Introduction to the *Handbook on Higher Education Management and Governance*

Alberto Amaral and António Magalhães

The university is a multi-secular institution, its origins dating from the Middle Ages. Walter Rüegg (1992) considers the university is a European institution, a creation of medieval Europe, of the Europe of the Roman Catholic Church. Over the centuries, old universities, rooted in medieval times, have defied the passing of time and adapted to the profound changes of society. Kerr (1982) lists some 85 Western world institutions, founded before 1520, that still exist today in a recognizable form, performing without interruption similar functions, 70 of them being universities (Van Vught, 1989, p. 51). This capacity of survival and adaptation to change rests on the fact that universities deal with knowledge, or as argued by Burton Clark, in universities "knowledge is discovered, preserved, refined, communicated and applied" (Clark, 1983, p. 12).

However, over the last few decades new pressures are being brought to bear on universities, pressures that have a different nature to previous ones, as they intend to promote changes of ideology and of values, and in the relationship between higher education institutions and the state and society (Amaral and Magalhães, 2003). These pressures result from similar policy developments at the system level (Samoff and Bidemi, 2006; Tilak, 2006) and cannot be accommodated only by mere structural adjustments.

These new pressures are the result of the emergence of the knowledge society which has transformed knowledge into an indispensable ingredient of economic competitiveness. The driving force of the new economy has become knowledge, and services and knowledge-intensive products are replacing material and labour-intensive products. The work most individuals now perform requires theoretical knowledge, the major resource of the post-industrial society becoming its well-educated workforce (Amaral, 2018).

As universities were recognized as being producers of new knowledge and innovation and of a well-educated labour force, they became progressively tied with the economy (European Commission, 2006). Guy Neave (1995) argues that the mission of the university is being redefined away from being an instrument for the distribution of wealth to becoming an instrument to supplement its generation. For Neave, these changes are the consequence of "the rise to pre-eminence of Economics as the prime driving force in the higher education of non-totalitarian societies, and very particularly those in Western Europe" (Neave, 2004, p. 131).

Under the influence of neoliberal policies and the emergence of New Public Management as a tool to reform the public sector (Reed, 2002), university governance and management were transformed by reinforcing the executive leadership and weakening collegial governance. Many governments have experimented with the use of markets for public sector regulation (Dill et al., 2004) and in the case of higher education new instruments were introduced for measuring institutional performance and increasing institutional accountability via accreditation systems. Public funding was in many cases reduced and allocated via performance-based contracts, with institutions being pressured to look for alternative financing sources, which

Alberto Amaral and António Magalhães - 9781800888074
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 10/25/2023 11:10:50AM
via free access

resulted in the development of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). These developments call into question the autonomy of universities, both pedagogic – students are expected to acquire the skills demanded by the immediate needs of employers – and research – projects must have economic relevance to be worthy of being financed.

This book presents an analysis of the changes in university governance from the Middle Ages to present times, with special emphasis on the more recent developments.

Part I is dedicated to the medieval university. In Chapter 1, Michael H. Shank examines different models of university organization in the medieval period in continental Europe. In its early days, the European university had essentially two different models, one where decision-making was vested in students, the other where it was vested in the masters. The University of Bologna is an example of the first model, being governed by students who hired the professors on an annual basis, controlling their assiduity and the quality of teaching, an extreme example of the present principles of customer satisfaction. The University of Paris is an example of the second model, where the chancellor of Notre Dame cathedral had the power to grant the licentia docendi thus ensuring some degree of external accountability.

In Chapter 2, Barbara M. Kehm analyses the autonomy of universities in the Middle Ages referring to the two main European continental archetypes of university, represented by the University of Bologna and the University of Paris. The idea that the medieval institution was autonomous is questioned by some authors who argue that universities were "squeezed between the ecclesiastic and secular powers" (e.g., Neave, 1995). University autonomy has been frequently violated along the years, by the Church, as well as by the prince. Kehm argues that in medieval times some of what are today essential components of autonomy (freedoms of teaching and research) did not play a major role. Indeed, research was not an important component of university life and "teaching was for a good part controlled by the Church" (this chapter), the faculty of theology being an important element of any university.

In Chapter 3, Teresa Carvalho and Sónia Cardoso examine the role of research and post-graduate studies in medieval universities. Medieval universities were rather removed from research concerns and orthodox academic science was comprehensively derided. When universities began to be established in the Middle Ages, procedures for being awarded a title of Master or Doctor were described in great detail (Verger, 1992, pp. 144–145). Candidates for a degree of doctor had to fulfil a number of strict conditions such as being of legitimate birth, without infamy, Christian and had to be able to speak and see. However, the theses were not based on original research; they were, in general, aimed at demonstrating the erudition of the candidate in a public disputation, rather than at producing innovative research. This changed when Alexander von Humboldt created the University of Berlin.

Part II is dedicated to the emergence of the modern university which was initiated with the foundation of Berlin University by von Humboldt and the Napoleonic reforms in France. In most European countries the relationship between universities and the state was based on the model of state control. However, there were some divergent cases, namely in the US and the UK.

In Chapter 4, Cristina Sin and Orlanda Tavares describe the model of state control. In this model the relationship between government and higher education institutions was heavily centralized, with the state controlling nearly all aspects of higher education (access, study contents, degree requirements, examinations, appointment of academic staff, etc.). This was the prevailing model in the European continental systems of higher education, and was built around the principle of legal homogeneity in order to ensure similarity of educational

standards and programmes. Under state control, autonomy in the Humboldtian university was granted only to individual academics, not to institutions, and it was believed that ensuring the university's *Lernfreiheit* was the state obligation and in its interest. Academic autonomy in the Napoleonic university was more restrictive (Neave and Van Vught, 1994, p. 270) as the state exercised close control over appointments and promotions, and over the development of programmes and courses (Carrier and Van Vught, 1989).

Chapter 5 focuses on the Humboldtian model of the research university and the Humboldtian myth. Alberto Amaral and António Magalhães analyse the emergence of the modern research university which is associated with the implementation of the University of Berlin founded by William von Humboldt in 1810 (Wyatt, 1998). Humboldt, in order to protect modern science and the pursuit of knowledge against outside undesirable influences arising from professions, religions or politicians, created an exclusive ivory tower in which the state protected individual academic freedom (Nybom, 2003). This was a model of individual academic autonomy, not of institutional autonomy. The research-based degree of doctor was developed at the University of Berlin and the implementation of "research forums" (and labs) were instrumental in the development of this new research degree. Recent research questions the role of Humboldt and the creation of the Humboldt myth.

Chapter 6 is dedicated to the analysis of the Napoleonic model of universities. In this chapter Emmanuelle Picard recalls that contemporary French universities are not the heirs of medieval universities which were abolished in 1793 during the Revolution. Universities were recreated in 1808 by Napoleon I, based on the principle of legal homogeneity, "which presupposes that they can be acquired under the same conditions regardless of where they are obtained" (this chapter). The Napoleonic model was far more restrictive than the Humboldtian model regarding academic autonomy, because of generalized state control ranging from simple administrative acts to the contents of programmes and courses, while the Humboldtian model assumed that universities were the state partners acting as the highest expression of the state itself and of national culture, and this element of partnership gave way to less restricted autonomy. The Napoleonic reform of higher education introduced the degree of doctor in 1810, and to be accepted research must present new results. Picard argues that it is around the degree of doctor "and its professional value that the battle for the autonomy of French academics is finally being fought" (this chapter).

Developments in the US were somewhat different from Europe. In Chapter 7, David D. Dill presents an analysis of the American research universities and their distinctive characteristics. In the US, the federal government does not play a role in regulating higher education institutions and there is no Ministry of Education. The first universities were private institutions where governing boards – also called boards of trustees – were responsible for making the overall decisions about the policies and long-term directions to be taken by academic institutions. With the passing of time American universities have adopted a unique model of shared governance combining faculty self-governance and collegial controls. The development of the American university was supported by three instruments: the laboratory, the lecture and the research group discussions (Veysey, 1965). What was original was the US implementation of the Graduate School model, a possible derivation of the German model, where the work for the degree of doctor comprises a structured taught component, in general, including research training, which is examined separately from the presented written work. This model of graduate education is nowadays being copied by European universities.

In Chapter 8, Guy Neave analyses the case of the UK traditional universities, which in contrast with the centralized systems of many European countries, had a high degree of self-government, and constitutional protection from external regulation or direction. This protection was given by their 'Royal Charter' which awarded them a quasi-private status (Fulton, 2002). In particular, the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge Universities at the turn of the nineteenth century are frequently taken to constitute as clear an example as can be found of the pure 'guild' model of the fully autonomous institution, governed and owned by its academic staff. Here were corporations, chartered or otherwise licensed by the state, and fully endowed by public or private donors some centuries earlier: institutions fully and solely owned and governed by their members, and thus protected from the market (and hence subject to Adam Smith's and others' withering critique) by their wealth (Fulton, 2002, p. 188).

Part III analyses the development of higher education systems over a period which roughly corresponds to the prevalence of the welfare state. A number of chapters deal with the massification of higher education systems which is associated with a change in the relationship between universities and the state, namely the change from a system of state control to one of state supervision. More recent transformations were associated with new forms of public policies, including the progressive use of markets as regulation tools, the emergence of New Public Management and the problems of delegation resulting from the competition of autonomous institutions in a market or quasi-market. Subsequent chapters deal with the progressive development of quality assessment policies, the diversification of funding systems and the access of students in massified systems.

In Chapter 9, Peter Scott refers to the development of the university in the second half of the twentieth century as being immersed in two new frameworks of political economy, the welfare state and the knowledge economy, frameworks which are both complementary and contradictory. The chapter is mainly focused on the welfare state, although always keeping in mind the second framework. It is possible to argue that this traditional model of the modern university survived without loss of legitimacy until the end of the 1960s (Amaral and Magalhães, 2003) or while the welfare state survived (Scott, 1995). The expansion that higher education systems all over the world experienced in the early 1960s did not change the previous pattern of relationship between the state and higher education, as far as budgeting and administrative coordination were concerned. This period also corresponds to a change from a 'primary' welfare state "designed to provide a safety net for the poor … [to a] 'secondary' welfare state in which political, social and educational institutions (including universities) are mobilized to promote a democratic culture and to encourage social mobility" (Scott, 1995, p. 79). Recent changes taking place over the last three decades have implicated universities in economic growth, either as producers of skilled manpower, knowledge and innovation or as "contributors to national prestige, as institutions operating in a market" (Scott, this chapter). Which justifies the question raised by Scott in this chapter, "is the university essentially and predominantly a social institution or an economic organization?"

In Chapter 10, António Magalhães and Amélia Veiga analyse how the transition of higher education systems from elite into mass or even universal systems, with their increasing complexity has induced a shift in regulation from state control to supervisory models and to quasi-market regulation. Governments have increasingly used markets as instruments of public regulation, assuming that market-like competition is the solution to reform the sclerotic behaviour of public services, forcing them to increase their efficiency (Ball, 1998). There was "an increasing colonisation of education policy by economic policy imperatives" (Ball, 1998,

p. 122) that provoked a change in the traditional pact between university and society by shifting the emphasis away from the social and cultural functions of the university and in favour of its economic function. Neave (1995) argues the supervisory state seeks to improve its strategic oversight over national policies by shedding the functions of a priori detailed control in favour of defining, monitoring, and evaluating, post hoc, the performance of individual institutions. The recent development of digital tools and rationales, which cannot be isolated from the global digital economy (Williamson, 2020) had a strong impact on governance by facilitating "data collection, storage, analysis, and dissemination at the institutional, national and international levels" (this chapter).

Subsequent chapters in Part III are divided into three sections. **Section A** is dedicated to student access systems analysing the consequences of the massification of higher education systems and how it relates to access equity, as well as policies aiming at promoting equity.

In Chapter 11, Malcolm Tight analyses the expansion of higher education systems in response to the demand for a well-educated workforce which has become the major resource of post-industrial societies (Amaral, 2018). Massification of higher education systems was accompanied by their diversification in order to attend to the very diverse needs and aspirations of a much more heterogeneous student population. Diversification has created a new, more subtle form of inequity, as students from deprived backgrounds have a tendency to concentrate in these new lower value opportunities (Koucký et al., 2010; Shavit et al., 2007).

In Chapter 12, Moris Triventi focuses on the obvious difficulties in attaining equity of access for all social groups to higher education despite the expansion of higher education systems. With the massification of higher education systems, there has been an increase in the number of students from deprived backgrounds entering higher education. However, diversification of the systems, usually by creating lower value opportunities (vocational programmes, short cycles, non-university institutions, etc.), has changed the nature of the game and the competition is no longer to enter a higher education institution but to enter the best institutions and the best programmes. In this chapter Moris Triventi distinguishes between vertical and horizontal aspects of inequalities, the first being related to differences in terms of degree course and achievement results and the latter to the type of higher education. Finally, the sources of social inequalities in participation are discussed.

Chapter 13 is dedicated to cases of affirmative action. The positional character of higher education makes the objective of fair access to higher education extremely difficult to attain. Marginson (2011) argued that the OECD reports show that it is more achievable and more fruitful to implement policies aimed at inclusion, rather than to increase fairness. These policies will be effective from the point of view of inclusion and may eventually, although slowly, contribute to increased fairness. There are, however, some countries where affirmative policies were implemented aiming at increasing fairness in higher education. In this chapter Júlio Bertolin presents two case studies of policies of affirmative action and critically analyses the results of those policies. These are the cases of the US (Dill, 2021) and of Brazil (Bertolin and McCowan, 2021).

Section B deals with the use of markets as instruments of public policy and the problems resulting from the autonomy of institutions and delegation problems.

In recent decades governments have been experimenting with the use of markets as instruments of public policy (Dill et al., 2004). A new belief developed that the more autonomous institutions were, the better they would respond to changes in their organizational environment (Amaral and Magalhães, 2001; Magalhães et al., 2013), and the better they would perform

(Aghion et al., 2009; Ritzen, 2011). In Chapter 14, Paul Temple calls attention to the use of markets, not only as instruments to promote the efficiency of public services, but also as instruments to allocate resources in higher education, and in other areas of public spending aiming to promote the power of consumers relative to that of producers.

Chapter 15 by Alberto Amaral is dedicated to delegation problems. Increased institutional autonomy, combined with market competition, may create regulation difficulties, as autonomous institutions competing in a market may follow strategies aimed at ensuring their own development and survival, to the detriment of the public good or the government's objectives (Massy, 2004). This explains why although institutions were given autonomy, the state has not disappeared or been completely replaced by the market. On the contrary, the government still keeps a firm hand on regulating the system. In the new model the state no longer acts as provider and delegates this activity. Governments face the classical principal-agent dilemma: "How the principal can best motivate the agent to perform as the principal would prefer, taking into account the difficulties [the principal faces] in monitoring the agent's activities" (Sappington, 1991, cited in Dill and Soo, 2004, p. 68). The principal-agent dilemma leads to a contradiction of neoliberal policies. The principal needs to ensure the agent's perfect compliance, to prevent them from acting "contrary to his or her (i.e., the principal's) preferences" (Kassim and Menon, 2002). The government will be tempted to intervene to steer institutional behaviour towards its objectives thus breaking the promise to reduce, as much as possible, government regulation in favour of market regulation.

Section C is dedicated to discussing developments in quality assurance processes in higher education.

In Chapter 16, Peter Woelert and Bjørn Stensaker analyse the emergence of the 'evaluative state' (Neave, 1988) which was observed in the late 1980s and the 1990s, with increasing public relevance given to quality. The rise of the evaluative state corresponded to a change in the relationship between higher education institutions and the state, namely the implementation of an "alternative to regulation by bureaucratic fiat" (Neave, 1988, p. 11), by looking for more flexible, less heavy and faster guidance mechanisms that would allow for increased capacity for institutional adaptation to change and shorter "administrative time" (Neave, 1988). Instead of the traditional a priori authorization, the state awarded institutions more autonomy, while creating a posteriori control mechanisms via quality assessment. This discussion is followed by a critical analysis of evaluative mechanisms and developments resulting from that shift in governance and of the transition from the 'evaluative state' into the 'evaluative society'. Finally, the authors present some possible future developments of quality evaluation processes in higher education.

In Chapter 17, Maria João Rosa and Sofia Bruckmann look at quality assessment as a tool for quite different kinds of action, ranging from the more academic concern with quality improvement to the implementation of markets and the interests of government control and supranational policy implementation (Amaral et al., 2007). Today, there is an increasing diversity of rationales explaining why quality and the measurement of quality have assumed such an important role. Chapters 17 and 18 present two examples of innovative uses of quality processes, the first one by Rosa and Bruckmann related to learning analytics and the second one by Manatos and Sarrico on the use of quality as a management tool. In Chapter 17 Rosa and Bruckmann discuss the possible interplay between internal quality assurance systems insofar as they aim at improving learning and teaching quality and Learning Analytics approaches. They suggest that internal QA systems "can work as 'baby cribs' for the implementation

or further development of LA approaches" while "LA approaches may contribute to future developments on quality assurance purposes, including for strengthening its use as a tool for learning and teaching innovation".

In Chapter 18, Maria J. Manatos and Cláudia S. Sarrico reflect on how quality has become a management tool in higher education institutions, and the transition from the narrower use of quality at an internal operational level to a broader usage for organizational development and the satisfaction of external stakeholders, and an understanding of quality as essentially a set of good practices of organizational management. In Europe the need for higher education institutions to develop their own internal quality management systems has become a reality, and standards and guidelines have even been defined at European level. Additionally, quality assessment processes may allow HEIs to go a step further, opening the possibility for them to move towards quality enhancement provided they are adequately implemented, so that they cover what lies at the heart of higher education: teaching and learning. The authors want to "provide an overview on how higher education institutions have been developing their quality management systems and integrating them in their broader management and governance systems, covering different missions, organizational levels, and the principals of quality management" (this chapter).

Section D discusses changes in funding systems and the ensuing problems of cost-sharing and debt aversion.

In Chapter 19, Agata A. Lambrechts and Benedetto Lepori analyse the changes in the funding of higher education with particular emphasis on performance-based funding (PBF) methods for education and research. The importance of performance-based contracts lies in allowing the government to have more detailed control over the outputs of higher education institutions. Using PBF governments enter into binding agreements with institutions to reward them with resources linked to the achievement of mutually determined performance-based objectives (Salmi and Hauptman, 2006, p. 17). As recognized by the OECD "There has also been a move towards linking funding to medium-term objectives negotiated between government and universities. Such 'performance contracting', pioneered by France in 1988, [was] followed by Finland and Switzerland in the late 1990s, and Austria in 2002" (OECD, 2003, p. 66). PBF is associated with the development of neoliberal policies and their emphasis on demands for more transparency in public spending and the need to increase the efficiency of higher education institutions – the famous 3Es of Margaret Thatcher (Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness) in the use of public funds.

In Chapter 20, Claire Callender analyses cost-sharing policies which aim at transferring to students and their parents at least part of the education costs. Those policies have been implemented with the rise of neoliberalism and justified by a change in the concept of education as a public good to being a private good. Cost-sharing uses two main instruments, tuition fees and student loans. To make this change more tolerable governments have created loan systems which can be of two types. In the case of mortgage-style loans (e.g., US) students start repaying the debt once they complete their studies and instalments are calculated for a specified repayment period based on the total amount of the loan plus interest. Mortgage-style loans are rather risky for students who may default if they do not complete their studies or if their earned income is excessively low. Income-contingent loans (e.g., England) offer more protection to students as default, in principle, is not possible. Graduates only start repaying their loans when their earnings go above a fixed threshold, when they start paying a percentage of the income above that threshold. However, low-income students are more likely to be debt averse, being

deterred from enrolling in higher education, which creates equity problems (Callender and Mason, 2017). Claire Callender uses England as a case study where, apparently due to a large number of students being unable to repay in full their debts, the government is facing challenging sustainability problems.

Chapter 21 by Steve Agnew examines the effect of government funding to support low-income students on their decisions to work part-time while studying and for how many hours. Student choices on enrolling in higher education instead of earlier entrance into the labour market, such as which institution or which programme to choose, are fraught with substantial uncertainty due to lack of information. As argued by Dill, "the relevant information necessary for effective student choices is not peer evaluations of teaching processes, nor subjective judgements of the quality of the curriculum, but objective measures of the value added by a particular academic programme" (Dill, 1997, p. 14). Those decisions may be influenced by the costs of higher education, namely due to increasing tuition fees (see Chapter 20) or progressive changes from grants into loans. In particular, they influence students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, which may be interpreted in terms of increased debt aversion. Working part-time while studying may be a way to soften the effects of debt aversion. However, working part-time may have a negative effect on academic achievement (Callender and Kemp, 2000; Curtis and Shani, 2002). In this chapter Steve Agnew uses New Zealand as a study case to conclude that "Students who receive government financial support are less likely to have a part-time job during term time" and " Students who do still work during term time and receive government financial support work for fewer hours, and have a higher GPA than students who work and do not receive government financial support".

Part IV of this volume deals with the emergence of the knowledge society and the resulting changes in higher education which led to the ruin of the traditional ivory tower model.

In Chapter 22, Peter Streckeisen analyses the challenges and contradictions confronting universities in the era of the knowledge society, and refers to the 'educational hypocrisy' (Piketty, 2020) of a system promoting equality of chances while producing extremely inequal outputs in terms of success. In the emerging knowledge society, holding a university degree is a necessary but not sufficient condition for access to economic power. In the new economy, knowledge workers have taken the place of factory workers and it is becoming increasingly frequent to see employees holding a tertiary education degree performing routine work. Streckeisen lists three characteristics that pose a threat to the universal values defended by the university.

In Chapter 23, Carla Sá and Alberto Amaral discuss the development of academic capitalism and institutional patent policies which are transforming what was "an academic public knowledge regime into an academic capitalist regime" (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2003, p. 225), while the traditional idea of free and universal knowledge has been replaced by the idea that "rather than being shared, intellectual property is owned", with "the proliferation of conflict of interest language and rules [in intellectual property policies]" being an indication that disinterestedness no longer lives in academia. Under the influence of corporate-led globalization, the relative importance of knowledge for its own sake has declined relative to useful knowledge that may be used for improving the competitiveness of the economy. Institutions are under pressure to produce research that has direct relevance for economic competitiveness.

In Chapter 24, Susan L. Robertson and Michele Martini use the case of the UK higher education system to analyse how successive crises since 1970 have promoted the progressive privatization of higher education and its transformation into a market (Robertson, 2020). Those crises are the result of the deep penetration of capitalist logics and social relations (this

chapter). Robertson and Martini use Network Text Analysis to examine several reports to show how they have produced a radical, ontological, shift in the structures, social relations and subjectivities that promoted the emergence of a higher education market. However, while universities have lost their relative autonomy to the market, the state has not relaxed its control over universities and knowledge creation, circulation and use.

Recent changes in the life of academics are examined by Teresa Carvalho in Chapter 25. The emergence of the knowledge society and the progressive implementation of managerial principles and values imported from the private sector have resulted in segmentation and stratification of academic careers. The development of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997) and institutional patent policies made faculty more like all other workers and less like university professionals, but the impact of these changes is not homogeneous across the higher education system, as there is a small group which is protected by tenure while most academics have seen a deterioration of their work conditions.

In Chapter 26, Roberto Moscati analyses the transformations of the academic identity under the changes occurring in the role of universities and their opening to society and the needs of economy. As universities were transformed into service providers, academics lost their aura of disinterestedness, and requests for increasing accountability have replaced the principle of faith in professional behaviour. The academy no longer enjoys great prestige on which higher education can build a successful claim to political autonomy (Scott, 1995). The academic profession has lost its attractiveness, as university careers are becoming more precarious and uncertain. Tenure has become more restrictive or even eliminated, an increasing number of part-time staff are being employed to teach students, and more bureaucratic control is directed at supervising their activities. Present developments based on the new idea of academic capitalism contrast with the traditional missionary ideal associated with the academic profession.

In Chapter 27, Rosemary Deem and António Magalhães refer to the intrusion of the rhetoric and management practices of the private sector into higher education via the emergence of New Public Management (NPM) which transformed students into customers or clients and academics into providers of educational services. NPM influenced governance reforms by introducing private sector management tools, emphasizing market-based competition, efficiency, performance and value for money and concentrating decision power in central administration, while weakening the representation of academics (Ferlie et al., 2009). NPM has empowered boards in university governance as key structures in defining the organization's strategies (Amaral et al., 2013; Shattock, 2012). In this chapter the cases of Portugal and the UK are used to analyse the emergence of external lay governing board members, a process sometimes described as involving 'boardism' (Veiga et al., 2015), and their impact on how universities operate and the changes affecting the balance of power between academics, manager-academics and external board members.

In Chapter 28, Maarja Beerkens discusses the emergence of the stakeholder in higher education and how it corresponds to the ruin of Humboldt's idea of university as an ivory tower. Humboldt aimed at protecting individual academics against any external interference, religious, political, economic or from the professions. On the contrary, at present the social and economic environments are now seen as a web within which higher education institutions must integrate and interact to become more responsive to societal needs. As argued by Bleiklie and Kogan (2007), the university is becoming a stakeholder organization. In this chapter Maarja Beerkens analyses how stakeholders are today involved in all governance layers of

higher education institutions and discusses the possible negative effects of their presence and activity on the core values and mission of universities.

In Chapter 29, Manja Klemenčič analyses changes in the civic and political roles of higher education students resulting from the progressive development of neoliberal policies which have undermined the democratic principles of shared governance. Klemenčič argues that other developments have offset the eventual loss of power of the student estate, a fortune quite different from that of academics. While academics are being downgraded from proud professionals into employees or work for hire, students have improved their fate and reinforced their institutional role, being transformed into clients or customers (Klemenčič, 2012). In reality, neoliberal policies by seeing students as consumers also give them more voice in university management, for example, through course evaluations and course choice, and sometimes even in curricular decisions within a course. And students fight for louder student voice based on their interest as primary beneficiaries of the quality of higher education and their 'expert' knowledge as consumers.

Chapter 30 is dedicated to discussing the intensification of the globalization processes and the reconfiguration of national political agendas of higher education, and the increasing influence of international organizations such as the OECD, IMF, UNESCO or the World Bank, on the discourses and practices of higher education governance. Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Rene-Manuel Delgado discuss the agendas of those organizations and their influence on the trends and developments of higher education systems and institutional governance. They present a critical analysis of the concepts of governance and global governance, and a classification of international organizations. This is followed by a presentation of the concept of think tanks, their classification and their role in producing and disseminating knowledge about public policies, namely those of education. Finally, they analyse three specific cases: the World Bank and how the absence of characteristics of transparency and accountability which should be present in global governance may create problems; the OECD and the soft tools used by this organization to have a high level of influence over education policies, despite the absence of instruments such as financial or legislative powers; and UNESCO's use of international conferences to influence policies.

In Chapter 31, Glen A. Jones and Alison Elizabeth Jefferson analyse the complexities of governance in the case of countries that are federations (e.g., Canada, Germany) or with confederations (e.g., European Union). Increased complexities may have diverse origins: the legal foundation and regulation of higher education systems; multi-use, multi-level complexities; and complexities associated with language and multination federalism. They argue that there are many variations of federalism and substantial diversity in how higher education is governed in the existing federal systems, which makes generalizations rather challenging. However, because different levels of government may have been assigned authority over the higher education system and/or its components, there are, in general, forms of complexity that are not present in unitary systems. The structure of federations may even lead to legislative blockage and is open to change due to tensions in the distribution of power between the different levels of government. Finally, they call our attention to the "modest body of scholarship focusing on higher education governance in federal systems".

In Chapter 32, Alberto Amaral and António Magalhães present the conclusions of this volume and make suggestions about the future developments of higher education.

REFERENCES

Aghion, P., Dewatripont, M., Hoxby, C. M., Mas-Colell, A., and Sapir, A. (2009). The governance and performance of research universities: Evidence from Europe and the U.S. (Working Paper 14851). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Amaral, A. (2018). Universities and the knowledge society revisited. In R. Barnett and M. Peters (Eds.), *The Idea of the University: Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 353–369). New York: Peter Lang.

Amaral, A., and Magalhães, A. (2001). On markets, autonomy and regulation: The Janus head revisited. *Higher Education Policy*, *14*(1), 7–20.

Amaral, A., and Magalhães, A. (2003). The triple crisis of the university and its reinvention. *Higher Education*, *16*(2), 239–253.

Amaral, A., Rosa, M. J., and Tavares, D. (2007). Assessment as a tool for different kinds of action: From quality management to compliance and control. In A. Cavalli (Ed.), *Quality Assessment for Higher Education in Europe* (pp. 43–53). London: Portland Press.

Amaral, A., Tavares, O., and Santos, C. (2013). Higher education reform in Portugal: A historical and comparative perspective of the new legal framework for public universities. *Higher Education Policy*, *26*(5), 5–24.

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policies. *Comparative Education*, *34*(2), 119–130.

Bertolin, J., and McCowan, T. (2021). The persistence of inequity in Brazilian higher education: Background data and student performance. In O. Tavares, C. Sá, C. Sin, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Equity Policies in Global Higher Education: Reducing Inequality and Increasing Participation and Attainment* (pp. 71–88). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bleiklie, I., and Kogan, M. (2007). Organization and governance of universities. *Higher Education Policy*, *20*, 477–493.

Callender, C., and Kemp, M. (2000). *Changing Student Finances: Income, Expenditure and Taking Out Student Loans among Full and Part-Time Higher Education Students in 1998/9*. Sheffield: Department for Education and Employment.

Callender, C., and Mason, G. (2017). Does student loan debt deter higher education participation? New evidence from England. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *671*(1), 20–48.

Carrier, D., and Van Vught, F. (1989). Government and curriculum innovation in France. In F. Van Vught (Ed.), *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education* (pp. 143–167). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Curtis, S., and Shani, N. (2002). The effect of taking paid employment during term-time on students' academic studies. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *26*(2), 129–138.

Dill, D. (1997). Higher education markets and public policy. *Higher Education Policy*, *10*(3/4), 167–186.

Dill, D. (2021). Access and inequality in US higher education: Policy issues. In O. Tavares, C. Sá, C. Sin, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Equity Policies in Global Higher Education: Reducing Inequality and Increasing Participation and Attainment* (pp. 47–70). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dill, D., and Soo, M. (2004). Transparency and quality in higher education markets. In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* (pp. 61–85). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Dill, D., Teixeira, P., Jongbloed, B., and Amaral, A. (2004). Conclusion. In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* (pp. 327–352). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

European Commission (2006). *Europe Needs Modernised Universities*. IP/06/592, Brussels, 10 May.

Ferlie, E., Musselin, C., and Andresani, G. (2009). The governance of higher education systems: A public management perspective. In C. Paradeise, E. Reale, I. Bleiklie, and E. Ferlie (Eds.), *University Governance: Western European Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 1–19). Cham: Springer.

Fulton, O. (2002). Higher education governance in the UK: Change and continuity. In A. Amaral, G. A. Jones, and B. Karseth (Eds.), *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance* (pp. 187–212). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kassim, H., and Menon, A. (2002). The principal-agent approach and the study of the European Union: A provisional assessment. The European Research Institute, Birmingham University, 4 July.

Kerr, C. (1982). *The Uses of the University* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Klemenčič, M. (2012). The changing concepts of student participation in HE governance in the EHEA. In A. Curaj, P. Scott, L. Vlasceanu, and L. Wilson (Eds.), *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms* (pp. 631–653). Dordrecht: Springer.

Koucký, J., Bartušek, A., and Kovařovic, J. (2010). *Who Gets a Degree? Access to Tertiary Education in Europe, 1950–2009*. Prague: Charles University.

Magalhães, A., Veiga, A., Ribeiro, F. M., Sousa, S., and Santiago, R. (2013). Creating a common grammar for European higher education governance. *Higher Education*, *63*(1), 95–112.

Marginson, S. (2011). Equity, status and freedom: A note on higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *41*(1), 23–36.

Massy, W. F. (2004). Markets in higher education: Do they promote internal efficiency? In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* (pp. 13–55). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Neave, G. (1988). On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: An overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe 1986–1988. *European Journal of Education*, *23*(1), 7–23.

Neave, G. (1995). The stirring of the prince and the silence of the lambs: The changing assumptions beneath higher education policy, reform and society. In D. Dill and B. Sporn (Eds.), *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly* (pp. 54–71). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Neave, G. (2004). Higher education policy as orthodoxy: Being one tale of doxological drift, political intention and changing circumstances. In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, and A. Amaral (Eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* (pp. 127–160). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Neave, G., and Van Vught, F. A. (Eds.) (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents: The Winds of Change*. London: Pergamon Press.

Nybom, T. (2003). The Humboldt legacy: Reactions on the past, present and future of European higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, *16*(2), 141–159.

OECD (2003). *Education Policy Analysis, 2003*. Paris: OECD.

Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reed, M. I. (2002). New managerialism, professional power and organizational governance in UK universities: A review and assessment. In A. Amaral, G. A. Jones, and B. Karseth (Eds.), *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance* (pp. 163–186). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ritzen, J. (2011). A framework for scoring the empowerment of universities in the EU member states. Paper presented at the University Policy for Strengthening Competitiveness and Social Cohesion, Maastricht.

Robertson, S. L. (2020). Powershift: Universities and the seismic winds of change. In L. Weimar and T. Nokkala (Eds), *Universities as Political Institutions* (pp. 11–32). Leiden: Brill.

Rüegg, W. (1992). Foreword. In H. de Ridder-Symoens (Ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume I: Universities in the Middle Ages* (pp. xix–xxviii). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salmi, J., and Hauptman, A. M. (2006). *Innovations in Tertiary Education Financing: A Comparative Evaluation of Allocation Mechanism*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Samoff, J., and Bidemi, C. (2006). Influence – direct, indirect and negotiated: The World Bank and higher education in Africa. In G. Neave (Ed.), *Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Research into Higher Education and the Knowledge Society* (pp. 133–180). Paris: UNESCO.

Sappington, D. E. M. (1991). Incentives in principal-agent relationships. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *5*(2), 45–66.

Scott, P. (1995). *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Shattock, M. (2012). University governance. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *16*(2), 56–61.

Shavit, Y., Arum, R., and Glamoran, A. (Eds.) (2007). *Stratification in Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Slaughter, S., and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* . Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., and Rhoades, G. (2003). Contested intellectual property: The role of the institution in United States higher education. In A. Amaral, V. L. Meek, and I. M. Larsen (Eds.), *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* (pp. 203–228). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tilak, J. (2006). Higher Education Between The State And The Market. In G. Neave (Ed.), *Knowledge, Authority and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Research into Higher Education and the Knowledge Society* (pp. 235–254). Paris: UNESCO.

Van Vught, F. A. (Ed.) (1989). *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Veiga, A., Magalhães, A., and Amaral, A. (2015). From collegial governance to boardism: Reconfiguring governance in higher education. In J. Huisman, H. De Boer, D. Dill, and M. Souto-Otero (Eds.), *The Palgrave International Handbook of Higher Education Policy and Governance* (pp. 398–416). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Verger, J. (1992). Teachers. In H. de Ridder-Symoens (Ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume I: Universities in the Middle Ages* (pp. 144–170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The Emergence of the American University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Williamson, B. (2020). Digitizing education governance: Pearson, real-time data analytics, visualization and machine intelligence. In A. Wilkins and A. Olmedo (Eds.), *Education Governance and Social Theory: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Research* (pp. 21–41). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Wyatt, J. (1998). The lengthened shadow of one man: The public intellectual and the founding of universities. *Higher Education Review*, *30*(2), 29–49.