

citizenship, which have in turn been driven by the increasing globalization. With such ideas spreading around the globe under the influence of economic globalization, American management models, international organizations, and consultants, the new model of human resources training has also diffused cross-nationally. Given that nation-states still vary in their domestic institutional cultures, countries characterized by strong institutional individualism are generally more amenable to the influence of the personal development model of training. An important prediction from this study is that as organizations around the globe become more penetrated by the notion of individual empowerment over time, this new model of human resources training will become part and parcel of the organizing principles of organizations.

NOTES

1. Respondents of this survey are allowed to consider more than one type of training to be the most important.
2. Data collection stopped in 1996 because since 1997 the journal has changed its name to *Workforce*. In order not to introduce any bias, I examined articles with the same journal name.
3. Specific-technical training emphasizes skills that are immediately related to the technical aspects of specific job tasks. Examples are specific new equipment training and product knowledge. General-technical training focuses on technical knowledge or skills that are useful across a wide range of job categories such as PC application, finance, and quality control. Human relations training emphasizes how people can get along with one another such as employee morale, grievance handling, and labor relation. Personal development training aims at improving one's cognitive and behavioral skills in dealing with self and others. Some examples are communication skills, time management, leadership, and creativity training. While human relations training emphasizes cooperation for the sake of cooperation and good employee morale (Gullén 1994), personal development training emphasizes how one can attain productive work through strategically dealing with self and others (Burich 1985).
4. If a firm is not able to document training expenses greater than 1.4 percent of its wage bill, it must pay the difference between actual training expenditures and 1.4 percent of the wage bill.
5. Based on prior studies, I collected ten indicators of the individual's role in national political and cultural institutions. I conducted an exploratory factor analysis of all these indicators. Five of the ten indicators load above 0.70 onto the first extracted factor, and therefore I use these five indicators and construct a factor score to measure institutionalized individualism.

10

Turning the University into an Organizational Actor

Georg Krücken and Frank Meier

Universities worldwide have gone through a variety of changes over the last half-century. From the offspring of institutes for learning and teaching in higher education in the late 1960s to the current emphasis on e-learning, methodological and systematic approaches to academic teaching have more and more replaced the belief in the natural teaching abilities of university professors. Educating university students has come to be seen as something that can be taught like physics or languages, and the individual style and aura of the professor gives way to a more sober and rationalized image of academic teachers. Likewise, the societal conception of academic research has undergone profound transformations. Academic research is no longer seen as a natural source of wealth and progress, which unidirectionally and in a quasi-evolutionary way leads to technological development and commercial applications. Instead, rational societal planning, deliberate innovation policies, and active networking of individual researchers are now seen as essential for connecting academic research to its socioeconomic environments.

Both global trends have attracted much scholarly and political debate, highlighting the nature and the risks and benefits related to the rationalizing of teaching and research. In this chapter, we want to discuss a third general trend in higher education, which is closely related to the first two. 'Turning the university into an organizational actor', as we label this process, is here conceptualized as one of the many facets of the overall tendency toward organizational actorhood in the current era of globalization. By the term 'organizational actor' we try to evoke the image of an integrated, goal-oriented entity that is deliberately choosing its own actions and that can thus be held responsible for what it does. Organizational actorhood, then, is closely tied to institutional management and leadership. The 'organizational turn' in higher education is by no means a trivial process as universities traditionally were not conceived as important decision-making entities in their own rights. Caught

between the academic profession and the state, there was not much legitimate space for institutional management. We suppose that this is going to change due to globalization processes, which, on the one hand, speed up observation and imitation processes and, on the other hand, foster the transformation of universities into organizational actors, which are able to act strategically and position themselves with regard to their competitors.

Mutual observation and imitation processes already took place among different national systems in the nineteenth and, especially, at the beginning of the twentieth century. However, a global horizon for comparison and competition among *individual* universities has only recently been established by global rankings, the proliferation of transnational degrees like MBAs, and the perception of a global market for higher education. Processes of observation and imitation foster the rapid diffusion of a generalized script for organizational actorhood, which cross-cut national and organizational boundaries.

Imitation is often connected to the active construction of a trendsetter whose allegedly superior practices are seen as worth taking into account. In our case the reference to the United States is obvious. Many contemporary trends discussed in this chapter can be traced back to American universities and early discussions on academic leadership and institutional management in the United States. Likewise, the United States is an important point of reference within international organizations, which actively promote the essentials of what it means to be a modern university organization. It is quite ironic, though, that in the 1960s, when concepts of higher education management began to diffuse on a global scale, American scholars and practitioners began to doubt the strength of leadership in American universities (see Section 1). Therefore, although American universities have effectively served as role models in the construction of universities as organizational actors, such models may have little to do with organizational realities. Indeed, the American university as the embodiment of central features of organizational actorhood is best understood as a powerful myth in current higher education discourse worldwide.

The diffusion of a globalized model of the university is not only driven by construction and observation processes *within* the sector of higher education. Nowadays, firms, hospitals, public administration agencies, and universities are conceptualized first and foremost as *organizations*, having typical *organizational* problems and being in need for efficient *organizational* solutions.¹ The number of organizations that may be selected as a role model therefore expands rapidly (Meyer 1994: 43–5; see also Strang and Meyer 1993). And exactly in this sense, universities are turned into 'real organizations,'² to which solutions from other contexts may be successfully applied. Though it is

typically claimed that these solutions should be cautiously adapted to universities and their peculiarities, the idea that the university is more or less an organization like any other stands in striking contrast to earlier, prevailing ideas about the university. Just over forty years ago, for example, Millett (1962: 4) matter of factly argued: 'I believe that ideas drawn from business and public administration have only very limited applicability to colleges and universities'. Through the successful diffusion of a generalized concept of 'the organization', whose abstract principles flow across different contexts, universities enact contemporary scripts about what it requires to be a modern organization.

Our foray into the new world of universities' organizational actorhood will start by briefly referring to traditional concepts in comparative and organizational research, which stress the role of national university systems and the uniqueness of universities as a specific type of organization (Section 1). Against this backdrop the shape of what we see as an emerging organizational model of the university becomes clearer, in which hitherto unquestioned boundaries between national systems and types of organizations are becoming blurred. Based on contemporary higher education research and discourse, we will discuss four main elements of the new, globalizing university model (Section 2): organizational accountability, mainly through the establishment of evaluation procedures; the tendency toward defining 'own' organizational goals through mission statements, in which the organizational self is created and openly displayed to others; the ongoing elaboration and expansion of formal technical structures around these goals; and the transformation of university management into a profession. These elements weaken traditional forms of control and solidarities central to universities. At the end of our chapter we will briefly discuss the consequences of the diffusion of the new, globalizing model of university actorhood. As it is re-embedded within specific national and organizational contexts, we strongly suggest that there will be heterogeneous outcomes (Section 3).

10.1. UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: THE DOMINANCE OF NATIONAL MODELS AND ORGANIZATIONAL SPECIFICITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH

From their very beginning universities incorporated many aspects of what nowadays are seen as strong indicators for processes of globalization (Altbach 2004)—an international body of members, both students and professors; a

common language, Latin; and the ideal of universal knowledge. The university, in fact, seems to be the inherently globalized institution. But universities displayed a strong local orientation ever since, and not only in the high period of the nation-state did universities mainly evolve in national settings, shaped by culturally different taken-for-granted assumptions of what it means to be a university. Therefore, historians and sociologists typically speak of the dominance of national models in the field of higher education.³

With the foundation of the University of Bologna in 1088, universities are undoubtedly among the oldest formal organizations.⁴ However, as university organizations traditionally relied on internal control by the professoriate and external control by the state, the organizational level was of minor importance. In this respect, universities were seen as 'specific organizations' (Musselin 2004a).

In recent years, the traditional forms of university governance are under pressure. There is a considerable loss of confidence in the capacities for self-governance of the academic community. At the same time, strong state regulation has become subject to a fundamental ideological critique, in higher education as in other domains. Thus, on a worldwide scale, one can witness a common trend in university systems based on very different national traditions. Universities are being transformed, with a new emphasis on the organizational level as an important and independent level of decision-making. Strong institutional management is now considered a key component of university governance (Braun and Merrien 1999; Rhoades and Sporn 2002).

In this process, two hitherto unquestioned features of the universities are challenged: the uniqueness of the national university system and the uniqueness of the university as a specific type of organization. As this contradicts decades of research on universities in the social sciences, we will briefly remind our readers of some of that research in order to highlight the conceptual changes involved in the new model of university governance.

International comparative research on higher education has shown clearly how national university systems differed in their forms of governance. Especially Burton Clark's seminal work (1983), which locates national systems within a triangle of market, state authority, and academic oligarchy, made these differences obvious. Four countries seemed to be of particular importance when it comes to delineating distinct and influential, not to say archetypical, university systems: Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. We will briefly discuss each of them.⁵

According to this conceptual framework, the traditional German model was an example of a system based on strong state authority and an equally strong academic oligarchy. There was hardly any room and legitimacy for the organization as an independent decision-making actor. Of course, in

universities collegial bodies produced collective decisions. Due to formal restrictions and the practice of mutual noninterference,⁶ the university was nevertheless conceptualized as a community of professors. The German full professor, traditionally, was an autonomous 'prince' who could legitimately refuse attempts at 'top down' governance within the organization. This picture gradually changed with the advent of the 'group university' in the 1970s, which implied the inclusion of hitherto marginal actors (students, academic and nonacademic staff) into collective decision-making processes. However, critical observers noted a tendency toward nondeliberations and immobility (Schimank 2001). The 'university as an organizational actor', in other words, was still to come.

The French model was even further away from a model in which intra-university governance was fostered.⁷ In a comparison between the German and the French system, Musselin (1999) has shown that in the French case there was hardly any organizational backbone within universities. Correspondingly, university professors did not identify with their organization, and the state focused on disciplinary, but not on organizational boundaries when it came to regulating universities. As Musselin sums up: 'Nowhere was a university considered as an entity' (1999: 45).

Even in university systems in which the state had a much weaker position vis-à-vis universities, the university was typically not conceived as an organizational actor in itself. This was the case in Great Britain, where faculty guilds dominated and collective decision-making was emphasized. As this system 'has placed strong authority at the bottom' (Clark 1983: 128), universities were subject only to a limited degree of centralized administrative power and accountability.

At first glance, the United States seemed to be very different, as the situation here was dominated by the market as the key form of governance. As Clark (1983) points out, this market orientation stood in sharp contrast to the European approach. Indeed, this difference had been noted as early as 1905 when Henry S. Pritchett observed that 'the American university has tended more and more to conform in its administration to the methods of the business corporation' (Pritchett 1905: 294) and that, moreover, the American university leader 'possesses an autocratic power which would not for a moment be tolerated in an European institution' (Pritchett 1905: 295). In Pritchett's view, the American university had 'the compactness and the directness of responsibility which the business corporation carries with it' (Pritchett 1905: 295).

It is not by accident that in such an environment, already in the 1960s there was rather extensive theorizing about the organizational characteristics of universities⁸ and the role of leadership in university governance, both from

practitioners and social scientists (see Millett 1962; Blau 1973). This kind of theorizing was literally absent in the European context of that time. Along with this literature came what Rourke and Brooks in 1966 called the 'Managerial Revolution in Higher Education',⁹ i.e. a broad trend toward rationalization in American universities: 'From now on the government of these institutions will reflect a much more conscious effort to plan the course of their development, to relate means to ends, and to seek to obtain a maximum return from the university's resources' (Rourke and Brooks 1966: vii).

A closer look, however, shows that these theoretical reflections were hardly an indication of a full-fledged model of organizational actorhood then in operation in the United States. On the contrary, the community character of universities was stressed in much of the academic writing of that time (Goodman 1962; Millett 1962; see also Musselin 2004a). Lazarfeld and Sieber (1964: 13) even diagnosed an 'academic power vacuum' and 'a dangerously low level of organizational development' at American universities. Also George Keller complained: 'Yet, one of the most significant developments in postwar academic life has been the progressive breakdown of governance and leadership' (Keller 1986: 27). Generally, there was a broad consensus among sociologists of that time that universities had to be seen as governed by the professoriate exercising professional control in the absence of levels of strong internal governance.¹⁰ In addition, organizational researchers in the United States characterized educational organizations as 'loosely coupled systems' (Weick 1976). In a similar vein, Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) and Cohen and March (1974) pointed to 'garbage can' decision-making processes and labeled universities 'organized anarchies'. These scholarly descriptions found their counterpart among practitioners. An allegedly powerful university president like Kerr depicted himself as a 'mediator' between different forces beyond his control (Kerr 2001: 27–9).¹¹ He went on to compare the university—which he labeled 'multiversity' in order to express what he saw as a loss of unity—to a 'pluralistic society with multiple cultures' and to the United Nations (see also Soo and Carson 2004).

To sum up, even American universities, with their stronger historical reliance on market-based mechanisms nonetheless were hardly seen as an exception to the rule that universities are unique organizations in large part because they were internally fragmented and centralized power was limited. In this, universities were said to strongly differ from the integrated and tightly coupled entities usually depicted in American organizational research, in particular in research on industrial firms (Chandler 1977; Perrow 2002). German, French, and British universities with their traditional reliance on state authority and/or academic oligarchy were even further away from a model, in which the organization is understood as an autonomous decision-maker.

10.2. THE NEW UNIVERSITY: FOUR ELEMENTS OF GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONAL ACTORHOOD

The picture painted so far might be overdrawn, and the heterogeneity *within* national systems has not been touched at all.¹² This backdrop, however, suffices to throw into relief the current, global transformation of universities. Following our analysis, four main and highly interrelated elements of the new, globalizing model of what it means to be a modern university can be distinguished. These four features document the transformation of universities into organizational actors.

10.2.1. Accountability

Accountability is the first central feature. The proliferation of quality assurance practices like evaluation (Brennan and Shah 2000; Geuna and Martin 2003) and accreditation (Schwarz and Westerheijden 2004) is the most salient indicator of the overall trend toward accountability. Transnational organizations like the OECD (1999), the World Bank (1994), the International Association of Universities¹³ or the European University Association (2004) strongly advocate the idea of quality assurance and accountability. The so-called 'Message from Salamanca', for example, signed by more than 300 representatives of European universities and university associations, stated:

Progress requires that European universities be empowered to act in line with the guiding principle of autonomy with accountability. [...] Thus, universities must be able to shape their strategies, choose their priorities in teaching and research, allocate their resources, profile their curricula and set their criteria for the acceptance of professors and students (EUA 2001: 7).

In a similar vein, the World Declaration on Higher Education insisted that:

Higher education institutions must be given autonomy to manage their internal affairs, but with this autonomy must come clear and transparent accountability to the government, parliament, students and the wider society (World Conference on Higher Education 1998, Article 13b).

The growing importance of evaluations and accreditations is accompanied by the creation of specialized organizations and associations.¹⁴ In submitting academic work to standardized techniques of counting and accounting, a broader societal trend toward what Power (1997) has called the 'audit society' seems to be reflected. In an audit society, in principle, all activities must be

subject to scrutiny if they are to be regarded as legitimate.¹⁵ Of course, from the advent of the research university, at the latest, the idea of organized skepticism and collective criticism has been at the heart of academic culture. But this is quite remote from today's 'audit university'. On the one hand, traditionally, the output of universities (i.e. knowledge and educated people) was seen as distinct from the output of other organizations, and though it could and should be subject to scrutiny, the formal measurement of knowledge and education seemed to create insurmountable problems. These problems are not solved yet, nevertheless formal measurements, e.g. based on bibliometric data, are rapidly diffusing into academia. As Weingart (2004: 119) puts it:

[O]ne can now witness internationally a dramatic shift from the well founded scepticism to an uncritical embrace of bibliometric numbers. This change of mind is not limited to policy makers and administrators but has taken hold of deans, department chairmen, university presidents and officials in funding agencies and research councils as well, i.e., of representatives of the scientific community that were most strongly opposed to external evaluation of research by any means.

On the other hand, the attribution of responsibility, which traditionally has been much more individualized, is now transformed into an organizational account. This implies that the university as an *organization* has—to use a formulation of Throw's (1996: 310)—'to explain, to justify, to answer questions' about its decisions, including its omissions and nondecisions. Blame can be attributed, and positive or negative sanctions can be enforced. In sum, outputs are seen as both measurable and as consequences of the organizational decisions of universities.

This overall trend toward organizational accountability is accompanied by three other developments, which indicate the transformation of universities into organizational actors.

10.2.2. The Definition of Goals

Universities must increasingly define their 'own' legitimate goals—as opposed to centrally imposed tasks or assigned societal functions. Nowadays one can easily get information on the 'missions' and 'visions' of higher education institutions from all over the world on their homepages. Though this mainly holds true for universities in OECD countries, one can also find sophisticated mission statements in developing countries. The web presentation of the University of Botswana, for example, can easily match with universities in European and North American countries. Even the key words used to describe

the organizational self ('center of excellence', 'national and international orientation', 'public accountability', 'quality management', 'life long learning', 'interdisciplinarity', 'focus on innovation and entrepreneurship') do not differ much from those of the most prestigious higher education institutions in the developed world.¹⁶ Many universities even place what they refer to as 'strategies' on their internet homepages, a decision which at first glance seems odd, since mission statements typically go hand in hand with references to increased global competition in higher education. Why should a university provide its competitors with documents on strategy, if they really guide the organization's decisions?

The answer to this question is twofold. In many cases, mission statements are deliberately designed in order to trigger organizational change by providing new opportunities for actors who might take such statements seriously and mobilize around them. But mission statements and 'strategies' are often also simply organizational window dressing, only loosely coupled to day-to-day decision-making. Insofar as this is the case, universities here provide an excellent example of what Meyer and Rowan (1977) have called the loose coupling between the formal structure and the activity structure of an organization, and one might also be reminded of Goffman's classical distinction between the frontstage and the backstage of an actor's behavior when reflecting upon such ostentatious display of strategies, mission statements, and the like. In the presentation of the organizational self the ingredients of such 'frontstage' statements are not randomly selected. Universities enact globally institutionalized scripts of what a higher education organization is expected to be.¹⁷

The very idea that a university is in need of a mission statement is based on generally available concepts in organizational management (here: 'management by objectives' or MBO), which aim at strengthening the link between the organization and its individual members in a way that goes far beyond traditions of professional and/or state control in higher education.

Several universities transform traditional and standard accounts of the activities that anchor the general institutional identity of a university (like 'research and teaching') into their 'own' and explicit mission. This might not add any information concerning the central activities of a particular university because conducting research and teaching is what a university is supposed to do. Nevertheless, this transformation confirms the idea that the university is an autonomous entity that deliberately chooses its own destiny and that is thus responsible for what it does. In some countries, missions statements assume additional tasks. In the United Kingdom, they serve as a benchmark for evaluation processes used to determine public funding (Mackay, Scott, and Smith 1995), and in Germany, mission statements are of major importance to

the accreditation of private universities (Wissenschaftsrat 2004). In short, mission statements may be understood as part of the overall trend toward transforming universities into accountable decision-makers.

10.2.3. The Elaboration of Formal Structures

An additional element of the new, empowered university is the ongoing elaboration, expansion, and differentiation of a fine-grained formal organizational structure, which is centered on explicit organizational goals. Historically, universities expanded in large part through processes of internal differentiation. In this, 'higher education is a differentiating society par excellence' (Clark 1997: 24). These differentiation processes, however, were mainly due to the ongoing creating of academic disciplines and sub-disciplines, especially in the nineteenth century (see Stichweh 1984; Ben-David 1991). In contrast, more recently, one can observe strong differentiation processes in formal organizational structures. A contemporary university has offices for a variety of tasks, which previously were not regarded as part of the organization's responsibility. Very much like the actorhood of the modern nation-state, which depends on a broad, yet standardized set of ministries (Meyer et al. 1997a, 1997b), the modern university is equipped with offices and organizational subdivisions for international affairs, personnel development, controlling, gender issues, organizational development, and psychological counselling.

A good example of the trend toward the differentiation of the university's formal structures is the institutionalization of technology transfer offices. Begun around 1980, the establishment of such offices has been hailed as 'a watershed in the history of technology transfer in the universities in the United States and Europe' (Gibbons et al. 1994: 87). The direct transfer of knowledge and technology between academic researchers and industry has a long history. But with the creation of transfer offices what was previously regarded as an activity of the individual researcher, carried out in addition to his or her main tasks of teaching and research, is now an institutional mission of the university itself. Informal and personal ties between academic researchers and industry are now explicitly complemented by formal, organized links, while the responsibility for technology transfer shifted from the individual to the organization.

The institutionalization of transfer offices is embedded in a broader *rationalization discourse* on how to effectively utilize scientific knowledge, which began in the 1950s. Step by step, what was seen as an unpredictable evolutionary development, became viewed as a process following rules, which

could be analyzed and actively shaped.¹⁸ Transfer offices, furthermore, are embedded in a variety of other activities that are supposed to enhance the university's agency with respect to economic activities, a development that led higher education scholars to introduce new labels like 'the entrepreneurial university' (Clark 1998) or 'the enterprise university' (Marginson and Consideine 2000). Technology transfer as an organized activity is sometimes contested on normative grounds, but the potential and actual revenues that technology transfer activities are supposed to generate for universities are usually taken for granted. Yet empirical research shows rather disenchanting results. A survey from the United Kingdom suggests that only a small number of universities are realizing considerable net income from the commercialization of intellectual property rights (Charles and Conway 2001). Despite the fact that American universities are usually seen as trendsetters in the technology transfer process, sharing their expertise with European and Asian universities through organizations like the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), links between transfer offices and university revenues in the United States are ambiguous at best (Siegel, Waldman, and Link 2003). More generally, an OECD (2002: 196) report concludes: 'It is unclear whether the returns from inventions that are licensed from the public sector justify the costs of patenting by PROs [Public Research Organizations]'.

What is clear, however, is the rise of *managerial agency* in these processes. In addition to organizational accountability, the definition of organization goals, and the creation of formal organizational structures around these goals, a fourth element of 'the university as an organizational actor' becomes obvious: the proliferation of management functions and the rise of management professionals.

10.2.4. The Rise of the Management Profession

With the development and diffusion of the management model the demands on the organization and its members increase. This tendency can be observed with regard to the academic profession: professors are nowadays more and more involved in a variety of rationalized administrative tasks beyond teaching and research, including personnel management, accounting, and quality control. More importantly, since it is assumed that only a professionalized staff will have the ability to successfully achieve stated management goals, professional management of the university is established in parallel with the formal statement of university goals. Whole new categories of professionals and related academic management positions are created. As Rhoades and Sporn (2002) have shown most convincingly for the United States, beginning

in the 1970s a whole new set of managerial professions came into being, especially in the areas of quality control, entrepreneurial activities, and students' services. Such new managerial activities are far from being 'peripheral' to the 'central' activities of teaching and research. Rather, the "periphery" has become the center' (p. 24). Notably, between the 1970s and 1990s, the number of full-time managerial professionals 'doubled' in size as the proportion of academics who are part-time double[d]' (26).

One indicator of this trend toward the professionalized management of universities is the emergence of specialized journals on higher education management like the *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *Tertiary Education and Management*, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, or *Planning for Higher Education*. Another—perhaps even more important—indicator is the establishment of academic programs and courses on higher education management.¹⁹ Currently one can apply to courses in higher education management, for example, in Pittsburgh (the United States), Bath (the United Kingdom), Speyer (Germany), Arndale (Australia), or Bangkok (Thailand).

Nevertheless, if in the United States higher education administration is an established and well-developed academic field with a large number of academic programs, as Altbach and Engberg (2000: 15) observe, the degree of management professionalization varies profoundly across national systems. Many observers point to the fact that the professional training of higher education leaders is often poor, especially in developing and transitional countries (Teferra and Altbach 2004: 31). This complaint reveals the global diffusion and taken-for-grantedness of the idea itself. While it is hardly surprising that higher education management in many countries does not meet global standards, it is striking to see that global standards are applied to universities worldwide in spite of diverging conditions and traditions.²⁰ This of course provides strong evidence for the assumption that globalized concepts of the university are advocated beyond instrumental justification.

Examples of transnational activities in the area of higher education management are manifold. In 1969, the OECD set up a Programme on International Management in Higher Education (IMHE). As early as 1964, the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP) was founded with the aim to 'support university Presidents, Rectors, Vice-Chancellors, and university leaders in general, in their strategic efforts to enhance the qualitative development of their institutions' (IAUP 2002: 4). In 1983, the Institute for University Management and Leadership (IGLU) was established in order to 'contribute to the training or professional development for university executives in Latin America and the Caribbean'.²¹ And the Association of African Universities (AAU 2003: 12) is involved with 'training in higher education leadership and management'.

These examples indicate that, obviously, chairs, courses, and journals are not enough when it comes to advising universities about how to become empowered organizations. Numerous actors like supranational organizations, state authorities, expert commissions, evaluation and accreditation agencies offer their help. Thus, every university can know how to be or how to become a modern—i.e. accountable, goal-oriented, differentiated, and professionalized—organizational actor.

10.3. WITHER NATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS?

Undoubtedly, there is tremendous organizational growth within and around universities, both through internal differentiation as well as externally through the creation of organizations that accompany universities on their way to achieving full organizational actorhood. Though most observers and actors stress the expected gains in terms of rationality, critics point to the 'personnel, time, capital and opportunity costs' (Rhoades and Sporn 2002: 26) of the new management model.²² But more generally, what consequences does the new, globalizing university model have?

Institutional patterns that diffuse globally, across national boundaries, do not lead to homogeneous outcomes.²³ The relationship between globally diffusing expectations, values, and structures on the one hand, and those expectations, values, and structures which are deeply embedded in the specific context of any national university system on the other, is a permanent source of conflicts and attracts criticism from both sides. While those opposing a global model typically criticize the imperialism of the 'sender' by invoking a distinct, worthy national heritage, those in favor criticize the resistance of the 'receiver' by emphasizing the benefits of a modern, rational university organization, which follows universal rules.

Since the diffusion of models across national boundaries is open to interpretation and deviation, the assumed 'culture clash' between global and national university models is not necessarily the end of the story. As Badie (2000) has shown in his analysis of the worldwide diffusion of the Western model of the state, the universalization of its dominant principles remains incomplete ('universalisation manquée') because of creative deviation ('déviance créatrice') on the 'receiver'-side. Given the long history of universities, which were shaped by different national systems it can be assumed that there is a lot of creative deviation in the transformation of universities into

organizational actors. Rather than the straightforward diffusion of a single model (or its rejection) we suppose that globalized features of universities as organizational actors are actively constructed in a variety of national settings, hence leading to very different realities.

In practice, adoption of a global model is more complex than a simple 'choice' between the new, global model and the former national one. Complete universalization typically fails, as elements of global and national models merge and give way to creative deviation from a given path. In this, we see a major, yet rather unexplored source of institutional innovation. Historically, the invention of the American research university is a good example (Geiger 1986). It came into being through the diffusion of the 'von Humboldt' ideal of the German university, which was the dominant global role model in the nineteenth century. This model was adapted and contextualized in a national setting, which was shaped by traditions very different from the German ones, i.e. the English college tradition and the strong American emphasis on the social embeddedness of higher education institutions. The related 'culture clash' resulted in what nowadays seems to be the dominant global role model.

But not only national contexts shape global diffusion processes. Universities are prime examples of organizations which routinely adapt to external expectations without necessarily transforming them directly into organizational change. The spread of global models of modern actorhood will certainly generate a great deal of loose coupling, ritual adaptation, and symbolic politics at the level of the individual institution. The pace and depth of organizational adaptation, however, will vary considerably. History matters, also for organizations. We assume that universities, which also in their past showed a high degree of openness toward their social environments will incorporate new institutional elements easier than those whose institutional history was mainly defined by concern with purity and a sense of elitism.²⁴ Former technical institutes and universities founded in an era of mass education, for example, will differ strongly from the proverbial 'ivory tower'. Taking the long history of universities into account as well as the specificities of particular national settings, it is obvious that enacting the common script of 'turning the university into an organizational actor' will produce very heterogeneous outcomes.

NOTES

1. With regard to expectations directed at universities as organizations it is worthwhile noting that the new management model has been heavily fueled by debates on organizations which only remotely resemble universities. Here one has to

think in particular of the debate on New Public Management (NPM), which took off in New Zealand (not a country being known for being a model country in higher education discourse either). Nowadays, in many OECD countries NPM lends the theoretical underpinnings to administrative reform. Under this label, very different organizations typically embedded in the public sector are advised to implement organizational structures and procedures, which mostly derive from business firms.

2. This term is borrowed from Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson (2000). In their instructive paper the authors describe a trend of organizational reforms in the public sector aiming at introducing properties like identity, hierarchy, and rationality. Through this, public sector organizations become more akin to the organizations traditionally described in organizational theory.
3. See, for example, Clark (1983, 1995) and Rothblatt and Wittrock (1993).
4. Kerr (2001: 115) once estimated that more than 80 percent of the organizations over 500 years old are universities.
5. The national traditions of university governance reflect underlying politics that shape more general political structures. For a typology of European politics, see Jepperson (2002b).
6. For an early account on this, see Plessner (1924: 420).
7. For a comprehensive account of the history and sociology of French universities see Musselin (2004b). Here, also more recent developments are discussed. With the introduction of contracts between the ministry and individual universities in 1989, each university 'now develops its own policy, defines its own project, with the institution's actors collectively determining its particular directions and priorities' (Musselin 2004b: 89).
8. Though Gross in 1968 lamented that: 'Universities are usually not viewed as formal organizations' (Gross 1968: 518). But see the edited volumes by Balldridge (1971) or Perkins (1973) only a few years later.
9. Clark Kerr noted: 'The managerial revolution has been going on also in the university' (Kerr 2001: 22).
10. See Parsons and Platt (1973) for the theoretically most ambitious statement on this structural feature of what they called 'the American university'.
11. A few years later Kerr complained: 'I wish I had not used the word "mediator" (Kerr 2001: 107) because the term suggested a weaker position than he had intended. Kerr's ideal university president is an active figure, an 'initiator' and a 'gladiator' but still he is far from being in control of the diverging forces that are shaping the university.
12. In a current research project on technology transfer between universities and industry funded by the German Research Council (DFG Grant KR 2001) we try to explore the idea that national university systems are composed of a variety of different university types which cross-cut national boundaries. In the United States and Germany we identified three distinct types. Preliminary results show that the variation between these types is greater than the variation between the

two national systems, hence challenging the commonly held assumption that the national context is the strongest predictor when it comes to explaining variances in technology transfer.

13. http://www.unesco.org/iaup/p_statements/af_statement.html (June 1, 2005).
14. Following Hedmo, Sahlin-Andersson, and Wedlin (2005a, 2005b) this tendency seems to be most advanced in the field of management education.
15. Power himself (1997: 98–104) uses the British Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) as an example from the field of higher education.
16. See [http://www.ub.bw/ \(May 30, 2005\)](http://www.ub.bw/ (May 30, 2005)).
17. Here one might also be reminded of Michel Foucault's analyses of the constitution of *individual* actors (see especially Foucault 1990: vol. 1). The related paradox that in becoming an actor one has to actively submit to standardizing societal forces reminds of the underlying concept of the constitution of actors—individuals, organizations, and nation-states—in neoinstitutional theory (see Meyer and Jepperson 2000). The similarities and differences between Foucauldian and neoinstitutional thinking, however, have not been much explored to date. But, for one attempt see Krücken (2002: 248–53).
18. Our own research has shown striking similarities between the United States and Germany, despite nationally specific historical traditions. See Krücken, Meier, and Müller (2005).
19. Note that there are obviously two complementary developments taking place: with the management of education comes the education of management (Moon and Woiwotka, Chapter 5). While on the one hand the sphere of higher education is increasingly filled with professional managers, these managers are increasingly educated by specialized higher education programs. In the course of advanced modernity, science, the most important rationalizing force gets rationalized itself.
20. The advocacy of global standards is not limited to the question of management training. The Task Force on Higher Education and Society, which was established by the World Bank and UNESCO, for example, states:

Traditions of governance vary from country to country and by type of institution, but the Task Force has suggested a set of basic principles that promote good governance across a wide variety of situations. Unfortunately these principles are frequently not observed, especially in developing countries, and especially where traditions of higher education are still not firmly established (Task Force 2000: 68).

For a critical stance on the imposition of globalized higher education models in newly industrializing countries and developing countries see Kemper and Jurema (2002).

21. See http://www.oui-iohe.qc.ca/lglu/en-index_centres.htm (March 31, 2005).
22. Ironically, the remedy discussed by Rhoades and Sporn (2002), i.e. encouraging universities 'to improve their accounting practices' (26) is part of the very logic that lead to the spiraling costs in higher education, and surely the formal control of control mechanisms can be subject to further control. Here, a process unfolds that can be perpetuated *ad infinitum*.

23. This expectation is consistent with much of the evidence presented in international comparisons of higher education reforms (Goedgebuure et al. 1992; Felt and Glanz 2003; Huisman and Currie 2004).

24. The 'ivory tower' image of the university strongly resembles White's concept of *arena markets*, which are defined as formalized settings with rigid external boundaries, in which the logic of purity seems to be dominant (White 1992: 51–4). The general trend of transforming universities into organizational actors competing directly with each other is a striking example of what White labels *production market*, i.e. a market structure based on mutual observation and 'the variation among producers in terms of quality' (White 1992: 43).

Globalization and Organization

World Society and Organizational Change

GILL S. DRORI, JOHN W. MEYER,
AND HOKYU HWANG

Editors

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford oxa 6dp

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States by Oxford University Press Inc, New York

© Gili S. Droni 2006

Published in the United States by Oxford University Press Inc

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn, Norfolk

ISBN 0-19-928453-9 978-019-928453-5

ISBN 0-19-928454-7 (Pbk.) 978-019-928454-2 (Pbk.)

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Foreword

The studies reported in this book reflect common efforts with a considerable history. We, and our collaborating authors, have benefited from our long-term links to the research tradition in the sociology of formal organizations, particularly at Stanford University. Much of the work reported here was done at Stanford, and by researchers in continuing communication with one another.

The roots of these efforts go back to the 1970s. At that time, research on formal organizations—which had blossomed in the previous two decades—had a distinctive cast. Organizational scholarship then focused on organizations as what organizations claim to be, namely efficient modern systems for tightly controlling and coordinating complex activities. The technical nature of the work involved naturally dictated the right ways to organize. Size and complexity of the work activity produced more organization(s), and made possible new efficiencies. As a matter of practice and policy, these accounts seemed fairly convincing.

Nevertheless, rapidly expanding traditions of theoretical and empirical work raised many questions that the organizational scholarship of the period could not ask or answer. The field of organizational scholarship identified empirical patterns that seemed anomalous in the dominant traditions. Organizations often do not control what they do very tightly; and organizations frequently make decisions that are ill informed, vague, and rhetorical, and commonly unimplemented in practice. Further, these decisions have a shadowy character, as organizations routinely copy patterns of the past or of more admired organizations. Some organizations—and even whole categories, or types, of organizations—survive for long periods of time with no evidence of efficiency or effectiveness. With these findings now revealed, too many little 'academic sins' seemed embedded in the confident rationalism of organization theory of the time.

Worse than the sins, perhaps, organization theory was uninspiring; research questions did not seem to be interesting or important. The focus on the influence of funding or size failed to lead to new propositions, and thus research was stagnating, whereas interesting phenomena visible in the rapidly expanding organizational systems of the time were not dealt with, or explained, or even noticed.

The result was an explosion of intellectual and research innovations, a good many centering on the organizations research community at Stanford