2007/2010 on institutional governance, performance orientation and evaluation. It is based on two separate chapters on governance issues in EUROAC Volume II.

In recent years major shifts in the internal governance of universities occurred as a corollary of NPM-inspired reforms. Whereas the academic profession traditionally had a strong role in the internal steering of their institution, academic self-governance has been replaced by more top-down management practices in many Higher Education systems. We attempt to analyse this shift in various European countries by taking into account the views of academics regarding their influence and participatory rights and the governance schemes prevailing at their institution. Hierarchies between academic staff in the surveyed countries will also be addressed.

In a second part, we ask how the academic profession perceives the evaluation of research and teaching in higher education and will come forward with three propositions based on the empirical results of our analysis: (1) "Bad NPM" or "good NPM" governance in combination with the evaluation of research and teaching. (2) Different NPM country clusters of governance and evaluation. A single map of NPM governance does not exist in higher education in Europe. (3) Evaluation-based governance of research and teaching: "cross-fertilising" evaluation approaches in research and teaching.

### **Steered through evaluation? The transformative power of accountability instruments**

**Emanuela Reale, Giulio Marini**

*Institute for Research on Firm and Growth CERIS, National Research Council (CNR)*

The university is changing. New perspectives and ideas about science as commodity and education being useful impact on the relationships between the government and universities, with the former seeking greater accountability and the latter trying to cope with the new challenges, by adopting different strategies. Moreover, the idea of science being accountable, contributing to economy and society, goes with the introduction of several policy instruments, such as competitive funding and evaluation.

The aim of the paper is to focus on how evaluation is likely to transform universities into more complete organisations, affecting hierarchy and rationality. Our research questions are: is evaluation, by the way of Quality Assurance and research evaluation, transforming the strategy of universities and their control mechanisms? How is evaluation affecting the vertical diversity within and between universities?

The paper uses the dataset developed within the TRUE Project – Transforming Universities in Europe – through a survey directed to different organisational levels within a sample of twenty-six universities in eight European countries (Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and France). We look at the effects produced at the policy level, dealing with the relationships of universities with national agencies for evaluation and quality assurance; also we want to look at practices and influence, strategies and management. This perception level will be compared to other information about the use and degree of relevance, especially financially (Central Administrator level); in terms of manifest strategies and leadership (Rector level); and in terms of results in practices (Middle-Management level). The last two levels determine the learning features about evaluation in strategies (designed objectives) and outcomes (behaviours). Besides this scheme, some light can be shed on the impact of the general ambition to steer universities.

## Participants

Aarrevaara, Timo	Network for Higher Education and Innovation Research (HEINE), University of Helsinki, Finland
Abbas, Andrea	Social Futures Institute, Teesside University, UK
Benninghoff, Martin	Observatory Science, Politics, Society (OSPS), University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Bentea, Cristina-Corina	Department for Teacher Training, University of Galati "Dunarea de Jos", Romania
Bleiklie, Ivar	Department of Administration and Organisation Theory, University of Bergen, Norway
Brennan, John	Emeritus Professor, Open University UK
Campbell, David	Institute of Science Communication and Higher Education Research (WIHO), University of Klagenfurt, Austria
Chevallier, Thierry	Institute for Research on Education, University de Bourgogne, France
Culum, Bojana	Department of Education, University of Rijeka, Croatia
David, Miriam	Institute of Education, University of London, UK
De Boer, Harry	Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, the Netherlands
De Groof, Jan	College d'Europe, Belgium and University of Tilburg, the Netherlands
De Jonghe, Anne-Marie	Learning Agency Network, Belgium
Dragšić, Žarko	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Drennan, Jonathan	School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland
Duckett, Jeff	Emeritus Professor, Queen Mary University of London, UK
Enders, Jürgen	Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, the Netherlands
Ewen, Amy	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Frølich, Nicoline	Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation Research (NIFU), Norway
Goastellec, Gaele	Observatory Science, Policy and Society (OSPS), University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Grossetti, Michel	LISST - Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Solidarités, Sociétés, Territoires, National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), University of Toulouse, France
Guehl, Anne	Unit for Humanities and Social Sciences, European Science Foundation, France
Guri-Rosenblit, Sarah	Department of Education and Psychology, Open University of Israel
Håkansson, Elias	Department of Economic History, Uppsala University, Sweden
Hedmo, Tina	Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden
Hermans, Stefaan	DG Research and Innovation, European Commission, Belgium
Hoffman, M. David	Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Höhle, Ester Ava	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Hope, Kristin	Department of Administration and Organisation Theory, University of Bergen, Norway
Horta, Hugo	Centre for Innovation, Technology and Policy Research (IN+), Instituto Superior Técnico, Portugal
Hyde, Abbey	School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland
Kehm, Barbara	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Kollasch, Aurelia	Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, USA
Koucký, Jan	Education Policy Centre, Charles University Prague, Czech Republic
Kretek, Peter	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany

Krücken, Georg	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Ledic, Jasminka	Department of Education, University of Rijeka, Croatia
Lepori, Benedetto	Centre of Organisational Research (CORE), Università della Svizzera Italiana/ University of Lugano, Switzerland
Lindblad, Sverker	Department of Education, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Little, Brenda	Open University Business School, UK
Magalhães, António	Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES), University of Porto, Portugal
Marini, Giulio	Institute for Research on Firms and Growth (CERIS), National Research Council (CNR), Italy
Mesquita, Paula Elyseu	Scientific Council for Social Sciences and the Humanities, Foundation for Science and Technology – FCT, Portugal
Michelsen, Svein	Department of Administration and Organisation Theory, University of Bergen, Norway
Mignot-Gérard, Stéphanie	IAE Gustave Eiffel, University Paris-Est Creteil Val de Marne (UPEC), France
Moore, Sarah	Unit for Humanities and Social Sciences, European Science Foundation, France
Moraru, Luminita	Department of Physics, University of Galati "Dunarea de Jos", Romania
Nokkala, Terhi	Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Papatsiba, Vassiliki	Centre for the Study of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Sheffield, UK
Paradeise, Catherine	Laboratoire Techniques, Territoires et Sociétés, Department of Sociology, University Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallee, France
Park, Elke	Institute for Science Communication and Higher Education Research, University of Klagenfurt, Austria
Patricio, Teresa	School of Sociology and Public Policy, Lisbon University Institute (ISCTE-IUL), Portugal
Politis, Yurgos	School of Education, University College Dublin, Ireland
Praisler, Mirela	Department of Chemistry, Physics and Environment, University of Galati "Dunarea de Jos", Romania
Reale, Emanuela	Institute for Research on Firms and Growth (CERIS), National Research Council (CNR), Italy
Reisz, Matthew	Times Higher Education, UK
Renaud, Marc	University Institute of Lisbon (ISCTE-IUL)
Rostan, Michele	Centre for Study and Research on Higher Education Systems (CIRIS), Department of Social and Political Studies, University of Pavia, Italy
Sahlin, Kerstin	Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden
Schimank, Uwe	Institute of Sociology, University of Bremen, Germany
Scott, Peter	Department of International and Lifelong Education, University of London, UK
Seeber, Marco	Centre for Organisational Research (CORE), Università della Svizzera Italiana/ University of Lugano, Switzerland
Sejersted, Ingebjørg Strøno	Research Council of Norway (RCN)
Smith, John H.	European University Association (EUA), Belgium
Teichler, Ulrich	International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Germany
Thoenig, Jean-Claude	Dauphine Recherches en Management, Université de Paris-Dauphine
Välismaa, Jussi	Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Veiga, Amélia	Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies (CIPES), University of Porto, Portugal
Weymann, Ansgar	Institute for Empirical and Applied Sociology (EMPAS), University of Bremen, Germany
Whitley, Richard	Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK
Wittrock, Björn	Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study (SCAS), Uppsala University, Sweden
Zgaga, Pavel	Centre for Educational Policy Studies, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

