

Article details

Article title: Higher Education Governance

Article ID: 9780199756810-0203

Article author(s): Jens Jungblut, Michael Dobbins

Publishing Group: Reference-US

Table of contents:

Introduction

General Overview and Historical Studies

Conceptual Approaches

System-level Governance

Institutional Governance

International and Multilevel HE Governance

Accountability and Autonomy in Higher Education

Quality Assurance

Governance Reforms and Change Processes in Higher Education Governance

Interest Groups

The Political Economy of Higher Education

Regional Approaches to Higher Education Governance

Federalism and Higher Education Policy

HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

INTRODUCTION

The governance of higher education has been a prominent topic for investigation at least since Burton Clark's foundational 1983 study on the higher education system (see *General Overview and Historical Studies*). While there is no universally agreed definition of governance in general or governance in the area of higher education, there are certain characteristics of it that are common to most if not all definitions. First, governance relates to decision-making processes and structures, many of which draw on long-standing historical regulatory models. In Europe and higher education systems influenced by Europe, these include, for example, the Humboldtian tradition of academic self-rule and the Napoleonic state-centered tradition, as well as the Anglo-Saxon model of stronger market-oriented regulation. The structures and decision-making processes inherent in higher education governance also generally entail multiple actors with often diverging interests and especially in higher education regularly take place in a multilevel

environment with diverse stakeholders This also relates to the second point, namely that higher education governance addresses supranational, national, regional as well as institutional processes; studies in this area can either focus on one of these levels or cut across several of them. Third, while higher education governance has some sector-specific characteristics it also shares many developments with general public sector governance. This is reflected in the fact that many conceptual approaches used for the study of higher education governance are imported from political science, public administration, public policy, or organizational studies. Finally, higher education governance also has intersections with other research fields, including, for example, higher education policy studies and studies on the political economy or the financing of higher education. As governance tools become more diverse, and since governance arrangements and dynamics are inherently political, it is hard to completely isolate this topic for the purpose of this bibliography. Therefore, a certain overlap or complementarity with other bibliographies, such as the one on higher education policy by William R. Doyle (2011), are inevitable. Our selection of themes is largely pragmatic and aims to cover all crucial dimensions and major themes of higher education governance addressed in academic research. We structure the bibliography along twelve sections starting from more general and conceptual analyses. For the sake of transparency and clarity we focus next on different levels of higher education governance: (1) system-level governance i.e., state steering of higher education, (2) institutional governance, i.e. university-level administration, and (3) international and multilevel governance. We then address studies on key modern-day issues in higher education governance such as accountability, autonomy, and quality assurance, before presenting a series of theoretically guided analyses on contemporary reform processes. The following segments are then dedicated to the linkages between higher education and the political economy, welfare state, and a diverse array of interest groups. In the end we address developments in specific regions of the world as well as higher education governance in federalist political systems.

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND HISTORICAL STUDIES

Austin and Jones [2016](#) provides a good general overview of governance in higher education. Huisman [2009](#) focuses more on different conceptual approaches used in the study of governance, while Paradeise, et al. [2009](#) highlights three main narratives that are dominant in contemporary governance reforms. Shattock [2014](#) discusses the distribution of authority in higher education

governance in different national contexts around the world, offering a comparison of the levels of autonomy and self-governance. The volumes by Amaral, et al. [2009](#); Gornitzka, et al. [2005](#); Kogan, et al. [2006](#); and Kyvik and Lepori [2010](#) all present results from comparative research projects that provide both an empirical overview and conceptual implications. The study by Clark [1983](#) is not only a foundational one but provides both a general overview of the higher education sector as well as a historical account of how sectors in different countries have developed. In a similar way, Goedegebuure, et al. [1993](#) as well as Teichler [1988](#) offer a comparative policy analysis in the area of higher education, which due to their years of publication have some characteristics of historical overviews. Finally, Shattock [2012](#) offers a detailed historical account of the development of the British higher education systems since 1945.

Amaral, A., I. Bleiklie, and C. Musselin. 2009. *From governance to identity. A festschrift for Mary Henkel*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402089947]

The editors and contributors address how and why higher education has increasingly been affected by European integration. They explore the challenges which paved the path to the Bologna Process. The chapter contributors discuss the mechanisms of European higher education governance. The second half of the volume presents case studies on the direct and indirect impacts of the Bologna Process in France, Italy, the Czech Republic, and The Netherlands.

Austin, I., and G. A. Jones. 2016. *Governance of higher education: Global perspectives, theories, and practices*. London: Routledge. [ISBN: 9780415739740]

This book gives an overview of the state of the art of research on higher education governance around the world. It presents different conceptualizations and theories of governance both in general and regarding higher education. The volume covers both system-level as well as institutional governance and it also presents the status quo in different countries. In a final chapter the authors discuss new issues and recent challenges in higher education governance.

Clark, B. R. 1983. *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press. [ISBN: 9780520048416]

Clark's book is one of the foundational works on higher education. Starting from the core characteristics of academic norms and values inherent in the sector, Clark discusses the distribution of authority within universities as well as the relationship between the state,

market, and “academic oligarchy.” The book also discusses change process in higher education as well as the uniqueness of higher education compared to other societal institutions.

Goedegebuure, L., F. Kaiser, P. Maassen, V. L. Meek, F. van Vught, and E. de Weert. 1993.

Higher education policy: An international comparative perspective. Oxford: Pergamon Press. [ISBN: 9780080423937]

This comparative study of higher education policy presents a set of detailed analyses of policy dynamics in eleven different countries that highlight the level of change visible in the different higher education systems, while searching for international trends and national variation.

Building on a common conceptual framework founded in Clark’s triangle of coordination, the final chapter of the volume presents a synthesis of commonalities and differences in policy developments in higher education in the early 1990s.

Gornitzka, Å., M. Kogan, and A. Amaral. 2005. *Reform and change in higher education:*

Analysing policy implementation. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402034022]

This comparative study of higher education policy presents a set of detailed analyses of policy dynamics in eleven different countries that highlight the level of change visible in different systems, while searching for international trends and national variations. Building on Clark’s triangle of coordination, the final chapter of the volume presents a synthesis of commonalities and differences in policy developments in higher education in the early 1990s.

Huisman, J. 2009. *International perspectives on the governance of higher education: Alternative frameworks for coordination.* New York: Routledge. [ISBN: 9780415989336]

This volume presents a selection of disciplinary approaches and frameworks to the study of higher education governance. Based mainly on different concepts from political science, public administration, and public policy research, the authors discuss different national developments, but also present a more comparative overarching analysis of specific dynamics.

Kogan, M., M. Henkel, M. Bauer, and I. Bleiklie. 2006. *Transforming higher education: A comparative study.* 2d ed. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402046575]

This book presents the results of a long-term research project that analyzed the higher education reforms in Sweden, Norway, and England that have been introduced since the 1970s. The comparative study uses documents, statistics, and interviews to assess the reforms of the different higher education systems on a state, institutional, and individual level.

Kyvik, S., and B. Lepori. 2010. *The research mission of higher education institutions outside the university sector*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402092435]

Against the background of the European Union's Lisbon Strategy to enhance the knowledge economy, this edited volume explores the research conditions, capabilities, and challenges of the nonuniversity sector of higher education. The individual case studies highlight the increasingly complex interactions between nonuniversity higher education institutions, universities, and governments.

Paradeise, C., E. Reale, and I. Bleiklie. 2009. *University governance: Western European comparative perspectives*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402086373]

The edited volume analyzes changes in higher education governance in Europe as well as related aspects such as doctoral education and research budgets. They show that countries are including more heterogeneous stakeholders in governance and turning universities into more rationalized, entrepreneurially oriented organizations. However, grand narratives such as New Public Management and network governance only tell part of the story, as policymaking still remains embedded in preexisting national settings.

Shattock, M. 2012. *Making policy in British higher education: 1945–2011*. Maidenhead, UK: Open Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780335241866]

The book provides an encompassing historical overview over policy developments in higher education in the United Kingdom since the Second World War. The author discusses chronologically and in great detail the policy decisions and processes that lead to the creation of today's UK higher education system. The book ends with a final reflection on the links between higher education and policymaking in the UK.

Shattock, M. 2014. *International trends in university governance: Autonomy, self-government, and the distribution of authority*. London: Routledge. [ISBN: 9780415842907]

This edited volume presents an assessment of reforms in higher education governance in numerous countries that aimed at modernizing the relationship between higher education and the state, focusing on institutional autonomy and self-governance of universities. The different chapters cover cases from around the world and are structured based on different university traditions, including the Humboldtian, the Napoleonic, the Japanese, and the Anglo-Saxon model.

Teichler, U. 1988. *Changing patterns of the higher education system: The experience of three decades*. London: Jessica Kingsley. [ISBN: 9781853025075]

This book presents the structure of higher education as well as its development in Germany, France, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States, Japan, and Australia over three decades. The author identifies structural patterns and models used to reform higher education systems. The key driver for the different developments are changes regarding access and admission to higher education in the late 1960s for which different countries found diverging solutions.

CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES

Governance of higher education draws from a broad range of concepts from different disciplines. Cohen, et al. 1972 is for example applicable to organizations in general, but as the authors developed their ideas using universities they are especially well suited for studying higher education. In several cases authors also transferred concepts from other contexts into the study of higher education governance. This includes Gornitzka and Maassen 2000 drawing from public policy analysis, Jungblut 2015 building on party politics approaches, Kauko 2013 drawing from political contingency and agenda-setting theories, Dobbins, et al. 2011 building a framework to trace policy developments, and Chou, et al. 2017 utilizing concepts from multi-level governance. Other authors use sector specific developments to develop new concepts. Examples for this are the works Neave 2012, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, and Schofer and Meyer 2005. A final group of authors uses neoinstitutional theory to study developments in higher education governance. This group includes the studies Powell and Solga 2010 and Pinheiro, et al. 2016.

Chou, M.-H., J. Jungblut, P. Ravinet, and M. Vukasovic, eds. 2017. Higher education governance and policy: An introduction to multi-issue, multi-level and multi-actor dynamics. In *Special issue: The Politics of Higher Education Policies*. Edited by Chou, M.-H., et al. *Policy and Society* 36.1: 1–15.

This introduction to a special issue presents a new conceptualization of the complexities of policymaking in higher education. By unpacking the concept of multi-level governance and through observations on recent dynamics in the area, the authors argue that contemporary higher education governance is characterized by the interactions between three “multis”: (1)

multi-issue, (2) multi-actor, and (3) multi-level characteristics. The contributions present different applications of these ideas.

Cohen, M. D., J. March, and J. P. Olsen. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17.1: 1–25.

This foundational article on dynamics of change in organizations such as universities exemplifies how problematic preferences, unclear technology, and fluid participation lead to the emergence of “organized anarchies.” These organizations are described as collections of choices looking for problems, issues looking for decision situations to be realized in, solutions looking for issues to which they are an answer, and decision makers looking for tasks to address and problems to solve.

Dobbins, M., C. Knill, and E. M. Vögtle. 2011. An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education* 62.5: 665–683.

The article presents a systematic classification of indicators for different dimensions of higher education governance. Three elaborated ideal types—academic self-governance, the market-oriented model, and the state-centered model—address the tensions between the state, market, and academia, while also considering the role of the state and external stakeholders. The indicators provide a useful framework for tracing policy change within and across countries over time.

Gornitzka, Å., and P. Maassen. 2000. Hybrid steering approaches with respect to European higher education. *Higher Education Policy* 13.3: 267–285.

The authors present four ideal types of governance relationships between the state and higher education. Each type is based on an inherently different ideological approach. Using data from a comparative research project, the authors conclude that there is a trend toward a market-based type of governance in Europe. They also highlight that, instead of ideal-types, we are more likely to find hybrids in reality.

Jungblut, J. 2015. Bringing political parties into the picture: A two-dimensional analytical framework for higher education policy. *Higher Education* 69.5: 867–882.

The author applies approaches from party politics to the study of higher education policy and governance. Based on the partisan hypothesis, which assumes that the preferences of parties from different party families diverge in line with their core ideology, the author develops conceptual expectations for party preferences in higher education policy along two dimensions:

the potential of higher education for societal redistribution and the governance of higher education.

Kauko, J. 2013. Dynamics in higher education politics: A theoretical model. *Higher Education* 65.2: 193–206.

Kauko presents a model for analyzing dynamics in higher education that draws on the conceptual history of political contingency, agenda-setting theories, and previous research on higher education dynamics. While exploring the Finnish case, he shows that dynamics in higher education politics are strongly related to changes external to the higher education system, namely the volatile positions of institutions and actors, and often impacted by the unexpected nature of the dynamics.

Neave, G. 2012. *The evaluative state, institutional autonomy and re-engineering higher education in Western Europe: The prince and his pleasure*. Basingstoke, UK Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9780230348035]

Neave focuses on the new relationship between higher education and the state. He discusses the implications of his observation of a general trend from a regulative to an evaluative state. Several national examples are used to highlight the central argument of the book that today's higher education governance is less about direct governmental control over higher education, but more geared toward evaluating the output of the higher education sector.

Pinheiro, R., L. Geschwind, F. O. Ramirez, and K. Vrangbaek, eds. 2016. *Towards a comparative institutionalism: Forms, dynamics and logics across the organizational fields of health care and higher education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald. [ISBN: 9781785602757]

This edited volume explores recent dynamics in higher education and health care, focusing on collective as well as individual actors, structures, processes, and institutional logics. The authors argue that hospitals and universities share several key organizational characteristics and that recent change dynamics have certain commonalities that warrant a thorough comparison. For this, the authors use a variety of conceptual and methodological approaches with a focus on neoinstitutional perspectives.

Powell, J. J. W., and H. Solga. 2010. Analyzing the nexus of higher education and vocational training in Europe: A comparative-institutional framework. *Studies in Higher Education* 35.6: 705–721.

The authors outline how processes of institutional change affect skill formation organizations that provide vocational training and general higher education. They argue that analyses of institutional change dynamics must consider the vocational and higher education nexus when assessing whether systems are converging. They propose a framework which combines institutional with comparative-historical analysis in order to understand changes in these systems as well as tensions between underlying ideals, norms, and policies.

Schofer, E., and J. W. Meyer. 2005. The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review* 70.6: 898–920.

The authors analyze the expansion of higher education enrollments throughout the 20th century. They find support for the world society hypothesis that growth in enrollments is especially high in countries more linked to world society and sharply accelerated after 1960. They argue that a new model of society became institutionalized globally, in which schooled knowledge and personnel are seen as appropriate for a wide variety of positions and more young people are perceived as appropriate for higher education.

Slaughter, S., and G. Rhoades. 2004. *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780801892332]

The authors argue that the global rise of the knowledge society led to a new relationship between higher education institutions and their respective societies. This relationship is characterized by what the authors call “academic capitalism.” This concept explains the inclusion of universities into the economic sphere as actors within the institutions who use a variety of state resources to create new forms of knowledge linking higher education and the economy.

SYSTEM-LEVEL GOVERNANCE

The studies in this section all address governance on the system level. Several studies focus on the introduction of New Public Management–related tools and their implication for governance of higher education. These include the Dill [1997](#); Ferlie, et al. [2008](#); and Braun and Merrien [1999](#). Jongbloed, et al. [2008](#) focuses on the growing number of stakeholders in higher education and its implication for universities, while Scott [1995](#) focuses on the influence of massification of higher education. Marginson [2011](#) presents a Confucian model for higher education systems with four distinct characteristics.

Braun, D., and F. -X. Merrien, eds. 1999. *Towards a new model of governance for universities? A comparative view*. London: Jessica Kingsley. [ISBN: 9781853027734]

In this edited volume the authors provide an overview of changes in the governance of universities since the 1980s. The aim is to investigate if, to what extent, and with what success changes in public governance have transformed the political and organizational management of universities. Empirically they draw from case studies from seven countries to demonstrate varied impact of increased state intervention on higher education.

Dill, D. 1997. Higher education markets and public policy. *Higher Education Policy* 10.3–4: 167–185.

Dill observes that market-like policy instruments in academic labor markets, institutional finance, student support, and the allocation of research funds are becoming increasingly important in many higher education systems. In most cases market competition is used as a means of achieving equity in the form of mass higher education. The article investigates the nature of markets as well as the policy instruments used for their implementation.

Ferlie, E., C. Musselin, and G. Andresani. 2008. The steering of higher education systems: A public management perspective. *Higher Education* 56.3: 325–348.

Based on approaches from political science and public administration, the authors highlight that developments in higher education steering are similar to other parts of the public sector, where the role of the state has been redefined. They further suggest investigating ‘narratives’ of public management reform and their variation or combination from one European nation state to another, highlighting three main narratives: (1) New Public Management, (2) network governance, and (3) a neo-Weberian narrative.

Jongbloed, B., J. Enders, and C. Salerno. 2008. Higher education and its communities:

Interconnections, interdependencies, and a research agenda. *Higher Education* 56.3: 303–324.

The authors propose stakeholder analysis as a tool to assist universities in classifying stakeholders and determining stakeholder salience in their specific situation. As incentive schemes and government programs attempt to encourage universities to reach out more to external communities, existing barriers to such linkages become more important. The authors argue that universities have to carefully select their stakeholders and identify the appropriate degree of differentiation to prevent ‘mission-overload’.

Marginson, S. 2011. Higher education in East Asia and Singapore: Rise of the Confucian Model. *Higher Education* 61.5: 587–611.

Marginson presents an overview of Asian-Pacific higher education and university research with regard to those countries that follow a Confucian Model of education. He finds that the Confucian Model rests on four elements: (1) a strong nation-state, (2) a tendency to universal tertiary participation, (3) national examinations that mediate social competition, and (4) accelerated public investment in research and research universities.

Scott, P. 1995. *The meanings of mass higher education*. Bristol, PA: Open Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780335194438]

This book discusses the implications of the move toward mass higher education for both higher education institutions and the state, taking into considerations economic, political, cultural, and scientific shifts. It focuses on the developments in the United Kingdom but also provides comparisons to the rest of Europe, the United States, and Australia.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

These contributions focus primarily on the allocation of authority and decision-making power within universities as well as issues of strategic management. The authors engage with the tensions between academics and university management and changing internal patterns of governance. The seminal study Clark [1998](#) elaborated on crucial components of entrepreneurial universities. Goodall [2009](#) argues that, despite the burgeoning rhetoric on entrepreneurialism, consumerism, and strategic leadership, renowned scholars are more effective university leaders. While Gumport [2000](#) contends that higher education in the United States has become an industry strongly characterized by management, consumerism, and stratification, Krücken [2003](#) sees a mismatch between discourse and actual change at the university level in Europe, thus focusing on their path-dependent character. The studies Frost, et al. [2016](#); Ramirez and Christensen [2013](#); and Stensaker, et al. [2014](#) engaged with the factors that facilitate the realization of strategic changes amid tensions between peer control and market responsiveness. Finally, Panova [2008](#) presents different conceptualizations of institutional governance in higher education and uses them to study governance in Russian universities.

Clark, B. R. 1998. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. New York: Pergamon Press. [ISBN: 9780080433424]

In this seminal study Clark investigates the entrepreneurial transformation of European universities. He highlights five common elements of a successful institutional transformation including: (1) a strengthened steering core; (2) an expanded developmental periphery; (3) a diversified funding base; (4) a stimulated academic heartland; and (5) an integrated entrepreneurial culture. The overall conclusion is that the university–environment relationship is characterized by an increasing asymmetry between environmental demand and institutional capacity to respond.

Frost, J., F. Hattke, and M. Reihlen. 2016. *Multi-level governance in universities: Strategy, structure, control*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. [ISBN: 9783319326764]

The authors study how contradictory demands stemming from the need for scholarly peer control, market responsiveness, public policy control, or democratization create governance paradoxes in universities. Based on their multilevel view the authors explore how universities develop strategies to cope with changes in their environment (macro level), how universities implement said strategies in their structures (meso level), and how universities design mechanisms to control their members (micro level).

Goodall, A. H. 2009. *Socrates in the boardroom: Why research universities should be led by top scholars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780691138008]

This book analyzes the impact of university leadership on performance, and specifically whether it matters if the head of the institution is a highly cited scholar. The author claims that presidents will have an impact on performance if they can prove that they are credible leaders and knowledgeable academic experts, characteristics that are inherent in highly cited scholars. Goodall concludes that better scholars make better leaders in a university context.

Gumport, P. J. 2000. Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education* 39.1: 67–91.

The author analyzes changes in public higher education in the United States over twenty-five years and diagnoses a macro-trend in which the predominant legitimating idea of public higher education has changed from higher education as a social institution to higher education as an industry. This leads to the rise of three interrelated phenomena: (1) academic management, (2) academic consumerism, and (3) academic stratification.

Kretek, P. M., Ž. Dragšić, and B. M. Kehm. 2013. Transformation of university governance: On the role of university board members. *Higher Education* 65.1: 39–58.

The authors analyze the empowerment of university boards in Europe as part of the transformation of university governance. They hypothesize that board members enact roles which are not only shaped and constrained by formal institutions, but also by conformable, appropriate, and legitimate role expectations of central role senders. They observe symptoms of role ambiguity and role conflict, which impact their activity and performance on the board.

Krücken, G. 2003. Learning the “New, New Thing”: On the role of path dependency in university structures. *Higher Education* 46.3: 315–339.

Addressing the question how universities adapt to new challenges regarding their new position as crucial nodes in the knowledge production system, the author argues that there is a mismatch between the rapid change of pace at the level of higher education discourse and the slow development at the level of universities. According to Krücken, the main reason is the path-dependent character of the structures of universities and their practices and identity concepts.

Panova, A. 2008. Governance structures and decision making in Russian higher education institutions. *Russian Social Science Review* 49.5: 76–93.

The article presents four models of institutional governance in higher education: the hierarchical, the collegial, the political, and the anarchic model. Two of these models, the hierarchical and the collegial, are then used to study the governance of Russian higher education institutions. The author comes to the conclusion that Russian universities in contrast to their European counterparts mainly use hierarchical forms of governance.

Ramirez, F. O., and T. Christensen. 2013. The formalization of the university: Rules, roots, and routes. *Higher Education* 65.6: 695–708.

The authors investigate changes in the formal organization of two universities, the University of Oslo and Stanford University. They focus on factors such as role differentiation, rule formation, and resource-seeking structures to describe organizational developments along these dimensions. The authors find that both universities embarked on similar paths involving greater role differentiation, rule formation, and resource-seeking activities. However, they find persistent historically influenced differences in their responses to the global environment.

Stensaker, B., N. Frølich, J. Huisman, E. Waagene, L. Scordato, and P. Pimentel Bótas. 2014. Factors affecting strategic change in higher education. *Journal of Strategy and Management* 7.2: 193–207.

The article identifies factors that actors in university governance regard as important in order to realize strategic change in their institutions. By linking organizational-level developments on strategic management with macro-level change in the context of the European Higher Education Area, the article provides an interesting view on the debate on convergence and differentiation in organizational fields. The study finds that strategic changes in universities are perceived as highly dependent on leadership, decision-making procedures, communication, and evaluation.

INTERNATIONAL AND MULTILEVEL HE GOVERNANCE

Although traditionally a domain of the nation-state, higher education has increasingly been influenced by reform pressures from the international level. In particular in Europe, the Bologna Process has functioned as a transnational platform with its own unique governance mechanisms, which in turn has prompted national governments and individual universities to reflect on the role, function, and efficiency of existing policies and structures. Neave [2003](#) discusses the historical foundations in which European universities are embedded and the new challenges that Europeanization poses to them. Ravinet [2008](#) systematically elaborates on the governance mechanisms of the Bologna Process, while Vaira [2004](#) as well as Marginson and Rhoades [2002](#) interlink global, national, and local factors in higher education. Maassen and Olsen [2007](#) and Maassen and Stensaker [2011](#) show how universities have taken center stage in the production of education, research, and innovation and are increasingly at the heart of the European integration process. Heinze and Knill [2008](#) presents an analytical framework with theoretical assumptions on the potential impact of the Bologna Process on national higher systems. Martens, et al. [2010](#) analyzes the concrete impact of Bologna on individual higher education system and demonstrates how reforms are contingent on national veto players and historical guiding principles, while Gornitzka and Stensaker [2014](#) explores how new regulatory arrangements for quality assurance have emerged in Europe. The studies Vögtle, et al. [2011](#) and Vögtle and Martens [2014](#) provide rich empirical data on processes of higher education convergence inside and outside Europe. Dobbins, M. 2017. Convergent or divergent Europeanization? An analysis of higher education governance reforms in France and Italy. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83.1: 177–199.

The author uses two competing theoretical approaches—historical institutionalism and institutional isomorphism—to explain the different higher education reform pathways of France and Italy. Using empirical indicators, he shows that France has consistently moved closer to a market-oriented model of governance. By contrast, academic oligarchies were initially strengthened in Italy during the Bologna Process, but the more recent Gelmini reform pulls the governance model back toward the state-centered and market-oriented ideal-types.

Gornitzka, Å., and B. Stensaker. 2014. The dynamics of European regulatory regimes in higher education – Challenged prerogatives and evolutionary change. *Policy and Society* 33.3: 177–188.

The article focuses on central characteristics and trajectories of the expansion of regulatory arrangements concerning external quality assurance in Europe and discusses drivers of this development drawing on an institutional perspective. The authors identify three stages in the establishment of a regulatory regime: (1) formalization and agencification at the national level, (2) establishment of common standards at the European level, and (3) an emerging global market-based system.

Heinze, T., and C. Knill. 2008. Analysing the differential impact of the Bologna Process: Theoretical considerations on national conditions for international policy convergence. *Higher Education* 56.4: 493–510.

This analytical contribution draws on numerous political science theories to derive hypotheses regarding the potential impacts of the Bologna Process on national higher education policies and in particular cross-country convergence. They argue that linguistic and cultural similarity, governmental preferences, preexisting policy similarity, similar problem pressure, and veto players are likely explanations for the prospects of transnational convergence in higher education policy.

Maassen, P., and J. P. Olsen, eds. 2007. *University dynamics and European integration*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402059704]

The authors investigate how European universities are affected by ongoing processes of European integration. They focus on attempts at the European level to enhance institutional capacity in higher education and research, and how these emerging European capacities relate to the national policymaking responsibilities. The book concludes with an encompassing

research agenda that could provide a better understanding of the role of universities for and in European integration.

Maassen, P., and B. Stensaker. 2011. The knowledge triangle, European higher education policy logics, and policy implications. *Higher Education* 61.6: 757–769.

The authors identify three sets of logic related to the external (i.e., European and international) reform agendas in higher education, which pose new challenges to how knowledge is created, diffused, and governed by universities. They argue that the European level moved center stage in complex interactions linking different levels of governance and impacting three levels of the knowledge triangle: education, research, and innovation.

Marginson, S., and G. Rhoades. 2002. Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education* 43.3: 281–309.

The authors present an analytical heuristic that goes beyond conceptions of nation states, markets, and systems of higher education institutions by stressing the role of globalization. Their “glonacal agency heuristic” highlights three intersecting planes of existence, emphasizing the simultaneous importance of global, national, and local factors in higher education. The authors also provide examples how their new heuristic can be applied in the area of higher education.

Martens, K., A. -K. Nagel, M. Windzio, and A. Weyman, eds. 2010. *Transformation of education policy*. Transformations of the state. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9780230246348]

This edited volume engages with internationalization processes and their impact on national policymaking, in particular the Bologna Process and PISA study, in Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and the United States as a contrasting case. The central argument is that the role of the state in governing education has changed tremendously. However, guiding principles on education and national veto players are decisive variables in explaining change and inertia.

Neave, G. 2003. The Bologna Declaration: Some of the historic dilemmas posed by the reconstruction of the community in Europe’s system of higher education. *Educational Policy* 17.1: 141–164.

This article outlines how European higher education grew in symbiosis with the nation-state over the past approximately two hundred years and how the British, German, and French

governance traditions evolved. The author argues that the superordinate (European and international) community and subnational units are becoming increasingly important points of reference and orientation for universities.

Ravinet, P. 2008. From voluntary participation to monitored coordination: Why European countries feel increasingly bound by their commitment to the Bologna Process. *European Journal of Education* 43.3: 353–367.

Pauline Ravinet explores how the sense of obligation among Bologna members to efficiently implement the Bologna guidelines took form. She traces the development of follow-up mechanisms, which have been increasingly equipped with formal tools and procedures. She argues that the tools developed within the Bologna Process provide foundations for comparison, socialization, and imitation, which in turn function as means of coercion.

Vaira, M. 2004. Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education* 48.4: 483–510.

Vaira creates a new theoretical framework to study organizational change in higher education in the age of globalization. Moving beyond previous “convergence” and “divergence” theses, he proposes integrating preexisting “convergence” and “divergence” approaches into one uniform framework known as “organizational allomorphism” to grasp change dynamics.

Vögtle, E. M., C. Knill, and M. Dobbins. 2011. To what extent does transnational communication drive cross-national policy convergence? The impact of the Bologna-process on domestic higher education policies. *Higher Education* 61.1: 77–94.

The authors explore how transnational communication driven by the Bologna Process has fostered the convergence of policies in Europe and beyond. They focus on study structures and quality assurance and show, based on a statistical analysis of country dyads, that the degree of policy convergence among BP participants is stronger than for nonparticipating countries.

Vögtle, E. M., and K. Martens. 2014. The Bologna Process as a template for transnational policy coordination. *Policy Studies* 35.3: 246–263.

This article focuses on the Bologna Process as a template for the reform and harmonization of higher education on a global scale. The authors show that policies promoted within the Bologna framework (e.g., study structures, actors involved in quality assurance) are diffusing beyond Europe. Interestingly, non-European regions are also reproducing modes of governance

inspired by the Bologna process such as regular intergovernmental conferences and working groups.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTONOMY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Accountability and autonomy are two intertwined concepts that often create a mutual balance. It is important in this context to clearly define what is meant by both terms. Berdahl 1990 as well as Huisman and Currie 2004 offer good foundations for this. Christensen 2011 discusses potential problems related to increased autonomy, while Enders, et al. 2013 investigates to what extent increased autonomy can be linked to changes in university performance. Burke 2005 provides an overview of the different forms of accountability that are used in the United States and discusses their shortcomings.

Berdahl, R. 1990. Academic freedom, autonomy, and accountability in British universities. *Studies in Higher Education* 15.2: 169–180.

This early article provides both a conceptual framework of university autonomy as well as arguments against the abolishment of the University Grants Committee in Great Britain. The author breaks down the concept of university autonomy into academic freedom and procedural and substantive autonomy and focuses on the tensions between political, bureaucratic, academic, and market forces with a view toward early market-oriented reforms in Great Britain.

Burke, J. C. 2005. *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [ISBN: 9780787972424]

This edited volume has three main goals: (1) to examine major approaches to accountability and their implementation, (2) to study potential linkages among these approaches, and (3) to develop a proposal for key aspects of a comprehensive accountability. Its empirical focus lies on private and public colleges and universities in the United States, and it offers models for each of the major approaches to accountability.

Christensen, T. 2011. University governance reforms: Potential problems of more autonomy? *Higher Education* 62.4: 503–517.

The author argues that policies based on New Public Management and aimed at increasing university autonomy may ultimately be leaving universities with less autonomy. According to the author, changing university and regulatory cultures with more management and centralized

control elements along with stronger environmental pressure may actually be weakening the professional autonomy and thus real autonomy of universities.

Enders, J., H. de Boer, and E. Weyer. 2013. Regulatory autonomy and performance: The reform of higher education revisited. *Higher Education* 65.1: 5–23.

Based on principal-agent models and institutional models, the authors investigate how the dominant narrative of political reforms has moved away from traditional beliefs in university autonomy, which are based on institutional trust and professional autonomy. The authors argue that autonomy has been redefined as a twofold concept consisting of “organizational autonomy” and “regulatory autonomy.” They highlight that there is only scarce evidence of a link between organizational autonomy and performance.

Huisman, J., and J. Currie. 2004. Accountability in higher education: Bridge over troubled water? *Higher Education* 48.4: 529–551.

The authors present a conceptualization of accountability and distinguish between political and professional accountability. They then discuss how and why accountability has taken center stage in higher education, before exploring national accountability-related developments. The main finding of this useful article is that soft accountability measures have been given precedence over hard accountability mechanisms (rewards and sanctions).

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality assurance has been a prominent topic both in debates of higher education policy as well as the higher education research literature. The three volumes of Dill and Beerkens [2010](#); Rosa and Amaral [2014](#); Schwarz and Westerheijden 2007; and Westerheijden, et al. 2007 offer helpful overviews on the introduction of quality assurance mechanisms in higher education. On a more critical note, Jarvis [2014](#) discusses in how far this development is desirable and helpful for higher education.

Dill, D. D., and M. Beerkens, eds. 2010. *Public policy for academic quality: Analyses of innovative policy instruments*. Higher Education Dynamics. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9789048137534]

The starting point of this volume is that the structure of higher education has undergone significant changes, giving rise to an increasing public concern for academic quality. As a consequence, new public policies on academic quality and new forms of academic quality

management have been implemented. The book analyzes these policies using examples from many different countries and focusing on professional, market, and state regulation.

Jarvis, D. S. L. 2014. Regulating higher education: Quality assurance and neoliberal managerialism in higher education—A critical introduction. *Policy and Society* 33.3: 155–166. The author starts from the observation that quality assurance regimes have become an increasingly prominent regulatory tool in higher education management. The article goes on to explore the emergence and spread of quality assurance regimes, the regulatory logics around qualifications frameworks, and their impact on the state–university relationship. The authors further highlight that these tools impose quasi-markets and competitive-based rationalities often informed by conviction rather than evidence.

Rosa, M. J., and A. Amaral, eds. 2014. *Quality assurance in higher education: Contemporary debates*. Issues in Higher Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9781137374622]

In this volume the authors address the consequences of introducing quality enhancement and risk management as new dimensions in higher education quality assurance. They cover different world regions including Europe, the United States, and Latin America. The volume also includes contributions of both scholars and practitioners in the field of quality assurance in higher education.

Schwarz, S., and D. Westerheijden, eds. 2007. *Accreditation and evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402055379]

This edited volume investigates the development of accreditation and evaluation in twenty European countries. Besides the detailed national case studies, the volume also includes developments across Europe. The authors highlight that accreditation has become a principal mechanism in the governance of higher education, and they also analyze the forces that promote the spread of these models in the context of the European Higher Education Area.

Westerheijden, D. F., B. Stensaker, and M. J. Rosa, eds. 2007. *Quality assurance in higher education: Trends in regulation, translation, and transformation*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402060120]

This edited volume covers both micro- and macro-level analyses of quality assurance in higher education in seven countries spanning three world regions: the United States, Europe, and South Africa. The contributions link the stability of quality assurance regimes to issues of

regulation, translation of practices, and transformation of policy instruments. In addition, the book takes a critical perspective on current practices in quality assurance and suggests proposals for improving quality assurance in the future.

GOVERNANCE REFORMS AND CHANGE PROCESSES IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

These scholarly works provide analytically innovative perspectives on national reform trajectories in higher education. They focus specifically on the policy process spanning from policy design to implementation, as well as new forms of statehood, symptoms of marketization, and interinstitutional relationships. The early contribution Jongbloed [2003](#) explores the ingredients of higher education markets, while Gornitzka [1999](#) proposes a resources-dependent and neoinstitutionalist perspective to understand the trajectory of change. de Boer, et al. [2017](#) also focuses on interinstitutional relationships to improve our understanding of horizontal differential processes in higher education. McLendon and Ness [2003](#) explore the higher education reform process at the US state level, while Musselin and Teixeira [2014](#) as well as Bleiklie and Michelsen [2013](#) focus on the dynamics of policy design and implementation in Europe. de Boer, et al. [2007](#) shows how the mode of governance in Dutch higher education has shifted toward steering at a distance based on a new public management narrative, while Jungblut [2016](#) provides an interesting new perspective on coalition governments in higher education policymaking.

Bleiklie, I., and S. Michelsen. 2013. Comparing HE policies in Europe. *Higher Education* 65.1: 113–133.

The authors develop a conceptual framework for comparative higher education policy analyses that focuses on structural characteristics of politico-administrative systems. Drawing from data from eight countries, the authors show that the comparative politico-administrative perspective is a useful tool in explaining cross-national variation in higher education reform policies in Europe.

de Boer, H., J. Enders, and L. Leisyte. 2007. Public sector reform in Dutch higher education: The organizational transformation of the university. *Public Administration* 85.1: 27–46.

Based on concepts defined as “construction of identity,” “hierarchy,” and “rationality,” the authors analyze various dimensions of the transformation of universities as professional

organization in the Netherlands. The show that traditional state-centered governing arrangements have been replaced by alternative modes of governance, which can be described as “steering at a distance.” These involve new public management approaches, communicative planning, and more network-based governance aimed at turning universities into more ‘complete’ organizations.

de Boer, H., J. File, J. Huisman, M. Seeber, M. Vukasovic, and D. F. Westerheijden. 2017.

Policy analysis of structural reforms in higher education: Processes and outcomes.

Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9783319422374]

This edited volume analyses structural reforms in higher education systems throughout Europe. It addresses vertical as well as horizontal differentiation process in higher education, and also includes reflections on institutional relationships. To study these different processes the volume uses a public policy framework focusing on agenda setting, policy design, formulation, implementation, and evaluation.

Gornitzka, Å. 1999. Governmental policies and organisational change in higher education.

Higher Education 38.1: 5–31.

Gornitzka elaborates a framework to address how higher education organizations change in interaction with government policies and programs. She proposes a resource-dependent perspective, which emphasizes how organizations are externally steered by means of their dependence on resources, as well as a neoinstitutionalist perspective focusing on the normative elements which steer organizational behavior.

Jongbloed, B. 2003. Marketisation in higher education, Clark’s Triangle, and the essential ingredients of markets. *Higher Education Quarterly* 57.2: 110–135.

This article discusses numerous conditions for market-making in higher education. Jongbloed specifies freedoms for providers (e.g., freedom of entry, freedom to set prices and use resources) and freedoms for consumers (e.g., freedom of choice of provider and product, freedom of information). The analysis provides a welcome extension to Clark’s Triangle and also nicely engages with the role of government in regulating higher education.

Jungblut, J. 2016. From preferences to policies in coalition governments: Unpacking policy making in European higher education. *Public Policy and Administration* 32.4: 323–348.

The article focuses on political parties in policymaking and it traces the development from party preferences over coalition positions to policy proposals. Jungblut argues that parties with

more similar preferences agree on more encompassing sets of policies, and that if a coalition formulates a policy in its agreement the chances for a subsequent policy proposal are higher. However, coalition negotiations with other parties mediate the influence of partisan preferences.

McLendon, M. K., and E. C. Ness. 2003. The politics of state higher education governance reform. *Peabody Journal of Education* 78.4: 66–88.

This article describes the landscape of public higher education governance on the state level in the United States. It assesses recent trends and reports results from a national survey of higher education governance reform. The authors highlight that governance reforms take place in a political context and at the intersection of legislative institutions, state higher education agencies, electoral cycles, and campus politics.

Musselin, C., and P. Teixeira, eds. 2014. *Reforming higher education: Public policy design and implementation*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9789400770270]

This edited volume studies reforms that led to a differentiated landscape of higher education systems, which were based on the observation that university practices and governance were poorly adapted to contemporary needs. This reform process is argued to have led to growing institutional differentiation in most higher education systems. The different authors use examples from multiple countries to highlight the general dynamics in policy design and implementation in higher education.

INTEREST GROUPS

Interest groups are becoming an increasingly relevant factor in higher education governance. In the European context the focus of interest group research in higher education has so far been largely on the role of student unions. The studies Jungblut and Weber [2012](#), Klemenčič [2012](#), Klemenčič [2014](#), and Luescher-Mamashela [2013](#) are good examples of this. In the United States the research focuses on a broader set of interest groups and their role in state higher education policymaking. The studies Ness, et al. [2015](#) and Tandberg [2010](#) are good examples in this category.

Jungblut, J., and R. Weber. 2012. National student governance in Germany: The case of fzs. *European Journal of Higher Education* 2.1: 47–62.

The authors outline four main areas of organizational change in student associations—ideology, the organizational structure, internal and external communication and membership—and then focus on the development of the main German student association “fzs.” They show that the relatively small, ideologically oriented, and network-like association grew into a larger, more professionalized umbrella organization, not least due to the impact of the Bologna Process.

Klemenčič, M. 2012. Student representation in Western Europe: Introduction to the special issue. In *Special Issue: Student Representation in Western Europe*. Edited by Klemenčič, M. *European Journal of Higher Education* 2.1: 2–19.

The author discusses different forms and strategies of student associations based on the concepts “logic of influence” and “logic of appropriateness.” She distinguishes between student associations as social movement organizations and as interest groups by comparing their organizational structure, political agenda, resources, mode of action, and outputs. The article also presents a useful conceptualization of student associations based on pluralism and corporatism as well as their formal or informal character.

Klemenčič, M. 2014. Student power in a global perspective and contemporary trends in student organising. In *Special Issue: Student Power in a Global Perspective*. Edited by Kearney, M.-L. and D. Lincoln *Studies in Higher Education* 39.3: 396–411.

This introduction to a special issue explores how students are organized differently across the world and how they impact policymaking at the university or national political level.

Klemenčič shows how the grievances of students vary over time and regions. She contends that higher education policymaking has become more “network-like,” less hierarchical, and involves a multitude of stakeholders. This has given organized student groups new points of access to policymaking.

Luescher-Mamashela, T. M. 2013. Student representation in university decision making: Good reasons, a new lens? *Studies in Higher Education* 38.10: 1442–1456.

The article discusses the historical origins of student representation and the changes which have occurred as a result of the “democratization” of universities in the 1960s and 1970s and the recent trend toward managerialism. The author then assesses numerous arguments for student representation (the political realist, consumerist communitarian, and democratic and

consequentialist cases), while also critically engaging with arguments against student representation.

Ness, E. C., D. A. Tandberg, and M. K. McLendon. 2015. Interest groups and state policy for higher education: New conceptual understandings and future research directions. In *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research: Volume 30*. Edited by M. B. Paulsen, 151–186. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. [ISBN: 9783319128344]

The authors of this chapter analyze the policy impacts of organized interest groups in the area of higher education in the different states in the United States. They review the existing literature and outline a research agenda that aims to deepen the conceptual understanding of relationships between interest groups and state higher education policy.

Tandberg, D. A. 2010. Politics, interest groups and state funding of public higher education. *Research in Higher Education* 51.5: 416–450.

Investigating the large differences in public higher education funding between the different states within the United States, the author uses a fiscal policy framework to evaluate the relationship between various factors and states' relative support of higher education. The results provide evidence of a significant impact of interest groups and politics on state fiscal policy with regard to higher education.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This strand of scholarship draws on welfare state research and deals with issues of funding and socioeconomic redistribution, as well as cost sharing in higher education. Willemsse and de Beer [2012](#) systematically addresses the linkages between higher education and the welfare state. The seminal study Ansell [2010](#) focused on the redistributive motivations of political parties in the funding of higher education, while the more recent analyses contained in Garritzmann [2016](#) show that different higher education–funding regimes around the world are contingent not only on partisan but also temporal factors. The studies Dar and Lee [2014](#), Hauser and Johnston [2016](#), and Taylor and Morphew [2015](#) focus on higher education funding in the United States. Dar and Lee as well as McLendon, et al. [2009](#) explore the conditions under which political parties impact state funding, while Taylor and Morphew also examine the factors leading to the shift in funding from governments to students. Jungblut [2016](#) comparatively analyzes how partisan differences affect the redistributive dynamics of higher education in Europe.

Ansell, B. 2010. *From the ballot to the blackboard: The redistributive political economy of education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780521190183]

The author looks at variations in education spending across countries and time with a view to the expansion from elite to mass education, partisan preferences, and the politics of higher education. Based on formal models, statistical analyses, and historical case studies the author highlights how redistributive political motivations, which are contingent on the electoral clientele and the openness or elitist nature of higher education systems, impact funding and structural reforms.

Dar, L., and D. W. Lee. 2014. Partisanship, political polarization, and state higher education budget outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education* 85.4: 469–498.

The authors investigate how partisanship affects state higher education policy priorities and expenditures in the United States. Assuming that party coalitions are heterogeneous and policy preferences differ, they find that Democratic Party strength positively affects state funding for higher education but that the effect decreases as political polarization or unemployment increase.

Garrizmann, J. L. 2016. *The political economy of higher education finance: The politics of tuition fees and subsidies in OECD countries, 1945–2015*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9783319299129]

Garrizmann's book explores higher education finance across OECD countries and argues that four worlds of student finance have developed across industrialized democracies despite relatively similar settings in the 1940s. The theoretical model "Time-Sensitive Partisan Theory" explains why divergent models of finance emerged. This innovative study does justice to the complexity of higher education funding by focusing not only on tuition fees, but also subsidy systems and partisan factors driving country-specific models.

Hauser, D. C., and A. Johnston. 2016. Public costs, relative subsidies, and repayment burdens of federal US student loan plans: Lessons for reform. *Higher Education Policy* 29.1: 89–107.

The authors study the net cost and distributional characteristics of four different methods of US student loan repayment: (1) the standard option, (2) the income-based option, (3) the Pay-As-You-Earn option, and (4) the proposed Student Loan Fairness Act. Using a set of repayment simulations they find an inherent trade-off between public loan cost and repayment burdens in

the sense that student loans that are more generous to poorer graduates are also the most expensive to the taxpayer.

Jungblut, J. 2016. Redistribution and public governance: The politics of higher education in Western Europe. *European Politics and Society* 17.3: 331–352.

Based on a two-dimensional framework capturing both higher education's redistributive dynamics and conflicts over higher education governance, the article develops theoretical expectations for partisan preferences of different party families. These expectations are then subsequently tested for all relevant parties in the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, and the Netherlands. Jungblut shows that parties do hold differing preferences along both dimensions, but that there is also moderate variation within party families.

McLendon, M. K., Hearn, J. C., and C. G. Mokher 2009. Partisans, professionals, and power: The role of political factors in state higher education funding. *The Journal of Higher Education* 80.6: 686–713.

The authors investigate how different political factors influence public funding for higher education in the different states of the United States. Drawing on literature on (1) higher education finance, (2) higher education governance, and (3) comparative state politics, they show that political factors are of central importance and that certain attributes of state political systems and institutions affect government spending on higher education.

Taylor, B. J., and C. C. Morphew. 2015. Trends in cost-sharing in the US and potential international implications. *Higher Education Policy* 28.2: 129–149.

This article investigates cost-sharing, meaning the principle that different sources contribute to the cost of higher education. Using university-level data from the United States the authors explore the increasing shift of costs from governments to students. Their results suggest that the share of tuition increases as a university draws a larger share of its enrolment from low-income households.

Willemsse, N., and P. de Beer. 2012. Three worlds of educational welfare states? A comparative study of higher education systems across welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy* 22.2: 105–117.

The authors apply central concepts of welfare state analysis to higher education. They explore systematic differences in higher education policies across nineteen developed western countries categorized as social democratic, liberal, or conservative welfare regimes. They conclude that

including higher education in comparative welfare states analysis might result in less clear-cut categorizations of welfare regimes due to variations in higher education regimes.

REGIONAL APPROACHES TO HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

These contributions address both the regional peculiarities of higher education systems as well as processes of regionalization, which frequently can be understood as targeted efforts to balance regional specificities with processes of globalization or to provide a common regional reaction to global developments. The somewhat older contributions Marginson and Considine 2000, Yonezawa 2003, and Dill 2003 examine higher education developments in Australia, Japan, and the United States respectively. Corbett 2003 addresses the emergence of the European Community as a key factor in higher education. Dobbins and Knill 2009 and Dobbins and Knill 2014 explore concrete impacts of Europeanization in both Eastern as well as Western Europe, while Tomusk 2006 analyzes the perception and impact of the Bologna Process in peripheral European regions. Lo 2014 focuses on China's role as a "norm-taker" and its potential for becoming a "norm-setter" in higher education, while Verger and Hermo 2010 compares regionalization processes in South America and Europe. Bernasconi 2008 presents a Latin American model of the university and debates to what extent this model is being challenged, for example, by the rising importance of the US-inspired research university. Cloete, et al. 2015 explores higher education in dynamics in sub-Saharan Africa, while Vukasovic, et al. 2017 addresses whether the political salience of the Bologna Process has faded over space and time. Bernasconi, A. 2008. Is there a Latin American model of the university? *Comparative Education Review* 52.1: 27–52.

Anchored in a historical analysis of the development of higher education in Latin America, Bernasconi discusses whether there is such a thing as a Latin American model of the university. He presents the basic characteristics of this model and afterwards highlights that this model is being challenged, among other things, by the rising importance of the model of the research university, which is being "imported" from US higher education.

Cloete, N., P. Maassen, and T. Bailey. 2015. *Knowledge production and contradictory functions in African higher education*. Cape Town: African Minds. [ISBN: 9781920677855]

This book presents the results of a long-term research project on knowledge production and higher education dynamics in sub-Saharan Africa. The different chapters address different

measures for the performance of universities as well as higher education's societal role and governance in this specific context. The authors end the book with some reflections on policy implications of their results for the further development of higher education in Africa.

Corbett, A. 2003. Ideas, institutions and policy entrepreneurs: Towards a new history of higher education in the European Community. *European Journal of Education* 38.3: 315–330.

This article investigates the higher education activities of the European Community (EC). By focusing on the history of the EC's involvement in the policy process, the author shows that this was a nonincremental process initiated at a particular moment by skillful politicians. The article presents an overview of the long-term development of European-level policymaking in higher education, highlighting that the years before 1971 were already characterized by intense policymaking activities.

Dill, D. 2003. Allowing the market to rule: The case of the United States. *Higher Education Quarterly* 57.2: 136–157.

Dill critically engages with the highly market-based structures of American higher education and addresses whether such markets function in the public interest. He analyzes the results of other larger studies and nicely outlines how higher education markets function in the United States and how they have been balanced by a growth in social support and benefit schemes such as federally subsidized loans, and tuition tax credits.

Dobbins, M., and C. Knill. 2009. Higher education policies in Central and Eastern Europe: Convergence toward a common model? *Governance* 22.3: 397–430.

The authors explore postcommunist higher education from the perspectives of historical institutionalism and institutional isomorphism. They develop empirical indicators for diverse aspects of university governance to measure whether the higher education systems of Poland, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, and Romania have converged toward a market-oriented model before and during the Bologna Process, or whether postcommunist reform trajectories were more decisively impacted by precommunist legacies and the persistence of communist governance practices.

Dobbins, M., and C. Knill. 2014. *Higher education governance and policy change in Western Europe: International challenges to historical institutions*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9781137399847]

This book provides a comparative analysis of the impact of “soft Europeanization” on higher education governance in Western Europe. Using concrete indicators of policy change, it focuses on university reform in Italy, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom to explore how historical legacies and transnational communication have impacted policy pathways.

Lo, W. Y. W. 2014. The emerging Chinese institutional architecture in higher education. *Chinese Education and Society* 47.1: 83–100.

Lo explores the emerging Chinese institutional architecture in Asia-Pacific higher education with a focus on Nye’s concept of soft power. He regards the Chinese cultural values and ranking systems and citations indexes as resources projecting Chinese soft power. Although China is still generally a “norm-taker” in higher education, Lo advances the argument that China may soon embrace the role of a norm-setter by promoting its own academic traditions, practices, and standards.

Tomusk, V., ed. 2006. *Creating the European Area of Higher Education: Voices from the periphery*. Higher Education Dynamics. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. [ISBN: 9781402046131]

This edited volume brings together a group of scholars focusing on the impact of the Bologna Process on countries perceived as peripheral (e.g., Russia, Turkey, Georgia, and numerous other Central and Eastern European countries). It engages with issues of imperialism, socioeconomic transformation, and higher education massification in these peripheral regions.

Marginson, S., and M. Considine. 2000. *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. [ISBN: 9780521791182]

The authors analyze the emergence of the “entrepreneurial university” in Australia on the basis of seventeen individual case studies. The reforms reflect a new direction in Australian higher education since the mid-1980s known as the Dawkins reforms. The case studies reflect a general trend toward what the authors describe as corporate-style executive leadership.

Verger, A., and J. P. Hermo. 2010. The governance of higher education regionalisation: Comparative analysis of the Bologna Process and MERCOSUR-Educativo. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education* 8.1: 105–120.

This very useful article explores the mechanisms of Europeanization of higher education. Going beyond numerous previous studies, which often fail to provide a definition of the concept of Europeanization and explicit theoretical approach of its underlying forces, this

article analytically clarifies the concept and provides a coherent framework to identify patterns of change. Specifically, it examines Europeanization based on external incentives (rationalist institutionalism) and European through social learning (sociological institutionalism).

Vukasovic, M., J. Jungblut, and M. Elken. 2017. Still the main show in town? Assessing political saliency of the Bologna Process across time and space. *Studies in Higher Education* 42.8: 1421–1436.

The authors examine the political importance of the Bologna Process for different actors involved and whether this varies over time, space, and types of actors. They investigate changes in the size and rank of delegations to the Bologna ministerial conferences. The results suggest that Bologna is losing political appeal for the national governments of European Union (EU) members, while for EU candidates and stakeholder organizations it remains politically salient.

Yonezawa, A. 2003. The impact of globalisation on higher education governance in Japan. *Higher Education Research & Development* 22.2: 145–154.

Yonezawa discusses changes in higher education governance in Japan with a focus on Japan's manufacturing-oriented social economy, internationalization pressures, and the country's purported "identity crisis". He argues that a lack of trust in higher education is a challenge to be overcome in order for the country to secure its global competitiveness.

FEDERALISM AND HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY

Federal states often represent complex environments for higher education governance due to the multiple levels of governance involved in decision making. Capano 2015 compares how three federal countries went about changes in their governance arrangements in higher education.

Jungblut and Rexe 2017 focuses in their analysis on a specific type of institution, coordination bodies, which are supposed to support coordination of state higher education policy in federal countries. Finally, McLendon, et al. 2005 analyzes higher education policy innovation and transfers between states in the United States.

Capano, G. 2015. Federal strategies for changing the governance of higher education: Australia, Canada, and Germany compared. In *Varieties of governance. dynamics, strategies, capacities*. Edited by G. Capano, M. Howlett, and M. Ramesh, 103–130. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [ISBN: 9781137477965]

This chapter focuses on recent changes in higher education governance in multilevel federal settings that are conceived as battles between governments and other major policy actors pursuing their own interests. This complex, unstable process is characterized not only by conflict, but also by agreements, bargaining and horizontal networking, or hierarchical relations.

Jungblut, J., and D. Rexe. 2017. Higher education policy in Canada and Germany: Assessing multi-level and multi-actor coordination bodies for policy-making in federal systems. *Policy and Society* 36.1: 49–66.

The authors focus on the way federal countries, where the responsibility for higher education is (partly) within the competences of the states, ensure coordination of their higher education policy. Using the example of Germany and Canada, the authors study how coordination bodies, (i.e., organizations with the specific mandate to coordinate state higher education policy) function and to what extent they share common structural characteristics.

McLendon, M. K., Heller, D. E., and S. P. Young 2005. State postsecondary policy innovation: Politics, competition, and the interstate migration of policy ideas. *The Journal of Higher Education* 76.4: 363–400.

This article investigates how policy innovation in higher education functions in the different states in the United States. It first describes the most recent wave of policy innovations and then analyzes several of these innovations using different analytical perspectives such as policy diffusion or interstate competition, focusing on a twenty-year period. The authors test their comparative framework for postsecondary policy adoption.