

O Caso Holandês

Presidente da Mesa – José Novais Barbosa

CONFERÊNCIA – Harry de Boer
(apresentada por Jon File)

José Novais Barbosa*

Temos agora uma intervenção sobre as formas de governo nas universidades da Holanda, a cargo do Dr. Jon File.

O Dr. Jon File é investigador no Centro de Estudos das Políticas do Ensino Superior, na Universidade de Twente, na Holanda, tendo sido membro da Comissão Nacional de Ensino Superior, na África do Sul.

Entre as suas publicações mais recentes, poderei referir, como exemplo: *Thinking about the South African Higher Education Institutional Landscape: an international comparative perspective on institutional differentiation and restructuring*, Pretória, 2000.

* Conselho Nacional de Educação

University Governance: Responses to Managerialism

Harry de Boer*

*At the Colloquium in Lisbon Jon File gave an interactive presentation based on a number of research projects CHEPS has undertaken on university management in the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe. This chapter by his colleague Harry de Boer covers many of the issues discussed in the presentation. The chapter is an edited version of chapter four "University Governance" in Jan Currie, Richard DeAngelis, Harry de Boer, Jeroen Huisman and Claude Lacotte (2002), *Globalizing Practices and University Responses*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.*

*Readers wanting more information on university governance in the Netherlands are referred to Boer, H.F. de. and S.A.H. Denters (1999) *Analysis of institutions of university governance: A classification scheme applied to postwar changes in Dutch higher education*. in: Ben Jongbloed, Peter Maassen & Guy Neave (Eds.), *From the Eye of the Storm, Higher Education's Changing Institution* (pp. 211-233). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.*

Introduction

Clearly, developing an optimal model of university governance will be challenging. On the one hand, executive powers within the university need strengthening to respond to external pressures, particularly within traditional

* Universidade de Twente, Holanda

A presente comunicação, conforme se assinala na respectiva nota preambular, baseia-se num texto de Harry de Boer, e foi apresentada no Colóquio do CNE sobre "Formas de Governo no Ensino Superior", por Jon File, também da Universidade de Twente, Holanda.

Continental systems where university authority distribution is characterized by a weak central level, which severely limits the capacity of universities to adapt and respond to change. On the other hand, the academic heartland, where traditional teaching and research values are firmly rooted, needs to survive and continue to substantially contribute to institutional decision making, particularly as valuable information concerning the markets is found in the lower levels of the organization. If the aim of governments and institutional leaders is to be successful, universities must consider allowing professionals ample room to maneuver and participate in strategic decision making. The future performance of universities depends upon the ability to blend traditional academic values with new managerial values.

This begs a question concerning the nature of ingredients for a successful blend. This requires a description of the institutional structures, backgrounds, and changes over previous decades. A comparable change of climate, such as the rise of globalizing practices with an overwhelming emphasis on managerialism, may distinctly impact on the blend. Moreover, it is likely that varying backgrounds may perceive the same phenomenon differently. This chapter presents the case studies of the University of Avignon, the University of Oslo, the University of Twente, and Boston College, the latter exemplifying a governance structure that originated from a vastly different background. This prompts a question as to whether there are similarities or striking differences between the American and European cases. However, the key question is whether managerialism, which we regard as a globalizing practice, has led to increasing homogeneity in institutional governance. Our focus concerns how people inside universities experience the governance structures and changes. Do they have similar observations, perceptions, and feelings?

Perceptions of Changes in Institutional Governance

Managerialism is a broad, vague ideology and it is beyond the scope of this chapter to describe in depth this multifaceted ideology (see Pollitt, 1990). Rather, with respect to university governance, we focus on a few

elements that characterize the managerial approach. These elements emphasize executive leadership at the expense of the professional role in decision making; instrumental rationality stressing the three Es (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); and top-down structures, such as centralization and hierarchy. Have these “managerialism” elements entered the daily governing practices in the universities of Avignon, Boston, Oslo, and Twente? Have there been changes to the operations of these universities? For instance, what is the role of academics in decision making? Has this role changed due to globalizing practices?

The Rise of Managerialism?

In Twente, an overwhelming majority of respondents said that there had been a shift towards managerialism and particularly the centralization of decision making. Approximately half of the respondents think this is a positive shift, while the other half have objections.

A few respondents had different perceptions, for instance some mentioned that the university is collegial, one said it is bureaucratic, and some believed that managerial and democratic features are blending. However, we need to remember the distinction between formal structures and regulations, and the mixture of formal and unwritten rules in practice, which are aptly depicted in the following quotes.

In theory we have become more managerial, but in practice we haven't. I think it would be fairly difficult to say that we have actually gone to a more managerial mode. It has been intended, but it has not been achieved. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

In a formal sense there is more line management but in practice I think the decision-making system remains highly collegial. (Twente, Senior, Male, Manager).

In Twente a shift has occurred towards “soft managerialism” (Trow, 1994) with the emphasis on collegial decision making at the lower levels of

the organization. The Twente respondents indicate that there is considerable autonomy at the “shop floor,” even though the deans and the central executive board have more power than before 1997. Clearly, since 1997 a more hierarchical structure has developed within the University of Twente and a more top-down rule for some strategic decisions – a point on which respondents are almost unanimous. Other structural governance aspects, such as “more businesslike,” “more transparent,” and “more bureaucratic” are rarely mentioned. Only three respondents believe that there have been few or no changes. Twente once had a rather decentralized structure, implying that a change more or less “automatically” means more centralization.

At the faculty level a split occurs between respondents who argue that deans now have more power and those who argue that middle-level decision making is still consultative. It is hard to draw conclusions from this result as the two answers are not, *per se*, at odds. There is no doubt that deans formally have more powers, but it is not evident how they use these powers, which according to at least half of the respondents is at times in a more consultative style.

Now it is a top-down management. Certainly for the faculties it has changed a lot. Now the dean has all the powers. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

Nowadays it's centrally managed. It used to be reasonably democratic, but it has changed. (Twente, Senior, Female, Academic, Sciences).

It's transformed itself a little bit now to become more centralized, because we need to have more steering power at the central level in order to guide the institution as a totality in the right direction. (Twente, Senior, Male, Manager).

The official way it is organized is the hierarchical way. But unofficially, the dean is a very open-minded and very approachable person. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

The changes aren't as dramatic as they look. You can only operate on a consensus basis, certainly in the Netherlands. It's still collegial or consensus decision-making, but let's say it has gone somewhat in the direction of more hierarchy. Some more central management has been installed. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

The Twente case is interesting as the interviews were held during a period of transition, and the individuals who were largely in similar positions under the previous administration frequently held the new positions. These individuals tended to carry over many of the old rules and their old habits, which may have hampered innovative efforts and reinstated features of the previous regime. Over time the reform process outcomes may look strangely similar to the practices innovators wanted to eliminate (Lanzara, 1998). It will be very interesting to see what happens with the next generation of deans. The following quotes illustrate this point.

Well, for my daily work it doesn't matter at all, because the dean we have now was the dean before. So he has changed very little in terms of organization. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

I mean they [deans] have been appointed by the executive board, but on the basis of a recommendation from the faculties, and most of them actually were the deans that were already in position at the time, so they still very much reflect the old traditions and the old values. Certainly they are not strong managers so to speak. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

As in Twente, a majority of Oslo respondents perceive a shift in university governance towards “managerialism”, and sometimes mixed with bureaucratic or collegial elements. Fewer than a quarter of respondents describe Oslo as “bureaucratic” and only a few describe it as a collegially run institution. Collegiality is regarded as something good, while bureaucracy tends to evoke negative connotations. The assessment of managerialism is split unevenly as in Twente, with approximately half

expressing negative perceptions, approximately a quarter expressing positive perceptions and approximately a quarter expressing mixed feelings.

In Oslo, the most frequently mentioned changes in governance at the institutional level concern increased bureaucracy and smaller governing bodies with external representation. In this context, the Norwegian respondents refer to bureaucracy as increased control, emphasizing transparency and accountability, and strengthening central steering capacity and centralizing power, meaning that the rector, deans, and heads of departments have more responsibility. The aim of creating smaller governing bodies at each level is to streamline and hasten decision making. By and large these changes are not appreciated for several reasons.

I left the university 25 years ago and it was governed by researchers, and I came back to a university governed by bureaucrats. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

The central administration has been strengthened. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

[There] were large bodies [with broad representation] at all three levels and endless discussion in many cases. But things were really discussed. There were so many represented in these councils that it was possible to have a feeling of what was going on. You had sufficient information, papers, background notes, memos and so on. Now these councils have been abolished, and we are left only with smaller steering groups. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

The most dramatic thing, at least symbolically, is that we have external representatives on the board. It was seen as threatening our independence. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

At the lower levels in Oslo the main responses to governance changes regard increased power for the deans and heads of departments, the need to economize due to budget cuts, and to a lesser extent the restructuring of faculties and departments into larger units. Despite the trend toward

managerialism and increased bureaucratization, the Oslo academic culture of democracy and collegiality remains strong. Managerialism and bureaucracy may have changed the role and freedom of academics to some extent, but at the end of the 1990s they have not fully undermined the academics. This is well illustrated by the following quote.

There is a managerial culture, the administrative culture, and the academic culture. And I would still think that by and large the academic culture prevails. I think in the central administration there is some move towards professional managerialism, but once you move out of that building you would still see the other culture prevailing. The academic culture is very, very strong. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

The situation in Avignon differs from Oslo and Twente, as respondents assert that managerialism has not as yet entered the institution governance structures. In addition, only a few Avignon respondents suggest that there has been a shift towards a managerial approach. Others perceive collegiality as the main feature, particularly within the university lower levels, while approximately one third of respondents perceive the bureaucracy as the main logic of organization. Several times respondents refer to the governance structure as blending collegial, bureaucratic, and/or managerial elements. Bureaucracy is mainly related to increased formalization due to university growth, which in turn places existing informal decision-making structures under pressure. The following quotes indicate these diverse points of view.

Such a university [the “old one”] could be managed informally and the larger size made it necessary to have this drive toward managerialism. I’m not so sure the term “managerialism” applies here. Let us say bureaucratic and more formal. (Avignon, Senior, Female, Academic, Professional School).

I don’t think that we have the logic of an enterprise at all. I don’t believe that there has been a shift towards managerialism at all. What struck me, coming from an enterprise into the

university, is the greater amount of internal democracy. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

I would say that the university functions according to a mixture of both bureaucracy and the logic of an enterprise. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

I would say that the university has more of a bureaucratic logic, mainly because of the streamlining of decision making. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

I would describe the administration more as having a collegiate logic – the decisions in the university are taken in a collective fashion – not like in an enterprise where the power lies in the hands of one individual. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Manager).

In Avignon the general mood is more upbeat compared to Oslo and Twente. In Avignon approximately half of the respondents feel there have been minimal changes in recent years, while other respondents mention some changes. However, most of these changes are not related to governance and management structures as such. The most often-mentioned change is the arrival of new leadership, and other mentioned changes include the new premises, better equipment, and new and renovated buildings. These are not governance changes, but nevertheless they can impact on the university operations. New presidents and new deans often introduce their own style. New premises at one location and the regrouping of faculties increase the chances for interaction, though the larger size of the new institution may be a countervailing constraint. A few positive changes include increasing transparency, solidarity, and responsibility. Those who perceive negative changes refer to greater financial restraint, fewer resources, and the loss of informality and a sense of greater impersonality.

I don't think there have been any fundamental changes in the way in which the university is governed. I would say that there has been more of a change towards modernizing the university, with the move to the new buildings, the new president, and new executive committees. So it is not really the manner in which the university functions which has changed, but rather its

surroundings and the people involved. (Avignon, Junior, Female, Academic, Sciences).

In comparison, Boston College differs completely. There has not been a shift towards managerialism in recent times as most elements of managerialism began to take effect in the early 1970s. Boston College respondents describe their university as being “centrally managed” at the institutional level and according to one respondent it is an extreme example of central management. There does not appear to be much resentment regarding this top-down kind of governing, even though there is no faculty senate. In other words, academics do not have much of a voice at the institutional level. Nevertheless, most faculty feel that the university is well run and that the amount of faculty involvement at lower levels is sufficient to maintain a good university.

Basically decision making is more centralized here than in many other places. And that’s worked well for us. And that comes out of our particular history. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Manager).

I would describe it as a benign dictatorship. (Boston College, Junior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

They run a tight ship here. It’s centrally managed. We don’t have a faculty senate. I think that they select a few faculty who are well rewarded and with whom they basically consult. (Boston College, Senior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

The majority of respondents state that there were few or no changes to Boston governance structures in the last five years. Most respondents are considerably pleased with the existing managerial structure. Despite this top-down structure for university-wide decisions, at the departmental level decisions are more collegially made. Nearly all respondents say that departments are either collegially and/or democratically run, as stated by one extreme respondent:

We vote on everything, and things we don’t vote on, we won’t vote on because we’re striving for consensus. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

It is not surprising that respondents within collegially-run departments have no complaints about the existing structure, as they do not feel constrained by the central administration. If people continue to feel that the university is well governed, they will tolerate the appointment of their leaders and a highly centrally managed university. For instance the following respondent favors more faculty participation, but he can see that the present arrangement has benefited him.

Yes, I would like more faculty involvement, but the system does work. I would say the level of alienation here is relatively low. I may just be saying that because I have been treated well by the place. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

In sum, the managerialism ideology has begun to take root in the structure of all three European universities, but in differing degrees. Twente is probably the clearest case, whereas the situation in Avignon is doubtful. Moreover, there appear to be differences between the levels in the universities. At the “shop floor” it is mostly “business as usual,” that is, collegial or democratic type decision making. However, managerial tendencies cannot be denied and are mostly visible at the institutional level. In contrast, Boston College has become increasingly managerial over the past three decades; yet there is little opposition to this trend of disenfranchising academics because they simply appear to lack the time or motivation to become more involved in university-wide decisions.

Academics in Decision Making

Approximately half of the Twente respondents believe that the role of academics in decision making has changed over the past five years. This is a remarkably low number considering the new 1997 Act and the perceived shift towards managerialism. Many regard the changes as not dramatic, and rather perceive them as modest.

Most of the respondents who perceive changes to academic roles indicate that their role has generally been diminished, but not necessarily in a negative way. The positive outcomes refer to increased transparency, efficiency, and less gratuitous interference with detailed decision making. The negative outcomes refer to the loss of collegiality, potential power concentration, and greater difficulty in being involved and well informed.

I'm not so sure about that, I must say. I think we are all too busy to notice actually the big difference. There is a difference, but I must say I didn't notice any difference actually. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

In the old system you were always cognizant about what was going on. You were involved, you knew the details, and you knew the topics that were on the agenda. Now more and more you find there was a topic and you didn't realize it. It had never been announced. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

Most of the Oslo respondents stipulate that the academic role in decision making has changed during the past few years, and most believe that academics now have a smaller role; however this does not imply that they are sidelined. Approximately one quarter perceive no significant changes.

The majority of those perceiving changes assess them as negative, including greater accountability, increased workloads, more power for the administrative staff, less teaching time, and lowered standards. A few respondents also mentioned a lowered degree of academic involvement. Those perceiving the changes as positive refer to the benefits of increased efficiency and greater accountability.

The common wisdom is that the power of professors has been reduced and the administration has gained. I think that is true, as a tendency, but it hasn't had that much effect yet. Because tradition is very strong and professors at this university have had a great deal of autonomy; they do exactly as they please. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

Clearly one of the side effects, if you like, of greater autonomy and more accountability is more administrative work. So we have generally seen an expansion in the resources used to measure various kinds of academic performance. For the academics this means an increase in planning, reporting, and increased administrative obligations. (Oslo, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

Earlier we didn't have to write a yearly report to the head of department telling what has been going on, how much we have published, but now we have to. But that is something that I think is OK, to write a yearly report, because you also have to be accountable to yourself. (Oslo, Senior, Female, Academic, Professional School).

It was indicated earlier that the Avignon respondents perceived fewer changes in their governing structures than Oslo and Twente respondents. Therefore, it is not surprising that Avignon respondents also perceive that the academic role in decision making has changed less. Approximately one third of the respondents perceive absolutely no change. Many of those who perceive some change express positive feelings, including increased openness, collegiality, and information exchange. Negative feelings regarding the role of academics involve less freedom or academic autonomy and the imposition of reforms upon academics. The following quotes illustrate the variety of responses.

Well, I don't think it changes our lives much in relation to our teaching. We do what we like. (Avignon, Senior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

Not fundamentally, no but it is true that we are now a lot closer to the administration offices, and so we have a far easier, far more direct contact with the administrative services than we did before. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

Well, I would say that we feel so much more directly involved now, we feel more concerned, because we are far more aware of what goes on here, of how things work. (Avignon, Senior, Female, Academic, Sciences).

Well, now there are a lot more people who are aware of what is going on at the university, and we have not only become more conscious of the problems in the administrative departments, but also of any problems generally speaking, and even of the financial situation of the university. So there is an increased collective consciousness of the university's functioning and problems throughout the university, and especially within the academics. (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

Everything regarding finances is being taken progressively out of our hands, and I get the impression that we have less and less freedom of movement to carry out our projects. (Avignon, Junior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

The Selection of Academic Leaders

The remainder of this chapter will analyze whether “managerialism” has had a direct impact on democratic decision making within these universities. This concrete point refers to the concept of democracy vis-à-vis the concept of guardianship. One distinction between these two concepts concerns the system used to select rulers. In democratic structures leaders are elected by a voting system involving all members, whereas in guardianship structures leaders are appointed. During the past three decades of the twentieth century, democratic university structures took root in several countries; however, before the end of the twentieth century these appeared to be in decline. In several countries, managerial ideologies appear to have put pressure on democratic and collegial structures.

What can be said about the concepts of democracy and guardianship in the four case studies? In Avignon and Oslo, leaders, such as the rector, deans, and department heads, are elected while in Boston and Twente these key positions are appointed. In all four cases respondents were asked to express their opinions regarding the opportunity to elect academic leaders. Nearly all respondents in Avignon and Oslo were in favor of democratically elected leadership, while in Boston nearly all respondents were against elections, and in Twente respondents were divided, with some preferring to

elect or at least feel sympathetic towards democracy and most not preferring elections.

These outcomes suggest that many respondents prefer the traditional methods for selecting leaders, unless some clear disadvantages are perceived. Obviously change is not appreciated or given much thought. In the Twente case, evidence of change appeared to lead to split or mixed opinions, perhaps largely due to the recent changes to mechanisms for selecting leaders. During times of transition, patterns in opinion appear to be less uniform.

Boston College has a strong tradition of appointing leaders and the majority of the respondents do not appear to have problems with this selection mechanism. Respondents do not want a change to the selection system and have not even considered democratic elections of academic leaders, as illustrated by the following answers.

I am totally unfamiliar with that process. It doesn't appeal to me. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

Oh gosh. It seems so remote I can't even imagine it. (Boston College, Junior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

Quite honestly the idea is so foreign to me that I find it hard to even contemplate how that would occur. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

Moreover, several respondents believe that appointing leaders works well, or conversely that a democratic system may not operate well within the context of U.S. universities. According to several respondents, the U.S. research universities appear to perform well compared to the European equivalents, and consequently a change to the system for selecting leaders is neither necessary nor desirable. Managerial expertise, that is, knowledge about the art of governing, is necessary and one should not take the risk by allowing members to decide who these persons should be. Faculty members do not seem to have sufficient capacities to pick leaders. According to the

respondents, they do not fully understand what it requires to run “big corporations”.

Ghastly idea. The problem in an elected system is that the most popular person will usually be the one to be elected. And the most popular person may not have the management skills to do the job. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Manager).

I think American universities are giant corporations and actually you need somebody who isn't just an old machine-style politician who just has a lot of support from various sections within the university. I think you need someone who can hire and fire. (Boston College, Junior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

I would be afraid, I think, that the democratic process would lead to a result that might keep the majority of the people happy but I don't think that it would necessarily be the best way to develop the university. So I feel comfortable with the mechanisms that we have for choosing people. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

There are a few respondents in Boston who believe that electing presidents and deans would be a positive change, creating closer and better connections between faculty members and a better understanding of the processes and practices of the institution. Yet others maintain their doubts, perceiving negative and positive aspects, or distinguishing between theory and practice.

Like, my gut reaction is to say “yes,” but my practical reaction is to say “no.” (Boston College, Junior, Female, Academic, Professional School).

Avignon and Oslo have a completely different tradition and background. These universities elect their leaders and are keen to conserve this university tradition. Democracy is normatively appealing to them, involving intrinsic values traditionally held by society. The democratic nature of the French and Norwegian societies *at large* is regarded as a reason to retain democracy *inside* universities. These arguments are not used

in the cases of Boston College and Twente, although the United States and the Netherlands are known as liberal, democratic countries. It is hard to find a plausible explanation for the fact that in some democratic countries, democratic values are taken for granted in organizational structures of universities, while in other democratic countries those values are not taken for granted. A possible explanation may be that the degree of (perceived) marketization within a higher education system impacts on the preferences in institutional governance. There may be feelings that the “market” and “democracy” do not fit well together in higher education and that there is more marketization in the United States and the Netherlands compared to Norway and France. A further possible explanation could be that preferences regarding democratic values in university governance are linked to opinions concerning the roles and functions universities are supposed to fulfill in society.

The way of life originating from the French Revolution plays a role in the French responses, and a similar lack of imagination witnessed in Boston College is frequently mentioned as a reason for maintaining existing procedures. This is evident in the following answers regarding the question about the preference to keep the value of democratically electing the rector, deans, and heads of departments at the University of Avignon.

It goes without saying. We didn't go through the whole French Revolution and cut off the heads of our kings only to end up today with a system where the former president chooses the next one. Heavens, no—this is absolutely unthinkable! (Avignon, Senior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

This is the only system we know, and quite honestly this is the only one I can imagine. (Avignon, Junior, Female, Academic, Sciences).

Other reasons frequently mentioned refer to a better choice of leaders, greater solidarity among academic staff and leaders, the development of a sense of responsibility, and mutual trust and respect for each other. Moreover, in the Oslo case it is argued that having different candidates running for president adds to and stimulates internal discussions. It invites

people to become informed and involved. A further interesting reason submitted by one Norwegian respondent provides a very clear answer to one of the classical questions in theories on democracy: “Who is entitled to determine who is qualified to rule?”

I think it is important to have an election because we who work here are more capable of saying who will be the best for the university than an external committee appointing someone. (Oslo, Junior, Female, Academic, Sciences).

Twente provides the most interesting and complicated case, as it has no tradition of electing its leaders directly. However, until 1997 the whole governance structure was characterized as democratic, as the various factions of the university community had the opportunity to elect representatives for university and faculty councils, which were the supreme decision-making bodies for some time. Moreover, these representative bodies had a voice in the selection of the leaders. Thus, it is fair to say that democracy was the dominant concept in Twente until 1997, even though academic leaders were not directly elected (de Boer & Denters, 1999). This is not very different from the French situation, where elected representatives choose the president and the deans. However, since 1997 the guardian concept prevailed and the rector, deans, and other executives are appointed. Nomination rights and the like are no longer formally in the hands of councils with elected representatives. What are the opinion of those within a structure that was previously perceived as democratic but has recently changed towards guardianship?

There are 9 out of 31 respondents who do not prefer to elect the rector and the deans, whereas 22 respondents would like to have a “kind of democracy,” that is, to have a democracy without direct elections for rectors and deans. Those in favor of elected leadership use similar arguments as their French and Norwegian colleagues, suggesting that universities are professional organizations that are impossible to manage without some kind of democracy. Expertise concerning the information for decision making and support for the implementation of policies is essential and requires involvement. Elections may contribute to that, or to put it a little differently:

I think for the best functioning of the academic environment it would be good to have academic staff to have a say in the ways the university is being managed. And the electoral process may be a very good mechanism for that. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

Like the other three cases, the Twente case shows that traditions have a considerable impact on opinions regarding the issue under scrutiny. Here it seems to be the experiences with previous structures and procedures that are considered to be important, at least according to the majority of the respondents.

What about the nearly one third of the respondents who declared themselves openly against elected leadership? They gave several reasons: elections might politicize internal decision making further, which is perceived as obviously wrong as also mentioned in the Boston case, and without elections decision making would be more efficient. One respondent mentioned that elections are not indigenous to the Netherlands and, consequently, they should not be introduced. Finally, the most expressed reason that was unique to Twente was that very few people are eager to fulfill those leadership positions, and therefore meaningful elections would be difficult. The following quotes indicate some of these objections to electing leaders.

We do not have that system [of elected leaders] and I do not see a need to introduce it. We have democratic elections for the councils but not for the dean or for the rector. I don't see it. That's not a tradition also in the Netherlands. (Twente, Senior, Male, Manager).

It's not such a question of electing; it is more a question of getting a person who is mad enough or idiot enough to do it! (Twente, Senior, Male, Manager, Sciences).

Universities and faculties need professional managers and not people who do that just for four years because they're elected, and they know they will be back in their group of peers afterwards and it will be someone else's turn. We need people

who can be managers, you know, individuals who understand finance, human resource management, and all those external relations and strategies. (Twente, Junior, Female, Academic, Social Sciences).

There would be a risk of even more politicized internal relations than otherwise. (Twente, Senior, Male, Academic, Professional School).

I would like to see people appointed, because then there is a clear-cut line of command. The previous law when everything was democratic was simply too much. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Sciences).

In reality, the differences between elected and appointed leaders are probably not as great as they seem to be on paper. The mechanism of appointing leaders does not fully exclude the involvement of various university actors. Sometimes the process may be collegial and the final decision is only a matter of rubberstamping. Take for example some quotes from Boston College and Twente, where the executives are appointed instead of elected.

I think the way we do it at Boston College is interesting. There is a faculty search committee that's assisting the academic vice-president. So I view that as a representative form. My new dean will not be appointed, he is going to be really the result of a representative process and of a multidimensional, larger committee. I know a number of the people on that committee so I trust their judgment. (Boston College, Senior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

I don't think the present situation is that bad. It may look undemocratic, but, of course, there is a whole circus behind the façade. It's more from top to bottom today, but it doesn't exclude bottom-up processes, not at all. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

In terms of the way it actually functions, it still has rather democratic elements in it. Our dean was more or less put forward by the faculty to central management, and then they

accepted him as dean. In the formal way it might not be too democratic. But in the actual functioning of it, it still has democratic elements. (Twente, Junior, Male, Academic, Social Sciences).

In sum, managerialism as a globalizing practice has had little impact on the opinions of respondents regarding the mechanisms for selecting academic leaders. By and large, respondents think that traditions should continue. However, the Twente case is somewhat confusing. There the influence of the university community in selecting their leaders has decreased, though there never was a tradition of having elected executives, but opinions differ as to whether this has been a shift for the worse or the better. Most of the Twente respondents appear to prefer to stick to their tradition of being involved in the process of appointments without the necessity of electing leaders.

Conclusions

Managerialism is one of the characteristic globalizing practices in higher education. According to the literature in the field, this globalizing practice appears to have an increasing impact on institutional governance. In fact, it is widely suggested that managerial ideologies have helped to establish broadly similar kinds of institutional regimes. Strengthened executive leadership, for instance, is supposed to be one of these consequences. However, at least two counterarguments can be put forward. The first deals with the different histories and backgrounds of the universities around the globe. There are significant differences between the universities under scrutiny, if only for historical reasons. Governance structures appear to be path dependent. Why should these different institutions automatically mold their internal structures in the same direction when they are exposed to managerialism? The second counterargument concerns the differences between formal change and its accompanying rhetoric on the one hand, and day-to-day practice on the other. Managerialism may be the talk of the town in many countries and within

many universities, but has it really changed daily policy making and management?

The case studies of the four universities clearly show a difference between formal rules and daily practice, or between imposed changes and day-to-day business. There is a tendency to strengthen executive leadership, or to centralize certain aspects of decision making, but this has not automatically changed the academics' role in decision making. It is also questionable how deep the changes have penetrated the university. At the "shop floor" level, only moderate changes, if any, were perceived.

A related conclusion drawn from both the country reports and the four case studies concerns the importance of traditions within universities. The way it was is the way most like it to continue. Managerialism appears to have entered the universities to some extent, but when it comes to the very practical point of selecting leaders, the overwhelming majority of the respondents in all four universities are inclined to maintain their established procedures. Tradition, at Boston College and Twente, balances consultation with appointment to gain greater central effectiveness; at Avignon and Oslo, it means elections are still sacrosanct and academics prefer their involvement in decision making at the cost of some greater central control of academic processes. Managerialism has had an impact on Boston and Twente to some degree but little impact on Avignon and Oslo. One explanation for the reduced impact may be that new concepts are being implemented by people who are used to the old rules and customs.

At the end of the day, it depends on how one looks at these kinds of phenomena and their effects. Suppose for argument's sake that we have a red, yellow, and blue university structure exposed to the very same black development. We can at least draw two conclusions regarding the action of black on the three other colors. The first one is that each university's color will change. Moreover, it will change in the same direction: all universities developing darker colors. The second conclusion to be drawn, however, is that the universities continue to have different colors! Red and black do not yield the same color as the yellow and black mixture. The ultimate color

depends, of course, on the precise composition of the mixture of colors. This analogy can be used to interpret the findings of our study (of course, if you were to add enough black the other colors will disappear-and that is the fear of those who see the threat of managerialism to traditional values in universities).

First the institutional governance structures of the four universities significantly differ (different colors). The case studies indicate that according to the nearly one hundred European respondents, managerialism – meaning strengthened executive leadership, instrumental rationality and centralization in universities – has begun to take root in all three European universities (mixing the colors with black). Managerialism was already strong at Boston College and it strengthened its roots over the last three decades. The intensity of the managerial ideology and its impact, however, differs from one university to another (a little more black is spotted at some places and is nowhere totally dominant). In the end it is clear that the four universities still have many differences in their governing styles and structures. Adding one single color has not (yet) resulted worldwide in one gray institutional structure for universities.