

## Submissions Abstract Book - All Papers (Included Submissions)

0296

Does Universities' Intensified Research Orientation Mean Restructuring the Governance Model? The Faculty Perspective in the Case of Russia

Anna Panova<sup>1</sup>, Maria Yudkevich<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>HSE University, Moscow, The Russian Federation

**Research Domain:** Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

**Abstract:**

It is believed that a model of governance based on academic participation is an inherent feature of a research university. Using data from surveys of Russian faculty conducted in 2012 and 2018, we show that in Russian universities, movement towards the research mission is accompanied by a strengthened administrative component of governance, namely control by senior administrative staff. In our analysis, we pay special attention to the differing perceptions of governance among teaching- and research-oriented universities. We analyze the dynamics of different control components in contemporary Russian universities of these two types and explain what the differences we have found are related to. The decreasing role of the chair in teaching-oriented universities and the significantly strengthened role of senior administrative staff in research-oriented universities leads to the fact that the main difference between universities at the moment is associated with the level of academic control in research-oriented universities.

**Paper:**

We analyzed data from the international projects "The Academic Profession in Knowledge-Based Society" 2018 and from the "Changing Academic Profession" 2012. There were 10 research-oriented universities; the number of teaching-oriented universities was 16.

We analyzed the control model dynamics through the prism of the three dimensions of control. Traditional *academic* control was measured from the perspective of three potential "control agents": colleagues in the chair in which the faculty works, colleagues across the university, and external experts. By *managerial control* we meant the control of a faculty member by his or her senior administrative staff (the head of a chair, the dean, or the rector). We had customer control – control by students.

Immediate peers' control appears to be the most significant dimension: in 2018, more than half of faculty mentioned its presence over research and two-thirds over teaching (see **Table 1**). Meanwhile, control by university peers was noticed by 22.2% and 23.1% of faculty respectively, and control by external "reviewers" was indicated by 33.2% and 10.5%. Traditional academic control, over research and teaching, showed a statistically significant decrease over the period under consideration. However, the reasons for the decline were different: while in teaching the decrease in academic control was caused by a decrease in the role of colleagues in the unit, in research the decline happened mainly due to other colleagues and because of a decrease in external control.

Overall *managerial* control remained stable during this time period, but we observe differences at the level of particular agents. In teaching and research there was an increase in control from university senior administrative staff in general. In research activities, a decrease in the role of senior administrative staff can be seen.

In Russia the chair has traditionally played an important role because many decisions directly related to a faculty member's work are made at the chair level. However, our data show that the role of the chair, namely colleagues and/or the chair head, has decreased, in both teaching (from 91% to 82%) and research (from 85% to 80%). Whereas back in 2012 the role of the chair was fundamental, by 2018 it had begun to gradually decline. Nevertheless, immediate colleagues and the chair head still remain the most significant agents of control, even today.

Student control in 2018 was, as expected, different for different aspects of activities, being high for teaching and low for research. In fact, there were almost no faculty who said that there was a complete absence of control on anyone's part, and nearly two-thirds of faculty noted the importance of self-control.

We expected that control and its dynamics might differ in universities with different orientation. Nevertheless, in both the teaching and research spheres there is a similar, statistically significant trend in these two groups of universities for one dimension of control – managerial control (**Tables 2-3**). Senior administrative staff control has increased noticeably in both groups, with a more significant increase in the group of research universities. We believe that this trend is related to the implementation of reporting indicators at the research-oriented universities. These indicators are monitored directly by the top-level administrative staff and are taken into account when making personnel and organizational decisions. The need to demonstrate constantly improving results even in the short run forces senior administrative staff to exert more control over faculty.

The role of external academic assessment in relation to research activities has decreased, which apparently provides evidence for the "substitution effect" of academic control by managerial control.

We see a decrease in the role of academic control in teaching, but these changes are significant only for the teaching-oriented universities. We observe a significant decline in the role of academic control, especially peer control in teaching-oriented universities, while the changes are insignificant in the research-oriented universities. We see the following multidirectional tendencies in research: the role of chair colleagues has increased at research universities, while the role of university colleagues has decreased significantly at teaching universities. The latter can be attributed to the ambitious objectives faced by universities. The control of students over research activities has increased in research universities.

The role of the chair in research and teaching has decreased significantly; the most significant decline can be noticed in the teaching universities. In 2018 we observe differences between the groups of universities in the role of academic control in assessing research– it is higher in research universities. Meanwhile, in terms of the level of managerial control in research activities, the universities have become more similar.

## **References:**

**Table 1. Dimensions of control: managerial, academic, and student (2012–2018)**

	Teaching		Research	
	2012	2018	2012	2018
<b>Traditional academic control (the academic evaluators)</b>				
Peers from the same chair or unit	<b>72.8%</b>	<b>67.0%<sup>†</sup></b>	53.2%	55.2%
Members of other chairs or units at institution	20.6%	23.1%	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>22.2%<sup>†</sup></b>
External reviewers	11.8%	10.5%	<b>45.2%</b>	<b>33.2%<sup>†</sup></b>
At least one agent is selected	<b>78.3%</b>	<b>72.5%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>76.6%</b>	<b>70%<sup>†</sup></b>
<b>Managerial control (managerial evaluators)</b>				
The head of chair or unit	76.6%	78.7%	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>70.0%<sup>†</sup></b>
Senior administrative staff at this institution	<b>43.2%</b>	<b>51.6%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>41.4%</b>	<b>48.0%<sup>†</sup></b>
At least one agent is selected	83.8%	85.7%	83.9%	81.4%
<b>Customer control</b>				
Students	60.1%	58.5%	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>14.9%<sup>†</sup></b>
<b>Self-control</b>				
Self-assessment	63.7%	63.9%	64.2%	63.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1592</b>	<b>1456</b>	<b>1484</b>	<b>1416</b>

**Table 2. Dimensions of control for different groups of universities: teaching activity**

	Research oriented		Teaching oriented	
	2012	2018	2012	2018
<b>Traditional academic control (the academic evaluators)</b>				
Peers from chair or unit	72.1%	67.7%	<b>73.2%</b>	<b>66.6%<sup>†</sup></b>
Members of other chairs or units at institution	22.0%	23.7%	19.7%	22.9%
External reviewers	12.9%	13.7%	11.0%	9.4% <sup>‡</sup>
At least one agent is selected	77.7	74.7	<b>78.6</b>	<b>71.3<sup>†</sup></b>
<b>Managerial control (managerial evaluators)</b>				
The head of chair or unit	77.4%	80.1%	76.0%	78.0%
Senior administrative staff at institution	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>49.0%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>46.3%<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>53.0%<sup>†</sup></b>
At least one agent is selected	84.5	86.1	83.3	85.5
<b>Customer control</b>				
Students	58.5%	58.6%	61.1%	58.5%
<b>Self-control</b>				
Self-assessment	62.7%	65.5%	64.4%	63.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>954</b>
<b>Department level (peers or head)</b>				
	91	89	<b>90.5</b>	<b>87.5<sup>†</sup></b>

† statistically significant changes

‡ statistically significant difference between groups of universities

**Table 3. Dimensions of control for different groups of universities: research activity**

	Research oriented		Teaching oriented	
	2012	2018	2012	2018
<b>Traditional academic control (the academic evaluators)</b>				
Peers from chair or unit	<b>51.8%</b>	<b>59.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	54.1%	53.0% <sup>‡</sup>
Members of other chairs or units at institution	26c.3%	23.2%	<b>26.9%</b>	<b>21.6%<sup>†</sup></b>
External reviewers	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>34.7%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>47.4%<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>32.4%<sup>†</sup></b>
At least one agent is selected	77.3	74.8	<b>75.4</b>	<b>67.4<sup>†‡</sup></b>
<b>Managerial control (managerial evaluators)</b>				
The head of chair or unit	73.9%	71.0%	<b>76.8%</b>	<b>69.5%<sup>†</sup></b>
Senior administrative staff at institution	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>46.2%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>46.7%<sup>‡</sup></b>	49.0%
At least one agent is selected	80.4	81.3	<b>86.1<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>81.5<sup>†</sup></b>
<b>Customer control</b>				
Students	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>14.7%<sup>†</sup></b>	12.3% <sup>‡</sup>	15.0%
<b>Self-control</b>				

Self-assessment	62.5%	62.5%	65.1%	63.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>920</b>

**Department level (peers or head)**

	82.3	81.7	<b>87.3<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>78.5<sup>†</sup></b>
--	------	------	-------------------------	-------------------------

<sup>†</sup> statistically significant changes

<sup>‡</sup> statistically significant difference between groups of universities

Reference:

Birnbaum, R.. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers

Geurts, P., Maassen, P. (2005). Academics and institutional governance. In The professoriate (pp. 35-58). Springer, Dordrecht.

Goedegebuure, L., Harry de Boer (1996) Governance and decision-making in higher education: Comparative aspects, Tertiary Education and Management, 2:2, 160-169, DOI: [10.1080/13583883.1996.9966897](https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.1996.9966897)

Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. I. Administrative science quarterly, 281-306.

Jones, W. A. (2011). Faculty involvement in institutional governance: A literature review. Journal of the Professoriate, 6(1), 118-135.

Kogan, M. (2007). The academic profession and its interface with management. In Key challenges to the academic profession (eds. Kogan, M. and Teichler, U) 159 -174