SRHE Submission
Jeff Abrams

Topic: Governance and the New Universities during a period of change a Case Study in the United Kingdom.
The Study:

Aims and Purpose of the Presentation: The aims of the study are to critically evaluate the phenomenon of change within post 1992 Universities. This will be achieved through the use of multiple case studies of 1992 universities. The theoretical framework will be multi-disciplinary and include elements of sociology, social psychology, public policy, political science, history, conflict theory and organisational theory. The theoretical framework is included at the end of this abstract.

Objectives:
1. By the use of multiple case studies to evaluate the processes and practices of organisational change and governance during a period of instability and turbulence.
2. To use a multidisciplinary academic lens to carry out the evaluation.
3. To adapt and shape grounded theory methodology which will include: content analysis of key documents, organisational wide questionnaires, discourse analysis of openly published material. The intention is to create new theory based on existing theory as this grows out of the case studies.
4. All data will triangulated against the academic themes developed from the literature search. This will be achieved through the use of NVIVO 9 qualitative data evaluation software.
5. Some of the academic themes will be reflected in the research questions below drawn from the literature.

Indicative Research Questions:
1. How do post 1992 universities respond to the pressures of change?
2. What is the managerial ideology and approach to such changes?
3. How do such organisations learn from their experiences, histories, contexts during turbulent times?
4. What is the nature of conflict, resistance, and power dynamics during such periods?
5. How are conflicts recognised and addressed?

6. What is the espoused theory with regard to managerial control versus employee autonomy? What is the theory in use on the same the topic?
7. What is the purpose of a post 1992 university? Who defines this? How is this reflected in the approach to management and leadership?
8. What is the relationship between central government and the institution? To what extent does this relationship shape the strategic thinking of the institution?
9. What is the relationship between the institution and its competitors? To what extent does this shape the strategic thinking of the institution?
10. Is there anything new or novel in the way the institution is approaching change or general management?
11. Is there anything new or novel about the institutions approach to strategic thinking?

Introduction and Indicative Literature review:

Universities in the UK and internationally (Silver 2007;Eddie, Anne et al. 2010Brown, Lauder et al. 2011) have experienced unprecedented changes over the last number of decades.   For example just 4% of the population attended university in 1959 compared to 43% today (Kearny 2006) . The growth in the university sector started in the 1960s with the campus based universities continued the 1970s with the instigation of Polytechnics and in 1992 the development of a unified university system with the removal of the binary divide between Polytechnics and Universities. Effectively over time we have seen a move from an elite system of universities to a mass system of higher education and some would argue back to an elite system due to the introduction of student fees. The complexity and impact of such changes is often not fully considered (Beck, BrÜDerl et al. 2008). This study will review some of these complexities.

The drivers for such changes have been a complicated mix of history, ideology, politics, demographics and economics. Most recently the present UK government has significantly changed the funding arrangements for universities which in turn have created a dynamic change environment. This however is set against a history of transformational changes from a system focused on elite universities with limited access to the focus on university expansion in an attempt to make universities accessible to as many citizens who would benefit from such an experience to the present where there is a move to restrict student numbers. All of this is set in the context of increasing pressure on managers in universities to look to make efficiency gains and at the same time to be more effective. In the 1990s the removal of the binary divide between older established universities and what were then Polytechnics removed Polytechnics from local authority control and replaced this with effectively chief executives accountable to a board of governors and ultimately the government of the day (Pratt 1997). This provided senior people in these institutions with unprecedented power (Becher and Kogan 1992; Shelley 2005; Deem, Hillyard et al. 2007). At the same time this potentially created a management culture that focussed short term gains and centralised control and the pseudo marketization of the new

universities (Middlehurst 2004; Hodges 2010; Report 2010). Inevitably there is potential for strain in system between those who manage and the managed. Academic autonomy is replaced with centralised control. Collegiality is replaced by a culture of centralised decentralisation and managerialism (Shelley 2005). The ability for the organisation to learn in this environment is challenging if not difficult.

This is also set in a global context of change within the higher education sector. For example Allen (2012 pg.1) States:

'The current instability of the global economy has altered the climate of higher education. External constituencies appear to be questioning the value of an advanced degree, calling for accountability and transparency, and using terminology that suggests the commodification of postsecondary studies to justify funding and allow students, as consumers, to have adequate information before selecting their college or university'.

Across Europe there has been introduction of procedures to assess, evaluate, control and improve quality of higher education in ways that have been unprecedented. The introduction of quality systems across Europe has further reinforced the control of central government over colleges and universities. In the UK this was established with the introduction of Quality Assurance Agency, alongside the Higher Education Funding Council and the processes set in train to evaluate the quality of research output.

In the United States the fiscal crisis has also further shaped the views of policy makers with regard to higher education as highlighted by (Weerts 2012)

'As the fiscal crisis in the United States persists, a dominant view held among policymakers and the general public is that higher education's primary role is to enhance the nation's economic position. This perspective posits that private benefits incurred through education will ultimately benefit the nation as a whole'.

Even against the backdrop of economic recession there is at one and the same time the global ambition to increase the number of people who benefit from higher learning as a vehicle to improve the economy and competitiveness. From 1991-2007 there has been a significant growth in higher education participation across the globe.

In all cases there has been an attempt to redefine the purpose of higher education, how it is financed and how it is monitored and controlled. Across Europe (Brennan 1999) has identified four broad categories that impact the shifts in quality systems. These are Academic, Managerial,

Pedagogic and Employment/Professional. This changes significantly the relationship between colleges, universities and the state and in turn the ways the institutions respond to such transformational changes.

The contribution of this study is to attempt to evaluate such changes from a multidisciplinary standpoint in order to gain fuller and in-depth analysis of the phenomenon of change through turbulent times. It would be insufficient to merely review change utilizing the change literature in isolation from wider literature in the fields of organisational sociology, social psychology, history, public policy, political science, conflict theory and organisational theory.

For example the roots of management theory and practice are grounded in managerial control and the subordination of workers to elite leaders within industrial organisations (Mouzelis 1975). The assumptions underpinning this thinking is that workers need to be controlled and effectively told what to do, how to do and require monitoring to ensure work is carried out. Underlining assumptions are that workers are lazy and require direction and control. At a superficial level this would seem absurd in the context of a higher education institution yet we can see elements of this ideology in a number of practices carried out within such institutions (Deem, Hillyard et al. 2007). These include the use of managerial appraisals, performance related pay, the measurement of research quality, the measurement of teaching quality and of course more recently the use of the league tables. The term managerialism has crept into the lexicon of higher education management language reinforcing this critique (Becher and Kogan 1992; Shelley 2005; Deem, Hillyard et al. 2007)
Successive governments have also been interventionist with regard to public policy as it applies to universities (Government 1988; Government 1990; Government 1992; Government 1998; Government 2004; Deem, Hillyard et al. 2007). There is a strong resource dependency culture (Becher and Kogan 1992) that has developed over time between the UK government and higher education institutions. This is will also shape the nature of institutional strategy as it becomes a game of guessing and second guessing the next political move on the part of government. Strategy is not developed in a political vacuum. Rather it is shaped by the political ideology and subsequence policy that develops on from the ideology. This in turn will inevitably impact the social psychological aspects of organsiational life, organisational learning, culture and behaviour. In other words the connections need to be made between these important aspects (variables) to fully understand the processes, history, impact and outcome of change during a period of significant turbulence. To attempt to address the issues from one disciplinary perspective misses the opportunity to provide a unique and important understanding of the whole.

Methods:

The methodology will combine qualitative and quantitative data from the results of multiple case studies. The methods to be used will include questionnaires, the content analysis of documentary evidence and discourse analysis of openly published material. These various sources of data

will be triangulated as part of the analysis. A form of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1999) will inform the study with the intention of using existing theory to generate new theory based on the development of existing knowledge but not constrained by it.

To include:

- Content and Discourse Analysis of Key Documents including strategic plans, organisational charts, published articles, over the last 5 years within 5 post 1992 universities in the UK.
- Questionnaire for all existing academics: This is to address the present position during a period of turbulence and transformational change.

The theoretical framework is highlighted below:

Methods: single case study. Multi-mehtods.

Org. Theory

Classical Management
Scientific Management
Human Relations
Contingency Theory
Organisational Development
Organisational Culture

Public Policy

Government Policy
Internal Perspectives
Political Ideology
Neo-Liberalism
Managerialism
History and Politics of HE Change
Institutional Theory
Resource Dependency Theory

Process & Change Interventions
-Drivers for Change
-Managerial Approach to Change
-Impact of the Changes

Org. Sociology

Classical Management
Scientific Management
Human Relations ideas
Contingency Theory
Systems Theory
Organisational Development
Bureaucracy
Post Bureaucracy
Weber
Marx
Michels
Fordism

Methods: Multiple
Case Studies

Organisation Wide

Org. Psychology

Psychological Contracts
Cognitive Dissonance
Cognitive Consistency
Resistance Theory
Organisational Health
Organisational Learning
Espoused Theory/Theory in use