Academic Identities—Academic Challenges?

American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research

Academic Identities—Academic Challenges?
American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research

Edited by

Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Academic Identities—Academic Challenges?
American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research,
Edited by Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen

This book first published 2011

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2011 by Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3439-4, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3439-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This edited volume grew out of two meetings of the Conference on Knowledge and Politics at the University of Bergen in 2007 and 2008: The Fifth Knowpol Conference, *America – a model for Europe? Comparing Regions in the debate on higher education and research*, and the scheduled Sixth Knowpol Conference, *Elitism vs. Creativity? The political and economic construction of knowledge hierarchies in times of mass higher education.* As this also indicates, getting the book on its feet extended over a period far longer than we had initially intended. Some of the chapters included were originally given as talks while others have been added along the way. We hope the wait and effort both have been worthwhile.

We wish to express our gratitude to the members of the organising committee of the Knowpol Conference at the Department of Administration and Organization Theory and the Department of Sociology. Financial support for the conference has been granted by the two departments and the Faculty of Social Science which we also would like to thank. Most importantly we wish to thank our contributors – particularly those who submitted their drafts early and waited patiently for the book to appear. Lastly we thank the publishers at CSP.

Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen

INTRODUCTION

TOR HALVORSEN AND ATLE NYHAGEN

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century the statement that universities are organisations in transition has become commonplace. Still an intense debate about how profound these changes are and to what kind of university they will lead to has been going on for the last two decades, in particular relating to changes in Europe (Neave, Blückert and Nybom 2006; Massen and Olsen 2007; Michelsen 2010). Looking back to the start of the 19th century universities were few in number and small in size, yet the pride of the nation states of Europe and the few selected given the chance to attain a degree. Today they are many in number, hosting more than half of the young population, and therefore also increasingly questioned in terms of its functions and organisation.

As a central institution of society, universities in Europe have been met with greater expectations and new demands challenging established identities and relations to other institutions. The former sense of pride and dignity has been exchanged with a deep sense of crisis as new actors have entered the field of higher education and research policy. Portrayed as lacking the quality needed to support an advanced knowledge economy, universities are only at the threshold of things to come in terms of necessary changes. International organisations, think tanks, consultancies and a host of other actors penetrating the sector from the outside as well as the inside share this agenda of extensive reform. According to Massen and Musselin core activities and central conditions of the universities of Europe are now being altered, including governance structures, funding sources, the organisation of primary processes, such as the teaching-research nexus, and the general political, economic and social conditions under which universities operate (Massen and Musselin 2009: 3)

Many changes are of course already in place and visible at the levels of institutions, nation-states, regions and even globally and the way these levels are inter-related in new ways. It does not seem an exaggeration to state that in a fairly short time the self image of the university in Europe – although a heterogeneous and incoherent image – has changed in important ways, a trend perhaps most readily recognized at the level of university

leadership. Increasingly we can observe that Rector's talk about links between knowledge, nation and culture is being replaced with the rhetoric of strategic management in search of excellence for the sake of competition. In contrast to being embedded within a national culture and the boundaries of the nation state, this kind of rhetoric builds on a vision of universities operating as nodes in cross border international networks competing with other networks for resources and reputation, influence and power. It presupposes a new division of labour where the national system character of higher education institutions is replaced by a new landscape of deregulated organisations fighting for resources from their states (which in Europe is still most commonly the owner) as well as from other funding sources now regarded as even more important, whether public, private, national or international.

The traditional role of the government for the planning of a higher education system and its research is presently challenged and reshaped by a new governance of the actors in the field of knowledge. Increased emphasis on internationalisation and globalisation demands new modes of coordination. This is where governance tools, such as ratings, rankings, benchmarking and citation–indexes, once created for inter academic communication (Fuller 1997: 71), enter the picture. Evolving out of an international discourse of necessary university reforms these are among the tools set out to deconstruct the traditional "national systems" of interlinked and cooperating institutions and reconstruct these into a new competitive field between strategic actors whose success depends on each actor's ability to gain access to resources. Government use of public resources still remain crucial, but more in terms of an adding on or a reward for successful project acquisition. The public debate about knowledge priorities is thus undermined as academic leadership is transformed into a matter of money chasing.

The success of a research university and its position in a network of universities developing a common competitive strategy is measured by the values of the knowledge based economy. The European area of higher education (EAHE) has for long been in the making and together with the European Research Area (ERA) it is part of the European Commission's strategy of improving Europe as a knowledge-based economy (KBE). Important parts of the discussions about the creation of a European Higher Education Area were inspired by the development of higher education and research in the United States, sometimes simply referred to as the "US model". The American system – the high quality of the US research universities, the diversity of institutions and their unique ability to set the

research agenda globally – has been held forth and is still used as an exemplary model for Europe to learn from, perhaps even to copy.

This understanding of the US as a model for reforms in Europe – at country level - has also in many ways reinforced the self understanding of the US community. Arthur M. Cohen , in his book "*The Shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*" provides a compelling example of this:

> "One clue to the viability of the system is afforded by the way it appears to the rest of the world. European influence on American higher education came in two stages. First was the college form, especially the curriculum and the residential pattern, imported from England. Subsequently, the German model of research, academic freedom, and public service was appended. But all that happened over one hundred years ago. Now, the Europeans look to the United States as a point of reference for reforming their higher education. They admire the American system's ability to charge tuition as it opens access to all education seekers and its ability to combine research and service, academic and vocational curriculum, and graduate and undergraduate studies, all within the same set of institutions. The diversity of forms and the students´ ability to transfer among them seems desirable, along with the capacity to modify structures and reassign responsibilities with minimal restraint from civil service bureaucracies. The Europeans know that their future has to include many aspects of America's complex, highly successful system" (Cohen 1998: 440).

The acclaimed superiority of American universities has, for example, stimulated a debate in Europe on competition and concentration of resources as means to upgrade universities at the top-end, thus creating an elite-group of European research universities similar to the American Ivy-League system. From other perspectives though, USA is held up as a contrast to how Europe ought to develop in the future. Europe's history of social recruitment, emphasis on popular enlightenment, regional commitments of higher education institutions and varieties of national priorities, or generally a combination of scale and scope potentially integrating large parts of the population in the process of knowledge development and dissemination are presented as assets and not obstacles. This perspective has perhaps been further strengthened by reference to the demands posed by the emerging knowledge society and the needs of an innovative economy. The European tradition with an emphasis on "knowledge distribution" might in other words be seen as a competitive advantage and not (only) a liability.

The European references to the US institutions can also be compared to the reforms and debates that have occurred within the US. In the last

decade several reform-proposals appear to have been questioning some of the merits and qualities that Europe actually has held forth as recipes for change. This was among others evidenced, for example in the US Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings Commission Report, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* (2006), and the debate spurred by this report. A contested issue was whether the report in its calls for reform brought forward a false sense of crisis. The following debate indicated consensus on the need for change, but somewhat paradoxically the critical issues identified in the report, such as affordability, access and accountability are to a certain extent parallel to what has usually been regarded as strengths of European experiences and educational traditions.

The new goals for the university sector are strongly expressed by international and supra-national organisations chief among them the European Union and, in particular, the European Commission. A dominating trend in the policy texts of the Commission is the notion of knowledge production and strategic research management (Keeling 2006) within the framework of competition. When research universities are told to be more useful in terms of economic and social development better management with power to make strategic choices becomes important. Creating a competitive framework for knowledge production depends on such management. Such a framework will eventually lead to a hierarchy where the best will set the standard for the rest. It will also lead to increased differentiation, not only vertically (between the best and the rest), but also horizontally between good and bad faculties within universities as well as to specialisation.

Liberal ideas about the "competitive state" are the source from which these EU-policies emanate. The role of the "state" (in this case the political centre and its elites) is to provide infrastructure for economic growth. For the European Commission the tool is the Knowledge Based Economy (KBE). This economy is best served by research universities that compete within EU and beyond on a market regulated by the same values that once created the US model for excellence, the winners of all ratings and rankings. The sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit reference to the US model justifies the transformation of the EU national systems as well as the competitive strategy for the EU research universities. Republican references to the common good are substituted by the liberal idea of the values of the aggregate effect of organisational competition. Also in the area of higher education and research a nation state republican tradition is exchanged with the EU liberalism of deregulation (Scharpf 2009). By copying (and thus competing) with the US universities, the hope

is that Europe will succeed in comparison both to the upcoming east and the model ideal of the west. But this needed change presupposes the delinking of the university sector from the frame of the nation states. The "open method of coordination" as a particular way of promoting the liberal competitive approach by help of a number of governance mechanisms of deregulation seems to be a successful way of creating a common European area of higher education. As an aggregate effect of this competition a shift of identity, legitimacy and legality to the EU and its knowledge based economy (KBE) follows (Jessop 2008 et al.).

In this book we are presenting a number of contributions which critically reflect on the value of the US model for Europe, as well as on the ideas about knowledge development through the new governance of a field of competition, the new emphasis on the KBE at the cost of democratic values and possible dysfunctional consequences of the kind of differentiation within higher education that follow from this. The different articles are not unanimous in their interpretation of the role of the US or the value of modelling. Perhaps how we view "the model" reflects some of our presuppositions about the model country as Claus Offe's book called "Reflections on America" shows (Offe 2005). The book itself is about how Toqueville, Weber, and Adorno experienced the new world of America and their reflections thereupon, but Offe makes this topic relevant for ways of comparing even today, as many comparisons of "knowledge systems" across the Atlantic are prone to rather uncritical ways of comparing. To understand these men's complex reaction to this state-less "land of action", Offe developed a simple model with four possible answers to the question of how Europe and the United States relate to each other. These answers, popular on both sides of the Atlantic in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, involves two incompatible models of the US as either:

> (A) an *advance guard* whose explorations allow Europeans to gaze into their own future

or

> (B) a *latecomer society*, a kind of immature Europe, standing at a stage of development that Europe has already passed.

To these hypothesises Offe attaches either a positive (1) or a negative interpretation (2). The positive interpretation of the two would be:

> A1: that the U.S. has a technological, democratic etc. origin that we European just have to reproduce

> B1: that the U.S. still has the ability to make use of energies and resources already exhausted in Europe.

The negative interpretations Offe characterises as:

> A2: That the development in the U.S. has gone so far that not only do we gaze into a (negative) future, we see into an abyss.
> B2: That U.S. is stuck at the developmental stage of raw, unbridled, uncivilized and destructive infantilism, which Europeans have overcome and sublimated in the form of civilization.

Much more could be said about these dichotomies and attitudes. For us they are a reminder that there are important general presuppositions at work when we compare Europe and the US, also influencing our understanding of the knowledge societies. Particularly in the debate about the role of the two regions in the process of globalisation it is necessary to try to make these explicit.

The "general education" tradition, as well as the Humboldt characteristics of the elite universities may be seen as values Europe should reproduce. The inequalities that this system reproduces, the social power of knowledge linked to these, are by others seen as a "negative future" the new "competitive Europe" might be driving us towards. For the late Martin Trow, leading scholar in higher education studies, there was however no doubt as to where to place oneself in Claus Offe's model. When comparing the two continents in, "*From mass higher education to universal access: The American advantage*" (Trow 2001), he argued strongly for the advantages of the American system:

> "European systems are moving towards American models: not because the United States is rich and a superpower, or because of the power of American popular culture – elements in the Americanization of so many other institutions in other countries. It is because American higher education as a system is simply better adapted, normatively and structurally, to the requirements of a "post-industrial age", which puts a great premium on the creation and wide distribution of knowledge and skill, and is marked by such rapid social and technological change that decision-makers in all countries begin to see (or at least believe in) the necessity of broader access to postsecondary education" (Trow 2001: 122).

The "American advantage" which Europe has to catch up with, is the already fully adjusted system to the mass- or even – universal higher education demands. Not only the celebrated research university, but the

mix of actors within the whole system made it better, and a model Europe ought to copy in time.

Examples of hypothesis B, linked to a negative interpretation, are often to be found in a combined critique of the US global influence with its religious missions. As the Australian political scientist Michael McKinley (1996) put it, knowing America becomes an attempt to understand how America understands the world, which again leads to questions such as: How is American knowledge produced, what does this knowledge tell Americans about the world? And what is this knowledge telling the people of the US about the world outside. Or generally: how does the US make the world an object for knowledge? A main worry underpinning such questions is the idea that the US is "a religion –mad country", as Harold Bloom once put it. Primarily protestant the religious element is perhaps the most stable element of the US culture over the years. This dimension is also penetrating the universities, and how they relate to the government and intermingle with think-tanks such as Rand, The Hudson Institute, The Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise, the Centre for Strategic and International studies and the Institute for Contemporary studies. Could one not argue that the best among the best is a proof of Gods way of choosing the best?

While parts of the EU bureaucracy perhaps would feel at home with this type of power concentration, a general feeling in Europe, particularly at the universities would be that we long ago have left behind religion as the guiding force, for the sake of enlightenment. After all, that is the precondition for academic autonomy and the identity of the professoriate. And, as asked; is it not this religious undercurrent which justifies US knowledge as global domination? Does not the US need to transform, at least if it is to be a model for a more modern and advanced culture like Europe?

Claus Offe's model reminds us of the importance to try to bring to the forefront the hidden and general presuppositions underpinning and steering our comparisons. This will also clarify our purposes for comparing, whether it is for understanding or for politics. Our modest hope is that this book may represent one among several contributions to the ongoing debate about Cross–Atlantic comparisons, based on broad historical-sociological understanding of how institutions on the two continents are shaped and why.

On the contributions

The idea behind the argument of shaping the higher education and research landscape according to a strict competition between institutions is that it will create a more diversified system in Europe, thus bringing it closer to the model of the US. If this will generate more elite institutions or even change the university rankings in Europe's favour is not easily answered. In the first chapter, David Hollinger presents a fair warning to the promoters of the idea of competition between university organisations as the salvation to European mediocrity. Not only is the celebrated elite university in the US under strong internal criticism from numerous actors within society, a criticism many of its European proponents tend to ignore, but it is also struggling to protect one of the central characteristics of the academic community, its academic freedom. Competition between organisations (and not as "academic competition" as Barry Barnes (1985) describes it) promotes greater cleavages between academic fields and disciplines, open up for external interventions due to funding dependencies, and promotes a carrier system where universities have to adjust to the values of the overall labour market.

These values are inclined to reward strategic market positions, rather than academic abilities. As wage differences, due to deregulation, also can be detected in Europe, the same references to the "market values" as in the US can be detected. The reaction of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the historical guardian of "academic freedom", may be typical for a profession being threatened. The professor's reaction to threats of degradation by the new strength of the competitive oriented university management seems to be to act more like a white collar social collective on the one hand, and on the other to adjust more on an individual basis to the demands of labour market and to university leadership. Both reactions seem to weaken the overall role of the university as a place for academics of all kinds 'seeking shelter' for their research. What is particularly worrying for professor Hollinger is the downgrading of the humanities and the social sciences, also in the eye of the public. The lack of respect for these disciplines, in contrast to the 1960s when the university of the US was the most valued institution (as both Bell and Parsons writings bear witness to), makes Hollinger end his chapter on a rather pessimistic tone: "Perhaps the whole problem of the autonomy of universities will disappear, because there will be nothing to be autonomous about".

In chapter two, Richard Münch, focuses on the present reconstruction of the academic world. The rhetoric of competition both serves to

legitimate far reaching and dramatic consequences concerning how and for whom knowledge is created, as well as hiding from view possible negative consequences of the new logic of academic capitalism for the German society. A central aspect of the new rhetoric of competition is that the university organisations as strategic actors will generate a knowledge society of higher quality than before. Contrary to this Münch argues that the knowledge created becomes less varied, less creative, less critical and of value only to a shrinking number of citizens. In the chapter Münch offers a critical comment concerning the consequences of the German 'excellence initiative'. He views this initiative as shaped by global pressures towards transforming the research university into autonomous actors in line with neoliberal ideas about deregulation/regulation. In the new rhetoric, a certified kind of excellence - a state authorisation - is given to those universities who through competition emerge as the best. However, as shown by Münch, both the kind of competition that actually takes place, as well as what is considered "best" violates the criteria both of fair competition and of what is considered good knowledge. It is the distorted economy of attention which is driving the process. A German society with a broad knowledge base and high quality knowledge in most parts of the country is scarified for the sake of a few shining "stars" who can potentially be ranked among the top universities.

Again it is the top universities in the US (according to rankings) which justifies the need for "global adjustment". But as Münch show, it is hard to know what dimensions of the US University that are idealised, apart from the rather abstract idea that competition in the US has created a growing concentration of economic and symbolic capital in a few universities, thus also created the global winners. The "tools" for the promotion of such a process in Germany (and Europe) may have some resemblance with the policy in the US, but there are important differences. The discussion of the three pillars of the "functional rhetoric" legitimating the road to a competitive academic capitalism, argues that it is the "struggle for attention" as organisations, not as promoters of academic competition for the best knowledge, as this knowledge evolves over time, which is the prime mover of the dramatic reforms.

The paradigm of differentiation, the entrepreneurial university, the international competition for innovation; these three clusters of functional arguments for competition, seek their legitimacy from the US model, but at the same time hides from view the interests and powers in Europe that drives this process. How social forces promotes a stronger hierarchy, the internal "differentiation" leading for example to less resources to the social sciences and the humanities, or rewards the entrepreneurial university,

which is feeding on a privatisation of knowledge and the use of public money for private gain, is hidden by the naturalisation of the US model. The transformation of influence from the academic community to the "entrepreneurs" as Hollinger discusses in chapter 1 thus does not figure in any comparison legitimating present reforms. Perhaps what is going on in Germany is an example of how bits and pieces of the US model justify changes that hardly adds up to copying the American model. Universities of excellence, inspired by the US research university, are chosen not according to knowledge criteria, but according to the oligopolistic networks of domination within the field of knowledge (Münch 2007). This system of oligopolistic selection, rather than promote the US research model, seems to have some unintended consequences. While in the US the professor and those aspiring to become professor actually do research – and are valued for doing so, and supported by its administrations, in Germany they are split between professors chasing funding and his / her assistants (many without any career possibilities) putting bits and pieces of the research together.

Mary Henkel, in chapter three, discusses how academic identities in the UK – with its distinct characteristics established over a long historical period – has been transformed during the last few decades by neo-liberal reforms as they evolved out of the regime changes of the 1970s and onwards. Showing how inspiration from the US, but also from EU in unexpected and new combinations gives momentum to the new policies for higher education and research, she argues that "the context in which academic professions and institutional identities are constructed in the UK has changed fundamentally in the last thirty years". The neoliberal policy pushing these changes is characterised by strong(er) political centralisation seeking both to promote more competition and regulation of this competition. As indicated also in chapter 2, Mary Henkel argues that these new identities are marked by a shift of power between government and universities. This shift, however, seems to be accepted, leading to an active redefinition of the academic roles and identities in Great Britain, at least at the collective leadership level. The Vice Chancellors and Principals bodies seem to have largely assimilated the externally defined policies. This raises the question, given the model of reforms in England (as argued for example by Meny 2008), how such changes of identity will spread to other parts of Europe?

Chapter 4 makes a turn from USA, England and Germany to Norway. Ragnvald Kalleberg's focus is on the cultural and democratic tasks of the universities. In a combination of analytical discussions, proposals for change and suggestions for theoretical reinterpretations of both Humboldt

and Merton, the USA and its universities (particularly the liberal art tradition of cross-disciplinary education) are presented as an inspiration. This inspiration is used as a critique of the Bologna process and the undergraduate reform which is leading away from the 4 year US college tradition. Most of the comparisons with higher education and research located in US has had the purpose of showing "what works better"; what to strive for when we, the Europeans, need to reform our own system. Over the last ten years, in the debate in Europe, it has been hard to find an article not mentioning the US as a model of some sort. It is argued, for the sake of reform motivation, that the US has better motivated students, better finances, better management and better quality assurance. Many voices also indicated that the whole Bologna process and the way it has been implemented in the reforms of our own university, would lead to a quality reduction. More students, but less time and money and a specialisation taking place too early compared to the first 4 years of the US with its ideas of "broad education". The Bologna process would undoubtedly have as an effect the opposite of its founding purpose; it would lead to brain drain - mostly to the more successful and quality oriented US universities.[1]

By building on the US experience, a rebirth of the Humboldt tradition, as reinterpreted by Kalleberg, might be possible. And while both Germany and England are concerned about the "death of Humboldt" (Lieb 2009), Kalleberg finds in Norway a reviving interest for Humboldt ideas. While the reforms at the beginning of this century were marked by the deregulation of the university sector in line with the developments in England as discussed in the chapter of Mary Henkel (a reform also know as Norwegian Quality reform), a later White Paper (2008)[2] represented a return to a focus on democratic values. Kalleberg discusses this inspiring shift in the public debate in Norway. And he links it to a long tradition of the university professor of also being active public intellectuals, thus more than in most European countries part of a public debate. But he also shows how it is marked by shortcomings. The present debate about culture and democracy, and the role of universities for *Bildung* has been rather weak also in Norway. It has not penetrated the educational system or the academic discourse, and as to what it should mean for curriculum, education as well as for students and professors the Norwegian practises and debates have not been very clear. Kalleberg offers constructive ideas as to how to move this debate further, and also suggest what changes should be pursued. The role model from USA is again referred to.

In the next chapter we turn to the topic of internationalisation of higher education and research. In chapter five, Halvorsen and Münch,

differentiate between two modes of internationalisation in higher education and research. These modes are termed old and new internationalisation respectively. The old mode is a matter of scholars and students crossing national borders so as to advance learning, research and knowledge as a collective endeavour. The new mode is a matter of universities conceived of as enterprises, which engage strategically in international alliances as a private asset for attaining a dominant position in the global academic field. What they argue is that a set of changes contribute to the increasing superimposition of the old mode of internationalisation with the new one. Amongst these are the OECD agenda of employment and growth in the knowledge-based economy and the Lisbon strategy of the European Union. In the wake of this agenda the nation states of Europe are expected to enhance the international competitiveness of higher education and research. Here the Bologna process of creating a European space of higher education may be seen as a tool to lean on to make this shift effective. But these developments are of a global kind as well. From the viewpoint of the global movement of New Public Management and international rankings, strategically internationalising universities are identified as key actors for enhancing the competitive strength of nation states. According to Halvorsen and Münch along with international rankings the differentiation of centre and periphery and the stratification of the academic field are being accentuated as part of this process. The transnational integration of top ranking universities is being accompanied by national disintegration and growing inequality in higher education and research. In their chapter changes in higher education and research policy in Germany and Norway are analysed. Recent reforms in both countries tend toward replacing the old mode of internationalisation with the new mode. Their conclusion is that this leads to increased stratification of the university systems in two countries which traditionally has been seen as representing less stratified systems.

In chapter six, Dieter Plehwe turns to a discussion of a transatlantic topic, the role of private partisan think tanks. As a phenomenon of growing importance in both Europe and North America, a think tank focus also provide new insights into processes linking European and American knowledge spaces in terms of mutual and continuous knowledge influence. The early influence of European scholars on the flora of neoliberal think tanks in the US, for example, shows that simple ideas about the spread of think tanks as "Americanisation" does not hold (Mirowski and Plehwe 2009). As part of the increasing privatization and commercialisation of academic research and education witnessed during the last decades, private partisan think tanks nowadays present a challenge to traditional centres of

academic research across disciplines, but most importantly in the sphere of social scientific policy research. Think tanks include a wide range of public or private organisations that do not only and not even primarily serve academic purposes, and yet are capable of generating highly competitive contributions to both intellectual and political processes. With an eye to influential partisan think tanks in politics and academia, Plehwe convincingly argues that relevance is a more important category than excellence in understanding the transformation of social sciences and knowledge power structures past and present.

According to Plehwe the think tank challenge confronts social science and policy analysis in a number of ways. Firstly, think tanks can be seen as a challenge to basic presuppositions within the social sciences about societal differentiation. Think tanks seem to advocate and demonstrate – through their practice – a dedifferentiation of society: Politics, knowledge and economics, or knowledge economy and society, are conflated within a society "pushed" by think tanks. With the number of think tanks estimated at about 6000, the pressure exerted by think tanks is additionally gaining weight in many policy fields and issue areas. Secondly, think tanks challenge dearly held images of social sciences as autonomous academic disciplines. Academic social science is both outcompeted by and increasingly under pressure to adjust to think tank knowledge since the universal values the academic institutions build on, which presupposes institutional differentiation (as discussed by Kalleberg in chapter 4) are no longer valid. Thirdly, according to Plehwe, ultimately it is not academic excellence that is driving knowledge developments, despite all the excellence rhetoric (see Münch in chapter 2). While good craftsmanship certainly is an important criteria in academic competition no doubt, the questions asked and the fields researched are by no means matter to internal selection processes only. Think tanks represent an effective answer to relevance claims and demands (for just in time social science solutions to present problems). In the last decades arguments raised about new relations between knowledge and society (particularly in relation to science and engineering) the way has been paved for the domination of relevance, as practiced by think tanks, at the cost of publicly created knowledge within universities. Last but not least, the challenge to be faced by social sciences implies the need to take the think tank phenomenon seriously as a research issue of great importance – both to understand the new role and character of think tank knowledge and to understand the influence of the social phenomenon "think tanks" in its global reach. Plehwe's contribution is an invitation to common research efforts in such a direction and represents a programme to guide future research in this area.

In chapter seven Diane Stone presents a complex case of a university establishment in Europe, the Central European University. The setting is again, as with Plehwe`s chapter, links between US and Europe, but this time illustrated by how philanthropy works, represented by the empire of the billionaire George Soros, in particular his Open Society Institute and Soros Foundation Network. A remarkable story is told about how a hybrid institution is created as a meeting place between donor interests, academic values and regional actor's commitments to change. Within this university, it is particularly the story of the establishment of the new master study in Public Policy that is depicted. Based on analytical ideas about processes of soft policy transfer, the hybrid character of the university and the discipline is seen to emerge as a result of a complex interplay between politics and knowledge at many levels. Global actors like World Bank and UNDP as well as local professorial work roles influence the organisational outcome. Avoiding simple explanations that tries to deduct organisational form and content from the character of the philanthropist or even his or her foundations, Stone highlight the complexity of how the new university (and later) one of its much debated disciplines came about. Although the Central European University is an American university, numerous influences, for example the role of EU through Erasmus Mundus and its linked Bologna standards, as well as European university and disciplinary networks, "dilutes" this image as set by the philanthropic donor. The complex interactions as analysed by Diane Stone are few and far between. The value of such a case study show itself first of all in its illustration of how the shaping of a new kind of organisation depends on the logic of "governmentalite", the partnership between numerous kinds of actors, from governments to civil society, and how this partnership is shaped by the ongoing discourse about "good practice" and by the soft policy transfer processes.

In Voldemar Tomusk's chapter the level of analysis is Europe in the widest meaning of the word. The Bologna process, which now is supported by 46 countries have over time developed and in many respects become a process driven by EU, or more particularly the European Commission. To Tomusk, this is both an ironic and a paradoxical situation, made possible by a well-organised propaganda machinery systematically misleading the European public to believe that the Bologna process is a success. Through numerous documents, backed by the moral appeal of the EU leadership, the impression of continuous and growing success of the different Bologna activities is created. Through his analysis of texts and activities, Tomusk show that this is far from the case. Tomusk observes how the different rhetorical, but academically well legitimised, policy

documents escalate the cleavages between the EU and non EU member countries of the Bologna process as it has been expanding its membership eastwards. As the "single largest donor of the process", EU, sees that the value of Bologna, its ability to promote the educational "brand Europe" to both keep and attract the good students, is made difficult by a new plurality of "branding interests". An illustration of the limits to rhetorical image building of escalating progress, among other things due to the new expansion, is identified through reactions, even protests against the attempt to build a dominating EU ranking methodology. The political sensitive question of how such a ranking also directs the flows of resources, for example the resources of the student market, is not easily hidden in the rhetorical optimism of the Bologna documents. How Bologna hides a variety of interests and cultural links to the rest of the world is also suppressed by such a process. The Bologna process that to EU is counted as such a success, and an important tool for the creation of European Area of Higher Education, may thus be detrimental to the continuation of the Bologna process itself given its present membership based on the cultural community of Europe?

In his chapter, Tomusk refers to the Erasmus Mundus programme of EU as a way of capitalizing on the Bologna image. The next chapter by Roser Cussó discusses more explicitly the US inspiration to this programme. She argues that the EC (European Commission) is not using the US University as an exemplary reference, but as a means to introduce policy and social change. Although emphasis is put on attracting "top level" foreign students, as the US universities are said to do, other learning effects for the European universities are of more importance in the long run from this programme. Cussó highlights how Erasmus Mundus train state funded universities to compete for European public funds, and, as discussed in previous chapters, in particular by Münch, how to base competition on "institutional behaviour" rather than on academic criteria. This competition, based on EC (European Commission) recommendation and Erasmus Mundus practices, are in the daily EC speak regarded as learning from the US and "best practices", despite the fact that the US kind of competition "does not compare". Rather this reference to the US serves to avoid overtly political debate. Erasmus Mundus contributes - by process of learning new practises - to accelerate the transition from "social democratic" to "social-liberal" policies. What has been a highly valued trait of the European higher education system now stand out as a drawback preventing this transition to come through smoothly and quickly: What used to be (and to many still is) a European context of "rigidity", egalitarianism, "isolation", as the Commission formulates it, are only

problems calling for profound change due to a stereotyped comparison with the US. Comparisons can be made for several reasons, but no matter what the purpose is, it is seldom neutral. When reference is made to the American system it is often only parts of the system which is highlighted.

During the 1990s international organisations like OECD and UNESCO in various ways started to promote concepts like the knowledge society and the knowledge economy highlighting new demands and challenges of and for higher education throughout the world – the latter becoming something of a buzzword for new policies aimed at transforming the university sector. For OECD an agenda for university reform has been a particular concern since the late 1990s linked to the concept of a 'new economy' (Godin 2004) and this particular organisation has become a very influential actor promoting and initiating country-specific university reforms as well as acting as one of many key 'globalising agencies' promoting "recipes" for the transformation of universities in terms of better management and strategic choices (Henry et al. 2001).

In their chapter, Susan Wright and Jakob Ørbeck, analyse the international context of a country-specific reform, the Danish university reform. Their focus is on OECD and how this organisation has adopted a specific style of framing moving university reform in Europe towards an increasing departure from the classical liberal university model, or the Humboldt model, towards a market-driven model. Replacing the traditional model of collegiate rule and the role of central government planning the new university policy promoted by OECD is aimed at making universities autonomous and more accountable moving the university closer to the world of corporate management. Still only implemented in a few countries this process has taken a firm hold in Denmark, and as the authors argue with important consequences for the identity of the actors within the sector. Their case-study reveals how the new Danish University Law of 2003 could be traced back to the work of the OECD and the new agenda for university reform. Their analysis confirms findings about how national governments have used international organisations as a way of gaining control over the domestic reform agenda (Martens and Wolf 2009) as well as adding how radical reforms elements are introduced by reference to old elements, thus appeasing resistance to reforms and giving the reforms further momentum. This particular way of introducing reform is analysed as a political strategy and it is analysed both over time and at different levels. Central to their argument is the employment of the concept borrowed from the cultural theorist, Stuart Hall, that of a 'double shuffle'. Originally coined as a term describing the political strategy of New Labour, moving to a market state via subordinated social democracy,

Wright and Ørbeck uses this as a frame for analysing the double shuffle played by the OECD in terms of discourse, but also how the double shuffle of university reform in Denmark and elsewhere also takes place in terms of policy, symbols and material or technological processes as well. They show how this double shuffle is played out on the level of university leadership, through the example of the rector of Copenhagen University, and his campaign for a new excellence programme. Their chapter thus adds new insights to the work on OECD and the influence this organisation has gained in education policy in general. In addition to influence through comparative statistics and the promotion of international benchmarks and good practices (Cusso and D'Amico 2005; Martens 2007), OECD is employing soft governance or OMC as a means of enabling policy convergence to their proposals. As analysed in this chapter, OECD through their policy framings using a specific mode of description, here called the double shuffle, also pushes the OECD agenda for reform forward.

Gry Brandser's chapter offers an historical-genealogical account of the German influence on the emerging US research university, or more precisely, the reception and subsequent transformation of German academic ideas in the American setting. The purpose is to illustrate the shifting relations between Europe and the US. While the German University before the first world war, due to huge numbers of US academics being educated in Germany, exercised great influence on a number of colleges and universities and affected the public debate on the role of scientific knowledge for societal development, this changed dramatically during and between the two world wars. An effort is made to trace some of the transformations that eventually came to determine which interpretation of Humboldt and the German university more generally that was to be accepted as the most viable or "true" in America. To capture these changes Brandser focuses particularly on the widely read and much debated "Harvard Report on General Education" from the crucial year 1945. The report is read as the culmination of a series of encounters within American higher education between German and Anglo-Saxon traditions. The report transformed previous academic traditions, as these can be seen as emerging from confrontations between the Anglo–Saxon university tradition of academic socialisation to leadership (the gentleman's ideal) and the Humboldt (idealist) ideas of individual cultivation of cognitive and creative capabilities through "science". The outcome of the Harvard report is a "third way", but also a compromise with the needs of the American society to reconcile its (Puritan) Christian cultural heritage with a modern culture of competence-based education. The Kant–Humboldt split between

both knowledge and belief and science for the sake of science and science as tool for society, are through the Harvard Report, reunited due to how faculties are organised, and education composed at different levels. A new meritocratic - and democratic - "gentleman's ideal" emerged, creating great success for the university giving its name to the report. Harvard prospered, and became the leading model, but not without new kinds of cleavages emerging within society. Brandser brings us back to the present debate in Europe, the transformations linked to Bologna, the EU push for more coordinated research and the idea that Europe can become a common "knowledge area" despite the different traditions of for example Great Britain and Germany. Reforms in Europe refer to the US as a model, but if we copy the US, what are we then bringing "back" to Europe? Are we accepting the American interpretation of the Humboldt legacy as the truth about our reality and thus losing out on valuable European insights and different experiences with the educational ideal of *Bildung*? Or does "copying" involve an even stronger emphasis on specialization and disciplinary research that the Americans found most problematic about the German universities as it undermined universities obligation to foster enlightened citizens with a shared sense of values? And is it possible to move beyond both by entering into new and rejuvenating dialogues with tradition and thus find elements that unite the Anglo-Saxon and German traditions in new and unforeseen ways?

In their chapter, Nyhagen and Halvorsen, analyse the decision to add a global dimension to the Bologna process. This effort to internationalise the European Higher Education Area was called forth by voices calling for a more competitive Europe as well as voices arguing for cooperation extended to the global level. The Bologna Global Strategy could then both be seen as a response to the dominating trend of globalisation of higher education as well as an effort to set the agenda for further globalisation process placing more emphasis on values contrary to continued competition and marketisation – such as solidarity and justice. Focusing on the agenda-setting phase and the decision-making process, Nyhagen and Halvorsen, show how this led to the development of a strategy with an ambiguous content reflecting the views of different actors and stakeholder groups involved in the Bologna process. The question of Europe taking global responsibility for developing alternatives to imperatives of competition is justified in the development of Bolognas own imperative of cooperation. Actual developments however show that this is far from the case and that this seems to be more rhetoric than an actual reflection of the internationalisation strategies in place in member countries. Reminiscent of the debate of Social Europe vs. Competitive Europe the authors offers

an analysis of the process that highlights the dynamic and evolving character of the strategy process where competition and cooperation alternate on taking the lead role in defining the strategy of Bologna global.

In Svein Michelsen's chapter about Quality Assurance and Accrediation, he shows how this kind of regulation transformed and became integrated in the governance of the Norwegian Higher Education system. However, as he explicates in a detailed analysis of two cases, not in a straightforward way as is often implied in the "multilevel" and organisational studies of globally promoted regulation systems. In the complex interrelation between a global distrustful movement for more regulation of higher education supply and demand on the one side, and the implementation of such a system of regulation in a culture of trust – where quality control has been part of the academic culture – on the other, Michelsen is able to show that local and national values still matter. Due to the eagerness to please Bologna and EU initiatives which could be said to be rather typical for Norway, the government and academic policy makers quickly adjusted to the new QA demands. But as Michelsen maintains, this happened in a manner that reproduced important elements of the Norwegian trust culture. Thus Norway might be posited as a divergent or special case where the academic community has retained or regained control at the academic shop floor. The variation between the two cases, the University of Oslo and the University of Bergen respectively, indicates, however, that the impact of ideas about the need for external control, the value of semi - independent and "europeised" organisations as tools for taking the quality control out of the hands of the academic community may have very different consequences. In the long run these may lead to adjustments that will undermine trust and promote the new level of bureaucratic control of the higher education sector in Norway as well, if power at the university level is shifted to the new managerial ideals prevalent in HE discourse today and strongly promoted by EU.

References

Amaral, A., Neave, G., Musselin, C. and Maassen, P. (eds) (2009), *European integration and the governance of higher education and research*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Barnes, Barry (1985), *About Science*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Cohen, Arthur M. (1998), *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass., Publishers.

Cusso, R. and D'Amico, S. (2005) "From development comparatism to globalization comparativism: towards more normative international education statistics", *Comparative Education*, 41: 2, 199 – 216.

Elster, Kristian (1999), "Visdommen er i USA", *Morgenbladet* 19. mars 1999.

Fuller, Steve (1997), *Science*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Føllesdal, Andreas (2004), "Kampen om kloke hoder", Kronikk, *Dagbladet* 21. juli 2004.

Jessop, Bob, Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak (eds), (2008), *Education and the Knowledge-Based Economy in Europe*, Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.

Neave, G. Blückert, K. and Nybom, T. (eds) (2006), *The European research university. An historical parenthesis?*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Godin, Benoit (2004), The New Economy: what the concept owes to the OECD, *Research Policy*, 33, 679 – 690.

Henry, M. et al. (2001), *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy*, Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Huisman, Jeroen (2009), "Governing European Higher Eduation", in Jon Aubrey Douglass, C. Judson King and Irwin Feller (eds), *Globalization's muse. Universities and Higher Education Systems in a Changing World*, Berkeley: Berkeley Public Policy Press.

Keeling, Ruth (2006), "The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Research Agenda: the European Commission's expanding role in higher education discourse", European Journal of Education, 44:2, 203 – 223.

Lieb, Wolfgang (2009) "Humboldt Begräbnis. Zehn Jahre Bologna-Prozess", *Blätter für Deutsche und Internationale Politik*, 6.

Martens, Kerstin and Wolf, Klaus Dieter (2009), "Boomerangs and Trojan Horses: The Unintended Consequences of Internationalizing Education Policy Through the EU and the OECD", in Amaral, A., Neave, G., Musselin, C. and Maassen, P. (eds) (2009), *European integration and the governance of higher education and research*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Martens, Kerstin (2007), "How to become an Influential Actor – The 'Comparative Turn' in OECD Education Policy", in Martens, K., Rusconi, A. and Leuze, K. (eds) *New Arenas of Education Governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Maassen, Peter and Olsen, Johan P. (eds) (2007), *University Dynamics and European Integration*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Massen, P. and Musselin, C. (2009), "European Integration and the Europeanization of Higher Education", in Amaral, A., Neave, G.,

Musselin, C. and Maassen, P. (eds) (2009), *European integration and the governance of higher education and research*, Dordrecht: Springer.
Mény, Yves (2008), "Higher Education in Europe: National Systems, European Programmes, Global issues. Can they be reconciled?", *European Political Science*, 7, 324 – 334.
Michelsen, Svein (2010), "Humboldt Meets Bologna", *Higher Education Policy*, 23, 151 – 172.
Mirowski, Phil and Plehwe, Dieter (2009), *The road from Mont Pèlerin. The making of the neoliberal thought collective*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
McKinley, Michael (1996), "American Intelligence as American Knowing", *Alternatives* 21, 31 – 66.
Münch, Richard (2007), *Die Akademische Elite*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
Offe, Claus (2005), *Reflections on America*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Scharpf, F. W. (2009), "Legitimität im europeischen Mehrebenensystem", *Leviathan*, 37, 244 – 280.
Trow, Martin (2001), "From Mass Higher Education to Universal Access. The American Advantage.", in Altbach, P.G., Gumport, P.J. and D. B. Johnstone (eds), *In Defense of American Higher Education*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Notes

[1] Føllesdal, Andreas (2004), "Kampen om kloke hoder", Kronikk, *Dagbladet* 21. juli; Elster, Kristian (1999), "Visdommen er i USA", *Morgenbladet*, 19. mars.
[2] White Paper/(2008), *Sett under ett. Ny struktur i høyere utdanning*, NOU: 3

WHAT THE RECENT HISTORY OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES OFFERS TO EUROPE: AUTONOMY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND THE RECENT AMERICAN ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE[1]

DAVID HOLLINGER

Nearly ninety years ago, the social theorist Thorstein Veblen, perhaps the most famous Norwegian American prior to, Karl Rove, the recently resigned aid to President Bush, published an excoriating critique of the corporate leadership of American universities, *The Higher Learning in America*. This book of 1918 lacerated university presidents as the passive and obsequious servants of businessmen who, according to Veblen, had no understanding of the life of the mind and believed that intellect could be produced, commodified, and marketed like bathtub soap or automobile tires. "The underlying business-like presumption," Veblen asserted, is "that learning is a merchantable commodity, to be produced on a piece-rate plan, price-rated, bought and sold by standard units, measured, counted and reduced to staple equivalence through impersonal, mechanical tests."

Yet a remarkable fact about American academic history during the last nine decades is that academics themselves, professors, have exercised a great deal more control over the curriculum, the research programs, the hiring and firing of faculty, and the admission and evaluation of students than Veblen allowed. The values Veblen espoused in his polemic of 1918 turned out to have multitudes of defenders among deans, provosts and professors, who, whatever compromises they made with corporate capitalism, resisted to a significant degree exactly the trends that alarmed Veblen. Even the most caustic of today's critics of recent and current partnerships between industry and academia condemn these initiatives on the grounds that these new industry-academia arrangements are portentous departures from a tradition of autonomy that goes back, indeed, to Veblen's own time. It was Veblen's contemporaries John Dewey and