CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Institutional change in the Irish university 2008-2014: an examination through the lens of institutional logics
Authors	Gannon, Anne Margaret
Publication date	2019
Original Citation	Gannon, A. M. 2019. Institutional change in the Irish university 2008-2014: an examination through the lens of institutional logics. PhD Thesis, University College Cork.
Type of publication	Doctoral thesis
Rights	© 2019, Anne Margaret Gannon. - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/
Download date	2026-11-06 05:14:30
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/9539



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Ollscoil na hÉireann, Corcaigh

National University of Ireland, Cork



INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE IRISH UNIVERSITY 2008-2014: AN EXAMINATION THROUGH THE LENS OF INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS

Thesis presented by

Anne Margaret Gannon

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University College Cork

Department of Government & Politics

Head of Department: Dr. Clodagh Harris

Supervisors: Dr. Aodh Quinlivan and Dr. Emmanuelle Schön-Quinlivan

2019

Table of Contents

Abstract viii

Acknowledgements ix

Declaration x

List of Tables xi

Guide to Abbreviations xii

Chapter One: Introduction 1

1.1. Introduction 2

1.2. Aims of this research study 2

1.3. Theoretical approach to the study 3

1.4. Addressing the current gap in the academic literature 3

1.5. Methodological approach to this research study 5

1.6. Structure and content of thesis document 5

Chapter Two: Literature Review & Research Framework 7

2.1. Introduction 8

2.1.1. Objective of this study 9

2.1.2. Theoretical basis of this study 9

2.1.3. Chapter Structure 12

2.2. The University 13

2.3. Defining Institutions 14

2.3.1. The Institutional Field 15

2.3.2. Putting the Organisation and the Individual in an Institutional Context 17

2.4. Institutional Logics 18

2.4.1. Pluralism, Loose Coupling and De-coupling within the Institutional Context 19

2.4.2. Institutional Logics at the *Macro* Level 21

2.4.3. Institutional Logics at the *Meso* Level 22

2.4.4. Institutional Logics at the *Micro* Level 24

2.5. The Inter-Institutional System Ideal Types Typology 25

2.5.1. The Institutional Framework 26

2.6. The Structural and Regulative Dimension 29

2.6.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Macro* Level 30

2.6.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Macro* Level. 30
2.6.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Macro* Level 34
2.6.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Macro* Level 36
2.6.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level 37
2.6.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level 37
2.6.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level 39
2.6.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level 40
2.6.3. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level 41
2.6.3.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level 41
2.6.3.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level 43
2.6.3.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level 44
2.7. The Normative and Cultural Dimension 45
2.7.1. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Macro* Level 46
2.7.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Macro* Level 47
2.7.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Macro* Level 48
2.7.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Macro* Level 50
2.7.2. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Meso* Level 51
2.7.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level 51
2.7.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level 51
2.7.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level 53
2.7.3. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Micro* Level 55
2.7.3.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level 55
2.7.3.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level 56
2.7.3.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level 57
2.8. University Institutional Analytical Framework 59
Chapter Three: Methodology 63
3.1. Introduction 64
3.2. Guiding Methodological Framework 64
3.3. Strategy of Inquiry – The Case Study 66
3.3.1. Chosen Research Cases 67
3.3.2. Case Study Design and Approach 69

3.4. Data Collection Strategy 70
3.4.1. Closed Question Questionnaires 71
3.4.2. Questionnaire Participant Engagement 72
3.4.3. The Missing Questionnaire Data 74
3.4.4. Semi Structured Qualitative Interviews 75
3.4.5. Secondary Data 78
3.4.6. Areas Explored 79
3.4.7. Ethical Considerations 79
3.4.8. Pilot Studies 80
3.5. Data Analysis Strategy 80
3.6. Strengths and limitations of chosen research approach 84
3.6.1. Addressing Falsifiability 85
3.7. The overall components of the research plan 86
3.8. Chapter Overview 88
Chapter Four: Government Policy Changes impacting the Irish University 2008-2014 89
4.0. Introduction 90
4.1. The Irish University Sector - Background Context 91
4.1.1. Government Institutions and Legislative Context 92
4.1.2. Research Activity and Funding 93
4.1.3. Resourcing and Growth 93
4.2. Drivers which led to changes in higher education policy 94
4.2.1. Pressures from Europe 94
4.2.2. Report by the OECD Higher Education in Ireland (2006) 95
4.2.3. Key Government Reports 2006-2010 96
4.2.4. Public Sector Reform 99
4.2.5. Funding Policies Impacting on Higher Education 99
4.2.6. The Impact of the Public Sector Agreements 100
4.3. The National Strategy for Higher Education ('Hunt Report') (2011) 102
4.3.1. Changing the Landscape 105
4.3.2. Achieving the Objective of the National Strategy for Higher Education 106
4.3.3. Completing the Landscape Process 107

4.3.4. Enabling the National Strategy: HEA Report to the Minister for Education and Skills 108

4.4. Further Developments 2013 – 2014..... 109

4.5. Responses to Reform..... 111

4.6. Chapter Overview..... 112

Chapter Five - Case Study 1: University of Limerick..... 117

5.1. Introduction: University of Limerick (UL)..... 118

5.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension..... 119

5.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level 119

5.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: workforce reconfiguration and targeted research strategy 119

5.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: market based objectives and systems 121

5.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: a weakening in collegial structures 124

5.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level 125

5.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: scrutiny and changing expectations 125

5.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: metric based appointment and promotion systems 127

5.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: changing focus in the academic role 129

5.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension..... 130

5.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level 130

5.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: the changing value of research 131

5.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: 'management speak' and disciplinary divisions 132

5.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: moving from the intellectual to the market 133

5.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level 135

5.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: promoting measurable output 136

5.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: performance and resources challenges 137

5.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: pressure and reduced autonomy 140

5.4. Conclusion 141

5.5. The University Institutional Analysis Framework - UL..... 142

Chapter Six: Case Study 2 - Trinity College Dublin..... 145

6.1. Introduction – Trinity College Dublin (TCD)..... 146

6.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension 146

6.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level 146

6.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: struggles for resources, command and control 147

6.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: fund raising and corporate strategy 149

6.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the discipline under challenge 152

6.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level 154

6.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: scrutiny, performance and accountability 154

6.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: workload and the student-customer 156

6.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the demise of professional autonomy 158

6.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension 159

6.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level 159

6.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: expectations and the knowledge economy 159

6.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: developing commercial mind-sets 161

6.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: holding onto the academic mission 163

6.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level 164

6.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: valuing outputs 164

6.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: adopting business behaviours 165

6.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the value of the old fashioned scholar 167

6.4. Conclusion 169

6.5. University Institutional Analysis Framework - TCD 170

Chapter Seven: Case Study 3 - National University of Ireland, Galway 173

7.1. Introduction: National University of Ireland - Galway (NUIG) 174

7.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension 175

7.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level 175

7.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: doing more with less 176

7.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: KPIs and the rise in “academic capitalism” 180

7.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: conflicts in the marketplace 182

7.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level 183

7.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level 184

7.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: changing roles and management systems 185

7.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the demise of academic decision making .. 187

7.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension 188

7.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level 188

7.3.1.1. Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: the changing public view of the university 189

7.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: competition and promotion..... 190

7.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: emerging divisions in the academic endeavour 192

7.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level 195

7.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: public perception and the changing research landscape 195

7.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: pressures and unease..... 196

7.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the changing academic identity 198

7.4. Conclusion 200

7.5. University Institutional Analysis Framework - NUIG..... 200

Chapter Eight: Analysis of Research Findings..... 205

8.1. Introduction 206

8.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension 206

8.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level 207

8.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: new rules, scrutiny and control 207

8.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: reorientation towards the market..... 210

8.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the loss of the academic raison d'etre 212

8.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level..... 215

8.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: delivering state driven outcomes..... 216

8.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: recognition and reward in the new marketplace 219

8.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the declining influence of the academic scholar..... 221

8.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension..... 223

8.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level..... 224

8.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: changing values for the knowledge economy 225

8.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: changing language and business behaviour .. 226

8.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the new academic, leadership, fear and freedom..... 228

8.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level 231

8.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: engagement and reorientation. 231

8.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: performance measurement, competition and diverse responses..... 232

8.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: competition, divisions and dissonance 235

8.4. University Institutional Analysis Framework..... 237

8.5. Chapter Conclusion 240

APPENDICES 245

Appendix A Questionnaire Template..... 246

Appendix B Questionnaire Respondents Identifier and Method of Completion 256

Appendix C Questionnaire Results..... 257

Appendix D Consent Form – Qualitative Interview 267

Appendix E Qualitative Interview Template 268

Appendix F Interviewee Detail..... 271

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 273

Abstract

Institutional change is an important research area in the context of the evolution of the Irish university sector. 2008-2014 was an eventful period in bringing about changes within the sector. Drivers of transformation led by the state during this time arose from two distinct sources; developments in government policy within the university sector and the impact of the economic recession. This study focuses on institutional change within the Irish university at both the *meso* level where the academic discipline is located and the *micro* levels where the experiences of individual academic professionals are examined. Institutional logics comprise the theoretical lens used in this study. In analysing institutional change, three specific institutional logics are identified and examined; representing the societal sectors of the state (the government logic), the business corporation (the corporate logic) and the academic profession (the professional logic). The development of a theoretical framework enables a comprehensive examination of i) the formal structural and regulative dimension and ii) the normative and cultural dimension comprising these three separate institutional logics in the university at both the *meso* and *micro* levels between 2008 and 2014.

Through application of a comparative case study approach across three Irish universities, this research study asserts that the government and corporate logic aligned strongly during this six-year period against the backdrop of the strong economic and ideological drivers present in the institutional field influencing change. These influences were significant across all the universities at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. With the strengthening of the structural and regulative infrastructure developed by the corporate logic in conjunction with the formal dimensions of the government logic, the capacity for professional logic to withstand the new structural and regulative environment deteriorates. This pattern is evident at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels within the structural and regulative dimension. However, within the cultural and normative dimension, despite institutional change, the impact on the professional logic is different. Here while there is some weakening of professional values, practices and behaviours at both the *meso* level and the *micro* level, these are not uniformly experienced across all the case study universities. The research asserts that institutional change experienced within the cultural and normative dimension of the professional logic will vary at the *micro* level according to the ability of the professional academic to withstand the influence of government and corporate norms, practices and values and to continue to exercise professional values, identity and practices.

Acknowledgements

I wish to warmly thank those people to who I owe a debt of gratitude for their encouragement and support during the past six years.

I would like to firstly acknowledge my supervisors Dr Aodh Quinlivan and Dr Emmanuelle Schön-Quinlivan. Thank you both most sincerely for all your advice, patience, inspiration and kindness throughout my PhD journey.

To the staff in Human Resources in UCC, I appreciate your friendship and support over the course of my studies. I am also grateful to the many members of staff throughout UCC who encouraged me in my scholarly endeavours, expressing interest in my research work, offering reassurance and a listening ear - as well as giving lots of practical support and advice. I am grateful also to UCC Library and in particular Garret Cahill for so helpfully facilitating my many requests for interlibrary loans. I feel proud and privileged to work in UCC - a learning institution which supports, encourages and enables scholarly discovery and independent thinking.

I would also like to sincerely thank those academics working in UL, TCD and NUIG who participated in this research study– in particular the 39 academics who engaged so honestly and openly in interview with me.

Thanks to my family for their invaluable support in particular my uncle Dr Edmund Hogan who was a constant source of assistance, my sister Clare Beausang for your reassurance and confidence, my late father, Tom Beausang who instilled in me an appreciation for education and my mother Dr Ita Beausang who continues to inspire my interest in research and learning.

To my husband Tony for his incredible and wholehearted support throughout the past six-years. I couldn't have done any of this without you.

To my children, Conor, Michael and Amy – Thank you for your patience and good humour and the welcome interludes – the chats and endless cups of rooibos that kept me sustained throughout all those weekend long study retreats. The door sign that says "I'm still busy!" will come down now.

Declaration

This is to certify that the work I am submitting is my own and has not been submitted for another degree, either at University College Cork or elsewhere. All external references and sources are clearly acknowledged and identified within the contents. I have read and understood the regulations of University College Cork concerning plagiarism.

_____

Anne Gannon

December 2019

List of Tables

Page Number:

Table 1 Illustration of the characteristics of the chosen institutional orders within the university ……..25

Table 2 Institutional analysis framework ……28

Table 3 University Institutional Analysis Framework ……..60

Table 4 Case Study Tactics for Four Design Tests ……...70

Table 5 Summary of participant response rates to questionnaire ……..73

Table 6 Profile of interview participants……...76

Table 7 Five components of a research plan ……87

Table 8 Timeline detailing key legislative and policy documents 2008-2014 ……112

Table 9 University Institutional Analysis Framework – UL ……...142

Table 10 University Institutional Analysis Framework – TCD ……..170

Table 11 University Institutional Analysis Framework – NUIG ……201

Table 12 Impact on the structural and regulative dimensions at the *meso* and *micro* levels….207

Table 13 Impact on the normative and cultural structural dimensions at the *meso* and *micro* levels …… .224

Table 14 University Institutional Analysis Framework – combined case studies ……238

Guide to Abbreviations

DCU	Dublin City University
ECF	Employment Control Framework
EU	European Union
EUA	European Universities Association
FEMPI	Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest Act 2009
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
HEA	Higher Education Authority
HR	Human Resources
IFUT	Irish Federation of University Teachers
IUA	Irish Universities Association
KPIs	Key performance indicators
MSc.	Masters of Science Degree
NDP	National Development Plan
NPM	New Public Management
NUI	National University of Ireland
NUIG	National University of Ireland, Galway
OECD	The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PHD	Doctorate
PRTLI	Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
RGAM	Recurrent Grant Allocation Model
SIPTU	Services Industrial Professional and Technical Union
SSTI	Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering & Maths
TCD	Trinity College Dublin
UCC	University College Cork
UCD	University College Dublin
UL	University of Limerick

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Introduction

This chapter sets out the aims of the research and an overview of the main methodological approach taken in this study. It also outlines the main contribution which this thesis makes to higher education research and institutionalism. The chapter concludes with an outline of the structure and content of the thesis.

1.2. Aims of this research study

The research question which this thesis seeks to examine is institutional change within the Irish university sector between 2008-2014 and whether government, market and professional logics have changed in emphasis, as a consequence of government-led policy. As will be detailed later in chapter four, 2008-2014 was an eventful period in bringing about changes within the Irish university sector. Drivers of transformation led by the state during this time arose from two distinct sources; developments in government policy within the university sector and the impact of the economic recession.

This is an important research area in the context of the evolution of the Irish university sector. Setting the scene for the timeline of this study, the Universities Act 1997 had a little over a decade previously set out eleven objectives for a university. In listing the purpose of the university, the professional aims were listed first and foremost. These focused on its traditional purpose in advancing knowledge, promoting learning and fostering independent critical thinking. It is noteworthy in examining government-led policy developments in the university sector between 2008-2014, that the 1997 Act also highlighted the university's contribution to the realisation of national economic and social development. As will be seen in this study, this objective became a key outcome sought by government during the period 2008-2014.

In establishing the objectives of the university, this legislation was clear that in its interpretation, a construction that would promote the ethos, principles and traditions of the university in performing its functions was viewed as superior to an interpretation that did not do so. The Universities Act was viewed by Walsh (2018, p.409) as "a compromise between traditional academic and managerial understandings of the university". It is against this backdrop that a little over a decade later, as will be described in chapter four below, the Irish university sector faced a changed operating environment in response to government-led policy developments.

In acknowledging the university in the context of the Universities Act 1997 as a complex multi-purpose entity, deeply rooted in the principles of tradition and academic freedom, the fundamental aim of this research study is to examine the institutional change which occurred between 2008-2014 as a consequence of government policy. In particular, this study focuses on institutional change within the Irish university at both the *meso* level where the academic discipline is located and at the *micro* levels where the experiences of individual academic professionals are examined.

1.3. Theoretical approach to the study

Institutional logics have been identified by the researcher as the theoretical lens best serving the aims of this study. At the outset, it is accepted that the university system is comprised of a number of discrete and identifiable institutional logics representing institutional orders present in society. As noted by Thornton and Ocasio (2008), institutional orders contain a central logic that guides organizing principles and both constrains and enables behaviour at all levels of society.

For the purposes of this study three specific institutional logics are identified and examined; the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic. These in turn represent the societal sectors of the state, the business corporation and the academic profession. Institutional logics enable analysis of both formal structures and regulations as well as informal normative and cultural aspects located in an institutional setting. The researcher is confident that the theoretical approach offered by institutional logics is an ideal mechanism to enable examination of both facets – the structural and regulative as well as the normative and cultural dimensions present within the university.

In examining the interplay of the formal and informal dimensions of the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels of the Irish university, the researcher is guided at the commencement of this study by the acknowledgement made by Scott (2013, p.91), that a lot can be learned by considering the "competition and struggle" exhibited by various actors "committed to contrasting institutional logics".

1.4. Addressing the current gap in the academic literature

Reay and Jones (2015, p.442) identify a deficit in the literature as to how institutional logics can be effectively "captured". The analytical framework developed as part of this study

addresses this deficit by providing a mechanism to identify, describe and examine institutional logics. The University Institutional Analysis framework (see Table 3) as developed by the researcher from various literature sources, primarily Bulmer and Burch (1998), Scott (2013) and Thornton et al., (2012) identifies the distinctions between government, corporate and professional logics in their structural, regulative, normative and cultural orientations. As will be shown, this model enables a comprehensive examination of these three separate institutional logics in the university at both the *meso* and *micro* levels between 2008 and 2014 and provides a valuable source of analysis for future studies in the area of institutional change. This is a most timely study given recent developments in Irish higher education in the past decade and with the direction taken by government towards the university sector.

Institutional logics have become a key theoretical construct in the study of institutions in recent years and a "vibrant research theme" (Greenwood et al., 2008). Commentators have noted that the full potential of institutionalism has not been realised in higher education research (Cai and Mehari, 2015). Institutional logics have been underutilised in academic research as illustrated by a study of publications (93 articles) which applied institutional theory in higher education between 1997 and 2014. Of this number, two studies applied the theoretical approach offered by institutional logics (*ibid*).

According to Lepori (2015, p.252) "[v]ery few papers draw explicitly on the theoretical and analytical machinery of logics theory in order to analyse higher education". No research has been uncovered that examines the influence of government action on institutional logics within the higher education sector, hence the significance of this study into an area of the institutional literature which has been largely neglected until now.

Thornton et al., (2012) describe how institutional logics operate across the spectrum at the *macro, meso* and *micro* levels. In acknowledging that hardly any research has been undertaken at the *micro* level, Zilber (2017) notes that the connections between institutions and those at the *meso* and *micro* levels have "remained quite outside the gaze of institutional logics scholars" (*ibid*, p.144). This study addresses this important gap in the academic literature in examining institutional change at the level of the individual academic.

Thornton et al., (2012, p.185), extensive contributors in the field of institutional logics, have highlighted the importance of future research to establish how stability and change at the macro-level influences orientations at the individual level. They identify the lack of an "elaborated theoretical framework linking macro- and microfoundations". In creating an

analytical framework which enables the examination of institutional logics across both the *meso* and *micro* levels, this study fills this void in the literature.

Finally, in carrying out a valuable analysis of the evolution of the Irish university sector during a period of considerable change and development between 2008-2014 and in examining the influence of change at the *meso* and *micro* levels, this study addresses a gap in public sector research and especially that of Irish higher education where studies of institutional change which employ institutional logic methodology at multi-level units of analysis, are limited.

1.5. Methodological approach to this research study

Thornton et al., (2012) proposes that a qualitative methodological approach has a lot to offer to the examination of institutional logics. Logics reveal themselves through the exploration of formal structural regulations and processes and informal norms and cultures.

The university sector between 2008-2014 comprised 7 universities. The researcher chose to examine three cases as a sample to enable an in-depth study. In identifying the case study universities, the researcher sought to select universities representative of the collective Irish grouping. The University of Limerick (UL), Trinity College Dublin (TCD) and National University of Ireland – Galway (NUIG) were chosen as representative universities. It is acknowledged by the researcher that the case study is both a useful and valuable methodological approach which readily enables an empirical inquiry into the phenomenon of institutional change at multiple-levels of analysis within the Irish university.

1.6. Structure and content of thesis document

The chapters of this thesis are structured as follows:

Chapter two sets out the theoretical framework together with a review of the scholarly literature in examining whether institutional change initiated by Irish Government policy has impacted institutional logics within the Irish university between 2008-2014. The chapter concludes with the presentation of a University Institutional Analytical Framework (Table 3) designed and developed by the researcher to enable a clear and comprehensive examination of three distinct institutional logics at the *meso* and *micro* levels

Chapter three sets out the research methodology applied in the study, detailing the guiding methodological framework, data collection and analytical strategy.

Chapter four provides a comprehensive description of the key actions of government between 2008-2014 which impacted on the Irish university sector.

Chapter five as the first of three case studies sets out the impact of government policy in the University of Limerick (UL) between 2008-2014 at the *meso* and the *micro* levels.

Chapter six presents the second case study analysing the experience of those working in Trinity College Dublin (TCD) during this time period.

Chapter seven sets out the third and final case study – which examines the National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG).

Chapter eight provides an analysis of the combined experiences of the three case study universities and in doing so addresses the research question whether as a consequence of institutional change driven by government-led policy, the prominence of the government, corporate and professional (academic) logic have changed within the Irish university sector between 2008-2014.

Chapter Two: Literature Review & Research Framework

2.1. Introduction

This chapter sets out the theoretical framework for this study which examines whether institutional change brought about by Irish Government policy has influenced institutional logics within the Irish university between 2008 and 2014. As will be seen in a later chapter, this six-year period was a time of significant activity within the university sector. State-led changes included developments in both the oversight and resourcing of the sector, as evidenced in government reports, speeches and various interactions between government representatives, state bodies and the universities. The clear intention of the Irish government between 2008 and 2014 was to bring about institutional change in the Irish university. The work of government and state agencies which brought about this change are described in detail in chapter four.

The scholarly literature asserts that contemporary higher education has and continues to be reshaped and redefined by its institutional environment (Gumport, 2000) and that in recent years a transformation has taken place within academe and its economic, political, cultural and ideological contexts (Henkel, 2012). A paradigm shift has taken place in recent decades in that higher education is no longer viewed primarily as a "public good" directed towards bringing about an educated citizenry. The various functions and meanings attributed to education have given rise to complex and active environmental pressures placed on the system (Meyer and Rowan, 2008). The effect of these developments is that the modern university pursues multiple goals and serves various constituencies and interest groups (Bleiklie and Kogan, 2007). As a result, many different logics are at play within its institutional field.

Institutional logics are revealed through rules, procedures, practices, values and beliefs (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). In this study attention is given to three specific institutional logics which have been identified by the researcher as being prominent within the contemporary Irish university setting. These are a) the government (or state logic), which comes from the state, b) the corporate logic, which comprises aspects of both the market and business, and c) the professional logic, representing the academic endeavour, which originates from the guild.

The government logic presents the university as an institute of the state, and university employees as public servants with the key focus on delivering objectives as set out by the state. The corporate logic considers the university as a business promoting its brand, focusing on its

competitive position in the market place, generating income and promoting performance. The professional (academic) logic views the university as encapsulating the ideals of preserving and enhancing its academic and scholarly reputation, with its focus on imparting learning and disciplinary expertise and adding to society's knowledge base.

2.1.1. Objective of this study

The objective of this study is to explore whether the government, market and professional logics have changed in emphasis as a consequence of government-led policy activity within the university sector between 2008 and 2014. Institutional logics are the theoretical lens which will be used to explore the impact of changes initiated by government policy. In seeking to achieve its objective, the researcher will concentrate on an analysis of institutional change at two separate levels: a) the *meso* level representing the academic discipline at the organisational level and b) at the *micro* level representing the academic at the individual level.

This study starts in 2008, a year which saw the publication of two key government reports: *Building Ireland's Smart Economy* and *Transforming Public Services.* These publications would set the tone and approach for further policy changes in the delivery of third level education within the Irish university sector. 2008, the year of the economic collapse, saw the funding of Irish universities significantly curtailed, and the introduction of resourcing constraint policies which impacted on institutions and employees. The study concludes in 2014, a year into the commencement of the performance evaluation framework for the Irish university sector, which placed metric-driven requirements on each university to deliver for the state.

In seeking to understand whether the institutional change initiated by government between 2008 and 2014 has resulted in a shift in emphasis in institutional logics, the case studies examined in this study will explore institutional logics at the *meso* and *micro* levels reflecting the experiences of disciplines and the individual academic. A brief introduction to the academic literature relevant to the study is set out below.

2.1.2. Theoretical basis of this study

Institutional change as described by Micelotta et al., (2017) has become a core research area in political science. The institutional change initiated by the government of Ireland within the university sector in Ireland during period 2008-2014 forms the backdrop to this study which will explore the extent to which the three institutional logics associated with (i) government,

(ii) market/business and (iii) the academic profession have changed in emphasis within the university in that time.

In commencing this study, it is accepted by the researcher that institutional change within the university has resulted from developments in government policy between 2008 and 2014. It is recognised that during this six-year period, as a consequence of the action of government, particular system arrangements, structures, values and behaviours have emerged within the university.

In presenting institutionalism, March and Olsen (2006, p.4) remark that it "comes in many flavours" which are all approaches to both "understanding and improving political systems". While the focus of political institutionalism is primarily on political behaviour, sociological institutionalism enables a broader examination (Bastedo, 2008). The focus of this study will draw on the strand of sociological institutionalism within neo-institutionalism which political scientists have been engaging with in growing numbers. As described by March and Olsen (1989, p.17), sociological institutionalism primarily describes how political institutions influence behaviour by shaping the 'values, norms, interests, identities and beliefs' of individuals.

According to Lowndes and Roberts (2013), while sociological institutionalism emerged from the influence of 'old' institutionalism, it has provided important building blocks for what they call the normative pillar of new institutionalism within the realm of political science. This normative dimension is of particular relevance within this research which explores the emergence and development of particular values, behaviours and practices within the university, arising from the influence of government policy.

Traditionally studies in political science have not been grounded in sociological institutional theory, although the emergence of neo-institutionalism within political science according to Peters (2012, p.128) had "its roots in the more sociological conception of institutions". Hall and Taylor (1996) note that neo-institutionalism which encompasses the sociological strand, has been of considerable benefit in increasing our understanding of the political world. They highlight the importance of an open approach and the extensive learning which can be achieved from exploring models from other disciplines, in carrying out studies of the political world.

The sociological strand of neo-institutionalism is considered appropriate to this study of the Irish university. As noted by Peters' (2012, p.128), it is particularly relevant to the study of

"the existence of institutions, their internal processes, and relationships with other institutions", all of which are key features of this research. In referring to a number of political scientists (March and Olsen 1984, Campbell 2002, and Schmidt 2008), Koning (2016) describes a differentiating characteristic of this theoretical approach in that it is concerned with the way institutions interact with norms and beliefs. These normative and cultural elements are central to institutional logics which comprise one of the main areas of this research study.

Institutional logics are a useful mechanism to describe and explore the topic of institutional change within the university in offering a meta-theoretical framework for analysing interrelationships amongst institutions, individuals and organisations (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999). The institutional logics construct is well matched to this study because its approach links the levels covered in this examination of the university within its institutional field, these being a) the *meso* level; the academic discipline, and b) the *micro* level; the individual academic. In offering this multifaceted approach, the institutional logics perspective provides a useful framework for looking at the university, which as Lepori (2015) notes, is complex in nature and contends with a hybrid of competing principles.

Despite being generally overlooked (Upton and Warshaw, 2017), institutional logics show promising potential for exploration of change within the university sector. While institutional logics have previously been applied to higher education research, these studies examined the sector in a different era and institutional context, several years prior to the notable engagement by government and supranational agencies such as the OECD with the university sector. Studies previously undertaken in the university sector include an examination of the higher education publishing industry (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999), an examination of performance management in Canadian universities (Townley, 1997) and an analysis of changing logics within the university setting such as that resulting from an identity shift from social institution to industry (Gumport, 2000). As the scholarly literature in the area of institutional logics and institutional change have been expanding in the past several years, this research study presents an opportunity to consider these sources and to make a greater contribution to the literature.

To summarise, the value of utilising institutional logics is that it enables consideration of institutional dynamics at various levels, from ideational beliefs, values and understandings to material practices, regulations and procedures. An institutional logics approach provides the opportunity to incorporate both structural, regulative, cultural and normative elements as well as state, corporate and professional aspects of the institutional environment within the research

study. This study is unique in that it employs institutional logics in a more involved way, at a number of levels of analysis in utilising a comprehensive analytical framework.

2.1.3. Chapter Structure

In establishing a systematic approach to examining the literature, the researcher initially set out to review academic sources in the area of institutionalism, institutional logics and the changing context of the university nationally and internationally at both the *macro*, *meso* and *micro* levels.

There is a significant body of literature in this area. The researcher did not establish exclusion criteria at the outset of the literature review process. While this may have enabled a stronger focus on core scholarly sources, the broad approach taken which encompassed a wide ranging review of the literature enabled the identification of the various conceptual elements at the heart of the research study to emerge over time. In presenting the literature, this chapter is organised as follows: Section 2.2 provides a description of the university as a public sector organisation. Section 2.3 provides an overview of the institutional theory which provides the theoretical underpinning of this research, together with a justification for the theoretical approach applied in this study. The institutional field, which is the environment within which the university as an institution operates, is introduced in section 2.3.1. Section 2.3.2 explains how the discipline at the *meso* level and the individual at the *micro* level fit within an institutional framework.

The second main theme from the literature; institutional logics, will be introduced in section 2.4 together with a description in section 2.4.1 of pluralism, loose coupling and de-coupling which are concepts relevant to this study given the multi-faceted and complex nature of the university environment. As outlined earlier, institutional logics in this study are examined at two levels; the *meso* organisational discipline level and the *micro* individual level of the academic. Section 2.4.2-2.4.4 describe how institutional logics operate in practice at the various levels. The inter-institutional framework which comprises the three institutional logics examined in this study are set out in section 2.5. Sections 2.6 and 2.7 presents the institutional framework comprising the structural, regulative, normative and cultural elements to enable analysis of the Irish university context between 2008 and 2014.

As the Irish university is the central focus of this study, the literature review will open by introducing this institution.

2.2. The University

Political science has been described as concerned with the formal aspects of government, including the law; its central focus is "the machinery of the governing system" (Peters, 2012, p.4). The university is described by Scott (2011) as a creature of the nation state. In Ireland, the university can be readily identified as a key instrument of the state, given its position as a major public institution (Kogan and Marton, 2006), as evidenced by the legislation that governs the university.

The structural, procedural and instrumental aspects of the university sector which comprise seven universities in the Republic of Ireland is reflected in the Universities Act (1997). Over the course of its forty-one pages, this institutional instrument establishes the government's authority and control in setting out the objects and function of the university and its relationship with the state. The 1997 Act sets out the governance arrangements and requirements to be adhered to by Irish universities in relation to such aspects as strategic planning, staffing, finance, property and quality assurance. This legislation also articulates the roles and responsibilities of central bodies and actors within universities including the governing body, academic council and key post holders including the University President.

Clancy (2015) notes the clear understanding amongst public policy makers that the university sector is a key factor in determining economic and social development. Many of the structural and normative dimensions of the university as an institution are reflected in the work undertaken on an ongoing basis by government departments and state bodies such as the Higher Education Authority (HEA) which is responsible for the strategic development of the Irish higher education and research systems. Government based administrative agencies such as the HEA, set out the on-going and operational expectations and requirements of the university in the service of the state. The Department of Education and Skills, under the control of the Minister for Education and Skills is in overall control of overseeing and determining policy, funding and the direction of the university sector in Ireland. In the context of much of the work of government, universities in Ireland are considered to be public service bodies.

The Irish government plays a critical role in the university sector arising from the fact that the operational costs of running the seven universities in Ireland are subsidised by the state in structured ways by direct and indirect means, through block grants, funds to support research in specific areas and performance related payments. Clancy (2015) notes that it is through the control of finances that the government has in recent years limited the autonomy of the

universities and as a consequence made it possible for the state to direct their activities in pursuit of its own objectives.

From an external perspective, the contemporary picture is one where universities are seen to be increasingly governed by the state and business and less by professional and academic considerations (Engwall, 2007). However, universities, academic disciplines and academics are all subject to pressures arising from the influence of various logics coming from government, corporate and professional structures and meaning systems. For example, within academic science disciplines, the particular logics, comprising the structures, practices and values of the profession and those of commerce, are both present and yet prescribe different behaviours. While the logics of the profession advocate for open publication and the pursuit of knowledge, this can be contrasted with the "proprietary retention and commercial exploitation of research results" which comes from the logics of commerce (Greenwood et al., 2011, p.318).

The university has been described as "a network of varying enterprises", comprising various disciplines and professions (Clark, 1983, p.29 as cited by Scott, 2017, p.857). Neither the university nor its institutional environment are simple or straightforward. The university environment is a complex and changing one, where universities, disciplines and individual academics experience various demands and expectations while working in an environment where multiple structures, practices, beliefs and values are present, some that work together and others that conflict. Given the shifting institutional context and the various demands and pressures faced by the Irish university as detailed in chapter 4, this study will also assist in identifying how these changes have impacted at the *meso* and *micro* levels

Having outlined aspects of the university context relevant to this study, the following section will provide a brief overview of institutionalism and its development.

2.3. Defining Institutions

For the purposes of this research, the university is considered as an institution in its own right. This is based on Selznick's view (as cited by Djelic, 2010, p.11) that an institution is an organisation "that has moved from being an instrument to becoming a meaningful community".

According to Peters (2012, p.1) "[t]he roots of political science are in the study of institutions. For March and Olsen, (1989) an institution is a formal collection of norms, rules, understandings and routines in addition to a carrier of identities and roles. North (1990)

describes institutions in a social context as a guide to human interaction which provides structure to daily life. Campbell (2004, p.1) also references the social dimension in depicting institutions as comprising the "formal and informal rules...and systems of meaning", the setting within which individuals and organisations operate and interact.

The initial focus of the early institutionalists in the mid to late 20th century was narrow, limiting its attention to the formal instruments of the state including the law. This formal-legal approach left little opportunity for the influence of individuals (Peters, 2012). The perspective of the new institutionalism which emerged in the 1980s was more expansive as it addressed the preponderance of 'under socialised' accounts of social, economic and political behaviour (Lowndes, 2001).

Bulmer and Burch (1998, p.603) invoke the social context to explain that institutional theory provides a link between those "deeper, structural factors such as those located in the economy, society and wider polity on the one hand, and human agency on the other". Arising from the premise that human agency is a product of institutions, both are considered inseparable (Bleiklie and Kogan, 2007). In explaining the emergence of neo- institutionalism, scholars have pointed to the increasing interest in the cognitive and cultural elements of institutions, (DiMaggio, 1991), those "shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and create the frames through which meaning is made" (Scott, 2013, p.67). According to Scott (*ibid*), these cultural-cognitive aspects are the primary distinguishing feature of neo-institutionalism.

The rationale for the inclusion of institutional theory in this study is because it provides a useful framework for exploring the impact of change in the university. The following section looks at the institutional field which comprises the environmental context within which the university as an institution operates. This literature is relevant to the study, as it highlights how aspects within the external environment may be drivers for creating institutional change.

2.3.1. The Institutional Field

The central construct of neo institutional theory is the institutional field (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). As a general guide, the field may include any element which creates a coercive, normative or mimetic influence (DiMaggio 1991) as well as those regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive structures that guide social behaviour and provide stability and meaning within organisations (Scott, 1995).

In carrying out its activities, the university maintains a presence in the educational, the economic and the community fields. This creates a situation where it hosts multiple logics in the form of differing practices, values and identities. Working within this arena offers the potential for shared values and working alliances as well as creating a situation, where there can be conflicting values or competition between activities within the various fields (Scott, 2017).

Organisations seek to achieve legitimacy, approval and resources from within the institutional field which comprise the social, economic and political environment and which are key to their continued existence (Parker, 2011, in citing Euske and Euske 1991, Fogarty, 1996; Stone, 1991). Within higher education, the institutional field is a "highly interactive relational space" (Hoffman and Wooten, 2008, p.142). It includes government, funding agencies, professional associations, special interest groups, business and commercial organisations, and the general public.

Fields can be viewed as "arenas of power relations", where some actors occupy greater advantaged positions than others (Brint and Karabel, 1991 as cited by Reay and Hinings, 2009, p.631). Institutional fields are not placid and settled social spaces, but arenas in which multiple players seek to advance their interests and where some are able, for longer or shorter periods, to impose their idea of the 'rules of the game' on others (Bourdieu, 1971,1984 as cited by Scott, 2013, p.221). The rules of membership and standards of practice that structure these fields can reward particular strategic positions and practices while sanctioning others, motivating those actors less privileged by current rules to work to overcome or change them (Bourdieu 1993 as cited by Lawrence, 1999).

Campbell (2004, p.19) notes that because organisations of a common type share a similar institutional environment, they can all adopt similar practices and approaches over time and so become isomorphic or homogenous. Deem et al., (2007, p.4.) writing about higher education, characterises the presence of institutional isomorphism as "irresistible cultural pressures generated by the dominant cultural values, policy priorities and structural designs that hold sway over defined historical periods within a particular institutional domains or fields" and "forces individual organisations to conform to whatever a prevailing archetype demands".

Institutions are maintained, altered and extinguished as they are enacted by collections of individuals in everyday situations" (Powell and Rerup 2017, p.311). Institutionalism which

describes the shaping and development of institutions is enabled through a process which is concerned with "the totality of relevant actors". It incorporates an inclusive 'top-down' approach where rules and regulations create an institutional field. At the same time, a 'bottom-up' shaping of structures is taking place, through such processes as fashion and sense making (Frølich et al., 2013). Campbell (2004, p.57) notes that while the formal elements of institutional change may be more abrupt, the informal aspects which comprise the normative and cultural are more gradual in nature. Lowndes and Roberts (2013 in citing Collier and Collier, 1991) also describe how a critical juncture can emerge at moments of political upheaval, such as the economic recession of 2008 which can bring about major and far-reaching change.

The cultural institutional perspective highlights the importance of informal norms and values which develop over time becoming features of institutional life and what Christensen (2011, p.506) describes as the institution's "cultural profile and soul". Practices, values and behaviours will endure and persist, often due to the "active efforts of those who benefit from them" (Powell, 1991, p.191). This concept of path-dependency can cause particular behaviours to become locked into the institution with the effect of constraining options for future actors (Campbell, 2004) or creating resistance towards institutional change and reform (Paradeise et al., 2009b as cited by Christensen, 2011, p.506).

Having examined the elements in the institutional field which are of relevance in considering institutional change, the following section describes institutionalism at the *meso* and the *micro* levels which is the focus of this study.

2.3.2. Putting the Organisation and the Individual in an Institutional Context

Institutional processes impact at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. The distinction between institutions and organisations is relevant to this study, given that the theoretical framework applied focuses on an examination of the university in an institutional context and the academic discipline at an organisational level. According to North (1990) organisations like institutions provide structure to human life.

To put the academic discipline in context is to think about it as an organisation, bound by common objectives whose development is determined by the institutional framework within which it operates. It is important to point out that the academic discipline which represents the organisational context in this study also influences the institution (the university), in enabling and constraining developments at an institutional level. Deem et al., (2007, p.27) in citing a

number of scholars (Trow, 1994; Beecher and Trowler, 2001; Shattock, 2003), acknowledges that the "primary allegiance of the 'academic tribes' may have always been to their discipline rather than their institution". Having set out the theoretical underpinnings of this study in relation to institutions the following section will describe the area of institutional logics which comprises the theoretical lens applied to this research.

2.4. Institutional Logics

Institutional logics capture the wider belief systems and material practices associated with key institutions in society (Friedland and Alford 1991; Thornton and Ocasio, 1999). They originate from sectors of society such as the professions, the state, the market and corporations. Each sector is guided by a distinctive set of norms, sources of legitimacy, authority and identity. Institutional logics "define the content and meaning of institutions" (Reay and Hinings, 2009, p, 631). Described as the 'rules of the game', (Ocasio et al., 2017 as cited by Smets et al., 2017, p.373) they are reflected in the structures, practices and beliefs relevant to a particular institution (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008, p.121). In addition to providing a template for action, (Bastedo, 2008), these structures, practices and beliefs provide meaning and guide decision-making within a given field (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999).

Both the interests, identities, values and assumptions of individuals and organisations are embedded within prevailing institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). In practice, institutional logics which govern different institutions within society represent particular ways of thinking and behaving which may be either complementary or competitive (Zilber, 2017) when they encounter other institutional logics. The institutional logics under scrutiny in this study - representing the government, corporation and profession - taken together create a multiplicity of meanings which both enable and constrain the process of institutionalisation. This dynamic then translates into different organising practices and approaches which can lead to change, as a consequence of contestation between competing logics.

Institutional logics possess framing capacities which assist "individuals to locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within their life space and the world at large" (Snow et al., 1986, p.464 as cited by Meyer and Hammerschmid, 2006). Institutional logics work in a practical manner to provide a link between institutions and action. They are of benefit to this study in facilitating an analysis of the university by providing a bridge between the *macro* at the level of the institutional field and at the *meso* and *micro* levels representing the discipline and the individual academic respectively.

According to Scott (2013, p.91) many of the key tensions and change dynamics observed in contemporary organisations and the institutional field can be effectively examined by considering the competition among various categories of actors, committed to contrasting institutional logics. This situation can be seen in the university where boundaries are constantly being redrawn, demanding operation in new public and service domains to satisfy various agencies, agendas and performance measures.

Institutional development occurs as the properties of institutions comprising rules, structures, practices and values are created and changed. These changes are driven by state requirements or where the university seeks to achieve corporate goals. At the same time as these developments are taking place, further institutional change may also be taking place as residues from former institutional arrangements continue, re-emerge and are re-invented (Djelic, 2010).

Within the university context, the resulting institutional complexity creates a situation where existing institutional models may be "contested and less taken-for-granted", compelling organisational and individual actors such as disciplines and academics to "navigate between competing institutional pressures" (Lepori, 2015, p.250). The dynamics of this particular complexity experienced by the university will be explored in the following section which describes pluralism and institutional de-coupling.

2.4.1. Pluralism, Loose Coupling and De-coupling within the Institutional Context

The higher education field is regularly given as an example of an institutional field which is characterized by institutional pluralism (Canhilal et al., 2016). Pluralism derives from the existence of different interest groups, each of which has the power to guarantee that their interests remain legitimate (Lindblom, 1965 as cited by Jarzabkowski and Fenton, 2006). Within a pluralistic environment, "very different beliefs and values might be simultaneously taken for granted" (Kraatz and Block, 2008, p.244). Lepori (2015, p.248) describes the experience of the university sector as one where as he notes:

> principles from the market sphere (orientation to customers, competition) coexist with principles from the state (equality, social justice) and with principles from the professional sphere (reputation, autonomy).

A key challenge for the university regarding the institutional environment is where "different segments of society tolerate the university and support it for very different reasons and its constituencies infuse it with a wide variety of different values and logics" (Kraatz, 2009, p.71).

Universities experience increasing pluralistic tensions arising from competing demands for growing commercial oriented performance whilst also maintaining their professional role in society and ensuring quality in their public services (Satow, 1975 as cited by Jarzabkowski and Fenton, 2006). It is the wide and varied nature of the institutional environment which imposes these multiple identities, makes different demands and creates continuing and inherent tensions internally (Frølich et al., 2013). Consideration of these pluralistic dimensions are central to this study in reviewing how government, market/business and professional (academic) logic have been influenced by the institutional change arising from the actions of government between 2008 and 2014.

In considering institutional change, Hannan and Freeman (1984, as cited by Ashworth et al., 2007) propose that organisational culture may be less open to the influence of change; that while environmental forces may change the periphery of the organisation which includes formal structures and processes, those core informal elements which encompass the organisation's cultural identity and value system remain unchanged.

Commentators including Birnbaum (1988) describe how the university can be managed effectively in a loosely coupled manner with informal normative and cultural aspects, which include practices and values, being kept separate from the formal structures of policy, regulations and governance. This concept of loose coupling has helped scholars to understand how institutions such as universities "continue to operate using familiar informal routines and practices despite waves of formal policy reforms and environmental pressures to change" (Sarrico and Melo, 2012, p.91). As a result of loose coupling, universities can be seen as meeting the expectations of the key stakeholders such as government during times of change (Ashworth et al., 2007), while those cultural practices, activities and behaviours attached to the former regime continue.

As a result of pressures to adopt new practices, some institutional logics will become decoupled - while on the surface a rule-based structure may present as compliant and exhibit symbols of efficiency and effectiveness, in reality those qualities will be lacking and the system will lack legitimacy. Decoupling can be effective in enabling organisations to "maintain standardized, legitimating formal structures", although practices on the ground may differ (Meyer and Rowan, 1977, p.357). For example, at the *micro* level, while an academic identifying with the profession will facilitate practices in keeping with prevailing norms, decoupling will arise where the practice runs contrary to established norms and as a consequence, the adoption of

new practices is resisted (Mezias, 1990; Jonsson, 2009 as cited by Boxenbaum and Jonsson, 2017, p.86).

The university has been described as a strong example of an entity with the capacity to adapt routinely to external institutional forces without experiencing change. This is down to the influences of social actors and internal institutional pressures which can generate a great deal of loose coupling at various levels of the organisation (Krücken and Meier, 2006). An example of this in the university setting is the creation of structures such as quality assurance systems and management procedures which together have commercialisation, quality, efficiency and value for money as their main focus. These institutional myths play a role in creating legitimacy where the university develops new structures, procedures and practices to demonstrate its adherence to both corporate logics and the logics of the knowledge society (Nokkala, 2007). While at the *meso* and *micro* levels, these structures and practices may not be recognised and given legitimacy.

Having introduced institutional logics, this concept will now be examined at the three separate levels. Our purpose is to provide a full understanding of institutional logics in the context of this study. Scott (2017) reports that one of the benefits of institutional theory is its ability to enable analysis across different levels from the individual to the societal. This study comprises an examination at the *meso* level where the academic discipline is located and the *micro* level where the individual academic is situated. The following section will look at each of these in turn, and will firstly present a description of institutional logics at the *macro* or institutional level.

2.4.2. Institutional Logics at the *Macro* Level

Historians have noted the development and strengthening of three distinct logics over time within the university, each of which presents a unique meaning and identity (Delmestri et al., 2015). While the university was traditionally characterised by the founding guild logic, it was then replaced by the professional (academic) logic. This was followed by the government logic which has more recently represented the identity of the university as a result of increased government oversight. More recently, the marketized logic which comprises the corporate logic has emerged which has seen many universities becoming more involved in professional marketing and branding campaigns, devoting considerable resources to these activities. Since 2008, changes facing the university "have compelled dramatic shifts in institutional logics in universities in order to compete in the global arena" (Howells et al., 2014, p.269).

Different logics can also be the source of political tension and difficulties, while the emergence of one logic over another brings with it changes in the value system, and a situation where a different set of values takes precedence (Friedland and Alford, 1991). Institutional complexity arises in the face of incompatible prescriptions from multiple and interconnected institutional logics (Greenwood et al., 2011).

Kraatz and Block (2008, p. 258) refer to the phenomenon of "the Selznickian institution" which provides an explanation for how a pluralistic and complex entity such as a university or an academic discipline may effectively function. A "Selznickian institution" possesses multiple institutionally-developed identities and "is an autonomous 'organisational self' which is capable of reprioritizing, reinterpreting, and mediating between its identities according to necessity". It also has constitutional obligations which limit the flexibility it can exhibit and require it to perform in a dependable and reliable manner. Having explored institutional logics at this institutional level, the organisational context for academic disciplines that operate within the university at the *meso* level will now be examined.

2.4.3. Institutional Logics at the *Meso* Level

Within this study, disciplines are examined at the *meso* level. Disciplines comprise formally organised academic units within the university. As described by Gornitzka (1999, p.12) each discipline or department "is a world in itself" arising from the minimal functional dependence between organisational units. Within each discipline, professionals are socialised, trained to research, and provide scholarly instruction in accordance with disciplinary norms. For the purpose of this research, three specific disciplinary fields are examined; arts and humanities, science and business.

Organisations act as players according to rules created by institutions (North, 1990). At the *meso* level (that of the academic discipline), the sources, meaning and impact of economic, political and social interests are contingent on the higher-order societal institutional logics present (Thornton, 2004). Deem et al., (2007, p.4) in pointing towards the isomorphism which can arise between disciplines notes that:

> organizations are highly constrained by the institutional environments and operational fields in which they are embedded and located, such that they tend towards the adoption and retention of very similar forms and practices.

Institutional logics at these higher levels work to create different types of organisational context for disciplines by defining their goals, design and governance structures (Meyer et al., 2013).

Systems of governance, strategy and of work are all set down by the central prevailing logic (Spicer, 2006). Key institutional agents and processes impacting at the level of the discipline, include those coming from the state, professions and international associations which impose regulative, normative and cognitive-cultural influences (Nokkala, 2007 citing Peters, 1999).

Within a specific discipline, with its varying identities, purposes, goals and belief systems, it can be assumed that no one group is likely to be completely content and political pressures will arise. Characteristics such as structures, rules and identity may cause a particular discipline to be more sensitive to some logics and less to others (Greenwood et al., 2011). In addition, struggles may arise which feature the "old guard", dedicated to preserving the *status quo* while a "new guard" demonstrates interest in creating new ways of working (Maguire et al., 2004). Logics may also be observed by disciplines specifically for the purpose of getting support and approval from key stakeholders (Greenwood et al., 2011).

Organisations may experience diverse demands as a consequence of the presence of a number of institutional logics. One example which illustrates this situation in the university context is that of Business Schools which have been described as "living in something of an audit culture" where they encounter demands from a number of highly organised institutional constituencies including governments (providing financial resources), the business community (who supply legitimacy, sponsorship and hire graduates) and professional associations, ranking and accreditation agencies (who specify requirements and set standards) (Walsh, 2011, p.217 as cited by Greenwood et al., 2011).

The discipline as an organisation can adopt particular strategies by being selective in addressing institutional pressures, or by hiring individuals who identify clearly with particular logics. Alternatively, structural demarcations can be created, such as the identification of specific roles or positions to separate out particular logics (Lepori, 2015). Institutional ambidexterity is a tool available to academic disciplines enabling institutional complexity or pluralism to be effectively managed where incompatible logics collide (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013). Ambidexterity is described as "the ability to simultaneously perform contradictory processes when both are critical to organisational success" (*ibid* p.44).

The discipline at the level of the organisation operates between the perspectives of the differentiated (macro-societal) institutional logics at the institutional university level and those logics which operate at the level of the individual academic, all of which provide potential for

influencing institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008; Thornton et al., 2012). The case which exists at the *micro* level is set out in the following section.

2.4.4. Institutional Logics at the *Micro* Level

According to Musselin (2007, p.1) the academic profession does not exist in a stable state but is adaptive and responsive to change while it strives to "enact its own environment". A good example of how institutional logics can be observed at the *micro* level is by looking at the concept of identity which forms a central link between institutional logics and the behaviour of individuals (Lok, 2010, p.1305). It is further shaped through interaction between individual actors and others (Henkel, 2012). Values are key to defining identity (Winter and O'Donoghue, 2012). Within the university sector, values are seen as underpinning all aspects of academic and university life by legitimising particular actions and approaches on the part of individuals, thus bringing particular institutional logics to prominence.

Connecting with a particular logic is considered a particularly political course of action (Bastedo, 2009 as cited by Upton and Warshaw, 2017) at the level of the individual and there may be implications by taking a particular approach, in terms of gaining or losing political capital. The literature on institutional logics suggests that organisational members' attitudes towards a particular logic is driven by the extent to which they have been surrounded by this logic arising from their education or professional experiences (Bourdieu 1980; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983 as cited by Pache and Santos, 2013). In responding, individuals may adopt a number of different stances towards a particular logic: it may be embraced, ignored, resisted or partly complied with (Lok, 2010).

Logics are not uniquely top-down; people in particular contexts with their own experiences "play with them, question them, combine them with institutional logics from other domains, take what they can use from them, and make them fit their needs" (Binder, 2007, p.568). This approach is presented as a tool kit approach (Swindler, 1986 as cited by Ocasio et al., 2017, p.515) which enables different logics to be drawn upon in different situations.

Bringing together the individual at the *micro* level, the discipline at the *meso* level and the university and institutional field at the *macro* level, Friedland and Alford's (1991, as cited by Thornton et al., 2012) theory on institutional logics highlights the interaction between three interdependent, autonomous levels, with individuals competing and negotiating, organisations in conflict and coordination, and institutions in contradiction and interdependency. In this way

institutional logics provide a bridge between both the *macro*, structural perspective and the *micro* process approach (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008).

The following section explores the differences between the three specific institutional logics applied in this study; (i) the government logic, (ii) the corporate logic and (iii) the professional (academic) logic. The inter-institutional system ideal types typology originally proposed by Thornton (2004) is used in the following section to illustrate the unique characteristics of each of these three logics.

2.5. The Inter-Institutional System Ideal Types Typology

As previously outlined, institutional logics comprise a field's organising principles. All these societal subsystems or institutional orders (Friedland and Alford, 1991) when "combined, compose the key cornerstone institutions of society" (Thornton et al., 2012). For the purposes of illustration, Table 1 below provides an example of the distinct and specific characteristics of the three institutional orders which appear in this study (as adapted from Thornton et al., 2012, p.57).

In this study, both the market and corporation are combined in a single institutional order, the corporate institutional order. This is in keeping with the approach proposed by Blomgren and Waks, (2015, p.3) where the market logic is accompanied by the managerial logic. A similar view is also supported by Thornton et al., (2012) as cited by Currie and Spyridonidis, (2016, p.7) who suggests that "market and corporate logic blend and blur".

Table 1 Illustration of the characteristics of the chosen institutional orders within the university

Key Characteristics	**State or Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional (Academic) Logic**
Institutional Goal/Mission	Contribution towards economic objectives	Market place performance, position in ranking tables	Scholarly reputation
Institutional Identity	University as an agent of the state	University as a business corporation	University as a professional association

This typology is helpful in approaching this study as it identifies the unique differences between the institutional logics of each of the chosen institutional orders. It also shows how those influenced by a particular institutional order, whether the corporation, the profession or the state, may be expected to understand their own identity, mission and goals. These characteristics and differentiators, will be applied to form a guiding framework within this study, to assist in identifying whether there has been a shift in institutional logics within the university in the period 2008 and 2014.

Key to an ability to analyse the impact of change within the university, is an appreciation of the institutional framework which enables institutional change. The following sections describe the institutional dimensions which will be applied in this study, to assist in uncovering whether government policy, has impacted institutional logics at the level of the discipline and academic.

2.5.1. The Institutional Framework

The institutional framework is composed of ideas and carriers. Carriers include relational systems, rules, practices or beliefs and they work to recreate, promote and spread ideas and establish their legitimacy. In some situations, actors and groups may be identified as representatives or carriers of a particular logic and as such, are seen to demonstrate a commitment to both defending and promoting practices associated with it (Pache and Santos, 2013). Alternatively, actors may not be associated with any logic and may instead draw upon different logics, according to the situation presenting. Meyer and Rowan (1977) argue the presence of 'institutional myths' such as structures, regulations, norms and behaviours which may be ceremoniously accepted to gain or maintain legitimacy in the institutional environment.

Scott (2013) offers a typology which provides an all-encompassing framework for conceptualising institutions. This three pillars framework comprises i) regulative systems, ii) normative systems and iii) mimetic or cultural-cognitive systems. Carriers within the first regulative pillar, take the form of rules and formal structures and create a coercive influence. The second normative pillar, defines ways of behaving and expectations around such aspects as roles and responsibilities. The third pillar, which came to prominence during the neo-institutionalist era, takes the form of cultural-cognitive carriers and encompasses beliefs, values and identities. In presenting the concept of the three pillars, Scott (2008, p.202) explains how

institutions are composed of diverse elements which depend on different bases of compliance and employ varying mechanisms.

Within this model, these institutional pillars constrain and enable actors in different ways; through rules, practices and narratives (Lowndes and Roberts, 2013). Hoffman considers all three categories as moving "from the legally enforced to the taken-for-granted" (1995, p.36 as cited by Peters, 2012). These structures, rules, norms, values and identities can be seen as "both instruments of stability and arenas of change" (March and Olsen, 2006, p.11). As these dimensions will be used in this study to describe aspects of the institutional context within the university setting, it may be useful to set out how these pillars play out in practice.

According to Scott (2017), one or another element will take precedence in different arenas. So for example, while practices and codes of behaviour may be prominent for the academic profession, for government, rules and structures which comprise the regulative system are the main target of attention. In stable social systems, activities persist and are reinforced because they enjoy the strength of the combined forces that are contained within the structural, the regulative and the normative and cultural dimension, assuming that they are supported by authorised powers. According to Scott (2003), most institutions are made up of elements of all three dimensions, and different components may be dominant at different times during the evolution of institutions.

Scott (2017) refers to the growing prominence of movements such as neoliberalism which are reinforced through regulative means. He notes that regulative efforts may encounter the institutional forces of normative practices or cultural cognitive beliefs which are resistant to change. As a consequence, a complex arrangement may emerge comprising both new institutional structures and regulations, as well as enduring and historical practices or beliefs. This situation reinforces the fact that while the impact of rules and formal structural changes may be powerful, the mediating influences of normative and cognitive aspects should not be ignored (Campbell, 2004, p.130).

Change occurs as institutions comprising regulations, normative behaviour, ideas and beliefs become deinstitutionalised and lose autonomy, as they become controlled by stronger institutions. The ability to adapt may also weaken as the environmental context changes and

becomes more complex and the meaning system for that institution becomes less coherent (Peters, 2012).

In the university setting, each of Scott's (2001) three dimensions; regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive are all present in varying degrees at the level of the university itself (the *macro* level), the academic discipline (the *meso* level) and for the individual academic (the *micro* level). Activity within the regulative, normative and cultural domains is considered integral to the institutionalisation process whereby the institution, (in this case the university) and those within it become shaped by the environment through the process of institutional adaptation and change (*ibid*).

Bulmer and Burch (1998, p.604) organise these institutional elements within a four category framework, as follows:

- Formal institutional structures representing rules, formal organisations and positions;
- Processes and procedures;
- Codes and guidelines;
- Cultural aspects relating to norms, values and identities.

The institutional framework set out in Table 2 includes aspects of both the model proposed by Bulmer and Burch (1998) and Scott's three pillars (2001, p.53) in setting out the identifying relevant characteristics within each of the structural, regulative, normative and cultural categories.

Table 2 Institutional analysis framework

	The Structural and Regulative Dimensions	**The Normative and Cultural Dimensions**
Institutional Indicators	Formal structures – i.e. governance systems; rules, processes and procedures.	Norms, behaviours and practices; beliefs, values, identities.

Source: adapted from Bulmer and Burch (1998) and Scott (2001, p.53).

The simple framework shown in Table 2 will be expanded upon later in this chapter to be used as a mechanism along with Table 1 which will analyse the structural, regulative, normative and cultural dimensions present in the university during the six-year period of the study.

In seeking to address the objectives of the study - the extent to which institutional change as brought about by government policy has impacted the discipline and academic, the following institutional dimensions will be looked at in turn;

(i) the structural and regulative dimension in terms of formal institutional structure, rules and procedures;

(ii) the normative and cultural dimensions in terms of the focus of activities, value orientation and behaviours.

Such an approach follows Campbell (2004) who notes that as institutions are multidimensional in nature, in order to analyse institutional change, it is important to identify all of the key institutional dimensions so as to observe the extent to which each one changes.

These two dimensions; i) the structural/regulative and ii) normative/cultural, will each be introduced in the following sections with an illustration as to how these become operationalised at the *macro* (institutional), *meso* (organisational) and *micro* (individual) levels.

2.6. The Structural and Regulative Dimension

The structural and regulative dimension is seen as having primacy over the other categories as it sets out the framework within which the more informal activities take place (Bulmer and Burch, 1998). Structures and rules in this context have been described as explicit regulative processes which include rule-setting, monitoring, and sanctioning activities (Scott, 2008). They are an important resource as noted by Scott (1987, p.508), "those who can shape or influence them possess a valuable form of power" in shaping and constraining behaviour.

The introduction of formal structures and rules is a way to appear rational, conform to the institutional environment and so gain legitimacy (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). The strength and influence of formal rules and structural changes is set out by North (1990), who notes that the pace of change brought about by formal rules is swifter than the rate of change from normative and cultural aspects. This leads to tensions between various elements in a situation, where formal institutional change takes effect quickly and may conceal what has been described as the "rigidities of underlying norms and informal practices" (Meyer and Rowan, 1977 as cited by Campbell, 2004, p.59).

Changes in formal structures however do not automatically lead to changes in actions and behaviours at all levels (Kogan et al., 2000 as cited by Saarinen and Välimaa, 2012). North

(1990) points out that although formal rules may change quickly due to political or legal influences, existing informal limitations represented by practices and behaviours can be unreceptive or resistant to policy or rule changes.

For the purposes of this research study which examines the impact of government policy on the academic profession, it is worth noting Scott's (2017, p.857) view that the most significant initiators and carriers of rule-systems in contemporary society are nation-states and the professions. Nation-states and the professions are similarly identified by DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.147) as the "great rationalizers", the key shapers of institutional forms in modern times.

How the structural and regulative dimension operate in practice at the university level will be set out in the following sections through the perspective of the government, corporate and professional logic.

2.6.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Macro* Level

Structural and regulative arrangements present at the level of the university arise primarily from the sources of power and influence which exist within the institutional field. Those entities which impact at the level of the university principally comprise government departments and state agencies for which the institution is an agent of the state. Other key sources of influence include business and professional associations. The impact of the structured interactions and requirements placed on the university, from within the institutional field can be observed through the lens of the government, corporate and professional logics. Each of these will be examined in turn in the following sections.

2.6.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Macro* Level.

Thoenig (2012 as cited by Diogo et al., 2015) points to the structural forces influencing institutional life such as economic and political agendas and national pressures. In recent years, great attention has been given to the government logic, the idea of higher education as an economic investment (Enders et al., 2013, Shore, 2010). The university has been seen as a key enabler of innovation in enhancing national standing in international league tables relating to output, performance and productivity (Neave, 2012, p.21). Commentators have noted the preferences that government show for particular types of knowledge "which is useful and likely to appeal to the market" will influence its view of its relationship with the university sector and how the sector should be organised (Kogan and Marton, 2006, p.84).

Howells et al., (2014) describe how over the past number of years, various economic structures comprising policy rationales and governance mechanisms have been developed with implications for the university's performance requirements, autonomy and control within the sector. Strong pressures have been exerted to change structures in order to manage within the requirements of this new policy environment (Henkel, 2005). What is emerging for the university from both the influences of government and supranational organisations is the need for it to "not only do things differently, but increasingly" to "do different things" (Scott et al., 2000, p.349 as cited by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016).

Supranational Influences

The future direction of the university is increasingly a subject for discussion at national, European and global level by government agencies and organisations including the European Union, World Bank and OECD. This is related to the belief that the university is "becoming one of the most important socio-economic institutions in post-industrial societies in which social and economic well-being is increasingly based on the production, transmission, dissemination and application of knowledge" (Kwiek, 2013, p.35).

Universities are more and more being viewed by government as key players in regional and national economies through research and other enterprising activities (Howells et al., 2014). Commentators note that policy changes ordinarily arise from external system events, such as changes in economic and political conditions which impact on belief systems (Bleiklie and Kogan, 2006 citing Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993). The source of structural and regulative changes is often located in "formal oversight structures, such as state agencies" (Ruef and Scott, 1998, p.878), supranational organizations such as the OECD, expert commissions and evaluation and accreditation agencies (Krücken and Meier, 2006).

Nationally and internationally, the changing role of the state in providing and funding higher education has been accompanied by efforts at transforming the university. Some commentators in discussing the key structural reforms impacting the university, including those in the area of governance and financing, have suggested that the structural changes "must be attributed to governments and particularly to the emergence of non-consensus seeking and heroic ministers" (Gornitzka, Kogan and Amaral, 2007, p.9-10 as cited by Kwiek, 2013).

Developments in Public Policy

A new public policy context has been developed which it is suggested will define how the university sector will function in the future (Kwiek, 2013). Increasingly, the key focus of

government policy is on governance, structural adjustments and performance management (Howells et al., 2014). The underlying government methodology is to reduce the direct role of government in the provision of education leading to a reduced public sector. The agenda promoting this change has been "a pursuit of greater efficiency and effectiveness of product and service delivery, particularly seeking greater outcomes for less input cost" (Parker, 2011, p.437).

This reform has seen a shift in the formal role of the state from 'funder' to 'partial funder' (Reale and Seeber, 2013 as cited by Howells et al., 2014). Pressure has been exerted on universities to become more financially independent and in this environment, greater accountability and efficiency is demanded as well as "a more pronounced and evident institutional leadership and management" (Henkel and Askling, 2006, p.85). This changing context has set new functions and roles for universities as public institutions and within the higher education system (*ibid*).

This economic rationalist approach to government policy reflects a clear belief and commitment amongst both politicians and bureaucrats "in the efficacy and applicability of the business model of organisational structure, planning, control and performance measurement" (Chow et al., 2005; English et al.,2005; Ter Bogt and Van Helden, 2005 as cited by Parker, 2011, p.437). New Public Management (NPM) has "become a dominant philosophy and discourse" in the public sector "percolating through to university missions, structures and processes" (Parker, 2011, p.437). In fact, as noted by Bleiklie (2018, p.1 in citing Paradeise et al., 2009 and Seeber et al., 2015), with the increased challenge brought about through budgetary restrictions, reforms focused on improving productivity, efficiency and the relevance of academic work have become a constant theme in recent years.

NPM encourages public institutions to "become more structurally autonomous, develop modern financial systems…and make greater use of modern management principles" (Paradeise et al., 2009a as cited by Christensen, 2011, p.509). In this new NPM operating environment, university funding "is assessed on the basis of its effectiveness and efficiency in achieving political purposes" (Olsen, 2007 as cited by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2014 p.113).

Enders et al., (2011, p.6) in commenting on the infrastructure impacting the university sector, notes the increasing number of external relationships with which the universities are required to involve themselves. Whereas higher education governance policy was traditionally a matter

between University and state, since the 1990s, changes have taken place which can be described as "from government to governance" and involves complex and active relationships at various levels. In recent years within the public sector environment, co-ordination has changed from a classical form of regulation where the state dominated, to forms which are described as multi-level multi-actor governance (Van Kersbergen and Van Waarden 2001, as cited by Enders et al., 2011).

In this setting, a considerable number of actors are active, influencing agenda-setting, policy development, implementation and evaluation (De Boer, Engers and Leisyte 2007 as cited by Enders et al., 2011). What has emerged are models of state supervision, instead of state control, systems of output control instead of process control, in addition to market-like competition combined with attempts to strengthen the actor-hood of universities as organisations (Enders et al., 2011, p.8). Clancy (2015, p.260) proposes that new research strategies, structural research funding requirements and a growth in procedures when seeking research funding, has "heralded the introduction of unbridled market principles into the steering" of the university sector and has "represented the government's most serious attempt to exert control over the internal workings of the university" *(ibid*). The structural and regulative elements as led by government which create the university context are wide ranging and are examined in the following section.

The University Context

The structural mechanisms put in place by government to enable institutionalisation within the university sector take many forms and include funding schemes, resource allocation models, constraints around staffing and promotion, and research assessment exercises. The government budgeting process is an example of a structural tool which can both shape and condition behaviour within the university system and achieve desired outcomes through revision of the existing financial model, which brings new performance requirements. Accountability has also increased to the extent that mandates for compliance with particular demands in the area of faculty productivity and student learning outcomes are increasingly being tied to state funding (Gumport, 2000, p.77).

In the context of policy changes, reallocation of resources can be a powerful structural influence. It can change the university's institutional landscape by compelling adherence to different requirements which can then lead to the emergence of alternative structural arrangements (March and Olsen, 2006 citing March and Olsen, 1995).

An example of the imposition of formal rules in the university is the adoption by funding agencies of managerial structures which involve a performance-based environment in which the research agenda is set, priority areas are identified and initiatives put in place which are in keeping with that agenda (Henkel, 2005). Public funding has increasingly become conditional on defining research as strategic; as a result, the autonomy and freedom to undertake research in particular areas have been curtailed. This has re-oriented institutions, such as universities, towards supporting particular areas of research.

Since the 2008 economic crisis, it has become clear that the university has had to adapt in order to survive the newly-structured funding environment which involves cuts in public funds and reduced institutional and corporate support (Howells et al., 2014). This new state funding system has indeed impacted on the behaviour of universities (Stensaker et al., 2012).

According to Frost et al., (2016), growth in the knowledge economy together with NPM and the emergence of what they describe as the 'entrepreneurial university', a product of the corporate logic, has been shaping the discourse throughout the university sector. The influence of this corporate logic at the university level is explored in the next section.

2.6.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Macro* Level

The changes in funding regimes and government policy described above have contributed in a shift towards the university's corporatisation and an increasing focus on income generation (Parker, 2011). This has led to what has been described as the 'financialisation of academic relations' within the university (Høstaker, 2006, p.109). Deem et al., (2007, p.49) describe how arising from the influence of changing government funding and policy, universities have "become much more overtly 'managed'. Henkel (2005) describe how universities increasingly refer to themselves as businesses. In this environment, an emphasis is placed on enhancing organisational performance through a managed approach, employing both market and hierarchical principles (Noordegraaf, 2015, p.191).

In a bid to ensure the functioning of the university as a service-based, competitive entity (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2014), and to deliver on the financial aspects of this model, a structural hierarchy has been imported from the corporate sector. This development has led to higher levels of professionalization within the university's central administration. New bodies resembling corporate structures comprising university management groups or teams are put in place to oversee operational and strategic matters.

A key objective within the university has now become the pursuit of competition, efficiency and excellence (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016). As noted by Billot (2010), in order to address economic priorities, competition has increased amongst higher education institutions to attract more fee-paying students. In this new corporate-facing environment, the comment has been made that if higher education were "an industry, it would be one of the world's biggest and most dynamic" (OECD, 2013 as cited by Lynch, 2015, p.192).

Bleiklie (2018) describes the movement towards institutional autonomy, where the interests of a number of key stakeholders need to be satisfied and where the academic voice is just one amongst a number of parties. As a consequence, decision-making is led by university leaders within a structural framework which enables those with authority and resources to effect strategic decisions. Walsh (2018, p.414) describes how in recent years, Irish university leaders have "adopted a similar discourse to politicians and civil servants regarding the positioning of higher education in relation to the economy, prioritising commercialisation, knowledge generation and corporate style management".

Developments have also taken place in the creation of units to oversee university services such as finance, student affairs, technology transfer, marketing and communications, alumni engagement and fund raising. Krücken and Meier (2006 citing Rhoades and Sporn, 2002) describe how managerial activities in the area of quality control, technology transfer and student services once peripheral to the work of the university, now take centre stage.

A central driver for the adoption by the universities of the corporate logic has been the 'massification of higher education' which has occurred in recent decades (Hattke et al., 2016a). The adoption of a business model has become an economic imperative to enable universities to compete within "new economic realities" (Gumport, 2000, p.73). In addition, the emergence of increased comparison and competition between individual universities brought about by global rankings and the perception of a world-wide market for education (Krücken and Meier, 2006) have also created the necessity for implementing a corporate approach.

All of these developments have prompted universities to become strategic actors in presenting a unique profile in a more competitive marketplace, as well as adopting a managed approach to determining particular resourcing strategies for new faculty, international students and funding sources (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016). As these changes have occurred within the

institutional field, universities have copied the strategies and approaches taken by other successful institutes.

Hermanowicz (2016, p.307) in a description of the change which has taken place in the university sector and its move to the market logic, references the "valorization of shiny things" which "decenters priority from the intellectual to the market, from knowledge to money" and where increasingly prestige is more of a marketable commodity than intellectual discovery. Having set out the structural and regulative aspects that operate within the corporate logic at the level of the university and its institutional field, the operation of the university in the context of professional (academic) logic is set out in the next section.

2.6.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Macro* Level

Traditionally, the university has been identified as comprising a strong community of academics, free to establish their own rules in accordance with professional norms (Minzberg, 1996, as cited by Grenier and Bernardini-Perinciolo, 2016). The institutional capital of universities is held within the academic profession, described as "the core of the academic enterprise" (Kwiek, 2013, p.41). In recent years, academia has survived arising from the profession being "defended by insiders and validated by outsiders and because its histories are encoded into "rules and routines", professional internal structures cannot be changed arbitrarily" (March and Olsen, 1989 as cited by Kwiek, 2013, p.89).

The primary legitimating perspective of the academic profession is in creating and preserving knowledge which defines academic work and the role of the academic worker. In the past this was viewed as the core purpose of the university. However, with the trend towards economic value being placed on knowledge, Gumport (2000, p.82) cautions that the idea of knowledge as a public good and the pursuit of academic knowledge is increasingly untenable in the emerging context where academic subjects and knowledge workers are subject to market influences.

An example of this is where academic research previously carried out by individuals is being undertaken by groups. Such change has been encouraged by funding arrangements which increasingly require work to be undertaken in cross-institutional and/or cross disciplinary teams (Bleiklie, 2018). In this and other ways, the university is being reshaped due to the influence of economic priorities. As a consequence, academic disciplines, programmes and research activity not considered valuable economically lose resources and positioning.

Such activities create a new relationship between academic profession and institution, one where the university according to Musselin (2013b, p.28) is:

> more present, more important and less escapable to its own members than in the past. Ignoring one's institution strategy is more difficult: the level of interactions between each academic and his/her own university is simultaneously higher and more constraining.

The impact of structural changes on the stability of the academic profession has been reported as significant because changes which establish managerial based requirements and criteria, will 'normatively fragment' the logic of professionalism and 'deinstitutionalize' its structural manifestations (Oliver 1992).

Deem et al., (2007, p.99) articulate the concern from within the profession, that the situation of "doing more with less" which arises from external pressures including government policy changes, could readily lead to "doing nothing that matters". Having outlined how institutional logics have been employed within the structural and regulative dimension at the level of the university as the institution, the following sections will review how these three logics – the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional operate at the *meso* level.

2.6.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level

The discipline which represents the organisational level is positioned at the interface between the institution (university) and the individual (academic). A particular dynamic exists where structures and regulations imposed at the level of the university are transported to the level of the discipline, where they become enacted into particular structures and formal arrangements. While the potential exists for representations of the government, corporate and professional logic to become institutionalised and accepted within the discipline, members of the particular discipline play a role in determining the extent to which the dimensions of the particular logics, comprising the rules, organising principles and structures put in place from within the government, corporate and professional logic, are enacted and accepted at this *meso* level.

2.6.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level

The requirements of government policy are communicated by the university to the disciplines - those academic units embedded within the university structure. The key message which the university receives from government which promotes an ideology of market-managerialism, sets the tone and approach for interactions between the university and the disciplines.

This neoliberal message coming from government has moved universities towards adopting "a commodified commercialised redefinition" of their roles (Parker, 2011, p.438). Lynch (2017, p.140) describes how NPM focuses universities on achieving "outputs measured in terms of performance indicators and rankings (often regardless of inputs or resources)"; where emphasis is placed on "the language of choice, competition and service users" (*ibid, p.*160). In this context academic disciplines are viewed and categorised within the university as "cost centres and revenue production units" (Whalen, 1991 as cited by Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p.181), within which, as described by Deem et al., (2007, p.51) "money rather than academic factors" drives many decisions.

Instruments of governance within the university have increased which impact at the level of the discipline. Tools are introduced to disciplinary units for the purposes of increasing ex-post evaluations and ex-ante controls. For some oversight mechanisms, the "locus of control" extends well beyond the campus and can be seen by the actions of state actors "inspecting slices of academic life/work/teaching/learning under a microscope" (Gumport, 2000, p.69).

Commentators have noted that the introduction of formal and standard evaluation criteria in order to make academia more transparent, has resulted in non-experts dominating the evaluative process, a role previously held by faculty (Henkel and Askling, 2006). As described by Ferlie et al., (2008, p.331 in citing Campbell, 2003 Schwarz and Westerheijden, 2004) an "irresistible expansion of assessment/evaluation bodies all over Europe" has taken place which sets standards for academic performance and delivery at the institutional, disciplinary unit and individual academic level. Gumport (1997 cited by Gumport, 2000, p.69) describes how the "assessment paradigm" has been powerful in "imposing an organizational and individual performance metric on every aspect of higher education with profound consequences for the academic workplace".

Changes are also experienced in disciplines where the research agenda has been challenged by government with research funding being explicitly tied to specific government goals and specific measures of societal contribution and economic relevance. This leaves little scope for the funding of basic or 'blue skies' research (Shore, 2010). This development has led one observer to the view that academic disciplines are being turned into "corporate research departments" (Monbiot, 2009 as cited by Shore, 2010, p.22).

On the basis that funding remains precarious, this in turn impacts on planning. Strategies responding to this uncertainty lead to a less permanent workforce, one with a notable increase in faculty of short-term contracts (Shore, 2008). Many disciplines have experienced a rise in 'temporary', 'teaching only' or 'research only' faculty (Gappa, 2002 as cited by Enders and Musselin, 2008). This workforce reconfiguration has been considered a necessity for many universities in order to incorporate the new constraints and demands coming from the economy (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004).

A review of the structures and regulations at the level of the discipline from the perspective of the corporate logic are outlined in the following section.

2.6.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level

While the traditional logic views higher education as educating and socialising society and advancing knowledge through free inquiry, the corporate logic considers the education field as one where the focus is on market forces and the necessity to remain competitive.

At this *meso* level, the introduction of managerialism as an ideology has impacted many activities that take place within the disciplinary unit such as the planning and evaluation of teaching and research. This new ideology has also had an effect on the formal organisation of management and administrative functions within the university (Krücken et al., 2013). Disciplinary "guild-like" structures have increasing lost legitimacy" and have been replaced by formal organisational structures for example, "more centralised corporate-forms" (Delmestri et al., 2015, p.124). This development has had implications for the allocation of authority, decision-making and position power as well as the organisational structures within the university (Henkel and Askling, 2006).

The corporate logic regards universities "as corporate actors oriented towards market competition" (Canhilal et al., 2016, p.177) and considers that within the institution, "performance should be managed through a well-defined hierarchy, where authority rests on the top management" (*ibid*). Within the corporate logic, decision making is centralised. As a consequence of these developments, emerging university structures have been characterised by "elaboration, expansion and differentiation of a fine-grained formal organisational structure, which is centred on explicit organizational goals" (Krücken and Meier, 2006, p.250).

Increasingly, decisions are made as to which area, programme or initiative will be enabled, depending upon the availability of funding and the willingness of management to put the

necessary funding in place. Choices to take a particular action, will often be made in pursuit of particular business-based goals. Decisions to grow one area will be made at the cost of others. This creates a situation where there will be winners and losers (Kwiek, 2016) both between and within disciplines. Within this context, disciplines that engage in developing entrepreneurial activities will either be "pushed by resource constraints or pulled by opportunities offered" to engage in the academic marketplace (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p.182). Henkel (2004) describes the dynamic between what she describes as "weak" and "strong" disciplines, where strong disciplines have the capacity to generate resources and enhance the university's reputation, while weak disciplines are limited in their capacity to do so. Within this competitive and performance-oriented environment, disciplinary collectives become less tolerant of unproductive colleagues and individuals become more conscious of how they perform.

Where university budgets are declining, faculty has become increasingly affected by the profit motive to secure external funding (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p.7). Actions associated with this perspective include scanning the environment for new opportunities, seeking out new student markets, changing the range of educational products offered, identifying new sources of income to maximise revenue, seeking to contain or cut costs as well as increasing the proportion of temporary and part time personnel (Gumport, 2000).

In the setting of the corporate logic, priority is given to systematic and structured action aimed at producing goods and services which fulfil customer requirements. Within universities, some disciplines become opportunity-seeking service providers competing for students, funding, faculty, and legitimacy in contested markets. In turn, students become consumers who seek the best human capital investments (Münch, 2011 as cited by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2014). Further examples of market-like behaviours are documented by Upton and Warshaw (2017) who refer to increasing competition for external research funding and student fees.

The professional logic that operates within the structural and regulative dimension at the level of the discipline is outlined in the following section.

2.6.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level

Traditionally the university was viewed as a community of scholars whose mission was to produce scholarly work and where peer reputation was paramount. Decisions were consensus-based and senior academic staff were seen as the sole source of authority.

The position of the discipline has come under challenge in recent years as the "organising structure for knowledge production and transmission, as guardian of academic culture, and as nurturer of academic identity" (Henkel, 2005, p.173). Whereas the professional logic is ordinarily oriented towards fundamental research enquiry, the government and corporate logic is centred towards shaping a research agenda which is entrepreneurial and applied in nature and focused towards industry (Parker, 2011).

The role and value conflict that arises between the tradition of the professional logics and the emerging expectations from government and society have led to the importation of practices and processes from the corporate world, as referred to earlier. As a consequence of these developments, the academic discipline itself becomes constrained in assessing how it might contribute and carry out specific tasks in supporting the university to achieve its goals (Weiherl and Frost, 2016).

Having examined the structural and regulative dimension at the *meso* level, the perspective of the academic actor at the *micro* level is reviewed in the following sections.

2.6.3. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level

The formal changes which take place in the structural and regulative dimensions at the level of both the university and the discipline in turn effect the individual academic. In acknowledging that institutions are continuously created and re-created by a number of actors with divergent interests and varying normative commitments as well as different levels of power and cognition (Streeck and Thelen, 2005), the individual academic may have scope to impact the institutionalisation process. However, at the same time, as noted by Deem et al., (2007, p.67) divisions are created at the individual level, arising from such differences in contractual status, workload, tensions between research and teaching, gender and the widening gap between managers/leaders and managed staff.

2.6.3.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level

Academics have experienced changes arising from the new role and influence of the university in the context of government policy changes and new government-university relations (Kogan and Marton, 2006). The changing policy landscape at both European level and the emerging funding environment which have brought new flows of research funding to the fore, increasingly influence the core missions of universities, which in turn directly impact both the nature and purpose of academic work (Kwiek, 2013).

The university sector is operating in a competitive environment where the concentration is clearly on excellence in research; this changes relationships between individuals both internally within disciplines and externally between staff within different institutions. As highlighted by an EC research report:

> Researchers compete with one another all the time – for funds, for new equipment…to get their publications accepted in the leading journals (EC 2005, p.35).

Arising from the nature of the funding environment, a two-tier system of research has been created, one which is valued and one which is less valued. This competitive funding environment has been criticised for its influence on the creation of knowledge and where availability of funding to support independent basic research has been reduced (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016).

Henkel (2005) raises the question as to whether the structured approach taken in the determination of research policy at national and international level has changed the nature of academic endeavour. While the value of research is reinforced, the right to research has been made conditional on an ability to attract income and deliver output which meets specific evaluative requirements (*ibid*). Also with the increasing dependence on external research funding, the level of competitive pressure amongst individual researchers to secure funds has grown (Bleiklie and Lange, 2010).

At the same time, the impact of public sector reform on the enduring nature of the academic profession has been questioned (Kwiek, 2013). This has been raised in terms of the context where more part-time, temporary and casual academic faculty are being employed as a consequence of state-imposed resource constraints. These developments have led to the emergence of a changing academic career path, one that is no longer clearly defined and where entry points are available to a minority with others being "relegated to a casualised periphery" (May et al., 2011, p.189).

Whereas responsibilities of academics were traditionally defined by the profession, increasingly the duties of academics are being circumscribed elsewhere, including by state agencies (Musselin, 2007). Reference has been made to the increase in structures controlling oversight of academic work, through mechanisms such as the UK government-led Research Assessment and the growth in evaluation procedures generally. Whereas previously academics were evaluated by their peers, more recently formal externally-led evaluation mechanisms are being applied by government agencies to measure, rank and benchmark academic activity.

The following section will explore the impact of the structural and regulative dimensions of the corporate logic on the academic.

2.6.3.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level

In observing the influence of the corporate logic at the *micro* level in the area of structures and regulations, the impact of the 'modernization' agenda can be seen on individual roles, where new rules have the potential to empower one set of actors while removing power from the other (Leach and Lowndes, 2007).

Many of the new requirements for academics, codified in management-led policies and regulations, have created a situation where academic behaviour has been translated into objective, quantifiable and comparable indicators (Hattke et al., 2016b, p.239), leading to coercive isomorphism amongst academics. This new governance model has also brought with it an increased administrative workload. Where responsibilities have grown, administrative tasks have become more involved. In addition, academics spend an increasing proportion of their time working with procedures and rules as well as on data collection to comply with institutional requirements (Henkel and Askling, 2006).

At the same time, with the weightier administrative workload, the work of the academic increasingly becomes described in "terms of its commercial interests and entrepreneurial output" (Shore (2010, p.26). For Noordegraaf (2015, p.191) the impact of this development is that:

> Instead of autonomous professionals, the focus is on employees with clear roles and responsibilities in turning organizational inputs – money, materials – into tangible results for identifiable customers.

As performance management measures have come into sharper focus (Frost et al., 2016), the nature of the academic profession has changed (Dacin et al., (2002). Recent years have seen the development in appraisal, evaluation and assessment mechanisms for teaching and research both within and external to the university. This has led to more managerial control over academics and additional linkages being put in place between performance measurement, evaluations, promotions and rewards (Musselin, 2013b).

Commentators have noted that the new connections created between student evaluations and market mechanisms have had implications for the academic in terms of "the profile of teaching reputations" which, in turn, has created a pressure on academics to consider making their programmes more popular (Henkel and Vabø, 2006, p.147).

In addition, the increasing diversification and complexity of the academic role has been noted where for example, ability to raise funds and oversee external funded research projects "is no longer something academics can do: it is something they must do" (Musselin 2007, p.177). In addition, activities such as outreach, writing research proposals and seeking external funding previously considered as of little consequence, are now viewed as key aspects of academic work. At the same time, pressures have been placed on the delivery of the research agenda arising from the identification of research reputation as being the most valued academic currency in universities at all levels (Henkel, 2005). As a consequence of the rise in the corporate agenda, academics have had to increasingly include an entrepreneurial purpose to their work (Krücken et al., 2013).

A challenge in combining task and market activities in an academic organisation as proposed by Mouwen (2000) is the resistance and acrimony which can arise between the traditional academic culture and the modern market-place culture, which can lead to real discord in the university. Gumport (1993, p.67 cited by Gumport 2000) describes the unease and pressure experienced by academics, in particular those working in areas that may be considered "of insufficient centrality, quality or cost effectiveness".

The operation of the professional logic within the structural and regulative dimension is considered in the next section.

2.6.3.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level

In the context of the professional logic, the structuring and organisation of work is carried out by academics themselves and the quality of this work is overseen by the group of professionals, generally through peer review (Blomgren and Waks, 2015).

The changing nature of work which places a particular structure on the design, delivery and evaluation of academic work has transformed the way academics organise and allocate their time (Musselin, 2013a). The changing specialisation amongst academics is notable, not only in the growth in administratively-based roles but also in the tendency for some in scientific disciplines to be more involved in project work and in maintaining industrial partnerships, than those working in the arts and humanities (Krücken and Meier, 2006).

Parker (2011) describes the options where different institutional logics are at play and where actors can seek to either align with or decouple from a particular institutional practice or process. He sets out two responses which are open at the level of the academic to either join

the managerialist system or withdraw from its influences. With the changing nature of work and where academics are obliged to engage within externally defined rules and structures, views have been expressed that academics' professional rights relating to self-regulation and self-determination have been diminished (Henkel, 2005).

Having outlined the structural and regulative context within the frame of the government, corporate and professional logic at the *macro*, *meso* and *micro* levels, the second key dimension which incorporates the normative and cultural elements will now be reviewed.

2.7. The Normative and Cultural Dimension

Taken-for-granted beliefs and shared understanding are viewed as underpinning the social order within this second category which encompasses the normative and the cultural dimension (Scott, 2013). Within this setting, behaviour at the *meso* and the *micro* levels is driven by compliance with templates provided by social institutions, which for the university may originate from the state, the corporation or the profession. These normative and cultural aspects may be either formal or informal in nature.

Within the normative and cultural dimension, behaviour is considered to be morally governed and social obligations are deemed to be as, if not more, important than external sanctions (Scott, 2003). People behave as they do because of normative standards (Peters, 2012 in citing March and Olsen, 1989). Standards of behaviour are assimilated through connections with institutions (Peters, 2012) which lead to regularities in behaviour amongst social actors and the tendency to become similar or isomorphic in actions and approach (Lepori, 2015).

Peters (2012) notes the importance of the process where new members of an institution are socialised into its values, norms and behaviours. The mechanism of communication and feedback which occurs at both the *micro* and *meso* levels are cited as a process which reinforces behavioural patterns as well as commitment to institutional values.

Normative and cultural elements also comprise beliefs, values and identities. A number of scholars including Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) consider institutions to be "primarily carried by cultural systems" (*ibid*, p xviii). This is where a common framework of meaning around beliefs, values, and identity is created which is understood and supported socially (Scott, 2013). This informal dimension comprising values, beliefs and identity is fundamental to the operation of social systems as it provides the building

blocks on which normative and regulative systems are constructed (Ruef and Scott, 1998, p.879).

This cultural-cognitive perspective comprising normative and cultural aspects is considered to be at the deepest level of all the institutional dimensions, arising from the fact that its foundations are pre-conscious, taken-for-granted understandings (Scott, 2013). This dimension does not require the imposition of regulatory sanctions or social controls to support it (*ibid*).

Values which form an important part of this dimension, have inherent meanings for all organisational members. Winter (2009, p.122 in citing Schwartz, 1994) notes that values which are core cognitive beliefs "transcend specific situations" and act as "guiding principles" in the lives of individuals. They are also central in defining identity both for organisations and individuals.

The concept of identity is a useful element to employ within this study as it links "structure with actor" within the policy context, the institution, the discipline and the individual academic (Henkel, 2000, p.22 as cited by Stensaker et al., 2012). Identity is shaped and supported in and by stable and strong communities (Henkel, 2005). As with other informal cultural-cognitive forms including values and beliefs, identity is invariably communicated through language (Winter, 2009).

The normative and cultural elements which comprise both the formal norms and behaviours - and the informal values, beliefs and identities of both the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic will be examined in the following sections at each of the three levels; that of the university, the discipline and the individual academic.

2.7.1. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Macro* Level

Arising from the reform agenda and the emergent policy environment, both university and academic community have been compelled to change their cultures and review their understandings about roles and relationships (Henkel, 2005). These drivers have influenced behaviour, practices and activities within the university in addition to creating a new value system. A description of what comprises the normative and cultural dimension at the level of the university in the context of the government, corporate and professional logic is set out in the following section.

2.7.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Macro* Level

Gornitzka (1999, p.10) highlights that for organisations to change as a consequence of government initiatives, a normative match; "a congruence between the values and beliefs underlying a proposed programme or policy and the identity and traditions of the organisation" is required.

The university as a public sector organisation and state instrument is a highly institutionalised environment which, because of its embedded formal rules makes it resistant to change and the influence of political forces (Ingraham et al., 2008). While formal rules and structures are powerful, the existence of informal rules is highlighted as the 'reality' which drives how social actors behave. Hence if there is a gap or dissonance between the formal structures and rules on one side and the informal rules or how actors behave in practice, the formal rules will become less relevant.

Identity as previously described, is a key element that operates at the normative level. In recent years there have been two key developments, firstly advances in technology, systems and innovation which identify the university as a corporate institution and secondly, the knowledge economy which identifies the university as a state institution. In recent years these have been increasingly been seen as more relevant to university identity, than traditional issues linked to the idea of a university (Maassen and Stensaker, 2011).

The influence of New Public Management (NPM) has also been notable in defining the mission of the university and the specific norms and values in place. Developments led by government, "have both reflected and driven a substantial change in social norms and expectations" in terms of the role and value of the university and of higher education (Parker, 2011, p.440). The changing nature of the public funding of universities has also redefined the character of state-university relationships. The growing expectation made of the universities to bring in more non-exchequer funding alters the organisational culture and internal behaviours.

Shore (2010, p.15) references this shift in view from the universities as places of "critical enquiry and autonomous learning" to "transnational business corporations operating in a competitive 'global knowledge economy' (*ibid*). Many now share the belief that universities are engines of the knowledge economy (Vorley and Nelles, 2008), where there is an expectation to create and sell products and services, prepare individuals for the workforce and so develop human capital, carry out research and progress economic development (Gumport, 2000). The expectations of government for the university sector has developed as the concept

of knowledge for the sake of knowledge has become "tricky to evaluate as an investment project- especially where taxpayers are paying the bills" (Spender, 2016, p.144).

The core cultural values of the university have moved to knowledge being a driver of national economic success. This encompasses the key importance of applied research to benefit industry; the preparation of graduates for employment; being competitive in the global market place and providing value for money educational products and services (Parker, 2011, p.440). As a consequence of these changes, university culture has shifted towards "a market driven and enterprise culture" (*ibid*).

According to Lynch (2017), the redefinition of higher education as a contributor to the exchequer, has caused conversations around education to change from a focus on needs and entitlements to a one on choice and markets. With this shift, the universities have moved towards giving particular attention to promoting their identity, brand and rankings both internally and within the public arena.

The coercive pressures that universities have experienced from government exerted through the reduction of budgets and requirements for greater value for money have translated into isomorphism at the normative and cultural-cognitive levels as universities experiencing this situation adopt the values and beliefs of others and follow the actions of the corporate world.

The emergence of this corporate logic within the normative and cultural dimension at the level of the university is the subject of the next section.

2.7.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Macro* Level

Commentators have highlighted that commercialisation has become normalised in the past decade and as a result commercial values and purposes have become part of the way things are done within the university system (Dill and Soo, 2005, Marginson, 2006; Steirer, 2003 as cited by Lynch, 2010). At the same time, in adopting additional business processes and commercialising their activities, progressive universities have placed a clear focus on a business-based methodology to create value and maximises returns (Parker, 2011).

The corporate logic has transformed research into a marketable commodity (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016). The development of productivity measures in research, derived in part from the growing popularity of ranking, a popularity based on the belief that output in the research area can be calculated. This has produced the widespread conviction that research outcomes, such as the quality of publications and other forms of research output can be readily quantified

and valued. At the same time, evaluation and auditing practices relating to university activities more generally have become widespread and have grown in significance, as a consequence of their role in determining the competitive performance of universities in the various global ranking systems.

The corporation has entered the academic arena also, through growth in professional managers bringing with them business language and practices from the corporate sector. This "wholesale import" of symbols, models and ideas from business has significantly altered the way in which university employees converse about their institution. Such terms as 'strategic planning', 'benchmarking' and 'quality assurance' have become the central discourse (Shore, 2010, p.23).

The introduction of corporate language has occurred as a consequence of a number of factors, including the changing requirements on the university, the expansion in its remit as well as the "(purported) need for surveillance and control" within the sector (Alvesson and Benner, 2016, p.89). Corporate discourse presents the belief that knowledge and research produced within the university is valuable in the monetary sense and can be sold, as with any other product. It also reinforces the view that the role of management is to control the process of work (*ibid*).

One key stakeholder in recent years is the student in the role of customer. This has become apparent in the Irish context where the student contribution (previously student registration fee) has increased from €900 to €3000 in the period 2008-2015 (Walsh, 2018, p.433). With the academic now required to engage with the student as consumer, there has also been a further growth in the interests and objectives which academics are required to consider, arising from the requirements of evaluation and auditing processes while adhering to accreditation procedures (Alvesson and Benner, 2016).

With the growing association between knowledge and profit, there has been an increasing acceptance that knowledge in the university environment becomes valuable where it can be measured and is results-based (Spender, 2016). The university's identity has become re-conceived as an economic, social and academic organisation, within which activities and outcomes are both measurable and administrable.

The following section describes the impact of the normative and cultural influences on the professional logic at the level of the university.

2.7.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Macro* Level

Within the university setting, the normative mechanism has its roots in "the processes of professionalization in which the values, codes, and standards are imposed by universities as well as professional certification and accreditation agencies" (Hanson, 2001, p.649). Traditionally, long-standing values such as collegial governance, institutional autonomy and academic freedom defined the key elements of the academic and organisational identity (Winter, 2009). In this setting, academic influence was accepted as a clear source of authority within the university and key decisions were made by the academic community.

The professional logic has endured within the university in view of the notion that regardless of whatever rules or structures come into play, inherited institutional dimensions will always be part of the "initial conditions in the processes that influence selection among new institutions" (Greif, 2014, p.58). The persistence of traditional values, identities and beliefs however may pose obstacles to the introduction of a corporate-based model within the university. Giving the example of the emerging government-led research agenda, Scott (1997, p.12 as cited by Ylijoki, 2003) proposes that the priorities, practices and leading values of university research are being challenged by the state. The impact of this is described in stark terms by Scott (*ibid*) where he states "[i]t is not simply that the priorities of university research are being challenged, or even its practices, but its leading values, even its essence".

Winter (2009), in exploring the university's identity and acknowledging its experience of conflicting professional and managerial principles and approaches, draws attention to its hybrid identity. In recognising that identities are fluid and pluralistic, he identifies the potential that exists for various expectations and discussions as to what the nature and purpose of the university is. The potential for identity schisms within the university is noted given the existence of conflicting values between the traditional academic cultures and the corporate business culture of recent years.

Arising from the developments taking place and the emergence of an entrepreneurial mind-set at the level of the professional, a redefinition of traditional academic cultures, norms and values is occurring within the university (Kwiek, 2016). While professionals exercise control through both normative and cognitive processes (Scott, 1995), the role of the collegiate in decision-making has been diminishing as a result of the growing number of stakeholders included within consultation processes, which formerly was the preserve of the academic group.

Having outlined the various normative and cultural elements at the level of the university from the perspective of the government logic, corporate logic and professional logic, the following sections review the same elements at the level of the discipline.

2.7.2. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Meso* Level

The discipline is viewed as the central context for academics within which their identities, values, modes of working and self-esteem exist (Henkel, 2000, p.22 as cited by Jawitz, 2009). The values, practices, behaviours which are inherent within the government, corporate and professional logic at this *meso* level are reviewed in the following sections.

2.7.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level

To many faculties embedded in their discipline, discussion about changes resulting from government actions is likely to appear somewhat remote and alien, whereas changes at the discipline level are likely to directly impact on their immediate work environment (Tapper and Palfreyman, 1998).

Developments which have occurred as a consequence of the changing economic environment have impacted a number of areas within the discipline. Its influence and its relationship with the university has changed, as the discipline become more dependent on the university both for their security and maintenance of its interests. The public encountering the work and reputation of the academic discipline has grown in importance and disciplines are being increasingly scrutinised both internally and externally as their outputs become more of a public concern (Henkel, 2004). In this setting, some disciplines manage to survive and thrive while others are considerably challenged, due to the erosion of their power and influence both within the university and externally with government and corporate stakeholders.

The normative practices and values which comprise the corporate logic at the level of the discipline are explored in the next section.

2.7.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level

In the current environment, where universities are increasingly employing market and corporate- based discourses to attain legitimacy, changes in practice can be observed at the *meso* level. This is a direct result of the emerging emphasis on academic management, evaluation and performance. Another development is the increase in the corporate logic where the status of disciplines has been elevated because of their value in the market (Nokkala, 2007).

Corporate values have entered the university at the level of the discipline while evaluation, audits and performance measurement have become "institutionalized and normalized in everyday life" (Lynch, 2010, p.55). These changes have been significant in re-focusing research, teaching and the culture of the university. In this new "entrepreneurial" environment, disciplines are celebrated for bringing resources or reputation into the university (Williams, 2004 as cited by Kwiek, 2016).

Differences between disciplines are viewed in terms of the potential to engage in what has been described as "academic capitalism" (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). While some disciplines are close to the market given their importance to the new economy, others because of their nature are farther away and as a result may have difficulties engaging in commercial activities. This creates a situation where further distance arises between disciplines, as a result of their potential to develop commercial activity in the market.

In response to the changes in the external environment, studies describe how some disciplines adopt pro-active strategies whereas others respond in a passive manner, the approach taken being reflective of the organisational culture and values of the discipline concerned. Those that take the initiative to respond positively, are seen as sharing the university's entrepreneurial values (de Zilwa, 2007).

There has been a shift in what is valued in research within the discipline. Following from the operation of university rankings systems, publication preferences have narrowed at the level of the institution, which then cascade down at discipline level into appointment and promotion requirements. Assessment criteria have increasingly become more explicit and metric based. From the perspective of the discipline, this shift has translated into greater concentration on the delivery of journal articles and less on monographs and book chapters (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016).

Clark (2000) presents the concept of 'collegial entrepreneurialism' which identifies an approach that addresses the challenges of reduced exchequer funding by focusing on academic collegiality, while at the same time increasing entrepreneurial activity. This mediating approach provides a counter force to the negative effects of the modernization agenda, as it seeks to sustain the autonomy of the institution. The extent to which entrepreneurial market focused activity takes place may depend upon the values of the faculty and head of the discipline.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p.197) identify that some faculty and academic leaders may come into the system under an "old regime" with a particular set of values attached to academic work while others who are newer to the system may be committed to a "more entrepreneurial conception of academe". Henkel (2004, p.30) describes how disciplinary leadership and their adoption of "strategies of accommodation" can be instrumental in sustaining the academic profession. Ryan and Guthrie, (2009) propose that the quality of academic leadership is central to ensuring that changes which activate the entrepreneurial agenda, do not damage professional values, identity and collegial culture.

The operation of the normative and cultural elements at the level of the discipline in the frame of the professional logic is outlined in the next section.

2.7.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level

While the discipline as guardian of academic culture has come under challenge, it remains a key influencer of academic identity, setting out what is important and giving meaning to the profession. Key to membership of the profession is the freedom to have a voice and to engage in critical debate and public discourse.

In the context of the profession, Shore (2010, p.27) notes that reforms within the university "have led to the replacement of professional relationships based on collegiality and trust with a regime of measurement, performativity and surveillance". Bleiklie and Kogan (2007, p.480) reference the introduction of quality assurance procedures that have replaced the value of professional knowledge and 'trustful' relationships between academics and their institutions. In supporting this view, Parker (2011, p.444) describes the values emerging from the "economic rationalist environment" which increasingly direct the plans and strategies of the university and then filter into the discipline and the collective of academics, influencing values and identities to align continually with financial and performance requirements. This development has characterised the focus and direction of academic work and led to increased oversight on academic outputs. In addition, administrative duties have increased, much of which have little relevance to the traditional understanding of the academic role. As a consequence of these changes, professional identity with its focus on scholarship has been altered and an increasingly competitive environment has emerged.

Academics possess distinctive values which develop during their scholarly education and socialisation into academia. This translates into an identification and commitment to their specific discipline. For some individuals, the emergence of values associated with performance

management may collide with professional values acquired from their disciplinary membership, which may then lead to reduced commitment being shown to the university. As a consequence of the changes taking place, academics are becoming "managed professionals" within a setting where they experience greater accountability but less autonomy (Rhoades, 1998, Vidovich and Currie, 1998 as cited by Ylijoki, 2003).

Research has indicated that academics consider themselves to be more committed to what has been described as their "disciplinary invisible college" and to their profession than to their employing university (Weiherl and Frost, 2016, p.174). These traditional structures provide support and legitimacy which encourage and enable academic engagement. This view is supported by other scholars, who propose that the culture of the discipline is a key source of faculty identity and expertise and more often than not sustains a stronger bond than an attachment to the university (Kuh and Whitt, as cited by Calhoun, 2006).

What is valued from a professional perspective is the activity that takes place within the scientific community amongst networks of peers (Krücken et al., 2013). Invisible colleges have been described as the communication networks which link academics and enable collaboration in a particular research area (Weiherl and Frost, 2016, p.174). These invisible colleges represent "informal groups" that "meet regularly at conferences and workshops, circulate manuscripts among colleagues to gather friendly review, publish in much the same journals" (Vogel, 2012, p.1015-1016 as cited by Weiherl and Frost, 2016). Such groups encourage a sense of identification for academics with their professional roles. Membership of this community also acts as a buffer against the effects of changes experienced elsewhere (Krücken et al., 2013). Advancements in communication technology have enabled these relationships to develop across national boundaries and be sustained (March, 2004 as cited by Bögner et al., 2016).

Within the university, a struggle has occurred between the disciplinary academy and other groups over control of those areas which were previously considered to be the academic domain. Although it has become a more powerful entity, the academic community is seen to identify less with university in such struggles. At the same time interaction between the academic discipline, the university and the academic has grown more complex in nature (Henkel, 2005), a result of the additional demands created by the emerging metric-based culture.

However, a number of authors have observed that the values of academics have not been directly affected by the changes which have taken place in the way academic activities have become more rationalised, formalised and outcome focused (Henkel 2000; Barrier 2011; Jouvenet 2011 as cited by Musselin, 2013b). This may be due in some part to the role of the discipline which is defended by its members and is considered to be a significant influence in the development and maintenance of academic agendas (Henkel, 2005).

The position of the academic within the normative and cultural dimension within the setting of the government, corporate and professional logic is considered in the next section.

2.7.3. Normative and Cultural Elements at the *Micro* Level

At the individual level academics have a number of social identities which reflect the multi-faceted nature of the inter-institutional system (Zheng, 2016). These identities arise from membership of particular groups, including research groups, professional disciplines or associations, or as a result of the focus of the particular role held, whether as a researcher, teacher or manager.

In addition to having a number of identities, academics as social actors will also have multiple beliefs and values which are rooted in a particular institutional logic. These beliefs and values may be in sync or in discord with each other and with the other facets of institutional logics, including identities. While these informal institutional elements are properties of institutions, they are also characteristics of individuals and the social and cultural worlds that they inhabit. The following sections look at the values, behaviours and practices which comprise the government, corporate and professional logic at the level of the individual academic.

2.7.3.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level

With the recognition of universities as important instruments in realising national economic policy and with the redefinition of state-university relationships, it has become more difficult to sustain the traditional academic identity. Strong pressures have been placed on the academic community to change their principles, values, cultures and structures in order that they can be managed within the new policy environment. Pressures have also been exerted on academics to review their beliefs about their roles and relationships within the emerging environment (Henkel, 2005, p.159).

At this *micro* level in the changed institutional environment, research activity has become "a competitive, self-interested, instrumental, outputs-oriented process" (Roberts, 2007, p.362 cited by Shore, 2010, p.28). As research funding has become competitive and more confined

to specialised research areas, concern has been raised that an increasing number of academics are in danger of becoming 'research non active'. Feelings of a "private sense of loss which has become a public loss of status and power" have arisen for some academics following research evaluation assessments, such as the RAE exercise in the UK. This exercise creates a stark outcome in placing academics into research active and non-research active groupings (Henkel, 2005).

The normative and cultural elements which impact the individual academic from the perspective of the corporate logic are reviewed in the next section.

2.7.3.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level

The drive towards income generation has directly impacted the way in which the university has been operating in recent years (Kwiek, 2013). The current university system and those within it are being challenged to demonstrate awareness and receptivity towards market pressures that would have been unthinkable in previous decades.

The new values at institutional level have filtered down to the work, beliefs and values of the academic. This has created a culture where "everything one does must be counted and only the measurable matters" (Lynch, 2010, p.5). Commentators have noted that with increasing and constant appraisals, an "actuarial and calculative mind-set" is developed and consequently relations "become transactional and product led" (Lynch, 2015, p.199).

In an environment where interactions take place within an audit and performance-focused culture, the traditional identity that is aligned with intellectual scholarship may be overtaken by a new identity, that of the academic performer who represents the approach associated with "whatever it takes to get published" (Gendron, 2008, p.104 as cited by Hattke et al., 2016b, p.246). Interactions with the university are increasingly constraining and academics experience less control, leading to a reduction in their social and institutional standing.

Studies have shown that with the passage of time, the emerging corporate and state-driven values become accepted as newer academic recruits take performance measurement for granted. This new academic generation is seen by established colleagues as having a higher developed understanding of the requirements for an academic career and of the competencies required for success (Henkel, 2004).

The tensions between corporate and professional logics, traditional values and the corporate management culture which emerge have been identified as "individual autonomy and collective

engagement; collegiality and managerialism; academic versus administrative authority" and "cultures of informality and formality" (Bolden et al., 2008 as cited by Christopher, 2012, p.557).

Commentators have also described how institutional changes have significantly limited academic independence through the imposition of a heavy workload, much of it unrelated to the academic discipline but administrative in character, associated with workload measurement, financial control and reporting requirements. Henkel (2004) notes that in an increasingly controlled environment, more time is spent on administrative work, leaving academics with less autonomy to manage their own research and teaching (Meek 2002, 2003, Ramsden, 1998 as cited by de Zilwa, 2007, p.560). These new institutional demands being made of academics are seen to conflict with their professional norms and values (Hattke et al., 2016b).

Bryson (2004, p.192 as cited by Teelken, 2012) also notes that engagement with the academic role has been curtailed for many academics, because of the increase in time-consuming business-focused assessments and administrative duties. Kwiek (2016) remarks that work which is not considered to benefit the university, by bringing in additional resources or adding to its reputation, does not continue. What is most valued, are those activities which bring academics in line with the university's stated strategic objectives and generate external sources of income and appeal to the university ranking agencies.

The following section outlines the professional logic at the normative and cultural dimension of the individual academic.

2.7.3.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level

Key values associated with academic work include self-determination and independence. Central to the traditional professional (academic) logic is the concept of scholarly discovery and the right to research. Collegiality has also been a strong principle enabling academics to work together and in enabling the community of scholars to thrive. This behaviour symbolises consensus in decision-making and "emphasizes the autonomy of professionals and their equal value, as well as a world where action should be driven by academic values and by the search for novelty" (Canhilal et al., 2016, p.174).

In the literature, Dowling-Hetherington (2013) describes how collegial decision-making, a central value underpinning academic life has declined with the increasing dominance of

management and executive decision-making approaches. Traditionally the academic community was self-governing; free to make decisions in areas that were clearly recognised as part of the academic domain. However, with the emergence of new managerial structures, the professional autonomy of faculty has weakened, while the role of administrative managers has grown in what were traditionally academic decision-making processes (Feller, 2009 as cited by Krücken et al., 2013).

Arising from the emergence of an audit culture and the increasing measurement of academic activity and performance, assessment criteria have been made more measurable and explicit. Clancy (2015, p.2), notes that the evolution of this 'evaluative state' accompanied by an increase in managerialism has led to "considerable unease among many academics". Deem et al., (2007, p.99) refer to concerns about loss of trust and autonomy academics face in carrying out their daily work and state that these "features of contemporary academic work" may be significant in creating a crisis as to the future purpose of universities.

As a result of changes in the academic role, the question has been raised whether the new logics which have come into the university arena are in line with the values and identity of the academic profession (Boitier and Rivière, 2016). Academic identity has traditionally been based on such factors as disciplinary scholarship, intellectual curiosity and professional autonomy (Winter, 2009). Amongst the academic community, research has generally been considered a pre-requisite to professional identity (Henkel, 2005). However, a new professional has been identified whose identity is different; the academic who has developed more administrative expertise and plays a greater role in progressing the university agenda (Winter, 2009).

Blomgren and Waks (2015) acknowledge the recent emergence of the 'hybrid professional'; individuals who possess skills and abilities outside their main area of expertise and as a consequence are likely to have the relational capacity to reconcile expectations coming from different institutional logics. Billot (2010, in citing Briggs, 2007) identifies two separate professional identities operating within the university at the level of the academic. The first is that of the managed academic who carries out teaching and research and has limited opportunity to effect decisions. In this role, the managed academic emphasises professional identity.

The values which correspond to this identity such as dedication to student learning and the creation of knowledge take centre stage. Another core value which academics identify with is

the focus on student learning as opposed to student numbers. Many individual academics express a deep commitment to their discipline and have less engagement with university management and strategic business direction; as such they can be considered to have disengaged from the university. In a second identity, the academic manager, true to the role, must walk a 'tightrope' fulfilling the responsibility to encourage corporate values by promoting commercial activities while at the same time upholding the core principles of academic normative values in terms of academic autonomy and collegial relationships (*ibid*).

The university's traditional values and enduring qualities have created pressure in a context where times have changed and outside academia, "political fashions and economic climates come and go with little regard for the well-being of academic" (Kogan and Becher, 1980, p.143-144 as cited by Kwiek, 2013). As a consequence of this and other factors, the attractiveness of the profession to a new generation has been questioned (Winter, 2009).

Having set out the theoretical framework, the following section provides rationale for the approach in carrying out this study.

2.8. University Institutional Analytical Framework

In reviewing the literature in relation to institutions, the structural, regulative and cultural aspects of institutional change and the area of institutional logics, the overall objective of this chapter has been to establish the theoretical framework for the emergent research. This will address the question as to whether institutional change which has been initiated by the Irish government, has impacted at the level of the university with respect to such structural, regulative, normative and cultural aspects as the rules, structures, processes, values, identity and beliefs which comprise the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional (academic) logic within the university.

The analytical framework shown in Table 3 developed from various literature sources, primarily Bulmer and Burch (1998), Scott (2013) and Thornton et al., (2012) provides a representation of these three logics in action in terms of their structural, regulative, normative and cultural characteristics. This thematic framework identifies the types of indicators used in this study to explore the extent to which institutional change arising from government policy has impacted at the *meso* and *micro* levels. It will also assist in identifying whether the focus and position of these three logics: the government, corporate and professional logics, have

changed at institutional (university), organisational (discipline) and individual (academic) levels between 2008 and 2014.

Table 3 University Institutional Analysis Framework

Structural and Regulative Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Strategy	Structures and plans enable the knowledge economy through output, performance and productivity measures.	Structures and plans enable commercial goals through rationalised corporate structures and managerial-led systems.	Structures and plans support the promotion of academic autonomy, pedagogical excellence and self-directed intellectual discovery.
Structural mechanism and focus	Formal state-based, output control mechanisms measure performance and delivery of state-defined objectives.	Managerial-led systems assess market-based objectives and set to deliver commercial and business oriented outcomes.	Peer-led collegial systems based on disciplinary expertise, seniority and academic reputation oversee scholarly work. The academic voice is identified as a clear source of authority within the university.
Source of regulative and structural arrangements	Structural arrangements and mechanisms put in place by government and state agencies enable the delivery of government led requirements.	The development of hierarchical and functional arrangements is based on practices imported from business.	Structural and regulative requirements are established by professional expertise of disciplinary peers. Membership of this community of scholars enables professional participation in public discourse and critical debate.

Normative and Cultural Dimensions	Government Logic	Corporate Logic	Professional Logic
Focus of activity	Activities are prioritised according to their strategic national economic importance.	Activities are predominately market led and competitive in focus.	Activities are focused on fundamental research enquiry and enhancing scholarly learning and academic reputation.
Orientation of value system	Economic and public service led values focus on contribution to the exchequer and the knowledge economy. Engagement with the student as a future contributor to the knowledge economy is valued.	Service-led values focus on income generation, market place position, choice and competition. Engagement with the student is valued as a consumer of university services.	Values are focused on intellectual priorities, discovering and imparting knowledge, maintaining academic standards and growing disciplinary expertise. Student engagement is valued in developing skills in critical thinking and academic enquiry.
Focus of behavioural aspects	Practices demonstrate increased evaluative measurement and scrutiny of outputs both internally and externally.	Practices demonstrate strong managerial oversight, customer and service delivery orientation.	Practices enable academic autonomy, protection of academic standards and the pursuit and preservation of knowledge within society.

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to set out the methodological approach to this research. The philosophical basis of the research study will be presented and the specific research methods applied will be described together with the justification for choosing these approaches. The chapter will also describe how the research will be undertaken and will identify the research sites which are integral to this study. In addition, this chapter details how the data is collected and the approach taken to data analysis. A review of the ethical issues associated with both the design and implementation of the study is also included. The chapter concludes with an outline of the approach taken to addressing falsifiability together with an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the case study as the chosen research approach.

The main objective of this thesis is to ascertain how government policy developments between 2008 and 2014 creating institutional change have influenced institutional logics within the university at the *meso* and the *micro* levels. As described in the literature review institutional logics are comprised of socially constructed sets of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs and rules that shape cognition and behaviour (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999).

In formulating an appropriate methodological approach, the researcher considered the guidance provided by Reay and Jones (2015, p.442) who note that as logics are revealed through language and practices, symbols and materials, the study of logics is suited to "qualitative data and methods that demand immersion in the phenomenon". This information was useful in guiding the researcher to a methodology which would best serve to elicit data and address the research objectives.

3.2. Guiding Methodological Framework

This section sets out the foundations of the study and the trajectory of the research enquiry.

Grix (2004, p.68) sets out the approach to carrying out research which involves:

> setting out clearly the relationship between what a Researcher thinks can be researched (her ontological position) linking it to what we can know about it (her epistemological position) and how to go about acquiring it (her methodological approach), you can begin to comprehend the impact your ontological position can have on what and how you decide to study.

In designing a framework for the research methodology Creswell (2009) identifies three primary and preliminary elements of enquiry:

1. What *knowledge claims* are being made?
2. What *strategies of inquiry* will inform the procedures?
3. What *methods* of data collection and analysis will be used?

Firstly, to address the knowledge claims that are being made, the philosophical approach in this research is the constructivist. Constructivists hold that "[t]here is no objective truth waiting for us to discover it" (Crotty, 1998, p.8). Individuals seek understanding of the world and develop subjective meanings arising from their lived experiences. These subjective meanings are created through social interactions and from the norms that function in individuals' lives (Creswell, 2009). Knowledge is "actively 'constructed' by human beings, rather than being passively received" (Ritchie et al., 2013, p.13). This is similar to key concepts within institutional theory which defines institutions as being socially constructed and impacted by cultural and historical aspects.

Constructivists "are concerned with the lenses through which people view events, the expectations and meanings that they bring to a situation" (Rubin and Rubin, 2011, p.19). According to Moses and Knutsen (2012, p.199) "the world appears differently to different people; its appearance varies with the contextual setting (temporal, geographical, engendered, ideological, cultural and so on) of the observers". Consequently, as Moses and Knutsen (2012, p.10) explain, the constructivist approach opens up the possibility of multiple experiences. According to Lincoln and Guba, (2013, p.12), for constructivists it is "the meanings we associate with any given tangible reality or social interaction which determines how we respond".

It is acknowledged at the outset of this study that since working in the university is a subjective experience, a variety of views would emerge. Hence the importance of devising and adhering to a robust methodological framework in order to validate the outcomes of the research and ensure that findings are both credible and dependable.

As a HR practitioner, the researcher has observed the ways by which people make sense of the world through social interaction and subscribes to the notion that diverse and subjective views of realities can exist. As Merriam (1998, p.22) states "reality is not an objective entity; rather there are multiple interpretations of reality". From a constructivist viewpoint, it is this window to the experiences of others that is explored, in order that knowledge may be elicited as to how government, corporate and professional logics are experienced within the university, at both

the *meso* and the *micro* levels. The challenge of this approach is in the gathering of participant-generated meanings, validating the accuracy of findings and both collecting and interpreting the data in an impartial manner. Mir and Watson (2000, p.943) provide the following illustration which aptly describes the intended approach to this research study:

> While realists conceive of the research process as *excavation*, wherein the terrain of phenomena is mined for valuable nuggets of naturally occurring insight, constructivists view the process more as an act of *sculpting*, where the imagination (or the theory-base) of the artist interacts with the medium of phenomena to create a model of reality which we call knowledge.

Within the constructivist paradigm, the epistemological position is that "knowledge consists of those constructions about which there is relative consensus among those competent to interpret the substance of the construction" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p.114). The role of the researcher is underlined by Yilmaz (2013), in his description of the necessity for the researcher to become the research instrument in drawing out rich, extensive data. This underlines the importance of a trusting, participant-centred environment in which the research participant feels comfortable and open to fully sharing experiences and opinions.

3.3. Strategy of Inquiry – The Case Study

The second element in a research approach is the strategy which provides a route map, setting out specific directions for carrying out procedures within the research design (Creswell, 2009). The strategy of enquiry which best lends itself to this research is the comparative case study. Merriam (1998) describes a qualitative case study as an "intensive, holistic description and analysis" of a phenomenon (Merriam, 1988, p.21 as cited by Merriam, 1998, p.27). According to Yin (2009), a case study is particularly appropriate to a situation in which the research question seeks to explain a social phenomenon and where the context and the phenomenon's variables are inseparable.

The case study approach enables a focus "on a single phenomenon or entity (the case)" through which the aim is "to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon" (Merriam, 1998, p.29). Conducting a case study approach offers the opportunity to "gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved" (*ibid* p.19). In conducting a comparative case study, a number of separate examples are examined in a bid to uncover similarities, differences and patterns amongst the cases (Campbell, 2010). Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007, p.27) promote the use of multiple cases which "typically yields more robust, generalizable, and testable theory than single-case research".

Merriam (1998, p.30) highlights the value of the case study in bringing "about the discovery of new meaning" where conceptual categories are developed inductively in order to examine initial assumptions. Cohen et al., (2013, p.289) describe how case studies:

> can establish cause and effect ('how' and 'why'): indeed, one of their strengths is that they observe effects in real contexts, recognizing that context is a powerful determinant of both causes and effects, and that in-depth understanding is required to do justice to the case.

Lincoln and Guba (2013, p.80) present a strong argument for conducting case study research, a view which is supportive of the methodological approach taken to this research study. They support this view on the grounds that this is:

> the only format that can remain true to the moral imperatives of constructivism, that is, to serve as a credible representation of the various local constructions encountered and of any consensus construction (if such can be attained) that has emerged; that can adequately identify and reflect the voice or voices that influence the outcome; that can enlarge the understandings of respondents while at the same time serving the purposes of the inquiry.

3.3.1. Chosen Research Cases

The purpose of this case study is to explore the phenomenon of institutional change in the Irish university through a comprehensive contextual examination of the experiences of academics and their encounters with regulative and structural, normative and cultural dimensions arising from government, corporate and professional logics at both the *meso* and *micro* levels within the university.

On case study research, Stake (2005, p.450) emphasises the importance of designing a study which makes a "representative selection of cases". In this study a purposive criterion-sampling approach has been applied in which "[m]embers of a sample are chosen with a 'purpose' to represent a type in relation to key criterion" (Ritchie et al., 2013, p.113). The main aims of this approach are two-fold. Firstly, it ensures that all significant members of the population relevant to the study are included and secondly, it ensures that diversity within the population is represented so that the "impact of the characteristic concerned can be explored" (*ibid*). The aim of this approach to theoretical sampling "is to choose cases which are likely to replicate or extend the emergent theory" (Eisenhardt, 1989, p.537). On this basis, the method applied seeks to uncover the greatest information possible and to maximise what can be learned within the confines of a sample study.

Three of the seven Irish universities are included in the research thus enabling a comparative analysis. Participating universities have been identified according to a specified design which takes into account particular variables which are covered to achieve a balanced sample (Ritchie et al., 2013, p.133). The intention of this method is to "catch the range of variability" in a bid to demonstrate generalizability (Cohen et al., 2013, p.295). The research design approach is as follows:

1. Firstly, one of the two most recently designated universities; University of Limerick or Dublin City University is selected.

2. Secondly, given that a significant number of universities are based in Dublin (three of seven are based in Dublin), one of these number is also chosen.

3. Thirdly, one of the National University of Ireland (NUI) universities is chosen. The NUI universities comprise University College Dublin (UCD); University College Cork (UCC); National University of Ireland, Galway (NUIG) and National University of Ireland, Maynooth (NUIM). (Note: University College Cork is not included on the basis that the researcher is employed there).

Efforts are made to ensure that the sample encompasses as wide a spread of representation as possible across the Republic of Ireland to enable broad-scale conclusions. On the basis of the design as described above, the following three universities comprise the chosen representative institutions:

- University of Limerick representing the most recently designated universities;
- Trinity College Dublin representing a university based in Dublin;
- University College Galway representing a National University of Ireland (NUI) university.

In order to elicit a broad range of responses, the research is carried out within each university in three separate disciplines; one from each of the arts and humanities, sciences and business. The purpose of including these three disparate areas is to ensure a wide representation of academic fields in uncovering the diverse and holistic experiences of academics working in each of these separate disciplinary areas.

The comparative case study employs an embedded design incorporating multiple levels of analysis at the level of the individual, the discipline and collective universities (Yin, 1984). It

compares and contrasts the state of institutional logics within and between each institution included in the study, in addition to addressing the overall research question, namely how government policy between 2008 and 2014 has impacted institutional logics within the Irish university.

3.3.2. Case Study Design and Approach

This case study research is informed by a constructivist perspective, a design which although it provides rich descriptions has been challenged for being less centred on issues around validity and scientific method (Easterby-Smith et al., 2012). To address this potential shortfall, the researcher plans to incorporate within this study, a number of the elements located in the planned, conscientious and structured approach to case study design and method proposed by Yin (2009).

In acknowledging Merriam's (1998, p.206) assertion that the application of data validation criteria into an inquiry which is conducted by researchers who are coming from a different and opposing epistemology is "something of a misfit", this research includes consideration of Yin's structured and methodological stance in building a successful case study. Indeed, Yin (2009) himself, may have been informed by a more positivistic epistemology given his focus in addressing concerns raised with the case study approach, around lack of rigor and systematic procedures.

Yin offers caution in relation to the case study planning process when he states:

> [I]n actuality, the demands of a case study on your intellect, ego, and emotions are far greater than those of any other research strategy. This is because the data collection procedures are not routinized (Yin, 2002, p.58).

Yin offers the researcher a road map in addressing this objective and encourages the adoption of a quality-oriented design and method which seeks to "maximise four conditions related to design quality: construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability" (Yin 2002, p.19). An explanation of each of these is outlined below:

(i) Construct validity is concerned with "the extent to which a particular measure or instrument for data collection conforms to the theoretical context in which it is located" (Cohen et al., 2013, p.189).

(ii) Internal validity addresses the question as to how research findings match reality (Merriam, 1998, p.201).

(iii) External validity addresses the extent to which findings can be more broadly generalizable (Merriam, 1998, p.207).

(iv) Reliability is concerned with "dependability, consistency and replication over time" (Cohen et al., 2013, p.199) and the extent to which the findings can be reproduced if the same study is carried out again.

Consideration is given to Yin's (2009) recommendations and arising from this, specific tactics (as listed below in Table 4) have been incorporated throughout the various stages of the research to address the four conditions required and so deliver a case study which will stand up to scrutiny and criticism. Adherence to this case study approach maintains focus clearly on the link between research design, data collection and analysis together with the research question and its theoretical underpinnings.

Table 4 Case Study Tactics for Four Design Tests (adapted from Yin, 2009, p.41)

Tests	Case Study Tactic	Phase of research in which tactic occurs
Construct Validity	• Multiple sources of evidence are used from a number of sources including questionnaires, interviews and documentary sources. • The research seeks to uncover context-rich and detailed information from research participants. • A clear chain of evidence is established – i.e. links between the questions asked, data collected and conclusions. • In seeking to ensure that validity is achieved, a pilot study of the research instruments is carried out.	data collection
Internal Validity	• A pattern matching approach is used.	data analysis
External Validity	• Replication logic is applied in carrying out multiple case studies.	research design
Reliability	• A case study protocol is applied.	data collection

3.4. Data Collection Strategy

The third element that comprises a research approach concerns methods of data collection and analysis. The constructivist worldview lends itself to a qualitative approach in which the researcher "seeks to establish the meaning of a phenomenon from the views of participants" (Creswell, 2009, p.16). Qualitative research is by its nature exploratory in its outlook and

involves an "interpretative naturalistic approach to its subject matter" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008, p.3). In fact, Reay and Jones (2015, p.1) remark, that the qualitative approach "holds great promise" for investigating institutional logics which are the subject of this study.

The research participant group included within this case study is made up of academic staff employed within arts and humanities, science and business from the three universities chosen. A two-stage approach to data collection is employed. The research focuses on exploring the phenomenon of institutional logics by firstly inviting individuals to complete a questionnaire and then secondly interviewing individuals in relation to their experience of institutional change within the university sector. All academic staff members within the chosen academic units in the three universities are invited to complete the questionnaire to ascertain in broad general terms opinions and experiences of institutional change in the university between 2008-2014 and in order to frame and scope the data requirements which the qualitative interview process seeks to uncover.

3.4.1. Closed Question Questionnaires

A copy of the questionnaire can be located in Appendix A. Primarily this survey instrument was intended for initial investigation and scoping purposes and its design sought to restrict the level of detailed data provided by respondents, in seeking general trends in opinions and attitudes towards institutional change in the university between 2008-2014. The questionnaire consisted of 24 questions comprising predominantly Likert-scale multiple choice closed questions, as well as a small number of open ended questions to enable respondents to expand on their views. The justification for this approach was that the second stage of the research process encompassing a semi-structured interview would provide greater scope for more detailed qualitative data.

In hindsight, given the findings which the questionnaire elicited where 26% of respondents noted that the content and focus of their role as an academic staff member did not change between 2008-2014, if re-designing the survey again, the researcher would include a question addressing the experiences of those who had not experienced changes to their role or identity. However, this gap was addressed in the second stage of the data collection process in the semi-structured interview.

The questionnaire was launched via *Survey Monkey*, an electronic survey tool on 7th March 2016 and closed on 31st July 2016. It was forwarded via email link to all academic staff (total 153) in three specific academic disciplinary areas in: (a) arts and humanities area, (b) science

and (c) business in UL, TCD and NUIG. Each respective university website was used by the researcher to identify the names of all academic staff within each relevant discipline under review. All academics were contacted initially and a follow up email reminder was sent to the full sample population a week following launch. To encourage response rates, a further prompt in the form of a copy of the printed questions accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope was forwarded to participants several weeks following the questionnaire launch. Further contact was made a month later by email to those within those academic areas from which a limited response has been received, to seek to elicit further engagement with the questionnaire.

The list of questions was designed to be completed in less than 15 minutes. The aim of the substantive elements of the questionnaire was to uncover the general opinions and experiences of participants of institutional change during the period 2008-2014. It also sought to identify participants' views with regard to changes in the university value system and their own roles and identities during the six-year period under review. The questionnaire invited respondents to identify whether elements representing the three institutional orders which operate in the university: government, the corporation/market and the academic community changed in focus between 2008-2014 and where changes had occurred, to outline the relative changes in emphasis which had taken place between these institutional orders. All participants were invited at the end of completing the questionnaire, to engage in the second stage of the data collection process which comprised a semi-structured interview. Of the 59 respondents, while 17 indicated a willingness to do so, 6 respondents were interviewed.

3.4.2. Questionnaire Participant Engagement

In total 68 responses were received from a sample population of 153 - a response rate of 44%. Of this number however, 9 incomplete responses were received, which brought the useable proportion to close to 39% of the population sample. Of the 59 useable responses – 49 were completed on line and 10 paper versions were returned via post (see Appendix B). While incomplete questionnaires could not be used on the basis that they did not identify the respondent's discipline and university, the information received from the incomplete questionnaires was of interest in addressing the issue of missing data which is discussed in section 3.4.3. The profile of questionnaire respondents was as follows: 44% were at Lecturer level with 35% at Professorial level, 14% at Senior Lecturer level and the remaining 7% were in the category of Teaching Assistant or University Teacher. In terms of gender 66% of respondents were male while 34% were female

Table 5 Summary of participant response rates to questionnaire

University and Discipline	Total sample population surveyed	Completed useable responses	Percentage of completed responses
UL			
Arts and Humanities	13	7	54%
Business	14	3	21%
Science	22	7	32%
Total UL	49	17	35%
TCD			
Arts and Humanities	14	4	29%
Business	14	4	29%
Science	23	12	52%
Total TCD	51	20	39%
NUIG			
Arts and Humanities	19	11	58%
Business	19	4	21%
Science	15	7	47%
Total NUIG	53	22	41%
Overall Total	**153**	**59**	**39%**

The rates of response from the three university types can be seen from Table 5. A good uniformity of responses overall was received. However, the level of engagement with the questionnaire varied widely between academic areas surveyed within each university. While this differentiation in response rate had not been anticipated by the researcher, it did raise questions at an early stage of the data collection process around the varying levels of engagement by academic staff in particular disciplines, in relation to the topic of institutional change.

This early finding prompted the researcher to seek to explore this question further when designing the semi-structured qualitative interview, the second stage of the data collection process. The two-staged approach to data collection adopted in this study is in keeping with Miles et al., (2013, p.70) who proposes that the process of analysis takes place concurrently

with the process of data collection, as ongoing review and consideration of the data being collected, assists in planning strategies for collecting better data.

3.4.3. The Missing Questionnaire Data

While the purpose of this research is primarily a qualitative study, as such the quantitative aspects are of less significance. However, the issue of missing data was considered by the researcher as an important matter to examine. While it is acknowledged that potential participants may have been caught up in their work, on leave or unavailable to complete the questionnaire, where those who received the request consciously decide not to engage because of their level of engagement with the subject matter, is an issue for the researcher.

A number of emails were received by the researcher from potential questionnaire participants advising that they would not be completing the questionnaire as they had an insufficient understanding or limited engagement in the areas questioned. This finding is significant to this study exploring institutional change and leads the researcher to conclude that essential data around experiences of academic staff may be missing from the questionnaire findings because the construct of the questions assumed that those completing this instrument had experienced, or were aware of institutional change in the university. At this stage of the research study, this was important learning for the researcher.

Another area of interest to the researcher at this research study scoping stage was the low level of response from business and the higher response rate from the sciences in addition to the lower responses in Arts and Humanities in TCD (29%) compared to both UL (54%) and NUIG (58%). While efforts were made to address this shortfall by specifically targeting and following up via email with potential respondents in under-represented areas, these attempts did achieve some results in addressing the limited level of engagement with the questionnaire, however response rates remained poor. This led initially to an assumption by the researcher that there was greater engagement in the topic of institutional change and its impact within some disciplines and universities than in others.

However, this hypothesis is not borne out in the second stage of the data collection process where semi-structured interviews are carried out. There are however a number of factors that may be influential here in accounting for the changing levels of engagement in the subject of institutional change – including the timing of the request to participate in research interviews which was made some 10 months following the request sent to complete the questionnaire. A further factor in the increased levels of engagement at the second stage of the data collection

process may also include the employment of semi-structured interviews which may be viewed as less constraining and more open than a questionnaire in enabling engagement with the topic of institutional change.

The researcher also considers that the questionnaire design which may have presupposed that change had taken place between the period 2008-2014 may have been a factor in the case of disengaging possible respondents from completing the survey, particularly given that 26% of those who completed the questionnaire noted that they had not experienced a change to the content and focus of their roles. Arising from these findings, a question not previously considered by the researcher around general engagement with institutional change was included in the qualitative interview, the second phase of the research study and the questions in this instrument were specifically designed as open and explorative in approach, to enable greater accessibility with the subject matter from amongst those who participated.

3.4.4. Semi Structured Qualitative Interviews

This second stage of the data collection process incorporated qualitative face-to-face semi structured interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to uncover detail, in particular interviewees' views and perspectives from their own work and experiences as to how rules, systems, practices and values changed in the university setting during the period under review. It was hoped that these interviews would provide a detailed and comprehensive understanding of experiences of institutional change during the period 2008-2014, together with an account of how institutional logics in the form of structures, rules, practices, values and behaviours were impacted during this time.

In addition to contacting those who in completing the questionnaire indicated a willingness to participate in a follow-up interview, the researcher used the UL, TCD and NUIG webpages to contact potential research participants in the particular disciplines.

The semi-structured qualitative interview was designed to be of thirty minutes' duration and was intended to take place at the participants' workplace where they experienced institutional change. A copy of the interview questions can be located in Appendix E and interviewee detail appears in Appendix F.

Where possible interviews were conducted face to face, while eleven interviews were conducted by telephone at the request of the interviewee. While recognising that the dynamic between a face to face interview and one conducted by phone can differ, the researcher made particular efforts to develop trust and build up rapport with telephone participants.

The researcher invited all participants to discuss the extent to which they experienced change in their role or within the university in the period 2008-2014. Questions were designed to enable respondents to readily describe their own contextual experiences of institutional logics and to set out changes they had observed in the university in terms of the structural and regulative dimension – encompassing strategy, structures, rules and procedures and the normative and regulative dimension – including practices, activities, values and behaviours between 2008-2014.

While the aims of this study do not include the examination of gender issues in the Irish University sector, in devising the research methodology strategy for this study, efforts were made to be gender sensitive in conducting this research by ensuring representation of genders to elicit gendered views and perspectives. This was a challenge for the researcher in approaching the university case studies, as inequalities in the gender composition of the population of a discipline exist. The questions in both the questionnaire and interview were designed to be gender neutral and relevant to both men and women.

Table 6 below indicates the composition of the 39 interview participants from within each university.

Table 6 Profile of interview participants

University and Discipline	**Profile of Academic Interviewees (senior level denotes participants who have held leadership positions)**
UL	
Arts and Humanities	2 male, 2 female – including 1 female at senior level
Business	2 male, 3 female - including 1 female at senior level
Science	2 male, 3 female – including 1 male and 1 female at senior level
UL total	**14 participants – 4 at senior level**
TCD	
Arts and Humanities	3 female, 1 male – including 1 male at senior level
Business	3 male, 1 female – including 2 males at senior level
Science	2 female, 2 male – including 1 male and 1 female at senior level
TCD Total	**12 participants – 5 at senior level**

NUIG	
Arts and Humanities	3 male, 2 female – including 1 male at senior level
Business	3 male, 1 female – including 1 male at senior level
Science	3 male, 1 female – including 1 male at senior level
NUIG Total	**13 participants – 3 at senior level**
Overall Total	**39 participants - 12 at senior level**

The semi-structured interview sought to address a number of specific questions while not restricting the "emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (Merriam, 1998, p.74). Interviews were considered particularly appropriate to this study on the basis of two key factors:

(i) "it is the world of beliefs and meanings, not of actions that is clarified by interview research" (Asksey and Knight, 1999, p.15-16 as cited by Tight, 2003);

(ii) interviews provide "depth, detail, and richness" (Rubin and Rubin, 1995, p.8).

Creswell (2007, p.38) has set out a number of characteristics of qualitative research, several of which as listed below, have been employed by the researcher in designing the research collection strategy:

I. the collection of data through face to face dialogue in a setting which is natural for the participants – the researcher sought to carry out interviews at the research participant's work place;

II. the researcher as the "key instrument" of data collection – in acknowledging the central role of the researcher, efforts were made to remain impartial and non-judgemental. However, at the same time, the researchers' level of insight into the research area from her experiences of working in the university environment, provided the opportunity for theoretical sensitivity. While she remained attuned to the participant's words and meanings, her insight, understanding and ability to give meaning to the data as well as a capacity to "separate the pertinent from that which isn't" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p.42.) was considered beneficial to information gathering and analysis. In carrying out the semi-structured interviews, the researcher worked actively to create a comfortable

relationship with research participants where she remained focused on actively listening to their perspectives and experiences;

III. the collection of multiple sources of data including both primary data (questionnaire responses, semi structured interviews) and secondary sources (university reports and strategic planning documents) were gathered;

IV. a focus on participants' views, meanings and perspectives which may create multiple realities – the researcher sought to remain conscious of the constructivist philosophy and the various frames of reference which different research participants bring, arising from their experiences and she consequently sought to analyse participants' descriptions as openly as possible;

V. development of patterns from the 'bottom up' working back and forwards between the themes and research participants' experiences in a bid to create a comprehensive set of themes – the development of an analytical framework in the literature review together with the compilation of a comprehensive databank of findings, enabled the researcher to identify a far-reaching collection of themes;

VI. the use of theoretical lens to observe and examine findings – a thorough examination of the literature together with the development of a thematic framework utilising institutional logics, offered a clear theoretical lens with which to analyse research findings;

VII. the development of a comprehensive and holistic view of the issues being studied – an expansive study of the literature, supported a comprehensive study to be carried out;

VIII. an interpretive enquiry – the focus of the researcher was in seeking to understand and reflect on the meanings research participants gave to their experiences in the university setting.

3.4.5. Secondary Data

Cohen et al., (2013, p.290) highlight the importance in case studies "for events and situations to be allowed to speak for themselves" and they compare the case study to a television documentary. This viewpoint highlights the importance of secondary data. Pertinent documents and webpages relating to the period 2008 – 2014 such as strategic plans and annual reports were identified and sourced both to provide further context to this study and also by way of background, to illustrate the institution's contemporary environment. These secondary

sources support the data analysis in providing further perspective to the study and in validating the research findings.

3.4.6. Areas Explored

As previously outlined, the main objective of this thesis is to ascertain how institutional change in the university between the years 2008 and 2014 has impacted institutional logics at the *meso* and the *micro* level.

In approaching the qualitative interviews, the intention was to explore participants' experiences of institutional logics. Thornton et al., (2012, p.2) describe institutional logics as:

> the socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, including assumptions, values, and beliefs, by which individuals and organizations provide meaning to their daily activity, organize time and space, and reproduce their lives and experiences

The perspectives offered by research subjects in describing their experiences of institutional change are of particular importance in assisting the researcher to interpret how institutional logics changed in the time period under review.

Bryman (2008, p.540) refers to the importance of language as a focus of interest and cites Gill's (2000) view that language is constructive and "discourse is a way of constituting a particular view of social reality" (Bryman, 2008, p.530). Given the importance of language to the social constructivist, the researcher has been sensitive to the language used in descriptions and illustrations put forward by participants. She has also been conscious of the language used during any interactions, to avoid unduly influencing research participants' thought processes and by doing so compromising the research study. This includes using non-directional language, precise wording, exploratory verbs and open questions to facilitate the research participant's full engagement during the interview.

3.4.7. Ethical Considerations

Merriam emphasises the production of "valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner" (1998, p.198). To address the issue of ethics, the approach employed follow the proposals as outlined by Groenewald (2004 as adapted from Bailey, 1996, p.11) and the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011). The interview consent form as attached in Appendix D, incorporates the following notifications to participants.

- An understanding that participants are participating in research,
- The purpose of the research, how it will be used and how it will be reported,

- The procedures the research will take,
- The voluntary nature of research participation and the participant's right to withdraw should they wish to do so at any time.

It is to be expected that those who completed questionnaires and those interviewed may have been concerned if they are identifiable in the research findings. Research participants have been assured that while universities are named in this study, the specific academic discipline is not identified. Each discipline is classified in general terms as belonging to either an arts and humanities, scientific or business discipline. Neither are individual participants identified other than indicating their level of seniority where relevant. Across the case study universities, senior academics who participated in the research study comprise individuals who during the period 2008-2014 held various leadership roles including head of discipline, head of department and head of school.

In promoting credibility and trust, participants were informed that the researcher is a staff member working in UCC. At the end of each interview an invitation was given to review both the interview transcript and the research findings before finalisation.

3.4.8. Pilot Studies

Being a firm advocate of the merits of planning and preparation, separate pilot studies were undertaken prior to the actual research being carried out.

The pilot study plays a key role in assisting the development of the data gathering instruments and interview protocol (Yin, 1994). Its objective is to ascertain the effectiveness of the planned approach in gathering data which is workable. Questions are pre-tested and the pilot assists the researcher to address issues concerning design of the questionnaire and interpretation of interview questions prior to these instruments being launched. The goal in the inclusion of a pilot study is to increase successful approaches and outcomes in the main study.

This pilot was conducted in UCC. Some useful feedback was received and a number of changes were made to the structure of the qualitative instruments prior to finalisation. In particular, the pilot prompted reconsideration as to how some questions were phrased.

3.5. Data Analysis Strategy

In setting out to analyse the data, Yin (2014) suggests searching initially for patterns, insights or concepts that appear promising in linking the case study data to concepts of interest. He

proposes the use of diagrams or memos to assist in moving in the direction of a clear analytic strategy. In conducting research, the researcher has applied what is described by Reay and Jones (2015) as an interpretivist analysis or "pattern inducing" technique. Pattern matching has been described as "an attempt to link two patterns" where one has its origins in theory and the other is observed (Trochim, 1989, p.356). Where the empirical and predicted patterns appear comparable, the results can assist in supporting the case study's internal validity.

The research method follows a "bottom up" approach, first examining the raw data from in-depth interviews eliciting personal experiences, next identifying patterns (or logics) and then coding and comparing this content with existing academic sources, in particular the analytical framework developed at the end of the literature review (see Table 3). Reay and Jones (2015) describe how researchers engaging with this methodology must:

> immerse themselves in the data, examining and categorizing text segments to reveal the existing underlying meanings and thus identify patterns of behaviors and beliefs associated with particular logics (2015, p.9).

In accordance with the constructivist methodology, meaning is created from the ground level data comprising questionnaire findings and interview conversations held with research participants as well as from secondary documentary sources. This approach takes the view that "meaning is tightly intertwined with context and "the only way [to] understand a particular social or cultural phenomenon is to look at it from the 'inside'" (Meyers, 2013, p.38 as cited by Fahruddin, 2018, p.25860).

On completion of the data collection the researcher reflects on the data, explores interpretations, uncovers categories, discovers similarities and differences in experiences and, through a process of upward theory building, identifies linkages to theory. Firestone (1993) describes how through detailed scrutiny and analysis of the data, interpretation and higher-order abstraction, theory generalization becomes a matter of identifying evidence to support the conceptualizations which emerge. In accordance with Yin's (2009) approach and as detailed in Table 4 (see section 3.3.2), the researcher has been committed to ensuring that data analysis methods employed demonstrate a rigorous approach.

The proposed approach to data analysis is also influenced by Merriam (1998, p.178) who describes it as:

> a complex process that involves moving back and forth between concrete bits of data and abstract concepts, between inductive and deductive reasoning, between description and interpretation.

This approach is similar to the pattern-inducing technique set out by Reay and Jones (2015, p.3) who describe "capturing logics" where as much of the raw data as possible is shown and where text segments from sources such as interviews or documents are "grouped into meaningful categories, that constitute a pattern or set of behaviours associated with one or more logics" (Reay and Jones, 2015, p.9). In adopting this approach, the focus of the researcher is primarily on an examination of personal experiences given by research participants and the identification of patterns and themes, prior to making any generalisations. Efforts are also made to present the exact vocabulary and phraseology provided by research participants and to avoid interpreting data.

In setting out this approach, the researcher is also guided by the work of Eisenhardt (1989) who has drawn upon some aspects of the systematic method proposed by Yin (1984). The intention here is to employ Eisenhardt's (1989) approach in setting out a theoretical foundation, from which theory can develop. This process requires an initial identification of key constructs from the literature, such as key words contained in the analytical framework, which are then specifically measured during the data collection process. In undertaking this study, the researcher has remained conscious of the challenge which accompanies a constructivist approach. This underlines the criticality of adopting a strong analytical method, which effectively anchors and re-focuses the direction of the research approach, in recognising and identifying themes and patterns as they arise in the research findings.

Eisenhardt (1989) describes the process of moving back and forward between the constructs and data to confirm whether any relationships develop between constructs and data gleaned from the cases. Despite the use of personal judgement, this method is considered objective, given its "close adherence to the data [which] keeps researchers "honest" (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007, p.25). The final stage of the process is concerned with reviewing the emergent theory against existing literature sources.

Creswell, (2007, p.38) describes the inductive approach to data analysis as "building...patterns, categories, and themes from the "bottom-up" by organizing the data into increasingly more abstract units of information". To achieve this, Eisenhardt (1989, p.540) suggests a number of tactics in seeking to uncover patterns. The approach in this study involves the identification of "categories or dimensions" and then searching for similarities and differences within the data collected. This method is useful in prompting

review of the data "beyond initial impressions" and so to "improve the likelihood of accurate and reliable theory" (*ibid*).

SurveyMonkey is employed to assist in capturing, summarising, comparing and supporting the analysis of the information received in the questionnaire responses. Following the completion of recorded interviews. the researcher uses *Dragon Naturally Speaking* software to transcribe interviews in their totality and *Nvivo*, the computer software package which assists in data management and qualitative analysis. These programmes enable the researcher to organise and manage data within the study and to support the development of a structured approach to coding, classifying and sorting the research data.

Questionnaire analysis is focused on identifying particular trends where there is general agreement amongst those who responded in addition to being used to identify any dissenting views. Analysis of the responses also enables examination as to whether a particular response pattern has emerged amongst those employed in the three separate universities and collectively within these three entities. Data analysis of the interviews is undertaken as follows:

The full content of each interview is retained on *NVivo* and each of the interview transcripts examined in a bid to highlight statements and examples which describe the research participant's experience of institutional logics. Adopting the approach to coding the data suggested by Rubin and Rubin (1995), an inductive method is applied allowing "interpretations to come …while also think[ing] about the themes, concepts and ideas" explored in each interview, as the responses are reviewed one by one (*ibid*, p.228). To enable this process, the interviews are manually coded in *NVivo*. Applying the method proposed by Reay and Jones, (2015, p.9) the focus initially is on the application of a "bottom up process to identify patterns (logics)" in the data. Through analysing and arranging the text in a way that identifies behaviour or beliefs guided by particular logics while taking account of symbolic or material elements involved, the researcher makes associations and identifies particular rationalities which adhere to the structural analytical framework in Table 3. Through categorising the data in this manner, patterns emerge from the data.

The aim on completion of this activity is to develop grouped categories and themes which identify particular logics as outlined in the University Institutional Analysis Framework (Table 3). Reay and Jones (2015, p.10) highlight the importance of clustering sections of text "into meaningful categories" which it is believed "reveal actors behaviours that are

guided by identifiable institutional logics" (*ibid*). As proposed by Rubin and Rubin (1995, p.251), the data is organised "in ways that help...formulate themes, refine concepts and link them together to create a clear description or explanation" of the topic under investigation.

The findings are examined across the three case studies to assist in addressing two key questions: (i) the universal experiences which all academic staff across the three case study universities have had in response to the institutional change which has taken place in the Irish university sector during the period 2008-2014 and (ii) the comparative experiences that staff have had in each of the three separate universities included as case studies, in response to institutional change. The initial interrogation of this data assists in uncovering overall trends, general options and levels of engagement generally.

Data analysis is carried out at the level of the university and comparatively between the different institutions. Yin (1994) highlights the benefit in examining more than one unit in overcoming researcher and respondent bias, hence the approach which has been taken here in examining multiple units (nine disciplinary areas) and in carrying out thirty-nine interviews.

This data is reviewed comprehensively against the theoretical typology for institutional system ideal types as adapted from various literature sources (primarily Bulmer and Burch (1998), Scott (2013) and Thornton et al., (2012); (see Chapter two - Table 3). This framework is the reference model used to identify any changes occurring in the three institutional logics. The experiences of the structures, rules, practices and values during the period of institutional change between 2008-2014, are examined against the identified characteristics of the institutional logics of the market, corporation and profession. This is beneficial in answering the research question as to whether institutional change has resulted in a shift in emphasis in institutional logics in the Irish university.

3.6. Strengths and limitations of chosen research approach

In setting out the methodology, the benefits and weaknesses of the chosen approach are described in this section and comment is made noting how any potential limitations are overcome.

The case study approach is considered particularly suited to this study given its strength in "addressing contemporary phenomena in real-life contexts" (Meyer, 2001, p.330). Reay and Jones (2015, p.2.) highlight that researchers studying logics "must ground their insights

and abstractions to the context through quotes, observations, and thick description". This advice underlines the usefulness of the case study approach which especially facilitates:

> the thick description needed to apprehend, appreciate, and understand the circumstances of the setting, including, most importantly, its physical, social, economic and cultural elements (Lincoln and Guba, 2013, p.80).

Another strength of this approach is that unlike other qualitative designs, the case study is "open to the use of theory or conceptual categories that guide the research and analysis of data" (Meyer, 2001, p.331).

The value of interviews is that they enable the case study topic to be targeted specifically and so provide insight into "perceived causal inferences and explanations" (Yin, 2009, p.102). A weakness associated with conducting interviews is that the interviewee's responses may be subject to bias and poor recall, hence the approach taken in this study with open questions posed in an open and unbiased manner.

One criticism made of the case study is the loose design which can result in poor outcomes. The researcher has endeavoured to overcome this concern by setting out a clear design structure as outlined in Table 4 above, comprising a number of tactics to counteract potential weaknesses as proposed by Yin (2009). A further concern raised around the case study is the limited basis provided for scientific generalisation. However, within this case study, the intention behind the sampling method, together with the replication of a standard approach across a number of cases within the study, is to support research outcomes as being generalizable to theoretical propositions.

Fahruddin (2018) also draws attention the nature of an interpretivist approach which means that while explanations may be relevant in the context of a particular study, findings may not be generalizable beyond this context. However, through adherence to the methodical approach detailed in this chapter, concerns around the use of an interpretivist approach can be minimised. Finally, the constructivist approach has been criticised for its focus on subjective and multiple perceptions. However, this weakness is militated against as this research design incorporates a clearly objective position to data analysis as the data itself informs the findings.

3.6.1. Addressing Falsifiability

A key objective in carrying out any research is the need to consider what evidence might question or refute the research findings. To specifically address this area, this research has

incorporated a number of approaches as suggested by Johnson (1997, p.283), intended to foster and promote qualitative research validity and rigor. These strategies include:

- Adopting a thorough, questioning and reflective approach as the research is being conducted and "eliminating rival explanations or hypotheses until the final "case" is made "beyond a reasonable doubt" (*ibid*).

- Applying the process of triangulation by incorporating multiple cases for data collection and analysis and also by employing a mixed methods approach where a number of different data sources form part of the study (Yin, 2009). The research study has included cross checking information from a number of sources, including questionnaires, qualitative interviews and a review of documentation. According to Johnson, (1997, p.283) "corroboration" is achieved where this approach is successful in reaching agreement between data sources and the use of a multi methods approach.

- Incorporating "low inference" descriptions "phrased very close to participants' accounts" (*ibid*) – In carrying out this study, the researcher has endeavoured to enable credibility in the research, by remaining closely attached to the narratives, language and descriptions provided by interviewees.

- Incorporating the opportunity for participant feedback on the interpretations and conclusions of the research findings. Prior to being interviewed, participants were advised that they could review the transcript of their interview in addition to the relevant case study chapter. Two participants requested sight of the transcript of their interview. Two requests were received to review research outcomes and the relevant chapters were forwarded in response to these requests.

- Being self-aware as a researcher of possible biases and predispositions as these may impact on the research process and findings. In her professional role, the researcher has undertaken training in unconscious bias awareness and remains alert to minimising the impact of bias.

3.7. The overall components of the research plan

Yin (2009) suggests a framework setting out five key components of a research plan. Each of these five factors in the context of this research study are set out below in Table 7.

Table 7 Five key components of a research plan.

Key Components	
1) Study Questions	Has change been experienced by academics between 2008 and 2014? Have structures, rules, procedures and systems changed? Has the strategy and focus of the university changed? Has the focus of academic work changed? Has the orientation of the university value system changed? Has identity as an academic changed? Have practices and behaviours in the university changed? If changes have occurred what are the key drivers for these changes? If change has not been experienced, why might this be the case?
2) Study Propositions	Institutional logics (procedures, structures, rules, values, behaviours, practices) within the university setting have been impacted by changes to government policy between 2008-2014. Institutional change during the period 2008 – 2014 has had a possible impact on the positioning and prominence of the institutional system types under review; the government, the corporation and the academic profession.
3) Units of analysis	Three Irish universities representing the sector enable multi-level analysis.
4) The logic linking data to propositions	The data is analysed through the identification of patterns in addition to cross-site and cross-case analysis (Yin, 2009, p.34).
5) Criteria for interpreting the findings	The data from this comparative case study is analysed to uncover through questionnaires, interviews and a review of secondary sources how institutional logics have changed in focus between 2008-2014. This examination is supported by referral to and application of the University Institutional Analysis Framework developed in chapter 2 (See Table 3).

3.8. Chapter Overview

This chapter has set out the methodological approach which is considered to be most appropriate to the study of institutional logics in the Irish university sector.

A constructivist perspective is considered suited to this study on the basis that it accepts that amongst a group or institutional setting, different views and interpretations of experiences prevail. This approach is of particular relevance given the study is concerned with institutional logics which encompass understandings, values and practices. The case study has facilitated exploration of institutional logics through "a variety of lenses which allows for multiple facets of the phenomenon to be revealed and understood" (Baxter and Jack, 2008, p.544). The multiple units featured as part of the case study design enable analysis to take place between and across the various settings comprising the universities under review. This has facilitated within case analysis and cross case analysis to take place, all of which create opportunities to produce valuable findings in exploring whether institutional change arising from government policy has impacted government, corporate and professional logic within the university at the *meso* and *micro* levels.

The three separate case study examinations are set out in chapters 5 (UL), chapter 6 (TCD), and chapter 7 (NUIG). The following chapter presents an account of the actions of government between 2008-2014 in bringing about institutional change within the university.

Chapter Four: Government Policy Changes impacting the Irish University 2008-2014

4.0. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to set out the key policy changes impacting on the university in the period 2008-2014. This will provide the context for exploring whether the impact of institutional change led by government policy created a shift in emphasis on institutional logics within this key institution. Institutional change in the university sector in this six-year period took place against the back-drop of significant economic challenges, resulting from the global and domestic recession which commenced in 2008/09. However, prior to the economic collapse, institutional reform had already been the focus of government.

In a speech at an EUA Study in visit in Dublin in January 2012, the Secretary General of the Department of Education and Skills commented that "[e]ven in better financial times" change had been occurring within the university sector in Ireland and she set out the following reasons:

- "a national shift towards better accountability, increased transparency and value for money,
- growing demand for higher education provision,
- a widening mission for HEI's, including greater participation in research and
- the need to better articulate to government the growing financial needs of the sector" (DoES,.2012a, p.9).

Following the prosperous years of the "Celtic Tiger", the period 2008-2014 was characterised by major challenges for the higher education sector, as a direct result of the economic crisis. Student numbers continued to increase at the same time as core funding allocations and staffing numbers declined (IUA, 2014). Total exchequer recurrent funding in the period 2008-2014 was reduced by over €302.5 million (*ibid*). The impact of the collapse of the economy on the sector, was compounded by an increasing focus on competition, the growth of the global market and a rise in the importance of university rankings.

This led to a situation where the quality of Irish higher education internationally deteriorated (Hazlekorn, 2014). As noted by the IUA, student staff ratios increased during this period from circa 1:20 to 1:23, representing a deterioration of 12%, while the OECD average staff: student ratio in 2012 was 1:14 (IUA, 2014). According to Walsh (2018, p.388), following the economic crash in 2008, at the beginning of the period which frames this six-year research study, "the primacy of knowledge based economic imperatives sidelined all other

considerations in an era of renewed austerity" a situation which as we will observe, continued for a number of years.

This chapter will commence with a brief description of the university sector in Ireland and the legislative and statutory structure within which it operates. It will then review the key policy developments immediately prior to and during the period under examination 2008-2014, in relation to change in the sector which has come about as a consequence of economic factors and public sector reform generally. These developments have changed the role of the universities and altered the nature of the relationship which universities have with the state (IUA, 2014, p.1). A time line detailing the key legislative and policy changes which are relevant to the period under examination is also included.

4.1. The Irish University Sector - Background Context

During the period 2008-2014 there were seven universities in the Republic of Ireland which are listed below:

- University College Cork (UCC)
- University College Dublin (UCD)
- National University of Ireland, Galway (NUIG)
- National University of Ireland, Maynooth (NUIM)
- University of Dublin or as it is more commonly known Trinity College Dublin (TCD)
- University of Limerick (UL)
- Dublin City University (DCU)

In presenting a short history of the Irish university sector, Trinity College Dublin (TCD) is the oldest of the Irish Universities having been established in 1592. The NUI universities were created in 1845. Known as the Queen's colleges, three new colleges in Cork (UCC), Galway (NUIG) and Belfast (QUB) were established by Royal Charter "for the Advancement of Learning in Ireland".

University College Dublin (UCD) originally founded in 1854 as the Catholic University of Ireland received its charter in 1908 under the Irish Universities Act 1908, as a constituent university of the National University of Ireland (NUI). This same legislation dissolved the Royal University and it was replaced by the Queen's University of Belfast and the National

University of Ireland. The National University of Maynooth (NUIM) joined the National University of Ireland in 1910. Two further universities which originated as National Institutes for Higher Education were established in 1989; the University of Limerick (UL) and Dublin City University (DCU).

4.1.1. Government Institutions and Legislative Context

The role of government in relation to higher education is to define national objectives, set policy for funding programmes which are strategic in nature and determine exchequer funding. The Higher Education Authority (HEA) is the statutory planning and policy development body for higher education and research in Ireland. It acts as an intermediary body between government and higher education institutions. This role assists in ensuring that institutions remain accountable to government in the achievement of national objectives, while at the same time maintaining academic freedom together with a significant level of institutional autonomy. The HEA's mission includes the key role of fostering the development of a higher education sector which has the capacity to address the changing needs and challenges in society.

In the context of this institutional study, the seven universities, HEA and Department of Education and Skills together with other government offices comprise the relevant actors which creates an institutional field which has been described in the literature review. Traditionally, the university sector has been predominantly publicly funded by grants from the HEA towards the cost of teaching, capital development and research along with research funding from public bodies. Private sources of funding include some capital funding, fees for particular categories of students, including non-EU and postgraduate students and student service charges. In addition, some areas of research are funded by business and industry and charitable organisations.

Prior to the enactment of the Universities Act 1997, universities mainly operated on an independent basis according to their individual charters and statutes (IUA, 2014, p.1). The Universities Act 1997 marked a significant development as it delineated the relationship between universities and the state including the objects and functions of the university, in addition to setting out clear requirements in relation to governance, planning and evaluation, finance, property and reporting. The statutory framework within which the universities operate is strongly grounded in institutional autonomy and academic freedom while also asserting the freedom of academic staff in their teaching, research and other activities.

4.1.2. Research Activity and Funding

Traditionally, Irish higher education institutions were predominantly undergraduate teaching institutions and relatively little attention was given to research and post-graduate education. It was not until the economic expansion of the 1990s, with the availability of increased public funding for research and development in higher education institutions, that universities became 'research intensive'. This arose in part from the motivation of the universities themselves; also from developments in the state's industrial policy, the opportunity for EU research-related funding, and a realisation of the growing importance of "higher order skills and the growing importance of human capital in social and economic development" (IUA, 2014, p.1).

Since 2000, funding from the Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions (PRTLI) assisted in building the Irish research and development system's capacity, an investment which contributed to a noticeable increase in Ireland's international reputation for research. By 2009, according to Hazelkorn (2012,) Ireland ranked 8th in the impact of research publications. However, it must be said the continued strong positioning of Ireland as a producer of quality research was significantly impacted, when government funding of research was reduced by almost 30% in 2009/10 as a result of the economic collapse.

4.1.3. Resourcing and Growth

The state has always been a key institutional actor within the university sector. This has been illustrated in its creation of rules and requirements as well as by decisions made in resource distribution within the sector. State policies responding to the demands of higher education have traditionally been determined by student numbers. The growth-rate experienced in tertiary education between 1965 and 2003, with student numbers increasing seven-fold, has been described as extraordinary by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2006). In 1996, free tuition was made available to qualifying full-time undergraduate students in all publicly-aided higher education institutions, leading Irish institutions to rely more heavily on the state for funding. Funding models have and continue to drive massification within the system.

The funding environment created significant challenges for the university sector during the period under review. Reductions in exchequer funding coupled with increases in student numbers led to a reduction in the standard unit of resource for an undergraduate student of 20% during the period 2008-2014; in the same period student registration charges increased by 203%. In this period where total exchequer recurrent funding (excluding research) declined by

€302.5m, universities were forced to strategically manage their budgets and seek alternative sources of income. During 2008-2014 some success was achieved with a modest increase in non-exchequer income (excluding research) of 18% (from €695m to €818m).

In its annual report for 2007 and 2008, the HEA stated that in securing the level of resources required to deliver on policy goals, higher education institutions should be encouraged and enabled to raise funding from private and philanthropic sources. Subsequently, in its 2008-2012 strategic plan, it also linked the allocation of state funding to the achievements of national objectives through the development of a performance-funding model. The HEA acknowledged that this approach would create significant changes in institutional mind-sets (HEA, 2008).

Having presented an overview of the background context, the following sections will review the institutional change that took place in the period 2008-14.

4.2. Drivers which led to changes in higher education policy

A number of developments which illustrate the key exogenous and endogenous changes created the context for change for the university sector in Ireland, commencing with drivers of institutional reform originating from Europe.

4.2.1. Pressures from Europe

European higher education systems have continuously experienced political reform since the late 1990's. These developments are viewed by some as "a product of some supra-national agencies that define, translate and disseminate" these rationalised myths worldwide, "acting as institutional carriers" (Scott 1995 as cited by Vaira, 2004, p.488). Examples of institutional carriers include the OECD and EU which will be referred to below.

As noted by Walsh (2018, p.387) the early part of the twenty-first century saw changes with "[t]he repositioning of higher education as a key driver of knowledge based economic development". The rate of change in the university sector accelerated in Europe at the turn of the millennium due to two key developments at EU level: The Bologna Declaration (1999) and the Lisbon Strategy (2000) (Enders et al., 2011). The Bologna Declaration which had at its aim the creation of a European Higher Education Area by 2010, sought to make higher education systems in Europe more competitive, while the key objective of the Lisbon Strategy was to create a more integrated, knowledge-based economy. The EU's Modernisation Agenda published in 2007 referred to education, research, innovation and the modernisation of higher education as key pillars of the Lisbon Strategy (Enders et al., 2011). In the first years of the

new century, the European Commission continuously highlighted the role of universities in contributing to the knowledge society and economy (*ibid*).

4.2.2. Report by the OECD Higher Education in Ireland (2006)

The introductory section of the HEA report entitled *Towards a Performance Evaluation Framework: Profiling Irish Higher Education* (2013) explains that an increase in public interest in the performance of higher education institutions has been linked to the transformation of progressive western economies, to post-industrial and knowledge-based economies towards the end of the last century (HEA, 2013c, p.15). This development challenged the "ivory tower" image of the university and introduced a new era for the sector.

An OECD report *Higher Education in Ireland*, published in 2006, which reviewed national policies for higher education, made reference to Ireland's economic success, which was seen as being fuelled by the expansion in the output of high calibre graduates in the labour market. It also highlighted the key policy objectives of promoting both the societal and economic roles of higher education. However, the report sounded a warning note, lest the importance given to Ireland's economic and social development should "obscure its role in the intellectual and artistic life of the nation and the contribution which it makes to citizenship and the civil society" (OECD, 2006, p.24).

The OECD report described tertiary education as being at a "crossroads", requiring modernisation and rationalisation, the embedding of a research culture, a broadening of its funding base and a movement towards international competitiveness and innovativeness. However, the OECD cautioned against the investment of resources without modernisation, particularly in the context where the universities are viewed as "significant vehicles for the continued development of what the National Development Plan (NDP) described as the "knowledge-based" economy where "intellect and innovation will determine competitive advantage… [and to which] the accumulation of 'knowledge-capital' represents a key contribution" (GoI, 1999, paragraph 6.35 as cited by OECD, 2006).

The 2006 OECD report was seen as "the catalyst for the major reform and modernisation agenda" (GOI, 2007, p.200) within the sector. One recommendation was that funding for institutions be based on a contract, which set out an agreed strategic plan. It was proposed that this requirement would increase accountability considerably. The review commented that:

> institutions cannot just adopt Pavlovian responses to social change; they need to operate from defensible philosophies for their multifaceted roles, which are often wider and deeper than those of politicians and other social partners (OECD, 2006, p.218).

In terms of policy goals however, the review report was clear in reiterating the responsibilities of universities, stating that to allow economic productivity to become the key criterion in place of their educational, social, cultural and democratic roles and responsibilities would be a "betrayal of their mission" (OECD, 2006, p.219).

Further drivers of change as set out in a number of government reports are described in the following sections.

4.2.3. Key Government Reports 2006-2010

A number of important strategic reports on higher education were published by government in the two-years following the OECD report. These included *The National Development Plan (NDP) 2007-2013, Programme for Government 2007-2012, The Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation 2006-2013* and *Building Ireland's Smart Economy* (2008).

The National Development Plan 2007-2013, entitled *Transforming Ireland – A Better Quality of Life for All*, positioned higher education clearly at the core of national policy. It stated that "[T]he future capacity and quality of Ireland's higher education system is vital to our social, cultural and economic well-being" (GoI, 2007, p.202). It identified underdevelopment in science, technology and innovation at both business and academic levels as a weakness of the economy.

The NDP referred to the Lisbon Agenda framework which set out a structure for the EU and member states to work together to achieve sustainable growth, higher levels of employment and greater social cohesion. The NDP cited the 2005 European Commission paper entitled "*Mobilising the Brainpower of Europe:* enabling Universities to make their full contribution to the Lisbon Strategy" which noted that:

> Europe must strengthen the three poles of its knowledge triangle: education, research and innovation. Universities are essential in all three. Investing more and better in the modernisation and quality of universities is a direct investment in the future of Europe and Europeans (GoI, 2007, p.202).

In committing to invest in education, science, technology and innovation, it was noted that the strategy under the NDP 2007-13 was consistent with the achievement of these goals. Investment in higher education would:

> assist Ireland develop from being a technology-importing, low cost economy to an innovation-based, technology generating society with research and innovative indigenous enterprises being the new drivers of economic development and of the country's international competitiveness (GoI, 2007, p.201).

The NDP detailed that key to progress, reform and modernisation of the higher education sector was the alignment of institutions with national priorities, by putting new funding arrangements in place. This drive for reform at the third level would "provide for the creation of an expanded fourth level to transform the research landscape further and allow Ireland to be among the leaders of a global knowledge economy" (GoI, 2007, p.202).

The Government had also laid out its commitment to higher education in the *Programme for Government 2007-2012*. One key objective in the plan was to "develop our third level institutions as world-leaders in research and development, helping Ireland to maintain and build on its undoubted progress" (GoI, 2007, p.42). A key deliverable was the development of a strong fourth level research sector which included reshaping, reforming and strengthening undergraduate education, to support the skill needs of society and the development of fourth level education. A further aim was to ensure that there was "enhanced industry/academic collaboration to benefit business and secure growth" (GoI, 2007, p.47).

The sights of government were clearly on higher education. *The Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation (SSTI) 2006-2013* developed by an interdepartmental government committee set out a strategy for transforming Ireland to a knowledge-based economy in line with the Lisbon Agenda. The vision of the SSTI was that by 2013 Ireland would be "internationally renowned for the excellence of its research, and ... at the forefront in generating and using new knowledge for economic and social progress, within an innovation driven culture" (Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, 2006, p.21). This strategy was viewed as "an essential foundation for economic renewal and expansion" in the 2008 government report *Building Ireland's Smart Economy* (GoI, 2008a, p.75). A Smart Economy as set out in this report is defined as an economy that "combines the successful elements of the enterprise economy and the innovation of 'ideas' economy while promoting a high-quality environment, improving energy security and promoting social cohesion" (GoI, 2008a, p.32).

According to *Building Ireland's Smart Economy*, the most successful economies of the future would be those that could attain these characteristics. This report also noted the importance of delivering upon the Lisbon Agenda, as any lack of clarity in relation to Ireland's future position in the European Union would be a serious threat to its future economic performance, in particular, the attraction of foreign investment. This report emphasised the re-examination of roles and relationships of higher education institutions in order to address and advance Ireland's knowledge capacity, in a bid "to enable the Irish system to reach new levels of research and innovation performance" (GoI, 2008a, p.75). The report remarked that:

> The challenge to the higher education sector itself is to create new possibilities through new alliances and new organisational arrangements that can advance our knowledge capacity and generate opportunity for new levels of efficiency, performance, innovation and growth (GoI, 2008a, p.75).

This it said, would include instilling a commercialisation culture in third-level institutions alongside the now embedded teaching and research culture.

Another significant government report published in 2010 *Investing in Global Relationships* in setting out Ireland's International Education Strategy 2010-15, highlighted the importance of the Irish education system in developing international engagement and in seeking to position Ireland as a world leader in the provision of high quality international education. In presenting ten strategic actions to enable Ireland's competitive position in the international arena, the report outlined the requirement to redevelop and promote the Education Ireland brand and to focus Ireland's higher education institutions towards becoming globally competitive and internationally oriented.

A differentiation set out in the literature review when describing pressures for change, separates routine, evolutionary and crisis change situations. (Hinings et al., 2004). Exogenous shocks, critical junctures or crisis changes can arise from changing socio-economic conditions. The following sections describes both evolutionary and crisis forces; the pressures for evolutionary change stemming from public sector reform initiatives together with the crisis pressures resulting from the economic collapse in 2008.

4.2.4. Public Sector Reform

At the broader level of public reform, a key aspect of government policy which also impacted on the university sector was the modernisation and flexibility agenda for the public sector as set out under the *Towards 2016 Social Partnership Agreement* published in 2006. In 2008, the Government published a report entitled "*Transforming Public Services*" which focused on a number of actions including i) the achievement of improved performance by organisations and individuals; ii) the identification of a transformation agenda in each sector: and iii) the achievement of greater efficiency, effectiveness and economy (GoI, 2008b).

This theme was also re-iterated in the 2008 report detailing the actions required to deliver on the Smart Economy, which addressed the matter of efficient and effective public services including the higher education sector. It stated that Ireland's public servants must be open to change and innovation, demonstrate flexibility and be willing to meet the rigours of performance management and external accountability. This report highlighted that the activities of public servants:

> must reflect new and emerging Government priorities and the core values of the public service: serving the citizen while providing value for money to the tax-payer (GoI, 2008b, p.99).

One of the actions arising from the creation of efficient public services as set out in the Government's Smart Economy strategy included a review of current expenditure programmes in each government department, the reduction in the numbers employed in the public sector, and the development of shared services by public bodies.

4.2.5. Funding Policies Impacting on Higher Education

A sustainability study by the HEA, *Aligning Participation, Quality and Funding in Irish Higher Education*, was published in November 2011. A key driver to change as set out in this study was the very significant change in levels of state funding for higher education, the impact of which had been partly lessened by the increase in student contribution.

Between 1990 and 2006, allocation of funding was based on a unit cost model whereby each university provided information annually which determined funding allocation. A new model for allocating recurring funding was introduced in 2006. The Recurrent Grant Allocation Model (RGAM) provided funding proportionate to the educational resource demands of the student population, based on the total level of funding available annually. The model was designed to incentivise postgraduate research activity and increase the income earned by each

institution. It also took account of the potential to raise income through the student service charge in calculating the recurrent grant funding for allocation.

Efforts were made during this time to implement an improved costing approach to university activity incorporating a holistic costing system covering all activities within the university. To capture the data required for this, academic staff would be required to complete an academic activity profile form and to allocate a percentage of their time across nine agreed activities encompassing teaching, research and other activities.

Public funding of Irish education institutions was cut by 35% between 2008 and 2014 (taking inflation during this period into account), a time when student numbers increased by almost 15%. During 2009, following a report detailing *Policy Options for New Student Contributions,* commissioned by the Department of Education and Skills, the then Minister for Education appeared to be close to announcing a scheme which would introduce a student loan scheme, mirroring the Australian Higher Education Contribution system, but did not go through with this action (Hazlekorn, 2014). However, it was the financial constraints imposed by the economic crisis and considerable curtailment in the public funding of the universities, which as noted by Walsh (2018, p.463) brought about the most significant pressures for rationalisation within the sector.

A number of the structural mechanisms created by the economic crisis are examined in the following section.

4.2.6. The Impact of the Public Sector Agreements

At a national level, the impact of changes in the higher education sector was accompanied by significant economic reforms across the public sector, in a bid to reduce the deficit and improve the efficiency of the public service. Both the *Public Service (Croke Park) Agreement 2010-2014* and the *Public Service Stability Agreement 2013-2016 (Haddington Road Agreement)* set out to achieve clearly defined efficiencies and to change the way in which the Public Sector carried out its work.

The *Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest (FEMPI) Act* was enacted in 2009 to stabilise public finances. Resulting from the reform agenda, in addition to seeking to reduce the national deficit as set out in the Croke Park and Haddington Road agreements and the FEMPI legislation, the terms and conditions for public sector workers became less favourable. The impact on workers in the higher education sector included pay reductions, a three-year increment freeze, along with increases in working hours and remuneration, in addition to

additional requirements around flexibility and performance management. Public sector pay cuts for university staff translated into reductions in take home staff of between 13%-23% (IUA, 2014).

Commencing 2008 and year on year during the period under review, the Irish higher education system was faced with particular unforeseen challenges as the recession brought further reductions in recurrent funding. As noted by Walsh (2018, p.490), the economic crash "accelerated the ongoing reappraisal" of policies impacting the university sector. The recession necessitated the development of policy in the key areas of labour market activation, where the sector provided a range of programmes for the unemployed.

Moreover, in response to the public sector staffing moratorium, an Employment Control Framework (ECF) was put in place which provided for the application of the moratorium to the third level institutions, subject to the continued oversight of the Department of Finance and the Department of Education and Skills. The purpose of the moratorium was to enable a permanent reduction in the numbers of staff serving in the public sector and to contribute significant and continued savings to the Exchequer. The Government imposed ECF set serious constraints on the recruitment of staff within the universities and constrained institutional autonomy.

This policy led to a reduction of 12% in core staffing across the universities in the period 2008-2012. This decline in staffing numbers was accompanied by a growth of 13.2% in student enrolments between 2007/08 and 2011/12, which as detailed in the 2011 sustainability study undertaken by the HEA, had a significant impact on the quality and availability of teaching and research support and the delivery of student services. In addition, given the upward trend in student numbers, under the RGAM, the unit of resource per student declined considerably during this period (IUA, 2010).

The university autonomy scorecard for Ireland as published by the EUA in 2014, highlighted the increased governmental control over human resources and finance within the university sector and referenced a clear gap since 2009-10 "between the regular legal framework in which universities operate and the setting up of apparently temporary economic policies, resulting in a reduction in university autonomy" (EUA, 2014, p.3).

Having set out the key drivers which influenced institutional change within the university sector, the next section will outline a key policy document which published in 2011, set out the national strategy for the sector.

4.3. The National Strategy for Higher Education ('Hunt Report') (2011)

In February 2009, the Minister for Education and Science established a process to develop a new national strategy for higher education. This process, led by a high level strategy group chaired by a business economist, Dr Colin Hunt, sought to examine how well Ireland's higher education system was performing, whether resource utilisation was effective and how the system could be reconfigured to best meet the challenges for the sector, in contributing to Ireland's economic recovery. In the foreword to the report, the then Minister for Education and Skills noted the multiple functions provided by higher education as follows:

> Our higher education institutions serve and enrich society in many ways…. Our institutions act as gatekeepers, disseminators and creators of new knowledge…They form a nexus of interaction and engagement between a complex range of interests on a local, regional, national and global basis (Hunt, 2011, p.2).

According to the Annual Report of the HEA in 2011, the National Strategy for Higher Education "proposed ambitious actions …and …a far reaching agenda of reform in relation to the configuration, governance and funding of the system" (HEA, 2011a, p.7). The strategy proposed a framework where institutions would "be autonomous, collaborative and outward looking…and fully accountable for both quality and efficiency outcomes" (Hunt, 2011, p.4). The strategy further proposed that institutions would "respond flexibly to the changing needs of the economy and of society" (*ibid*).

Turning to a more detailed analysis of the text of the report, the strategy noted that in the decades ahead, higher education institutions would "need to strike a balance between the demands of the market and their academic mission" (Hunt, 2011, p.92). They would need to be innovative and enterprising in their research and teaching, to collaborate with industry seeking to align programmes with the needs of employers.

While remarking that Irish Higher Education was at a point of transition, the report set out a number of principles for the development of the higher education system. It signalled the importance of research in the sector connecting "to enterprise and society in new and imaginative ways to harness its potential for economic and social well-being, including a more

effective approach to knowledge transfer and commercialisation" (Hunt, 2011, p.12). It stressed renewal and transformation in the relationships between higher education and enterprise as the only way to ensure an effective return on public investment in higher education and research over the next decade. In terms of future research funding, the report noted that it should be allocated on the basis of specific requirements.

The report acknowledged that in the context of funding, developing the system to meet increased capacity and improved performance would require efficiency reforms, a broadening of the funding base and reforms in the approach to funding. Of particular significance in the context of the reform agenda is that the report marked the creation of new system arrangements as follows:

> [a] new contractual relationship or service level agreement between the state and the higher education institutions...and [that] this should be used to ensure that the requirements for performance, autonomy, and accountability are aligned (Hunt, 2011, p.14).

These service level agreements would seek to establish "the key outputs, outcomes and levels of service to be delivered and the resources allocated to achieve them" (Hunt, 2011, p.25). It meant in principle that "institutional strategies would be defined and aligned with national priorities" (*ibid*).

The report recorded that the policy framework in relation to higher education would make national expectations evident and that the objectives and operations of both higher education institutions and funding and quality agencies would be mutually aligned and "underpinned by a sustainable funding model" with "clearly defined structures for system governance and accountability" (Hunt, 2011, p.27). This would ensure the maximum societal return on public investment. The report proposed the application of government structures to develop national priorities for higher education and to oversee their implementation. In addition, it was suggested that a reformed HEA should have a strong central oversight role with responsibility for engaging with and enabling higher education institutions to meet national priorities as well as agreeing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), against which institutional performance would be measured and funding determined.

In the area of system governance, the report proposed the redefining of the relationship between the state and the higher education system, based on a new contractual arrangement or service level agreements, to ensure that institutions are accountable for all activities, regardless of funding source. Furthermore, the Strategy Group proposed that the HEA should report to the Minister for Education and Skills on the outcome of the strategic dialogue and that this report should inform the allocation of funding for higher education. In the interests of transparency, the Strategy Group also suggested that the strategic dialogue report should be published.

Also in 2011, a new appointment was made to the Chair of the HEA, the first appointment to this position from the private sector. It was noted that John Hennessy, the new Chair "wanted the universities...to be more like the private sector and become more competitive (Walsh, 2014, p.146). At the time comment was also made in the *Irish Times* as follows:

> [R]ecruiting the chairman from industry speaks to a number of government objectives. It is designed to foster better working relationships between industry and academic activities. There are plenty of public servants in the HEA already. He's a man for the times. (Holden, 2011)

In June 2011, a report was published by the Department of Education and Skills which detailed the implementation plan for the recommendations as set out in the National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030. An Implementation Oversight Group would be established to identify national priorities for the higher education sector. These priorities would then inform the strategic dialogue between the institutions and the state through the HEA. The implementation plan set out the actions required by those actors involved in the sector and timescales for the delivery of these actions.

Of significance in the context of university autonomy is that the plan noted that legislative changes would be required including amendments to the Universities Act 1997, together with legislation in the area of strategic dialogue and performance funding. However, proposed legislative changes were already underway, with the Government seeking to enact legislation which would serve to reduce universities' autonomy (EUA, 2014). A gap had developed between the legal framework within which the universities operate and the establishment of economic policies as evidenced by the publication of the Universities (Amendment) Bill in 2012.

The impact of this revision to the 1997 Act was that powers would be given to the Minister for Education and Skills to instruct a university, requiring it to comply with a policy decision relating to the remuneration or numbers of public servants employed, or a collective agreement entered into by the Government or Minister. Such developments would introduce new control and accountability measures between the Government and universities, reduce institutional autonomy within the sector and accordingly brings new pressures to bear for the universities. As Hedley (2012) noted of this development "[t]his is a bill to force universities to do what the minister says… [a]nd university autonomy be blowed" [1].

It was clear from these developments and most notably the publication of the National Strategy for Higher Education in 2011 that institutional change within the university sector was being progressed by government forces. The following section describes the actions of the HEA during 2012 in bringing about change.

4.3.1. Changing the Landscape

In February, 2012 the HEA issued a document *Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape,* (the Landscape Document) which set out the rationale for structural change within the system, necessary to enable the objectives of the National Strategy for Higher Education which had been published in 2011 to be realised. Three key outcomes for the higher education system were set out in this report: firstly, to improve the student experience; secondly, to enhance the impact of the system on society and the economy: and thirdly, to develop the reputation of the quality of Irish higher education internationally and to enable the system to compete for resources on an international basis. The HEA praised the national strategy as presenting "an opportunity to bring a nationally coherent and co-ordinated approach to the development of the sector while respecting institutional autonomy" (HEA, 2012d, p.2).

In progressing the strategic agenda for higher education, the HEA described its approach in its report entitled *A Proposed Re-configuration of the Irish System of Higher Education* as involving "a combination of bottom-up and top-down processes" (HEA, 2012a, p.5). Each higher education institution was invited to prepare a response to the *Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape* report and to set out an "institutional strategic vision indicating where and how it sees itself within the future higher education landscape". At the same time as it

[1] http://9thlevel.ie/university-law/universities-amendment-bill-2012).

engaged with the individual institutions, the HEA engaged an International Expert Panel to advise it on the "optimal configuration of the Irish higher education system" (*ibid*).

The report *A Proposed Reconfiguration of the Irish System of Higher Education* was prepared by the International Expert Panel and published by the HEA in November 2012. The background context of the report is outlined as follows by the authors:

> a growing concern that while the *laissez-faire* development of the Irish higher education system has achieved successes in some areas – higher participation and research activity – it has also led to mission drift, confusion over the role and mission of institutions, growing institutional homogeneity, unnecessary duplication and fears about the quality and sustainability of the system (HEA, 2012a, p.5).

In their report entitled *A proposed Reconfiguration of the Irish System of Higher Education,* the International Expert Panel agreed that the achievement of the panels proposals would "rest on a system of sophisticated mission based compacts negotiated between institutions and the HEA" (*ibid*, p.10), in addition to the creation for the system of a "realistic and sustainable funding base....that balances increased investment with increased efficiency and effectiveness, including any necessary reform of work practices or employment contracts" (*ibid*).

4.3.2. Achieving the Objective of the National Strategy for Higher Education

The HEA report entitled *Institutional Responses to the Landscape Document and Achieving the Objective of the National Strategy for Higher Education: A Gap Analysis* published close to the same time as the report of the Expert International Panel records that the submissions received from the higher institutions:

> …leave much of the system unchanged. This is despite the fact that "the tenor of the National Strategy, the Landscape Document and evidence from international examples suggests that Ireland must make significant structural changes to its higher education system to achieve its multiple and sometimes contradictory set of objectives (HEA, 2012c, p.29).

It was reported that from the responses received "the seven universities have indicated no significant plans for rationalisation". The report indicated however that in order to realise the strategic objectives of the higher education system, "it is inevitable that ...that structural adjustments are required which "will not be universally palatable" (HEA, 2012c, p.31).

On 22nd November 2012, in a speech on higher education reform, the Minister for Education and Skills set out his priorities around strengthening the university system, which incorporates "the best utilisation of the academic staff and resources available, aiming high, being world class and playing a greater part in the globalised higher education market" (DoES, 2012b). The

Minister also expressed concern that the Gap Analysis report published by the HEA showed a mismatch between the sum of institutional aspirations from within the universities and what was required of the sector. While acknowledging the constrained funding environment, the Minister commented that "further productivity gains in every area of institutional activity, management and administration would also have to be made" to deliver on "greater productivity and innovation in how we deliver Higher Education" (*ibid*). The Minister stated that he would introduce legislation as necessary to underpin the reform objectives set out and he urged all institutions "to take a long hard look at their future sustainability". He made the following warning:

> They should also look at their place in our Higher Education system, especially if their submissions have been predicated on wishful thinking. Because the harsh reality is that as a country we can no longer afford to indulge plans that are not based on credible and realistic analysis of likely outcomes (*ibid*).

Since 2010 research activity had been steered through a research prioritisation exercise undertaken by the Department of Enterprise, Jobs and Innovation. The report of the Research Prioritisation Steering Group in 2012 recommended fourteen priority areas around which future publicly-performed investment in research with a direct economic motive, should be focused. It was noted that the areas identified would need to deliver "sustainable economic return through their contribution to enterprise development, employment growth, job retention and tangible improvements in quality of life" (Forfás, 2012, p.7).

This exercise as noted by Hazelkorn (2012, p.4) reflected the following developments:

> the end of laissez-faire and building a broad base of expertise in favour of strong endorsement for a "more top-down, targeted approach" with an emphasis on research, which links directly to societal and economic needs.

4.3.3. Completing the Landscape Process

In January 2013, a further document entitled *Completing the Landscape Process for Irish Higher Education* was published by the HEA. This document proposed a number of possible options in relation to outline configurations for the higher education system in Ireland. The report noted that a key objective of the process of reform was to "protect the distinctive roles and mission of universities …while delivering the quality outcomes in teaching, research and engagement for students and stakeholders envisaged in the National Strategy" (HEA, 2013a, p.1).

The principles outlined in this report included taking a coherent approach to ensure that funding and other policy mechanisms supported the development of strategies which met national policy objectives; distinctiveness and diversity within the system; specialisation; the promotion of more collaboration, coordination and collaboration, engagement and quality; cost effectiveness, market responsiveness and institutional autonomy, while delivering on national objectives (HEA, 2013a).

Institutional change can be described as "the movement from one institutionally prescribed and legitimated pattern of practices to another" (Hinings et al., 2004). The following parts of this chapter describes the process of institutional change which occurs as government and HEA, both powerful central actors within the institutional field seek to drive the universities towards change through such mechanisms as "formal authority, the control of critical resources, and discursive legitimacy" (Hardy and Philips, 1998, p.219 as cited by Levy and Scully, 2007).

4.3.4. Enabling the National Strategy: HEA Report to the Minister for Education and Skills

In April 2013, the HEA published a report addressed to the Minister for Education and Skills on system re-configuration, inter-institutional collaboration and system governance in Irish higher education. This report detailed how key elements of the National Strategy for Higher Education could become a reality.

In noting the societal and economic role of higher education, the report highlighted "the significance of higher education institutions as repositories of cultural and intellectual wealth, as places where the pursuit of knowledge is its own reward and where the emphasis is on the holistic development of the individual" (HEA, 2013b, p.6). The report also made reference to the importance for higher education to "have the flexibility and agility to respond to changing conditions" (*ibid*, p.7) and the need for a balance between institutional autonomy and accountability to "ensure that public investment is being used to best effect" (*ibid*).

Of particular significance in the context of reform, the report on system reconfiguration, inter-institutional collaboration and system governance in Irish higher education detailed the introduction of the strategic dialogue and performance funding which would aim to attain a "differentiated set of challenging targets" (HEA, 2013b, p.12). This process would set aside a small amount of the core grant annually which would then be allocated according to the delivery of institutional performance against agreed individual plans. The report noted that the

compact would comprise formal agreements of three-year duration, developed through strategic dialogue between the HEA and the institutions.

In developing these compacts, each institution would be requested to set out its strategic objectives, which would then be assessed by the HEA to establish whether or not they fit the overall system plans, are applicable to the mission of the institution, and are both credible and challenging. In addition, each institution would set out the qualitative and quantitative indicators for the measurement of success in delivering these plans and the financial plans to underpin the institutional strategy. It would be the role of the HEA to make sure that institutional and system plans aligned and were capable of being funded.

The HEA envisaged that compact negotiations would commence in 2013 with the intention that formal agreements would be in place by the time grants were being allocated in 2014. As noted by Walsh (2018, p.446 in citing Walsh and Loxley, 2015), the proposed role by the HEA "in driving forward the process of rationalisation was consistent with the NPM practice of delegating significant authority to developed executive agencies, which were empowered to deliver a managerial reform agenda". The report also stated that institutions would be required to show that the research carried out within the institution is appropriate to the mission and "underpinned by a coherent and robust research strategy built on existing institutional areas of strength with identified areas of focus" (HEA, 2013b, p.37).

This report set out the division of responsibilities in the strategic dialogue process. The role of the Minister for Education and Skills was to set national objectives for the sector through national strategy. The HEA was identified as being responsible for advising on national goals, with each institution carrying out their responsibility for delivering clear and sound system outputs to meet national objectives. The higher education institutions were obliged to reflect national objectives in their plans. In addition, the higher education institutions were required to amend their plans based on dialogue meetings with the HEA and to implement and be held accountable for these plans.

4.4. Further Developments 2013 – 2014

In May 2013, the Minister for Education and Skills announced a major re-organisation of the higher education sector in Ireland. In a letter to the Chair of the HEA, the Minister declared a new relationship between the state and the higher education institutions would be implemented that will "allow the system to deliver the outcomes that have been identified as essential for Ireland's social and economic well-being" (DoES, 2013).

The Minister identified that "key to the delivery of these objectives by a mission-diverse, well-co-ordinated system of higher education institutions [would] be a new performance framework and a process of strategic dialogue between the Higher Education Authority and the higher education institutions". Primary outcomes of the strategic dialogue as had been identified by the Strategy Group included a performance element tied to core funding which would incentivise good performance and penalise institutions which failed to deliver; also the availability of reports detailing the success of the institutions in meeting national goals and associated KPIs.

It was noted by the Minister that a significant contribution would be made by the higher education system to the achievement of national priorities, on the basis that seven objectives were met. These agreed objectives included meeting Ireland's human capital requirements; promoting quality in teaching and learning; continuing research directed at the Government's areas of priority and the achievement of other societal objectives; and expanded research collaborations amongst both the public and private sector. The objectives also incorporated the goal of ensuring that Ireland's higher education institutions would be internationally focused and globally competitive. In terms of practices within the system itself, it was proposed that these would be reformed and that diversity and quality within the system would be restructured. The final objective was directed at accountability within the higher education system with the aim that that it be increased in the context of the public funding dimension.

In December 2013, the HEA published a report entitled *Towards a Performance Evaluation Framework* which set out the preliminary framework for performance evaluation for higher education. The significance of this framework as noted in the report was that it provided:

> a national framework within which to advance landscape, funding and governance reform, and to enhance performance evaluation in Irish higher education (HEA, 2013c, p.8).

The report highlighted that the performance of higher education institutions had been put "under the spotlight to an unprecedented degree" (HEA, 2013c, p.6) as had been demonstrated by the rising popularity of global university rankings. The decline in Ireland's economic profile since 2008 had negatively effectively its reputation, which had in turn impacted on higher education and university rankings.

At an address to the Union of Students in Ireland (USI) conference in April 2014, the Minister for Education and Skills referenced the reform taking place across the third level education sector when he stated as follows:

> [i]t is not a utilitarian view that seeks to reduce education to a commodity, but it is a recognition that education must prepare our people for work as well as for life (DoES, 2014b).

The first report of the HEA on the Performance of the Higher Education System was submitted to the Minister for Education and Skills in May 2014. It was acknowledged that strategic dialogue represented a significant change for the sector from the structure of accountability that existed to that time. In an address during the IUA Funding Symposium in September 2014 (DoES, 2014e), the Minister noted that the implementation of the new system performance framework was viewed as re-framing the relationship between government and the higher education system. At this conference, it was noted that exchequer funding of all higher education institutions had been reduced by 32% between 2008-2014 from €1,393.2m to €938.9m.

4.5. Responses to Reform

During this time period much criticism was levelled towards the direction and focus of the government reform agenda as described by Walsh (2018, p.491) "in the pursuit of economic imperatives, employing various mechanisms with a definite NPM imprint". These ideological concerns were expressed publicly from several quarters: by academics working within the Irish university sector, university presidents and by the combined group of university presidents as represented by the Irish University Association (IUA) as well as formal groups including Defend the University which was established in November 2013, a movement supported by IFUT (Irish Federation of University Teachers) and SIPTU (Services Industrial Professional and Technical Union).

As highlighted by the Defend the University campaign, notwithstanding the funding crisis, what emerged despite Ireland's "long and rich tradition of a thriving university system" was "a crisis of perspectives, a failure of the imagination and an un-thought-out turn towards marketisation and managerialism" which it said, would "destroy Irish higher education if ..allowed to pose as the only game in town" (Defend the University, n.d.). In its charter for action launched in November 2013, Defend the University set out the importance of "academic freedom over a fear- driven consensus, creativity over blind compliance and collegiality over managerialism" (*ibid*).

Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski, President of DCU between 2000-2010 was particularly forthright in expressing his dissatisfaction with policy developments during this period. As an author of a blog between 2008 and 2018 which commented on life both inside and outside the university, he was regularly critical of the Irish government and its reform agenda. In one entry he recalled the "recurring and deeply frustrating experience [s]... encountering politicians who had persuaded themselves that the university sector received too much funding, wasted resources and needed more control to resolve this problem" (von Prondzynski, 2014).

Another outspoken voice was Mary Gallagher, a UCD academic who in publishing a book entitled *Academic Armageddon: An Irish Requiem for Higher Education*, lamented the "very utilitarian" vibe which had developed in the university arising from government reform. In an *Irish Times* article, published on 15th February 2014, journalist Joe Humphries posed the ideological question - what is higher education for? In responding Gallagher stated,

> There is no breathing space any more for education for its own sake…We have given up on the idea that knowledge makes you free. Instead, education is branded as excellence; we talk about 'world-class' academics, and use a discourse of efficiency, and inputs and outputs…we are in a world where education is being bought and sold like a commodity, and that brings its own pressures and lies (Humphries, 2014).

Despite concerns levelled at government, the reform agenda progressed. In analysing the impact of government policy, this research study examines the Irish university at the *meso* and *micro* level.

4.6. Chapter Overview

A time line detailing the considerable body of key legislative and policy documents relating to the period 2008-2014 which are referred to in this chapter is presented below in table 8.

Table 8 Timeline detailing key legislative and policy documents 2008-2014

2008	Building Ireland's Smart Economy (Government of Ireland)
2008	Transforming Public Services (Government of Ireland
2009	Financial Measures in the Public Interest Act 2009 (Government of Ireland)
2010	Resource Management and Performance (IUA)
2010	Public Service Agreement 2010-2014, 'Croke Park Agreement' (Government of Ireland)

2010	Investing in Global Relationships – Ireland's International Education Strategy 2010- 2015 (DoES)
2011	National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (DoES)
2011	National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 – Implementation Plan (DoES)
2011	Sustainability Study: Aligning Participation, Quality and Funding in Higher Education (HEA)
2012	Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape (HEA)
2012	Report of the Research Prioritisation Steering Group (Forfás)
2012	Universities (Amendment) Bill 2012
2012	A Proposed Reconfiguration of the Irish System of Higher Education (HEA)
2012	Institutional Responses to the Landscape Document and Achieving the Objectives of the National Strategy for Higher Education: A Gap analysis (HEA)
2013	Report on Completing the Landscape Process for Irish Higher Education (HEA)
2013	Report on System Configuration, Inter-institutional Collaboration and System Governance (HEA)
2013	Public Service Stability Agreement 2013-2016,''Haddington Road Agreement' (Government of Ireland)
2013	Towards a Performance Evaluation Framework: Profiling Irish Higher Education (HEA Report)
2014	Higher Education System Performance, First Report 2014-16 (HEA)

In the period 2008-2014, the university sector in Ireland experienced changes arising from two distinct but interrelated factors;

(i) policy reform and development in the area of higher education and

(ii) financial and cost cutting measures as a direct consequence of the economic environment.

The impact of the 2008 economic crash was significant for the university and as noted by Walsh (2018, p.490) and evidenced in this chapter hastened reform within the sector directed towards the promotion of the knowledge economy, the acceptance of the Government's concept of accountability, the requirement to do 'more with less' and the achievement of performance based outcomes.

The numerous policy documents published during this period, together with multiple action plans arising from policy changes over the six years, are an indication of the shifting environment and the changing relationships within the sector, with the Government setting the agenda for higher education and redefining the *macro* operating environment for the universities.

Of key significance is the Higher Education Strategy (2011), which according to Hazlekorn (2012, p.9):

> marked a clear "move away from laissez-faire, light touch regulation to a more systematized, directed and regulated approach, focused on measurable outcomes.

Such change can be described as a re-institutionalisation process whereby a transformation takes place from one order to another, based on different "normative and organizational principles" (Olsen, 2010, p.128).

During the period under review, the state formalised system oversight within the sector in an effort to re-orient the activities of the universities towards addressing specific government-led objectives. As noted by Walsh (2014, p.52) the "intensive and systematic way in which official objectives are being pursued represents a far-reaching change in educational policy".

The *First Report on Higher Education System Performance 2014-2016* acknowledges the following:

> reform is timely such are the demands on the system; the centrality of a well performing higher education system to social and economic development and the pressures of globalisation of higher education. That reform is now underway....Overall, the programme of reform in higher education, encompassed in the phrase "strategic dialogue", is one of the most significant and wide-ranging reforms in the Government's wider strategy of reform in the public sector (HEA, 2014a, p.9)

The publication of this first report on Higher Education System Performance provides evidence of the new developing relationships between the universities, government and society. This approach highlights the process of institutional change, which as described in the literature review, takes place where there is a shift from one institutional template to another.

The research carried out in this thesis will seek to establish the extent to which government policy instituted change has influenced institutional logics during the period 2008-2014

Chapter Five - Case Study 1: University of Limerick

5.1. Introduction: University of Limerick (UL)

In the first of three case studies, this chapter focuses on analysing the influence of changes brought about as a result of government policy (as detailed in chapter four) at the *meso* and the *micro* level within the University of Limerick. This case study is the first of three which underpin a full comparative analysis of institutional change arising from government policy developments, which will be carried out in chapter eight.

The University of Limerick (UL) was founded thirty years ago, almost 150 years after the previous Irish university had been established. Having had its origins from 1972 as a National Institute for Higher Education focused primarily on teaching, UL achieved university status in 1989. In 2008 the year of the commencement of this study, the university had 8,800 full time students and 1,324 part-time students totalling 10,124 students. Six years later in 2014, these numbers had increased by a notable 31% to a total of 13,282 students.[2]

Between 2008-2014, a relatively short period in the life of a university, considerable change took place in UL. From being predominantly a teaching institute with a significant focus on student learning, it became a research-led university, in which the profile of the research agenda was raised and where a performance-managed culture was accelerated (A9).

This chapter asserts that within UL during this six-year period, the structural and regulative dimension became substantially more prominent from the perspective of both the government and the corporate logic. There was notable activity at the *meso* level in elevating the status and marketable significance of research in this traditional teaching-based institution and teaching became less valued. This development had the effect of diminishing the strength and position of the professional logic which include discovering and imparting knowledge and disciplinary expertise.

A significant 74% of questionnaire respondents in UL reported that the content and focus of their role as an academic changed in the period 2008-2014. As will be seen in this case study, a major development at the *micro* level was the change made to academic recruitment procedures and the creation of a tenure track process. These had the effect of elevating the position and status of the government and corporate logic at the *micro* level and reducing the

[2] http://www.hea.ie/en/statistics/overview accessed on 13 November 2016

power and authority of the disciplinary peer-based structures, which traditionally had autonomy over academic appointments.

5.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension

A number of structural and system-based changes impacted disciplines and academics within UL. As a direct result of government policy, UL experienced a strong change in strategic direction whereby arrangements were introduced which sought to deliver both for the government-led knowledge economy and the pursuit of university corporate goals. This had the effect of raising the profile of both the government and the corporate logic within UL.

This research contends that the government and corporate logic were powerful in creating workforce arrangements, research activity and streamlined administrative systems, to comply with increased oversight and regulative requirements. In the resource constrained environment, disciplines were forced to focus on delivering income and results and this was difficult to achieve. These developments combined in challenging professional collegial structures.

5.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level

This section provides an analysis of the structural and regulative changes experienced at the *meso* level arising from the influence of government policy. These findings are examined from the perspective of the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic within UL across three disciplinary areas; arts and humanities, science and business.

These changes included the university's strategic decision to drive research activity in some science disciplines and set it aside in other areas of science and arts and humanities. This led to a weakening of professional, collegial-based structures and arrangements within and between disciplines. As this case study will illustrate, particular disciplinary areas were elevated due both to their strategic importance to government in the creation of the knowledge economy and their funding potential for achieving the corporate goals of the university.

5.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: workforce reconfiguration and targeted research strategy

Government-led structural arrangements which determine the resources available to universities translated into a significant deterioration in government-based funding during this six-year period. This development was keenly felt by all disciplines within UL. In the literature Clancy (2015), describes government control of finances as enabling the state to direct the activities of the universities in the pursuit of national objectives. Within UL this action was

described by a senior science-based academic as “government dis-investment in education”, which created a struggle for survival (A12).

Another example which illustrates the increasing prominence of the government logic’s structural and regulative influence came from the impact of resource constraint mechanisms including the Employment Control Framework (ECF). The operating environment became severely constrained in UL as a direct result of this unyielding control measure which translated into a recruitment moratorium on permanent appointments. As a consequence, the casualization of the university workforce increased considerably during this six-year period.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) note that workforce reconfiguration has become a necessity for many universities because of new economic constraints and demands. In UL, there was increased incidence of gap-filling through the supply of junior colleagues, often hourly paid, who had no security of employment (A4). Described by a senior academic based in arts and humanities as the growth in “precarious labour” (A7), this situation then led to a “battle over resources” between disciplines. These changes combined led to a deterioration in collegial academic structures. In the literature Kwiek (2013) questions the stability and continuity of the academic profession in the context of an increase in temporary, part-time and casual academic faculty.

Howells et al., (2014) note that increasingly, the key focus of government policy is on governance, structural adjustments and performance management. In UL, this new environment can be evidenced by the introduction of organisational rules and procedures which had their origins in the legislative requirements led by government and the EU. These national and supranational influences have been described by Scott et al., (2000, p.349 as cited by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016) as “the requirement not only to do things differently” but increasingly at organisational level to “do different things”. Examples of these obligations in UL which became more visible during this time included the development of procedures to comply with data protection legislation, an increased focus on equal opportunities and involved rules for reimbursement of expenses.

A key strategy by government between 2008-2014 was the drive for growth in research activity in science disciplines and the “potential to attract foreign direct investment” through such sources as the IDA or Enterprise Ireland (A3). The university’s strategic plan during 2011-2015 set a clear objective to enhance research profile and strengthen the impact of research both nationally and internationally. However, in reality, these opportunities were limited to

specific disciplines. Arising from the national economic situation, those working in particular areas of science with major European-funded industry relevant projects in place in 2008 considered themselves lucky when compared to the rest of the institution because, during the difficult years, they enjoyed collaboration with industry and other European university partners. As a consequence, as noted by two senior science-based academics, while well-resourced disciplines were able to progress and develop, they were more insulated than other areas, from what was taking place generally within the university (A12, A14).

The influence of national policy developments can be seen in the actions taken by university management in UL where during the period 2008-2014, the university put a targeted strategy in place in pursuit of its strategic goals. In making these plans, there was an acknowledgement that the university was seen to support particular disciplines. In 2009, as described by academics working across arts and humanities and science disciplines, decisions were made by university management to prioritise government research funding opportunities in the hard sciences and engineering and not to support the ambitious plans for PRTLI funded research in the arts and humanities and some scientific areas (A7, A10). This approach is in keeping with Henkel (2005) who describes how universities have become more strategic and accordingly more selective in supporting particular areas of research.

As described by a science-based interviewee:

> If you were a glass half full person, you could consider that there is a certain movement within the institution to support certain disciplines and build a critical mass around certain disciplines and research areas. And if you are outside that …, you could feel a little disenfranchised or unrecognised (A10).

It is evident from this examination of structures and procedures at the *meso* level through the lens of the government logic, that state-based policy changes were instrumental in effecting significant institutional change within UL during the period 2008-2014.

5.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: market based objectives and systems

Within the walls of UL, the idea of the university at the level of the discipline was seen to change with the development of a strategic focus towards the market-based client (A9). Kwiek (2013) notes that the drive towards income generation has directly affected the way universities have been operating in recent years.

During the period 2008-2014, the corporate logic came to prominence in UL from the emphasis given to the business-driven imperative to make more money. The 2011-2015 strategic plan set a new ambitious goal in competing for international students and growing the international

student cohort by a significant 50%. While goals such as increasing internationalisation were generally presented in the context of benefits to teaching pedagogy and cultural exchange, interviewees across all levels, in both business and arts and humanities (A4, A5, A7) shared the view that as stated by one academic "everyone knows it is about money and getting in non-EU students to provide that extra money" (A4).

A senior academic based in arts and humanities noted that the "changing funding model across the university made people very mean and focused on their own area" and drove decision-making to become less about education and more about what the resource allocation funding model would achieve (A7).

Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.7) describe the situation which arises where university budgets are declining and where faculty becomes increasingly affected by the profit motive to secure external funding. A senior business academic from a business discipline considered that arising from financial considerations which put additional pressures to subsidise other disciplines (A1), business was impacted more than science, engineering and health sciences. The business school opened officially in 2010 with the annual report that year referencing the success of the university in developing high quality graduates, "sought after in the world of business and industry" (UL, 2011a, p.3). An additional push was felt by business disciplines in UL to further generate funds through recruiting students, in particular postgraduate students or students who would bring in more money (A4, A7).

During these years, UL developed structural arrangements to enable delivery of its market-based objectives. With the increased focus on rankings, internationalisation and research outcomes as well as developments in the creation of a corporate organisation within the university, a strong signal was coming through from the new managerial structures of the university. There was a markedly changed organisational approach which included the creation of business-based systems as well as a greater focus on outcomes and metrics. As noted by 84% of questionnaire respondents, the university experienced a growth in professional and management structures within the university during these years. This development is in keeping with Parker's (2011) observations in the literature where he describes progressive universities adopting business processes and methodologies to create value and maximise returns. One example of this activity in UL, was the drive towards accreditation in the business disciplines, a requirement which was viewed as critical to raising funds.

Restructuring within the university and the rationalisation of academic units which took place during this time, was seen as a mechanism which enabled management to carry out its role more effectively, with one interviewee commenting that perhaps the management hierarchy in UL felt that it was easier to manage four schools, (when they were negotiating and interacting with the School Deans), than previously when there had been six schools (A3). Delmestri et al., 2015 has described how in recent years "guild like" disciplinary structures have lost legitimacy and been replaced by formal organisational structures. However not all newly created school structures endured. Academic pressure within one school which sought to enable stronger disciplinary representation and visibility (A8) was successful in splitting a recently created school during this time and reverting to smaller disciplinary units.

During this six-year period, as noted by a senior science-based academic and an arts and humanities academic, UL experienced an increase in more streamlined and bureaucratic systems which are characteristic of large and growing organisations (A14, A5). This was seen by a senior academic based in arts and humanities as a progressive step, given that the university did not have a sufficient procedural framework in place prior to 2008 (A7). However, concerns were raised that this systems framework had grown too rigid and lacked the flexibility needed when dealing with people (*ibid*).

Musselin (2013b, p.28) describes the university as experienced by academic disciplines which become more influential and where level of interactions increases and become more constraining. Managerial-led mechanisms, including goals, targets, expectations and demands to achieve particular outcomes, increased significantly between 2008 and 2014 "without any real discussion as to the consequences of producing all those targets" (A4). Disciplines experienced a considerable increase in the number of new electronic processes for activities such as recording student grades, as well as approval and payment of expense claims. While the professionalization of such processes was seen as positive, it was accompanied by an increase in paperwork, more form filling and new rules which added to the administrative burden.

The operating environment changed within UL during these years. With the increasing focus on market influences and income generation, decisions became more about income and less about scholarly considerations. As noted by a questionnaire respondent whose focus was predominantly teaching, based in arts and humanities "decisions became more budget-oriented rather than pedagogically-oriented" (#15).

Having examined structures and regulations within the corporate logic at the *meso* level, the remaining part of this section explores these aspects from the perspective of the professional logic.

5.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: a weakening in collegial structures

Traditionally, the university has been characterised by a strong community of academics, free to establish their own rules in accordance with professional norms (Minzberg, 1996, as cited by Grenier and Bernardini-Perinciolo, 2016).

The status of collegial peer-based disciplinary structures within UL declined as a result of the growth in status of managerial functions, so that it felt according to a senior business-based academic as if "the foot soldiers – teachers, lecturers, professors... became second-class citizens" (A1). This was in a context where the academic profession had become diluted arising from retirements and temporary and part-time faculty increased. In addition, as noted by this senior academic, the profession experienced a decline as high calibre academics moved from their traditional discipline-based roles, where they had been "excellent teachers and excellent researchers" (*ibid*) to take up highly-paid administrative positions in central areas of the university.

With the loss of colleagues and growth in internal management structures, rules and systems, it became increasingly difficult for faculty to formally engage in discussion with the institution. While observing the implementation of corporate structures and managerial-led administrative and reporting systems together with the objectives to pursue commercial goals, there was a general sense that the university had become just purely a business (A6). In addition, it became "increasingly difficult for staff to have a voice, or critical debate or show resistance to policies from higher levels" (A4) and as noted by a respondent to the questionnaire departmental/school level, politics had become less important.

In accordance with corporate-based organisational structures, Faculty Board meetings became the forum for systematic reporting mechanisms around each department's performance activity. This would include the quality rating of the journals in which academics were publishing as well as listings of externally-focused activities undertaken by staff, information not collected prior to 2008 (A4). Krücken et al., (2013) describe how the introduction of managerialism as an ideology has impacted planning, evaluating activities, and the formal organisation of the university. In UL's academic committees, the space for discussing academic work or the role of the academic in society had disappeared.

The impact of this change was described as follows by an arts and humanities academic:

> The university developed into a more managed institution, so that the feeling was that what we did at faculty board, we just pushed paperwork… We didn't discuss education; we didn't discuss if the student should be doing X or Y or was it good for them. We discussed whether we had met the deadline to get the paperwork to the committee for this course to go through (A5).

These changes weakened the legitimacy of traditional disciplinary structures as the opportunity for academic input into university decision-making processes was removed. Hence the collegial structures inherent within the professional logic weakened.

5.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level

The experience of structures and regulations at the individual level during this time period are examined below through the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic. With new demands made of the academic, which included working with bureaucratic systems, enhanced scrutiny, and requirements to achieve quality-based measurable outcomes, the operating environment at the *micro* level changed. As illustrated below, while the position of the government and corporate logic rose in significance, that of the professional logic at the *micro* level deteriorated, in face of the many challenges faced by the individual academic.

5.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: scrutiny and changing expectations

In describing how university accountability has grown, Gumport (2000), gives the example of faculty productivity as increasingly being tied to the provision of funding from the state. Interviewees in UL considered Irish universities comparatively well off compared with universities in the UK, Germany and the United States (A9, A3) where additional expectations were made of academic colleagues. One specific example given was of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK which individuals considered would "be coming our way in the future", prompting two academics working in business disciplines that they should get themselves "REF ready" (A2, A3) and produce research in line with UK norms, where the expectation was to produce four articles every two years to retain employment (*ibid*).

Enders et al., (2011) describes the development of output control systems which has taken place in the university in recent years and the efforts made to strengthen the actor-hood of universities as organisations. UL acknowledged the changing expectations coming from public bodies including government and its agencies, as well as external quality-assurance bodies, where it was "increasingly recognised that, as public bodies, universities are accountable for the conduct of their affairs and are subject to scrutiny by a variety of parties" (UL, 2011b, p.5).

In the literature Henkel (2004), describes academic activity is being increasingly scrutinised both internally and externally as outputs become more of a public concern. Arising from the introduction of government-led oversight mechanisms from state agencies such as the Department of Finance during the period 2008-2014, more professionalism was experienced. As noted by an arts and humanities academic, these new controls meant the following:

> There were more checks and balances, things were done in a far more professional way - these quality assurances were there to make sure that people weren't privileged or divisive (A6).

However, there was also a sense for the individual academic of "being under the magnifying glass with more scrutiny taking place of your finances and receipts" (A8) as well as mandatory evaluation surveys and other demands which university management claimed were HEA requirements (A4). Henkel and Askling (2006) note how in order to make academia more transparent and accountable, formal evaluative criteria have been introduced with the result that non-experts dominate the evaluative process, a role previously aligned with academic faculty.

The bureaucracy associated with management of research funds became more onerous, along with an increased expectation placed on the return that was expected for the funds provided (A10). As identified by a science-based academic, although support structures were established to assist with more complex research-grant applications and requirements around the management of research funds (A10), the level of support available was viewed by a senior academic working in science as insufficient. In the literature Clancy (2015, p.260) notes that structural research funding requirements and a growth in procedures when seeking research funding, has "heralded the introduction of unbridled market principles into the steering" of the university sector. As described by a senior science based academic in UL, a lot of time was spent alone in the pursuit of much-needed funding, with a lot of this effort proving unsuccessful (A12). In addition, as noted by a senior science based questionnaire participant, the growth in targeting specific areas and disciplines with funding had produced the development of a critical mass towards large projects and a move away from more speculative research (#6).

Considerable time was spent by individuals seeking to source research funds; and while some external research funding opportunities did become available towards the later part of the 2008-2014 period, it was more competitive, and the funds made available from government sources were far more limited than in previous years. There was a view that the existence of the

"Matthew effect" [3]had been operating in the research arena where those who were successful in the past in securing grants continued to be successful while those who had failed, continued to lose out on research applications (A11).

As identified by a senior science-based academic, this situation was particularly detrimental to early career academics who found it almost impossible to progress their research careers (A12). One research active interviewee working in an area no longer prioritised by government during this time period, described securing €250,000 research funding just prior to the crash, funds which never materialised (A10). For those who were seeking to engage outside of these prioritised research areas there was a view that "they could either sink or swim" (A11) and without the supportive structures or mechanisms in place these academics generally didn't succeed (*ibid*).

It is evident that the introduction of structural arrangements, system controls and new bureaucratic systems, many of which were initiated as a result of government requirements and expectations led to considerable changes in the day-to-day work experiences of the individual academic.

5.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: metric based appointment and promotion systems

Within the corporate-based university environment, significant changes to processes and procedures took effect during this period which impacted at the individual level. One example cited was the metric-driven appointment and promotion regulations. Towards the later part of the six-year period covered in this study, some limited academic staff recruitment activity took place in UL. The standards required of candidates appeared to increase year on year, arising from the competition for positions and the additional expectations made of academics in the corporate focused academic environment. Interviewees in both business and science disciplines questioned whether their 2006 and 2010 profiles would have been successful in securing a position in 2013-2014 (A2, A8). The hiring environment had become "a completely different playing field" (A8).

In the literature Reihlen and Wenzlaff (2016) refer to the shift in appointment and promotion requirements where assessment criteria have increasingly become more explicit and metric based. In UL, appointment requirements now comprised a PhD in addition to several

[3] The Matthew Effect is social phenomenon often linked to the idea that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

publications and this was very different to what had been acceptable previously. Candidates were also required to demonstrate at interview how they would contribute to the university's strategic goals, to endorse the values of the university and to "really step up" (A2).

During this period as has previously been highlighted, managerial-led systems were put in place in a bid to deliver business-oriented outcomes. One example was the introduction within UL of a tenure system, where new appointments were made on a five-year contract basis and if the appointee was not promoted to 'an above the bar' appointment in that time, they wouldn't have a job. This completely changed the employment landscape. It became no longer the case that a candidate could "just show up do a 45-minute interview and have a job for life" (A2).

The tenure track process described as "a management practice imported wholesale from England" led to a situation where many younger colleagues were seen to be made to "work above and beyond common duty with absolutely no guarantee that they would get a permanent job" (A6). This finding resonates with May et al., (2011) who describe the recent changes to the academic career path as creating a career plan that is no longer clear and straightforward. However, in UL as in other universities, this new tenure-based appointment system enabled the delivery of performance-based outcomes, an approach which originated in business.

New managerial-led requirements for academic staff post-appointment, also came into effect which included formal mentoring, teaching qualifications, para-counselling and research leadership courses. These new conditions echo Peters (2012), where he describes the importance of socialising new institutional members to enable institutional change. Promotional opportunities which were reintroduced towards the end of this time period also featured a change in dynamic, with a new level of performance and activity goalposts required for promotion purposes (A4, A13). For 74% of questionnaire respondents in UL the nature of the academic profession changed.

These developments led to a "ferociously competitive" working environment as described by an interviewee based in arts and humanities (A6). A science-based academic described how colleagues worked towards promotion by "neglecting some of the things they should be doing and focusing on the things that tick a box" (A11). Another science-based academic described the changes that took place as follows:

> the working environment was transformed during this time, "…we started to look at the person who is the workaholic and all had to strive to achieve the same as that person who never leaves the office (A13).

Hattke et al., (2016b) describes how increasingly many of the new requirements made of academics are set out in policies and procedures, which then lead to coercive isomorphism amongst academics, where deliverables are objectives, quantifiable and comparable. The establishment of appointment regulations and the tenure track mechanism was instrumental in accelerating the business oriented, performance-based changes which took place within UL.

5.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: changing focus in the academic role

The focus of the academic changed during this six-year period as reported by two business-based academics at both junior and senior levels, with the academic role becoming significantly more "skewed" towards research, to the detriment of teaching and the student (A1, A3). This resonates with the findings from the questionnaire conducted in which 74% of UL respondents reported that the content and focus of their role as academic staff members changed in the period 2008-2014, with the growing administrative nature of their role and greater emphasis on research activity and outputs, metrics and performance indicators.

Structural requirements and focus of activity for the academic changed noticeably with a greater weight of administrative work and increased teaching loads. As remarked by a senior business-based academic, there was a sense of loss of what was previously viewed as the profession's primary function, namely a strategic focus on the combined areas of "teaching and research and looking after students" (A1).

Krücken et al., (2013) proposes that what is valued from a professional perspective, is the activity that takes place within the scientific community amongst networks of peers. This work acts as a buffer against the impact of changes experienced elsewhere. Within UL, conscious of the changing environment and endeavouring to retain professional focus and membership of valuable peer-led collaborative networks, academics took action to preserve and develop their professional research links. Because of deterioration in national funding and the changing nature of university-based relationships, academics across disciplines reported active engagement with European and Asian research projects and networks to secure funding that was available outside Ireland (A1, A5, A8, A10). A senior academic in arts and humanities recorded that engaging with peers externally involved:

> becoming more connected with networks outside Ireland for the purposes of seeking knowledge, providing knowledge, passing on knowledge and looking for and making more connections (A5).

This activity, according to a senior business-based academic, was a "positive aspect of the crisis in the national funding landscape" (A1).

It is evident that the individual academic made valiant efforts to maintain his role in peer-led collegial structures externally, despite the changes to university structures and procedures which impacted at the *micro* level. However, this was a challenge particularly in the context where as noted by 84% of UL based questionnaire respondents, the influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols in UL increased during this six-year period. Having examined the formal structural and regulative dimensions, the focus of the case study now changes direction to an examination of the informal normative and cultural dimension.

5.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension

Moving from the structural and regulative dimension, the remainder of this chapter examines the values, behaviours and practices which comprise the normative and cultural-based landscape within UL during 2008-2014.

As this section will contend, the values, activities and practices in UL changed at both the *meso* and *micro* levels during this six-year period. Government-led expectations and requirements together with the emergence of a corporate environment, focused on factors such as service delivery, metric-based performance and achievement of commercial-based outcomes, while the elevated status of funded research in particular scientific areas created a new dynamic within the discipline and for the individual academic. These changes elevated the status of both the government logic and the corporate logic. 84% of all questionnaire respondents within UL agreed that the value system changed during the period 2008-2014 with most of this group pointing to an increased emphasis on internal economic and efficiency metrics, academic reputation and operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness. With the emergence of this new cultural environment, the weight afforded to professional values and practices, such as student learning, fundamental research enquiry, academic autonomy and collegiality declined.

5.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level

The following section provides an analysis of the effect of government policy on the informal normative and cultural dimension which encompasses values, beliefs and practices at the *meso* level. This is examined from the perspective of the government logic, the corporate logic and the professional logic.

With the increased focus shown to activity which delivers state-based objectives, the institutional value of funded research in particular science-based areas increased. As a result, the environment for other disciplines became very challenging. Coupled with this change,

growth in managerial oversight and focus on service delivery and academic outputs rendered the cultural setting at the *meso* level more closed and oriented towards metric-driven performance and the marketable value of the academic endeavour.

These developments had the effect of raising the profile of behaviours and values inherent in the government and corporate logic, while lessening professional values and activities focused on fundamental research enquiry, collegial relationships and academic autonomy. Concerns were also raised as to the impact on academic standards of the priority shown to service-led values focused on income generation.

5.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: the changing value of research

It was clear that government was steering work in the university to serve national economic objectives – the idea of higher education as an economic investment (as identified by Enders et al., 2013 and Shore, 2010). Within UL, government was not seen to be on the side of the arts and humanities disciplines. For these the impact of budgetary cuts felt more pronounced than elsewhere, as the budgetary situation prior to 2008 was already poor with "less outside funding and a less than generous budgetary situation to begin with" (A9) in 2008. As remarked upon by one resigned academic "it is harder to cut away at things when there is not much there anyway" (A9).

With the pressure from government to increase the focus on research, the university was "pivoting into a far more research active state" (A2). One science-based interviewee described how this development occurred within UL in reflecting that:

> The university had woken up and UL had realised that in order to move up in the rankings, you need to have a high-profile in terms of research (A13).

During the period 2008-2014, many of the research opportunities available to the arts and humanities disciplines "dried up" with the "possibility of interacting with colleagues in other Irish institutions or even abroad funded by the Irish state having just gone right out the window" (*ibid*). With the deficit of research monies for arts and humanities, the view from these disciplines as noted by a senior arts and humanities-based academic was that when funding ran out, internal collaboration deteriorated (A7). Working within a budgetary-constrained work environment with an increased emphasis shown to specialised research activity, the culture at the *meso* level became more competitive and increasingly oriented towards public service-led values. This development created a marked divide between those in arts and humanities and other disciplines.

One of the most striking features of the period under review was the shift in the value placed on research and teaching. In UL, as identified by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, (2016), research had become transformed into a more valuable commodity. According to a senior science-based academic, teaching was now less valued than it had been prior to 2008-2014 while research was given a higher value (A14) and a split had emerged between the value of research active and teaching focused academics (A11). A senior science-based academic described his fear that faculty were "too into teaching and that would kill their research" and this would impact the profile of the university (A12). There was also a perception by others that "those who were turning out research appeared to be rewarded more than for other activities" (A3). Teaching it was felt had been "thrown to the wind" (A3).

New practices permeated the academic role. Administrative duties previously undertaken on a voluntary basis, such as the module satisfaction survey, became mandatory requirements overseen by university administration, which stated that these were demands set down by the HEA. However, this was not wholly believed and the view held by some was that university management was using government as a lever, to enable the delivery of university requirements. It was evident that government influences were influential in effecting normative and cultural changes at the *meso* level.

5.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: 'management speak' and disciplinary divisions

85% of questionnaire respondents agreed that UL grew both as a business organisation and as a commercial entity during the period 2008-2014. According to a senior arts and humanities academic, the university's adoption of a more corporate orientation alongside the development of values demonstrating "management speak" (A7) came about as a result of senior management taking "Harvard courses in management" and from the larger input of external consultants in the university (A6). As a result of these and other changes which included the creation of a small but powerful executive (A7, A9), the mission and values of the university became more "business focused" in both content and tone (A8). Vocabulary employed took on a new character, "becoming more coercive ...and closed in" (A5). The new corporate discourse, as suggested by Alvesson and Benner (2016), represents the belief that knowledge and research produced in the university is valuable in business and monetary terms.

In the literature Deem et al., (2007, p.99) refer to concerns about loss of trust and autonomy academics face in carrying out their daily work. Within UL, as noted by a senior arts and humanities academic, internal relationships between disciplines and the university generally

changed from being personal to more business-focused (A7). While there was a recognition by this academic that business-based structural models succeeded in making individuals more accountable, there was a feeling that the culture of the university had become more "macho and less open" (*ibid*) and that in decision-making processes, the key focus on the budget, forced individuals to talk in financial terms in a bid to achieve a favourable outcome.

In terms of the differential effects between disciplines, a senior arts and humanities academic was clear that there "was more interest and interaction in the arts and humanities when there was more money" and in recent years as the "focus had really tightened around the hard sciences and engineering" this had "been very excluding" to those working in her discipline (A7). This resonates with the research of Roberts, (2007 as cited by Shore, 2010) who described the feelings of loss and reduction in status and power experienced by academics as a consequence of evaluative outcomes.

With management increasingly taking a business and performance-based approach and as the vocabulary of the university became more managerial and business-focused in content and tone, the orientation of the value system at the *meso* level became more aligned towards the corporate logic. This is also evidenced by the development whereby research has become increasingly valued for its worth in the market. As evidenced in the experiences of UL academics, the corporate logic at the *meso* level increased in prominence. This section concludes with an examination of the normative and cultural dimension as experienced through the lens of the professional logic at the *meso* level.

5.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: moving from the intellectual to the market

As noted by a business-based academic in UL, the relationship between strategy and targets and the discipline's health at local level during this six-year period, was influenced to a significant degree by who was in charge and whether they adopted a corporate or a professional approach (A4). A widely held view was that the status of university strategy at discipline level depended to a large extent on dissemination and communication of information by the unit head.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p,197) identify how some faculty leaders may operate under the "old regime" while others more recent to the system may seek to work with a "more entrepreneurial conception of academe". Leadership in UL at school and departmental level was a key influence at this time. An academic working in a science-based discipline described how their head of department tried to protect the discipline from the corporate and government

influences and what was going to "rain down on top of us" (A11). While an arts and humanities-based interviewee described how as a result of the changes which were taking place "people were afraid. I think our experience was to do with the head… And certainly there was a feeling of, I think fear – because nobody knew what was going to happen next" (A5).

As staffing changes occurred, senior academics across all disciplines noted how morale within the discipline weakened, as a consequence of the loss of senior colleagues who retired and were not replaced and also the limited opportunities available to those at mid-career who needed to progress within the profession (A1, A7, A14). As a number of colleagues who held administrative roles left, more pressure was put on remaining colleagues to take on these duties. The numbers of those available to take on additional roles also declined. And when retirements took place, hourly paid instead of salaried replacements, became the norm (A5). Moreover, as identified by arts and humanities academics (A6, A7) the impact of senior colleagues leaving and not being replaced, created an academic leadership deficit which was problematic to the discipline. Ryan and Guthrie (2009) report that the quality of academic leadership is key to ensuring that changes taking place to deliver the business and government agenda, do not damage traditional academic values and collegial culture.

As noted by 77% of questionnaire respondents, the university as a community of scholars reduced in focus during this time. Prior to 2008 there was a general feeling within the University of "bonhomie, of collegiality, of people more or less working together to try to develop higher education, to do good research" (A6). While previously there had been some encouragement to engage in research activity, after 2008 the focus moved to the *impact* of research. As a consequence of this, as identified by a science-based academic, the quality of the journal in which the research paper was published and the number of citations it received now became significantly more important in assigning value to research output (A13). Both Frost et al., (2016) and Dacin et al., (2002) describe how as performance measures have come into clearer focus, the nature of the professional has changed.

In an environment where there was an increasing focus on performance measurement, academic relationships changed within the discipline. The reduction in research monies created increased competition with everyone actively applying for funds. This impacted on the working environment. For an interviewee based in science who moved from a contract position to a permanent role during this period, this had the effect of significantly changing the internal

dynamic of the discipline and its collegial environment (A13). As described by another interviewee working in an arts and humanities discipline:

> Everyone turned in on themselves...People were so busy you wouldn't say to somebody can you go for coffee and we'll have a chat...And so collaboration began to dry up because often research collaboration starts with a conversation over lunch (A5).

The availability of time and resources enabling student learning also changed, was described by a senior academic in the arts and humanities who recalled:

> I remember everything shrinking and a real feeling of having to do more than less …with more students, I found myself being a bit meaner and I didn't like that – but you have to do that to survive. There was too many of them so the numbers, the increase in student numbers made a huge impact (A7).

Maintenance of teaching standards, a key endeavour for the academic profession became very challenging in the context of growing student numbers, increased teaching loads, funding cuts and the introduction of new budgetary models. Concern was expressed by a senior business-based academic, that standards had been sacrificed in the drive towards income generation and the "quick fix approach" of "recruiting PhD students from countries that have the money but not necessarily the best students" (A1). This resonates with Hermanowicz (2016) where he describes the significant changes taking place in the university sector, with the priority moving from the intellectual to the market. These developments impacted negatively on the traditional focus of scholarly reputation within disciplines. It is evident from this analysis of the normative and cultural dimension at the *meso* level, the professional logic declined in prominence.

5.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level

The following analysis completes an examination of the normative and cultural dimension within UL during the period 2008-2014. The focus here is the effect of government policy on the normative and cultural aspects which comprise informal practices, focus and beliefs at the *micro* level.

The orientation of the academic endeavour changed during the period 2008-2014, as academics were required to develop their research expertise. Those who did not deliver became less valued by the institution. With increasing public scrutiny of academic work together with increased activity in the control and management of performance, the cultural environment became significantly output-focused, with research becoming the most valuable commodity. In addressing these new requirements, academics changed their practices and sought to deliver

work that was valuable within both the government and corporate domains. This created a competitive and metric-driven cultural environment, which in a very resource-constrained university, focused academics on growing income. This further created self-interested behaviour. With the increased dominance of both the government and corporate logic at this *micro* level, the professional logic, which values collegial and collaborative relationships, weakened.

5.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: promoting measurable output

With the recognition of the important role of the university in realising national economic policy and with the redefinition of state-university relationships, it has become increasingly challenging to sustain the traditional academic identity (Henkel, 2005). At the *micro* level, as identified by both business and arts and humanities academics, with the growth in research ethos and the increased value placed by government on measurable and productive output, UL academics, many of whom were "teachers at heart" (A14) were challenged and pressurised to research (A2, A5). Arising from changing expectations, the proportion of academics in the Business School holding PhD qualifications grew significantly from 20% in 2006 to 70% in 2014 (A2). While traditionally a teaching-led university with a key focus on students, attention in UL appeared to shift to research impact and university rankings (A13). As expressed by a science-based academic:

> The focus has completely shifted. It's now research, impact, university rankings – it's all about research…the money is all going into research and unfortunately teaching and learning has fallen by the wayside (A13).

In this context, as noted by a senior science-based academic, those not delivering on the university's research expectations in 2014 were no longer considered valuable, despite the standing they might have enjoyed previously (A14). In addition, there was the view that although the promotion scheme ranked teaching and research as being comparable, the reality of the situation was different with research being considered the most important category (A13, A14).

The mid-career academic who had originally been brought into the university to teach was now being pressurised to adjust and carry out research as a consequence of the changing mind-set by government that "we better start getting these people to start earning their bread" (A3). For those who did not already hold a PhD there was an understanding that without it they couldn't expect to be promoted. One interviewee in this situation described the pressure leading to the achievement of this qualification as "the monkey on my back during all of that period" (A3)

and that when his PhD was awarded he "really felt" that he was contributing. For another arts and humanities interviewee, the way in which people changed their work practices to engage in research activity and "do some things that they should have done before" was a positive development as "people who were not at all engaged in research started becoming a bit more conscious that maybe people may be looking at them" and started to perform better (A6).

Expectations of individuals at the *micro* level grew with increasing and competing demands to grow commercial oriented performance whilst also maintaining a professional societal role in society and ensuring quality in their public services (Satow, 1975 as cited by Jarzabkowski and Fenton, 2006). While acknowledging that UL had always been known for its external engagement and while many academics previously engaged in outreach activities enjoyed community-based endeavours, outreach became a considerably more strategic activity valued for public promotional purposes (A3, A5, A11, A13). Within UL at the level of the individual, greater value was attached to outreach activities and development of a more public-facing role. However, the attack on the public service which was ongoing during the recession translated into some academics retreating and just carrying on their roles quietly without engaging publicly either within the university or externally (A5).

It is evident from this investigation that government policy was influential in enhancing the prominence of the government logic at the *micro* level, as experienced at the normative and cultural level.

5.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: performance and resources challenges

The introduction of practices demonstrating strong managerial oversight and business focus re-directed the academic orientation. The sense of personal accountability which had existed prior to 2008 was overtaken by goals and performance-reporting processes where quantitative systems were put in place to implement, review and monitor performance (A3). Heads of departments started having discussions with academics about the progress they were making against the previous year's performance and such conversations became part of the normal business practice within the discipline (A4 A13). An academic based in the arts and humanities in responding to the questionnaire, highlighted the increased demands surrounding measurable 'performance indicators' which "was accompanied by the withdrawal of practically all supports towards the achievement of same" (#49). Many academics record that the university's new performance-focused perspective loomed large during the period under review. For one senior

interviewee based in arts and humanities, workload norms within the university had changed and had:

> gone from one extreme to another… from a position where nothing was counted or measured and it was almost a grace and favour situation to a completely quantified model which did not allow any possibility of flexibility or thinking time (A7).

Academic accountability and delivery of outputs took on an increased importance. In this new environment, there was a clear expectation that an academic had to be seen to be "producing something" (A13).

In UL amongst senior management there was a view that research which had a measurable societal impact was to be prized, while research which lacked such outcomes was no longer worthwhile (A11). This value-based shift encouraged academics to increasingly adopt practices to market and promote their work, to advertise their research activity and so to ensure they became noticed in the public sphere – activities which were viewed by some as playing the corporate game. In the literature, Parker (2011) describes the choice available to either align with or decouple from a particular institutional practice – in the case of the academic either to join in and comply with the new managerialist approach or withdraw from its influence.

Henkel (2004) proposes that resulting from the increasingly competitive and performance-orientated environment, disciplinary colleagues have become less accepting of unproductive colleagues and individuals have become more conscious of their own performance. Competition was described as "palpable" by a science-based academic who progressed from a temporary contract through a tenure track position and finally into a permanent post during this time (A13) as she described the pressure from other colleagues also seeking permanency in the following manner:

> So the competition was on. And it very much felt like competition – how many publications have you? What are your teaching reviews? What did they look like? What did you score out of 5...? (A13).

Such increased competition and opportunity-seeking approaches within academia have been referred to by Upton and Warshaw (2017) as an example of the development of market-like behaviour.

Research active academics were also challenged by new requirements to translate their research into industrial-based outcomes. Krücken and Meier (2006) have described the tendency for some working in scientific disciplines to be more involved in project work and maintaining

industrial partnerships. As reported by one UL science-based academic, "one of the difficulties is I'm a researcher – I'm not a business person…yet because we do need money to keep things going…you're now running a small company" (A14). This broadening of the academic role and its growing complexity has been noted by Musselin (2007, p.177) who notes that the ability to raise funds as well as to oversee external funded research projects "is no longer something academics can do: it is something they must do".

Lynch (2010, p.5) describes the emergence of a culture where "everything one does must be counted and only the measurable matters". New management approaches, institutional pressures and re-orientation of the value system, manifested themselves in a variety of forms. University funding was raised as a deterrent if outcomes were not delivered and threats became a lot more explicit at faculty board. One individual described being told by their head of department that if they didn't comply "there would be no funds to pay salaries" (A5). In some quarters, according to a senior academic based in arts and humanities, there was a feeling of being "at the mercy of the Dean" so that if the Dean, as a senior university manager was engaged with and promoted the faculty, that was positive for academics; however, if that was not the case, the individual academic was powerless (A7).

The increased focus on money and income generation at a functional level led to a situation where those academics who secured new non-EU postgraduate research students started asking, "what is being done with my money?" (A8). Non-pay budgets disappeared in some areas and there was a common feeling of living within a very resource-constrained system (A10) – it became difficult to travel to conferences and constraints were put on office postage, photocopying, telephone calls and even the most basic office supplies (A10, A2). One example of this was given of a business-based academic going to an administrator to ask for an eraser who then "took out an eraser, cut it in half and gave it to me" (A2). A senior academic working in a science discipline noted that if pens, paper or flip charts were needed, they were not available from the department. Yet such items were readily available in the better funded research centre they were associated with (A14). "A confluence of two pressures which created strain and difficulty" (A10) was how the situation was described by a science-based academic. These comprised budgetary pressures, additional students and workload.

This section examines evidence of the change in corporate culture and business-focused behaviour experienced at the *micro* level where performance and delivery of outputs have grown in importance and research is viewed as a marketable commodity, valued in the public

sphere. Moving from examining the norms and behaviours from corporate influences, the experience of the professional logic at the *micro* level is examined in the following section.

5.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: pressure and reduced autonomy

The inherent ability to perform as an academic with a strong focus on scholarly discovery and to enhance scholarly reputation was impacted during the six-year period 2008-2014. Henkel (2005) describes how the right to research has become more restrictive given the linkages between the value of research, the ability to attract research income and deliver output. In conducting research, as noted by a senior business-based academic, it became a matter of "trying to survive" than being able to progress (A1). As an academic working in the university with increased demands in teaching and administration workload, it became harder to do research, because there were so many other things to do (A5).

While previously for those who were research active, there had been greater "liberty to research what you wanted to research", during the period 2008-2014, with the focus moving to money, this changed (A6). A senior academic in arts and humanities noted that as a consequence of the changes as to how research was actually valued and how academics were promoted, "a lot of people felt undervalued in their roles" (A7). All these developments hindered the progress of fundamental research enquiry and the enhancement of scholarly work and so impacted the status of the professional logic.

For several interviewees working at all levels across disciplines, their individual identity as academics didn't change, although their roles did (A4, A7, A4, A8). This finding resonates with Winter (2009, p.122) who in citing Schwartz (1994), highlights that core cognitive beliefs "transcend specific situations" acting as "guiding principles" in the lives of individuals. Winter (2009) however describes how the attractiveness of the academic profession has been questioned as a consequence of institutional changes. Academics working in UL were certain that recent developments had changed the quality of the academic role.

These changes which created "full time *all the time* work" deterred one arts and humanities-based academic from encouraging her best students from developing a career in academia (A9). A senior science-based academic in completing the questionnaire, noted that the soul of the university was disappearing (#6). As remarked upon by another science-based academic, "I would often say to my own graduates who are really good academically, don't go into an academic career. It's not the same as it used to be...it won't go back to the good old days" (A11). Yet, an optimistic note was expressed by one business-based academic, that as the

university had endured since 1088 with the creation of the University of Bologna, core values hadn't changed just "because of one huge economic shock" (A2).

Scott (1995) describes how decision-making within the academic collegiate has been reduced as a consequence of the growing number of stakeholders included within the consultation process, in what was previously the domain of the academic. Within UL, there was an appreciation that despite the actions of management and budgetary pressures, academics still retained "a certain amount of autonomy" (A11) within the teaching aspect of their role. However, academic freedom was impacted as pressures were put on academics in the context of the student as a consumer of university services, to become "more responsible for student learning than students are" (A4). This situation translated into more pressure being placed on academics to explain student grades and increased interference from higher levels of management if grades were considered too high or too low. There was also a view that the quality of information previously collected from student evaluations had been more pedagogically useful and that with the move to a forced evaluation process, it was no longer of real academic benefit. (A5).

With the removal of space, opportunity and freedom for the academic to concentrate on fundamental research enquiry, the normative and cultural dimension within the professional logic deteriorated at the *micro* level.

5.4. Conclusion

This chapter examines the University of Limerick as the first of three case studies. In presenting the primary research, we witness the impact of government-led requirements and the difficulties of working in a resource-constrained environment. Internally within the university the structural operating environment changes with the introduction of new policies and procedures, management-led structures and business-led systems and the period 2008-2014 reveals a pronounced period of change for disciplines and academics. This creates an increase in the strength of the government and corporate logic within the regulative and structural dimension at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels and a weakening in the influence of the professional logic.

As institutional expectations changed in UL between 2008-2014 with the emphasis increasingly on funded research and financial and resourcing constraints, the environment became more pressured, competitive, performance oriented and less collegial. Both the government logic and corporate logic within the normative and cultural dimension increased

in prominence at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. Despite efforts within the profession at the *meso* level to preserve disciplinary links externally, the impact of increased competition, singular focus on specialised areas of research activity, income-generating pursuits and loss of status in the teaching function led to a deterioration in the positioning of the professional logic at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels.

5.5. The University Institutional Analysis Framework - UL

Applying the University Institutional Analysis Framework presented in Table 3, the findings from the University of Limerick (UL) case study are presented below in Table 9.

Table 9 University Institutional Analysis Framework – University of Limerick

Structural and Regulative Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Strategy	Strategy seeks to deliver for the knowledge economy. through oversight and control of resources. Government-led focus drives increased research activity.	Ambitious plans seek to drive income generation through growing international student numbers. Strategic support of funded research activities is focused on hard science and engineering disciplines	While there is a clear drive to develop research excellence, this is not widely experienced across disciplines. Support for academic autonomy and pedagogical excellence diminishes.
Structural mechanism and focus	Formal state-based, resource constraints introduce new controls and re-orient the direction and focus of research activities. New legislative mechanisms require compliance and add to administrative workloads.	Managerial-led stream-lined and bureaucratic systems are put in place to oversee and deliver budget-oriented outcomes and plans to grow income.	Peer-led collegial systems become weakened and less influential as a consequence of academic retirements and the increase in part-time and temporary faculty.
Source of regulative and	Controls put in place in the form of the Employment Control Framework together with changing	The development of new managerial-led metric based procedures is evidenced in the new academic promotion	The legitimacy of traditional structures dissipates as the space and opportunity to

structural arrangements	expectations of government create new oversight mechanisms. Scrutiny of finances increases.	processes together with the introduction of a performance tenure track system for new academic appointments.	discuss academic work diminishes.
Normative and Cultural Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Focus of activity	Increased focus demonstrated in delivering for state-based objectives through the focus on research activity generally and in government funded research opportunities in the hard sciences and engineering.	Activities are focused on increasing income and curtailing costs. Administrative work loads increase and the focus of academic activity becomes more competitive.	The academic role becomes re-focused towards funded research activity. Freedom to engage in fundamental research activity is curtailed. Efforts are made to focus on retaining collaborative links through continued engagement in professional research networks
Orientation of value system	Serving national economic objectives particularly in research activity increases. Accountability increases with greater scrutiny of public finances. Public service-led values increase with greater value given to outreach work.	Adopting a more corporate orientation, the values of the university become more business-focused in content and tone. Academic work becomes more valued as it becomes valued in the marketplace.	Opportunities for internal collaboration decrease. Teaching becomes less valued. Trust in and the autonomy of academics deteriorates. Fundamental research enquiry declines in value. Academic leadership serves as key in preserving traditional academic values and collegiality.
Focus of behavioural aspects	Practices demonstrate increased focus on measurable and productive outputs particularly in the area of research. Pressure	Practices focus on management oversight and business re-direct the academic orientation. A strong managerial approach	There is a decline in practices which enable academic autonomy, personal accountability and the protection of

	from government increases to develop research activity.	becomes more evident focused on performance measurement.	academic standards. Competition and opportunity-seeking behaviour increases.

Chapter Six: Case Study 2 - Trinity College Dublin

6.1. Introduction – Trinity College Dublin (TCD)

Employing the university institutional analysis framework developed in chapter 2 (see Table 3), this chapter - the second of three case studies, analyses the extent to which institutional change arising from government policy has impacted at the *meso* and the *micro* levels in TCD.

Trinity College Dublin (TCD) was the first university established in Ireland, granted a royal charter by Queen Elizabeth 1 in 1592. In times past it identified itself as a self-contained community, committed to scholarship and teaching and a number of traditions which reflect the inward looking nature of the university remain, for example the election of the Provost by a predominantly academic electorate. TCD's identity originated from the College's historical beginnings as an autonomous corporation governed by provost and fellows. In 2008, there were 13,037 full time students and 1,932 part time, totalling 14,969 students.[4] By 2014, overall student numbers had increased by 4.5% while between 2008-2012 core staff declined by 12%[5]

This chapter contends that within TCD during the period 2008-2014, both the structural and regulative dimension and the normative and cultural dimension as experienced through the lens of the government and the corporate logics became more pronounced at both the *meso* and the *micro* level, with an increased focus on income generation, performance and accountability. At the same time the positioning of professional structural and system arrangements together with academic values, norms and practices at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels were challenged by the impact of the institutional changes taking place.

6.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension

The formal actions taken by government and university management through initiating structures and systems to deliver on both economic and corporate-led strategies were influential at both the *meso* and *micro* levels. These changes challenged the structures of the professional logic and removed power from its collegial systems with the effect of weakening its influence at both the level of the discipline and the individual academic.

6.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level

At the *meso* level, government strategy together with the revision of state-resourcing mechanisms, increased the strength and influence of the regulative and structural dimension

[4] http://www.hea.ie/en/statistics/overview accessed 13 November 2016.
[5] https://www.irishtimes.com/news/education/universities-warn-student-staff-ratios-near-critical-levels-1.1692580 accessed on 15 June 2018.

within the government logic. As a consequence of the changing environment, the university adopted a number of corporate-based structures and business-led organisational systems and arrangements. These changes increased the position of the corporate logic at the *meso* level. All these developments led to a weakening of the influence of disciplinary structures and collegial supports which form part of the regulative and structural dimension of the professional logic. The following sections examine these formal changes in further detail.

6.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: struggles for resources, command and control

One of the key sources of government-led changes during this period was the implementation of structural arrangements and mechanisms. As described by a senior business-based research participant, government was putting in place a strategy and exerting its power "to move the University into some new era...Increasingly the university was being funded to achieve outcomes…predominantly linked to macroeconomic indicators (B3) most notably the "production of job ready graduates" (B8).

A significant carrier of this new regime was the government funding model which translated into significantly reduced funding from the exchequer through the university to disciplinary areas. As noted by Scott (2013), formal rules, such as economic rules create a coercive influence and are the key instrument employed by government. 2008, the year of the economic collapse saw university funding significantly curtailed and the introduction of resourcing constraint mechanisms. The reduction of the state grant, erosion in the value of the student fee remission, and increased competition for research funds, produced a sense of struggle for resources within the university (B2). As noted by March and Olsen (2008 in citing March and Olsen 1995), reallocation of resources is a powerful structural influence which has the capacity to change the university's institutional landscape.

The reality of the situation was recalled by an interviewee who as head of a science-based discipline noted how "we were getting €4,500 per undergraduate and this had reduced to little over €1,000" which meant that exchequer funding was "reduced by a quarter" (B12). He suggested that as TCD student numbers did not expand to the same extent as in other universities, funding from the exchequer reduced and "as a consequence [in TCD] we had actually less money into the system" (B12). In the context of this reduced funding stream, the organisational operating environment changed across all disciplines and this action was significant in moving the role of the state from funder to partial funder as noted by Reale and Seeber (2013, cited by Howells et al., 2014).

Adjustments made to external funding mechanisms between 2008-2014 were instrumental in bringing about change. In the context of strategy, the "Irish university was forced to change rather quickly from being almost entirely government funded" to a position where "we became only 40% government funded ...and we made that change, very, very quickly" (B12). North (1990) points to the rapid change which occurs where formal rules are imposed by the state. Arising from the loss of core government funding together with uncertainties as to future state funding and the limitations created by the HEA Employment Control Framework (ECF), concerns were raised by TCD in its annual report 2008/09 as to whether an environment was being created "that is clearly aligned to deliver a 'smart economy' for Ireland" (TCD, 2009a, p.5).

In observing developments during this period, government-led structural mechanisms expanded, as evidenced in "an increased centralisation of command and control" over the sector which then "became part of the institutional logic" (B1). According to 63% of questionnaire respondents based in TCD, government led regulatory controls increased during this time. The emergence of accountability requirements resonates with the developments described by Olsen (2007 cited by Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2014 p.4) where he refers to adoption by government of an NPM model which increases expectations for public institutions such as the university to deliver effective and efficient business-focused outcomes. As remarked upon by a business-based academic, actors in the external environment "the HEA, the Department of Finance... were imposing a lot of strictures during this time" (B3). As remarked upon by a business-based interviewee "most of the structural change [in the university] came about in order to provide hard evidence to the external environment that the institution was being well managed" (B3).

From the perspective of a senior business-based interviewee, government-imposed regulations and systems oversight created a dynamic where it was perceived that the university as a public-sector organisation "was caught in a trap of having to have belt, braces and whatever so not get caught out" for non-compliance (B2). This development illustrates the implementation by government of NPM mechanisms of oversight and control focused on performance measurements and outputs.

Structural changes were also experienced directly, a result of government policy decisions made in 2009 which introduced a staffing embargo. Significant impact was felt where retirements took place and no replacements were made arising from the government-imposed

ECF. An interviewee in a leadership role in science recalled how "the whole issue of staff replacement and the ECF had a very big impact…it was a big game changer when we suddenly realised if we wanted to continue with our mission, we couldn't rely on exchequer funding" (B12).

Resulting from the revised funding model, demands made by government for increased university accountability and the staffing embargo, the government logic increased in prominence at the organisational level during the period 2008-2014.

6.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: fund raising and corporate strategy

TCD experienced strong pressures between 2008-2014, bringing a re-orientation of strategy through the introduction of new corporate-based structures required to manage the operating environment. As identified by Gumport (2000), the adoption of this business model became an economic imperative to enable universities to survive in this new economic reality. Within TCD, the following was the commonly held view, as expressed by a business academic:

> The education sector had become an industry like any other sector with all of the kind of approaches to running a business having been applied to the university, from having strategic objectives to meeting financial objectives, to competing in a global market around certifications and accreditations (B3).

Reihlen and Wenzlaff (2016) describe the managed approach taken by universities in determining resourcing strategies as a consequence of developments within the institutional environment. The strategic resourcing strategy taken within TCD moved to "fundraising everywhere... postgraduate students, getting non-EU students" (B5) and the university "became a factory" (B6) with a shift in the core strategy to "making money" (*ibid*). Time and again during the six-year period under review, the annual reports from the university highlighted the actions taken as a direct result of funding pressures. The 2009/2010 report noted the pursuit by the university of:

> a financial strategy where income generation and diversification is promoted and motivated, cost management is supported by procurement, efficiency initiatives are prioritised and activity is managed within budgeted resources (TCD, 2010, p.4).

However, an uneven playing field was created within the university between disciplines, as described by a senior arts and humanities interviewee - while university management took a "slash and burn" approach to the internal budget in his discipline, in business disciplines strategic discussions were taking place to invest "golden money and big resources" to "revamp the Business School" as a "matter of prestige" (B8). In its annual report 2008/2009, TCD referenced the significant internal restructuring activities and approaches to resource allocation

undertaken within the university "to prepare for a more challenging and rapid changing environment" (TCD, 2009a, p.6). In the literature, Gumport (2000) has warned against such a development where academic disciplines are subject to market influences, become less valuable and where in consequence the university becomes reshaped as a result of economic priorities.

A further example of structural mechanisms which sought to deliver business-oriented outcomes and the disparity between disciplines was illustrated by a business interviewee who referenced the "significant" income generated for Masters programmes in the Business School, which was then "redirected towards other departments to compensate for the lack of funding from the state... to basically to fund the rest of the university" (B4). As described by Kwiek (2016), choices and decisions made in one area in the pursuit of business-focused goals are at the cost of others and a situation is created where there are winners and losers. In TCD, with large classes and high student numbers located in arts and humanities, these less capital-intensive areas of the university were used to balance deficits created in the science disciplines as well as subsidising what were perceived to be "grandiose projects" in science (B1). According to an arts and humanities academic "we had to fight harder for funding" while the activities in STEM were continuously being "showcased" on the web and in the university leaving her and other colleagues feeling "like the poor relation" (B7).

The emerging university strategy, focused on income generation and operating within the constrained public funding environment during these years, created a requirement for new business-based managerial-led structural arrangements and operating systems within TCD to facilitate commercial goals. The business based challenges facing TCD were referenced in the interim report of TCD's 2009-2014 strategic plan which highlighted the severe financial situation and the need to "increase income and eliminate unnecessary costs" (TCD, 2012, p.3).

Reihlen and Wenzlaff (2014) observe that in re-orienting the university towards being a service-based competitive entity, a structural hierarchy is imported from the corporate sector. In TCD, academic departments and disciplines became redefined as financial cost centres (B8) and the new "corporatisation of the university" (B9) brought with it "layer upon layer of administration" including "quite a lot of senior administrators – whose view of what the university was, an academic based in science noted sadly "differed from mine as an academic" (B9). Whalen (1991 as cited by Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p.181) refers to the changes facing academic disciplines in the new corporate-focused environment, where they are

reframed as “cost centres and revenue production units” arising from the pressure to become “revenue production units”. As noted by a questionnaire respondent who had moved into a headship role, the role had moved “from one of academic oversight to one on a par with a commercial business manager” (#44).

Krücken and Meier (2006, citing Rhoades and Sporn, 2002) explain how in the new corporate environment, activities once peripheral to the work of the university become centre stage. In TCD a senior science-based interviewee highlighted her frustration at the growth in administration - that it was “almost like the system being driven by these people, while those who actually have to deliver were the ones that were smaller in number” (B10). With the creation of new organisational structures, Weiherl and Frost (2016) describe how within the corporate logic, decision-making is centralised, hierarchical relationships are created and the academic discipline becomes constrained in its contributions.

At illustrated in the annual TCD reports, focussing on non-exchequer income generation through additional activity in the area of international student recruitment, commercialisation and philanthropy and the application of constraints to budgeting, remained important priorities for the university during this period. The annual report 2011/12 reported that the University generated more than 40% of its total income from non-exchequer sources and noted that its plan was to grow that percentage. By September 2014, funding from non-exchequer sources had risen to 49%, a notable increase of 9% since 2012.

Arising from the external funding pressures and the strategic re-focusing of the university towards generating income and containing costs, the period 2008-2014 saw the introduction of a new business model within TCD. A science-based interviewee described the significant change in staffing policy which took place. Noting that “the vision and the policies of the university was not to look back” and to “draw a line under” positions that were lost during this time, the business-focused staffing strategy was “if you want these staff you can have them, but you have to generate the income” (B12). It was evident that faculty had become increasingly affected by a new focus on external funding (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997).

As a consequence, strategic, structural and functional arrangements within the corporate logic increased in significance at the organisational level during the period 2008-2014. The final view of structural and regulative mechanisms at the organisational level is through the professional logic.

6.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the discipline under challenge

The capacity to support the professional strategic endeavour within the profession, to enable collegial systems, preserve disciplinary research expertise and promote academic autonomy was impacted by the increased demands made of academic staff during this time period. Close to 70% of questionnaire respondents agreed that work spent on scholarly activities decreased and for 58%, the influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university lessened.

A significant factor in the changes in focus and content of the academic professional role arose from the staffing embargo and the revised funding framework which created a high outflux of staff and resources from TCD (B2). An arts and humanities interviewee described how "we went down from 13 full-time members of staff down to 7 in this time which created "a huge impact in terms of the number of teaching hours, the administrative load and then of course the impact on research…where the impact was felt most was in terms of research time" (B7). 68% of TCD questionnaire respondents noted that their role changed between 2008-2014 with many citing the increase in non-academic administrative duties and the reduction in available resources to support academic work. This created a difficult challenge for those in the academic community whose fundamental purpose was the production of scholarly work.

Interviewees described the demise of professional consultative structures and how new arrangements were put in place without reference to academic factors. This resonates with Henkel's view (2005, p.173) that the position of the discipline has come under challenge in recent years as "the organising structure for knowledge production and transmission". An arts and humanities interviewee observed resentfully how with the development of committee structures for decision-making, academic "opinions were no longer solicited" and decisions "were presented as fait accompli to schools" (B6). Concern was raised that "while decisions used to be made by the academics and fellows…these were side lined...and it moved to the commercial movers and shakers…" (*ibid*). The introduction of new corporate university structures as described by Leach and Lowndes (2007) was instrumental in draining power and influence from the academic profession.

An example of the conflict that arises between the tradition of the professional logic and the development of corporate systems as noted by Parker (2011) and Hattke et al., (2016) was described by a head of discipline in arts and humanities, where he illustrated how new centralised and increasingly formalised academic appointment and promotion regulations were

adopted, which conflicted with traditional structural arrangements within the profession for making academic appointments. As observed by this senior academic:

> instead of being asked to use your judgement to pick the person who seems best for a job, if you're on an appointment committee, it's the five criteria and everything ranked and the numbers have to come out in the correct order. So in a sense, the minute accounting for a decision took precedence over the values underlying the decision and all of that was bad [for the profession as under the new system] the person with the greatest number of qualifications and publications will get onto a shortlist whereas others who might have more to contribute [to the academic profession] are no longer open to consideration (B8).

Oliver (1992) describes how developments such as these have been significant in de-stabilizing the academic profession because changes which establish managerial criteria for legitimacy assessment will 'normatively fragment' the logic of professionalism and 'deinstitutionalize' its structural manifestations.

The opportunity for academic influence, fundamental to the enduring nature of the academic profession, was also impacted during these years. Prior to 2008, programmes were designed collaboratively by disciplinary colleagues who worked collegially and creatively. As described by a head of department who had overseen the development of many programmes:

> you took your decisions, you spoke to other people and then you devised a programme and you decided how best to examine it. You handled your finances which were always inadequate but you had a good deal of autonomy (B8).

Arising from the creation of new managerial-led rules and procedures, many discussions and decisions were removed from the level of the discipline. As described by a science-based academic "if you wanted to launch a new programme, there were lots more boxes to tick, lots more approvals…a lot more bureaucracy, a lot more form filling, a lot of changes that made life [for the academic profession] more difficult (B11). The central university model which emerged after 2008 was viewed as inflexible from the perspective of the discipline, although it was noted that the creation of programme combinations and levels of standardisation reaped some benefits in enabling cross disciplinary programmes (B8) and was considered a positive development, enabling an increased level of professional collaborations beneficial for the sustainability of the professional logic.

The divide between disciplines became more prominent during this time (B1, B2). Collegiality traditionally a key enabler within the profession suffered as tensions were felt across disciplines arising from what was perceived as the inequality of the internal funding framework. As

described by Gumport (2000), those academic disciplines considered less valuable in an economic sense became less significant and lost resources, positioning and status.

Following the increased demands made of academic staff in the context of falling staffing levels and the introduction of new structures and formal arrangements which usurped professional decision-making structures, structural and regulative mechanisms within the professional logic weakened at the organisational level during this six-year period.

6.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level

The following completes an analysis of the structural and regulative landscape as experienced in TCD between 2008 and 2014. Within this section, the focus is on the impact of these procedures and systems at the level of the individual academic.

As we will observe, at the *micro* level, government-led changes were powerful and increased the strength of the regulative and structural dimension of the government logic. The university actions in requiring individual academics to work within new business-focused, market-led systems and administrative arrangements, were impactful in raising the positioning of the corporate logic. These developments were strongly influential in weakening the power and influence of peer-led collegial systems and structures which support academic autonomy and so at the *micro* level, the professional logic declined in strength.

6.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: scrutiny, performance and accountability

During this period, the direction of government policy was focused on governance, structural arrangements and performance measurements as evidenced by bureaucratic arrangements established between a number of government agencies and the universities. These new structural requirements translated into a greater increase in rules and procedures which many TCD based academics were compelled to adopt and implement (B1, B2, B5). A science-based academic experienced growth in auditing requirements, which for him originated from the "wider audit culture, this idea that we need to be scrutinised and inspected" (B9). Musselin (2007) notes that increasingly the work of academics is being defined elsewhere by agencies including government, which have introduced formal control structures and evaluative mechanisms to appraise and assess academic activity.

For academics working in TCD, a more complex performance-led and results-driven environment had been created as a consequence of the application by government of private sector thinking. For them, according to a business-based academic, this translated into the

measurement of performance and the introduction of specific formal requirements in academic work. This development according to a business based academic:

> fed right down literally to face-to-face level – workload management, performance management and relationships became more explicit, as opposed to implicit…and this created a much stronger awareness of accountabilities, responsibilities and value for money everywhere (B3).

Feller, (2009 as cited by Krücken et al., 2013) notes how performance management has weakened the autonomy of faculty, while enhancing the position of administrative managers in what were traditionally academic decision-making processes. It was clear that TCD "was moving into a much more managed, value for money environment" which removed the opportunity "to allow people to stand back and stare or think great thoughts" (B3).

Within this strained environment, there were increased requirements associated with oversight of research funding, with the adoption by external agencies of what Henkel (2005) describes as managerial structures and mechanisms which create a performance-based environment. As witnessed by a science academic, there was "tighter bean counting, an audit culture and specific requirements for reporting back to funding bodies" whereas previously there had been "more flexibility in terms of how we would deploy the money" (B9). This approach is observed in the literature by Gumport (2000, p.69), where he describes how the "locus of control" has spread to the level of the state and officialdom can be observed "inspecting slices of academic life/work/teaching/learning under a microscope.

Because of requirements for greater accountability and efficiency impacting on the university, Henkel and Askling (2006, p.85) note the demands for more evident institutional management and leadership. In TCD, the demands of the new environment were felt more strongly by those in leadership and administrative positions where requests from government were routed through the front of college to the discipline. As described by a science academic who held a headship position, there was "a feeling that government were wanting us [universities] to be "more accountable" (B10). While this interviewee recalls that "as an individual academic we didn't get much of that feeling" it was a message she received when she took on a leadership role.

Directly as a result of government strategy, the research environment changed significantly for the individual academic. As described by Shore (2010), the potential to undertake basic or "blue skies" research dried up with the new focus on research which became closely aligned

with the government agenda and specific areas identified by government to be of particular societal and economic relevance.

Reihlen and Wenzlaff (2016) identify the two-tier system of research which has been created: one considered innovative and possessing funding potential, the other less valued and poorly funded. In TCD, because of the national funding landscape, the sciences were considered more favoured than arts and humanities. Hence different challenges were experienced across disciplines. STEM disciplines had been particularly challenged during this period, arising from what has been described in the literature as the emergence of a competitive funding environment and the reduction in funding to support independent basic research (Reihlen and Wenzlaff, 2016). Those working in arts and humanities disciplines were often left thinking about their own survival and that of their students (B1, B3).

Research participants' experience of the structural and regulative dimension at the *micro* level through the lens of the government logic, illustrates that somewhat contrary to the view held by Kogan and Marton, (2006) not all individual academics in TCD encountered changes driven by policy and new government-university relations. While the prominence of the government logic increased for those in leadership and administrative positions, some individuals in academic roles experienced limited impact from these government-inspired actions. This group comprised both academics who had not "stepped up to the plate" (B1) as described by a business-based academic, along with academics who had been protected within their discipline from the impact of government-led changes. In addition, arising from the two-tier research which emerged, the impact of the national research funding context which sought to establish and specify the research agenda, was less keenly felt by research inactive academics across disciplines.

6.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: workload and the student-customer

As noted by Parker (2011) and Høstaker (2006), changes in government policy were influential in the corporatisation of the university and the growing focus on income generation. In the experience of many academics, 2008-2014 was marked by a greater strategic emphasis on attracting high economic-value students, particularly postgraduate fee-paying students recruited outside the EU. A science-based academic in a management position reported that "suddenly we were forced to look at other sources of funding which we felt as academics – that's not our job. It became a big part of our job – finding money" (B12). Of the 68% of TCD questionnaire respondents who confirmed that the content and focus of their role as academic

staff members had changed in the period 2008-2014, 79% cited an increased focus on income generating opportunities, while 68% noted an increase in marketing and promotion activities.

A business-based interviewee reported that from having to deal with a much greater workload and higher number of fee-paying students, all in the context of a more customer centric market-based environment (B4), significant demands were placed on the academic in carrying out the student-facing role. Henkel and Vabø (2006) draw attention to new connections established between student evaluations and market mechanisms, which created a pressure on academics to make their programmes more popular. A business-based academic in TCD described hearing from her colleagues that "academics would prefer to be doing other work with students, but it is much easier to go in and give students what they want rather than teach them what they should know" (B3). This she viewed as "disruptive and detrimental to the real nature of the profession and the academic-student relationship which is really around encouraging people to grow and learn and being in a safe environment" (B3).

Science-based interviewees disappointingly noted how with the changing landscape and focus on budgetary measures between 2008-2014, priority was no longer afforded to supporting the development of research skills amongst students – viewed as critical in the development of academic expertise. In this situation, as described by one interviewee, the message from the university was that while these projects were recognised as important and worthwhile "it was kind of well get on yourselves and raise your own money kind of thing" (B10).

There was a view that the duties and responsibilities of the academic also changed with new structural, administrative requirements to complete forms and engage with internal computerised financial control systems. Traditional structures and ways of working which supported the promotion of academic autonomy declined. An arts and humanities-based academic described how these changes, coupled with the general bureaucratisation of daily work, "reached levels of intrusion and itemised recording" which were "pretty well unprecedented" (B8). Another arts and humanities interviewee described how she could "easily spend 30 hours a week doing administration and a lot of it was pretty meaningless stuff" (B5). As highlighted by Henkel (2004), in an increasing controlled environment, more time is spent on administrative work.

These developments combined, had the effect of creating a revolutionary shift in the system within which academics worked and, at this *micro* level, the regulative and structural components of the corporate logic within TCD increased at the individual level. One senior

arts and humanities academic expressed his sense that with the increase in formal control mechanisms, the system was "being pulled inside out by administrative requirements" (B8). The view was that while previously the interests of students and the quality of academic work had always been front and centre, this had changed with the new regulative structures and requirements.

6.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the demise of professional autonomy

The gaps in resourcing caused by the government-imposed ECF created significantly increased teaching and administrative workloads leaving less time for academic work, research activity and collaborative projects (B7). A science-based interviewee described "scrambling around for money" with "less resources for teaching" and that "we were expected to teach more students with less money" (B11). This translated in "fewer modules being run" and having to "manage larger classes". While acknowledging that unlike most other universities TCD did not have "a massive increase in student numbers, a science-based head of discipline questioned whether the "quality of teaching had perhaps been reduced" during this time (B12).

Alvesson and Benner, (2016) describe how in the corporate university the role of management has been to increase control over work processes. The loss in professional autonomy which had taken place in TCD with the introduction of rules was described as being "all about permission … we were not as trusted as we used to be" (B6). The university had become "much less liberal in terms of allowing the autonomous development of the researcher" with "the attempt at tying us down, knowing where we are – we have to ask permission to go to a conference" (*ibid*).

The changing "fashion" in making academic appointments during this time which gave "greater and greater emphasis to numbers and types of publications" had as noted by a senior arts and humanities academic, "given rise to a lob-sided approach to what we [academics] are here for" (B8). 74% of TCD-based questionnaire respondents noted that internal economic and efficiency metrics increased in focus between 2008-2014. As expressed by a business-based academic who during this time period had gone through an appointments process, "the big change" that took place "was the fact that metrics were systematically present… with research output becoming a metric in terms of numbers, types and quality of the publication according to certain tables and rankings of academic journals" (B4).

It was clear that the prominence of the formal structural and regulative dimension within the professional logic declined at the *micro* level within TCD during the period of this study.

6.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension

This second part of the chapter continues to describe the experiences of TCD-based academics across three separate academic areas: arts and humanities, science and business. It puts forward the normative and cultural changes experienced between 2008-2014. As will be seen below, the normative and cultural dimension within the government and corporate logic increased in prominence through the initiation of government and corporate-led values, practices and behaviours. The prominence of traditional values, behaviours and practices associated with the professional logic at the *meso* level were subsequently challenged.

At the *micro* level, however, as the following sections will evidence, individual academics were more successful than at the *meso* level in retaining the core values inherent in the professional logic, in particular their own values intrinsic in the professional academic identity.

6.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level

The influence of the government logic at the *meso* level has been notable in prioritising the training of students for the knowledge economy. This is accompanied by a shift in core values towards market and service-led outcomes at the *meso* level, which raises the positioning of the corporate logic. While the normative and cultural dimension of the professional logic is challenged at the *meso* level, the discipline appears to rally against external forces in seeking to protect particular values, practices and behaviours which enable the cultivation of the academic endeavour.

6.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: expectations and the knowledge economy

Maassen and Stensaker (2011) suggest that the university's identity has been influenced in recent years by the promotion of the knowledge economy which portrays the university as a state institution. A senior academic in business reported the increasing promotion of the university as a key contributor to the knowledge economy, as a "trainer of future employees" (B2). However, as noted by another business academic, the creation of this mass education sector by government was incompatible with the value system and approach proposed by the university founding fathers: Humboldt who had promoted unity of teaching and research and Newman whose vision was the promotion of teaching in enabling the creation of an intellectual culture (B1).

An arts and humanities interviewee observed the university's attempts to influence government, to show that "we were modernising, that we were innovative and that we were responsive to government policy" (B5). A difficult situation emerged where individuals,

particularly those in leadership roles, found themselves having to "straddle two horses at the same time," compelled to take decisions which on occasions they considered in conflict with the ideals of their professional academic roles (B1). According to a business-based academic, while TCD may have appeared on the surface very similar in 2014 to how it appeared in 2008, in reality it operated internally in a very different way, which he described was "uncomfortable" as "all these changes then became embedded into the organisational culture of the university" (B1).

The government vision was that Ireland would become "internationally renowned for the excellence of its research" (Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, 2006, p.21). A science-based interviewee in TCD described how he saw the focus as being "all about excellence, research excellence and excellence in rankings" (B11). Another science-based academic remarked "there was almost this compulsion" that TCD "should become the world leader in certain things" and he found this "a combination of arrogance and laughably optimistic" because "we are a very small institution funded in a very tight economic environment from a really small financial base in a country with 4 million people" (B9). For another science-based interviewee, the aspirations of the university to be "at the top" felt unrealistic "like putting up a big balloon full of hot air" (B10).

There was a strong level of sympathy and understanding expressed by interviewees for those working at senior management level who had to negotiate this difficult terrain. As remarked upon by an arts and humanities academic, senior university leaders were under enormous pressure to do what they were told by government and its agencies (B5). As expressed by a senior arts and humanities academic, university leaders "were always dealing with bad news and having to respond to cuts" in an environment where "the expectation was that we must all be very wasteful and we could do the same with less" (B8).

It was apparent that the growing gap between disciplines took place as a consequence of the reorientation of the value system by government and the alignment of the university with the economic and employment agenda. A business-based interviewee commented that with differentiating values placed on basic and applied research together with the internal competition for funding and resources, fragmentation grew between disciplines. "It has been a pretty brutal seagull fight for resources, the norms of operation became "quite brutalised and competitive within the context of a veneer of collegiality" (B1).

This analysis of change from the perspective of the normative and cultural dimensions of the government logic confirms that the influence and position of this logic strengthened at the *meso* level. Despite internal frustrations and general dissatisfaction expressed at the developments, the focus of activity and orientation of values became increasingly directed towards the delivery of economic and public service-led indicators and engagement with government-led objectives.

6.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: developing commercial mind-sets

Shore (2010) describes the new vision of the university as a transnational business corporation, within which academic work increasingly becomes described in "terms of its commercial interests and entrepreneurial output" (*ibid* p.26). All those interviewed across disciplines were clear in their view that the university value system moved in this particular direction during this six-year period. An arts and humanities interviewee, reported that "the core values of the university had shifted tremendously towards making money and this has eclipsed the identity of the university from what its proper core mission was...to teach and research" (B6). This view is supported by the questionnaire finding which indicated that while 37% of participants agreed that commercial oriented performance was a key focus in TCD in 2008, in 2014 this figure increased to 68%.

As Stensaker et al., (2012) describe in the literature, the introduction of the revised funding system changed behaviours in the university. In the experience of a business-based academic, it "trickled down across the whole day-to-day working" of the university (B3). The university developed a much stronger commercial mind-set. Examples of this market-led activity included renting out grounds for rock concerts and recruiting commercial managers and marketing personnel (B2, B5, B6). This created a disconnect between academics endeavouring to do their work and activity in the university beyond the work of academia.

Williams, (2004 as cited by Kwiek, 2016) describes how in a business-focused environment, disciplines are rewarded for achievements in bringing resources into the university. A science-based academic in a leadership position described how during this time "a direct link was made between the numbers and the money". She was told "you have to have X number of students and if you don't you're going to get less money" (B10).

While previously the international student cohort was considered "a really interesting group of people bringing some resources and adding diversity", their recruitment now became viewed as a "strip-mining activity, a hard-nosed, bottom line" quest for much needed resources (B1).

As remarked upon by one interviewee "if we were asked for money, they'd (university management) say well it is in your hands to get it. Go and get some more Chinese students" (B12). Arising from the pursuit of commercial goals, academics described the pressure felt from central administration when assessing international applications from perspective students to consider their income-generating potential. This led to feelings of concern by the academic community that income was being prioritised over academic standards, with 64% of questionnaire respondents in TCD in agreement that during the period 2008-2014 the quality of the academic endeavour reduced in focus.

The literature notes that academic disciplines which respond positively in response to emerging values in the university are viewed positively in sharing the university's entrepreneurial values (de Zilwa, 2007). In TCD, while STEM disciplines had become more managerial in the way they approached their work, arising perhaps from their engagement with industry, the shock which managerialism created in arts and humanities disciplines was "palpable" (B2). There was a strong feeling that their discipline had been "denigrated" that, as noted by one observer, "there was a huge push on the science subjects, while in arts, we had to push for anything" we got (B7).

A senior arts and humanities academic recorded that he and his colleagues "were very aware that we were being questioned as to our utility" (B8). Arising from debates and discussions within the discipline and reacting to external pressures, the discipline strove to re-think its programme offerings. In the setting of the corporate logic, priority is given to producing goods and services which fulfil customer requirements. An arts and humanities interviewee reflecting on the kind of ideological thinking that took place in her discipline remarked "we're a sort of supply and demand institution now, we can't be offering things that people don't want" (B5).

Interviewees described the increase in external-led activity. Across disciplines, research participants referenced the growth in focus which had taken place in "embracing a corporate identity" to give visibility to the university in the marketplace. An academic working in science recognised that outreach activity was good "for optics and recognition of the university" (B12). One academic based in arts and humanities described "the strange twist" given to the notion of becoming "a welcoming community to the outside world" and expressed her displeasure that the gardens traditionally reserved for academics had started welcoming members of the public who wanted to walk their dogs (B6). With these changes trickling into the day to day workings of the university, the focus became more "outside-in as opposed to inside-out" (B3).

The emergence of the corporate logic became very visible at the level of the discipline within TCD between 2008-2014. With advances in market-led activities together with the emphasis on service, external-led activity and achievement of commercial goals, the position of the corporate logic at the level of the *meso* level expanded in this six-year period.

6.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: holding onto the academic mission

A business-based interviewee reflected the view that some disciplines, particularly those less influenced by external stakeholders, endeavoured during this time to hold firmly to traditional values, behaviours and principles previously cherished, despite efforts within business and government to move the university into a new era (B3). Greif (2014) points to the enduring nature of the professional logic in explaining that, regardless of changes, inherited institutional characteristics will endure. This view was shared by a head within arts and humanities who noted that despite institutional and external developments, the discipline had managed to retain traditional activities focusing on the education of students and assisting them in discovering and pursuing their interests. A business-based academic also acknowledged that the university's values were "still committed to research and pedagogical excellence" and that these were "definitely present" within the university (B4). While a senior academic in arts and humanities lamented that the survival of professional dimensions "wasn't because of improvements in the system, but was in spite of improvements" (B8).

Despite the loyalty and dedication many academics felt towards their discipline, collegiality, morale and academic leadership was a casualty as the resourcing environment among disciplines became more combative. It was also reported that different disciplines operated in very different worlds. A business-based interviewee offered the view that further removed from the outside world, "in the arts and humanities, people have really had to think about survival" which "really makes people focus" and while "they don't want to and rail against it…they really try to hold on to the old visions and values of the University" (B3). A science-based head recalled how previously there had been "an academic mission that would filter down from the top". However, this was now receiving less consideration, given the university's priority to raise income. For him in his leadership role in communicating to his colleagues, he "had to change that message…so not to lose sight of our academic mission" (B12).

For another arts and humanities-based interviewee, a number of internal and external drivers were identified which enabled positive developments in the orientation of the academic value

system. Internally these included the creation of a school structure which brought academic disciplines together. For a senior academic based in arts and humanities, this development presented an exciting opportunity to branch into new scholarly work and create synergies with other disciplines, by drawing on the strengths which came from the overlap between different areas (B8). External drivers included the changing nature of the international student body, developments in the jobs market, technological developments and the new and emerging interests of potential students. As noted by this academic, all these factors were seen as positive enablers in creating new streams of scholarly work (B8).

An arts and humanities interviewee described her "considerable loss of faith" listening to what was happening in her subject area in other institutions and the "crash of academic standards" within the discipline "in other institutions" where "people who should have been failing were simply passing the whole way through" (B5). She described feeling "very protected" in TCD where "admissions were very protected" and "we were not simply packing in more students" as was happening elsewhere (B5).

The challenges faced by the academic discipline from the perspective of the professional logic have been significant as a result of government-led changes and the influences of the corporate logic. While some limited, albeit positive, impact was experienced arising from some changes which enabled scholarly activity and practices to continue, more generally the powerful influence of competitive, service-led, income-generating behaviours and values, aligned with the government and corporate logic in the institutional environment, led to the deteriorating position of the professional logic at the *meso* level.

6.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level

At the *micro* level, some academics remained unaffected by the influence of government. However, this was in the face of very real pressures placed on the individual academic to adopt government-promoted and corporate-led values and priorities. The strength and standing of the professional logic can truly be described as resilient at the *micro* level where some individuals have made valiant efforts to retain and nurture academic values and practices.

6.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: valuing outputs

While the re-orientation of government priorities was clear in setting out expected behaviours and values, somewhat surprisingly this message did not reach everyone. Interviewees described how some academics, whose roles focused primarily on teaching and scholarly research, were largely unaware of this developing public sector context (B11).

A business-based interviewee noted that as a result of the ECF, an "enormous tension of people was building up, among those who genuinely should have been moving forward" into higher level posts within the discipline but were unable to do so (B1). As a consequence, academics who could readily move out of the Irish university system did so, going to Australia, Europe and the UK. Those left behind, particularly at lower levels, felt disenfranchised, leading to problems in collegiality both within and between disciplines. In the words of an arts and humanities academic, "the harsh economic climate, the constant cut backs … certainly had an effect on morale" (B8).

A business-based interviewee noted that experience of the new operating environment caused academics to become more mistrustful of corporate structures and government; and morale within the profession deteriorated (B1). This resonates with the views of Shore (2010, p.27) who notes that university reforms have "led to the replacement of professional relationships based on collegiality and trust" with a system focused on performance, measurement and oversight.

The big "shift" identified by a science-based academic between 2008 and 2014 was the value placed on "research funding and research income [which] was seen to be the means by which one then went on to do research and research was the ultimate goal" (B9). As identified by Roberts (2007, p.362 cited by Shore, 2010, p.28), arising from institutional changes led by government, research activity has become a "instrumental, outputs-oriented process". Activity that was particularly valued was money-making research which would benefit the financial position and reputational standing in the ranking league tables, as opposed to research which would elevate its scholarly standing (B5, B6).

Practices, values and normative influences coming from the government logic strengthened their influence at the *micro* level. The experience of change through the lens of the corporate logic is set out in the next section.

6.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: adopting business behaviours

New business-focused behaviours filtered into the collective of academics influencing values and identities to align with performance and financial requirements (Parker, 2011, Lynch, 2010). Reflecting on the introduction of a corporate value system, and changing behaviours, a business academic who had worked previously in a corporate environment, described his response between 2008 and 2014 when the university was experiencing huge shocks and hits to existing budgets and resources. He outlined how in these new circumstances he simply

adopted the approach from his experience in the private sector and focused on enabling income, through the mechanism of strategic planning and generating revenue (B2). For this interviewee, the university was becoming more and more like his old job with fewer decisions being made around academic issues and more being based on budgets and business led metrics. This interviewee described how his skills previously used in business "started to develop a primacy and that the academic skills kind of went into abeyance" (B2).

Individual academics described how they experienced a new external market-led emphasis during these years on prioritising income generation (B3) and creating profitable programmes (B4). Kwiek's (2016) view is that the focus of disciplinary work is on bringing additional resources to the university and adding to its reputation. As if aligned to this view, the advice a head of a science discipline said he would give to anyone seeking to get an initiative off the ground would be to go to the meeting and announce "I've got a great idea for making money and then everyone listens to you, whereas if you say I have a wonderful idea that's really good for academic mission, the response you would get is 'well if it's going to cost money, forget it (B12).

Rhoades (1998) and Vidovich and Currie (1998, as cited by Ylijoki, 2003) describe how as a consequence of university reform, academics become "managed professionals" where they experience greater accountability with less autonomy. A business-based academic (B3) described being reduced to working in a managed environment where her role was intensified "with endless lists and doing things" in an environment where it was "all hands to the tiller" and where "enormous pressure" was required to maintain her research output, while the career "she had worked very hard for (was) being stripped away". Her strongly-held view was that during these difficult years, the university "became a vulture...our lifeblood was just being sucked out of us".

Another business-based interviewee described a more positive aspect of the new operating environment, which enhanced their professional academic role during this six-year period, namely that he had become empowered to undertake activity of benefit to students and the external marketplace. He noted that "the good thing about this period... that it created some entrepreneurial aspect to the job, where creating a new Masters was a new venture and there was a sense of excitement about doing this (B4). Krücken et al., (2013) note that with the increased focus on the corporate agenda, academics have had to increasingly include an entrepreneurial purpose to their work.

It is evident from an examination of the experiences of TCD academics that corporate values and behaviours created a culture where, at the individual level, academics were increasingly influenced by market-oriented behaviours and values. While interviewees expressed mixed sentiments about this – it is evident that it changed the focus of academic work by encouraging them to adapt their behaviour in line with a more managed and corporate-like university environment. As a consequence, the normative and cultural dimension of the corporate logic increased in prominence at the *micro* level.

Experiences at the *micro* level from the perspective of the professional logic are examined in the following section.

6.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the value of the old fashioned scholar

Changes were experienced at the individual level from the perspective of the professional logic. An arts and humanities academic described the "usurping of the original values of the university" which was "to nurture a research environment". She was clear that as these values were no longer fostered by the university, prospects for professional academic development and promotion "would diminish" (B6). While the work context greatly influenced this development, another factor was the nature of Irish society which over this time placed less value on the intellect and *de facto* academics – creating a situation which has "made the work of a professional, or thought-leader increasingly challenged" (B3).

A science-based interviewee recalled meetings during which academics were told that people were not actually interested in their research, but as soon as it became evident that it could generate funding "that was the point at which the research became interesting" (B9). Consequently, the type of academic that was valued within the university changed. This was to the detriment of other aspects of the academic role. Arising from the greater delineation that took place between disciplines and the shift from fundamental research, collegiality too was impacted upon, especially between the 'have's' and the 'have-not's'- those individuals getting grants and getting ahead and those who were unable to access research funds (B1).

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) highlight the influence of head of an academic unit's values in bringing about change in market focused activity. A science-based academic described having "no sense about" what was going on in the university between 2008 and 2014. She noted that "the big thing that affects your experience is your head of school and how they organise and do things". She described being protected from what was happening by her head of school (B11).

The concept of the old-fashioned scholar became less valued and systems which developed were no longer supportive of traditional scholarship. At the same time interaction between the academic discipline, the university and the academic grew more complex in nature (Henkel, 2005) arising from the additional demands created by the emerging metric-based culture. In TCD, traditional values of teaching at undergraduate level (B2, B5) and service to the community, deteriorated during this time (B1, B2, B5). What had become valued were big research groups and delivery of metrics to the extent that for one cynical observer "it became all about KPIs" and "you spend so much of your time so much time measuring KPIs you don't actually get around to doing the research sometimes" (B11).

Academic identity, a key component of the professional value system which determines the focus of professional activity changed for some of those interviewed during this period. A business-based interviewee noted that she could "definitely see a very strong pull away from learning for learning's sake and knowledge and intellect" (B3).

With the reorientation of the values system, some academics felt undermined in a highly competitive environment where, as remarked upon by a frustrated science-based interviewee:

> It's harder to get along and just do what you're interested in and be the sort of individual academic doing things that interest you and publishing and trundling along as a middle of the road academic. You have to be excellent or you are nobody (B11).

She described "a sense in which colleagues were written off…because they were only publishing in this conference and only bringing in that number of thousands of euros" (B11). Whereas in previous years, "it was okay...if you did a decent job and got a few publications and brought some money in" (B11). For this interviewee, the situation became "impossible", "the goalposts had absolutely changed" and the "old-fashioned scholar" had become "less valued" (B11).

In line with the research undertaken by Weiherl and Frost (2016) who propose that academics are more committed to their profession than their employing university, others interviewees described how their individual identity did not change during this time period. An arts and humanities interviewee described their experience of TCD as "an idealistic place" where respect remained "for sheer curiosity, wanting to find out about your subject and researching those aspects which you find really interesting" and that this "was still strong" (B8). Another science-based academic described the "conscious effort" he had made to retain his academic

identity and keep it safe and intact because of the conviction that the changes which had occurred "were not going to be in the best interests of the profession" (B9).

From this analysis it is evident that the normative and cultural dimensions of the professional logic remained strong between 2008-2014, despite the significant challenges experienced by individuals within the institutional setting. What is noteworthy, as identified by Kogan et al., (2000 as cited by Saarinen and Vàlimaa, 2012), is that change in formal structures experienced at the *meso* and *micro* levels within the government and corporate logics have not automatically led to alterations in behaviours, values and focus within the professional logic.

6.4. Conclusion

As the second of three case studies, this chapter illustrates the re-orientation of strategy, operating systems, rules and procedures in TCD towards the government and corporate-based agenda in place between 2008-2014.

The chapter contends that between 2008-2014 changes took place in the structural and regulative dimension of TCD at the *meso* level. As a result of pressures on resources and income, the increase in government-led NPM mechanisms of control and oversight, and the development of corporate-based managerial- led structures and systems, the government and corporate logic grew in prominence. Within the professional logic, arrangements supporting academic autonomy weakened arising from factors including the demise of academic leadership, reduction in faculty numbers, and the powerful influence of managerial-led, output-based mechanisms such as academic appointments and promotion regulations. All this contributed to lessening the power and impact of peer-led collegial systems and reduced the influence of the professional logic within the structural and regulative dimension at the *meso* level.

At the *micro* level, oversight arrangements overseen by government departments brought more scrutiny to academic work at the individual level. The new performance-led environment brought with it a more managed approach and increased requirements for individual accountability which increased the influence of the corporate logic. The position of the professional logic deteriorated as individuals experienced less autonomy in their roles. The weakening of the professional logic was also influenced by pressure to grow income and create support mechanisms for specific research areas which favoured some disciplines and not others. This strategy had the effect of creating competition and resentment between

disciplinary areas and individuals which impacted the strength of structures within the professional logic.

Within the normative and cultural dimension at the *meso* level, with the re-orientation of the value system towards economic and market-led values, growth was experienced in the status of both the government and corporate logic. Academic disciplines endeavoured to preserve professional values focused on student learning however this became increasingly difficult. While there was some deterioration in the position of the professional logic at the *meso* level, this was limited in part, arising from the work of some academic disciplines to maintain those professional values which serve scholarly work.

At the *micro* level, the promotion of government and market-led values and behaviours was felt most strongly by academics in headship positions. The normative and cultural dimensions of the professional logic for the most part remained intact, despite the challenges faced by individuals as a consequence of the de-valuation of professional autonomy. This was achieved due to the conscious efforts made by academics, to hold on to the deeply held professional value system despite what was happening elsewhere. At the *micro* level, academics continued to cherish the ideals of student engagement as well as discovering and imparting knowledge, although some felt less valued as professionals. As highlighted by North (1990) informal practices can endure, despite formal changes.

6.5. University Institutional Analysis Framework - TCD

The key findings from the Trinity College Dublin case study are represented below in Table 10, employing the framework presented earlier in Table 3.

Table 10 University Institutional Analysis Framework – Trinity College Dublin

Structural and Regulative Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Strategy	Structures and plans enable government-led outcomes principally the production of job ready graduates for the economy in addition to research and development to enable	The core strategy shifts towards a focus on external fundraising activities. A financial strategy emerges where decisions are made to support and invest in certain disciplines (i.e.	Academics committed more to their profession than to the university retain their identity, some making a conscious effort to retain those academic values which support

	the knowledge economy	Business). In addition income is redirected from commercially wealthy areas to support other less-capital intensive disciplines	and nurture scholarly work.
Structural mechanism and focus	Government resourcing constraint mechanisms together with research funding models create a struggle for resources in addition to increased competition and uncertainty within the university.	Academic units become redefined as financial cost centres. Decision-making is centralised and hierarchical relationships are created. A more managed performance-led environment prevails.	The influence of discipline-based collegial systems become constrained – opinions are no longer solicited and decisions are presented as a *fait accompli* to the academic community.
Source of regulative and structural arrangements	The expansion of government-led structural mechanisms creates a centralised system of command, formal control, evaluative and oversight arrangements. In addition, comes the requirement to provide evidence that the institution is being well managed. This translates into a greater increase in rules and procedures.	The development of corporate systems as evidenced in the establishment of managerial-based criteria for academic appointments and promotions conflict with traditional professional structural arrangements.	Discussions and decisions are removed from the academic discipline. The power and influence of peer-led structures becomes weakened. Collegiality is negatively impacted arising from the perceived inequality of the internal funding framework.
Normative and Cultural Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Focus of activity	Training students for the knowledge economy is prioritised. The focus grows in seeking excellence; research excellence and excellence in the	Activities are focused on attracting high economic-value students. Pressure to make programmes more popular increases. The focus on students	With the change in focus arising from the government and corporate logic, the academic-student relationship which seeks to encourage

	university league tables.	moves towards giving students what they want rather than what they should know.	growth and learning is impacted. Support to develop students' research skills declines.
Orientation of value system	Research which benefits the finances and reputational standing in the league tables becomes increasingly valued. However, awareness of the developing public sector context does not fully permeate the university. Mistrust of government increases, leading to poor morale.	Performance becomes rewarded according to criteria which can be measured as determined by management. Core values shift towards money-making activities.	Professional autonomy declines together with loss of trust. Concern for the quality of teaching standards increases. With competition for resources, fragmentation occurs between disciplines. Some academics feel questioned as to their utility. However, at the *micro* level, individual commitment to research and pedagogical excellence remains.
Focus of behavioural aspects	University management comes under pressure to comply with government requirements. Oversight by government brings increased scrutiny to academic work. The harsh economic environment together with resource constrains creates tension with limited career development opportunities available.	Engagement with administrative and financial control systems increases. Workload associated with administrative activity intensifies. The commercial mind-set permeates throughout the university and trickles down into day to day operations.	The traditional core focus on the interests of students and the quality of work declines. Increased teaching and administrative workloads leave less time for research and collaborative activity. The focus previously shown to teaching and research wanes as the focus moves towards activities which achieve commercially-based outcomes.

Chapter Seven: Case Study 3 - National University of Ireland, Galway

7.1. Introduction: National University of Ireland - Galway (NUIG)

This third case study provides a review of the influence of government policy within NUIG at the *meso* and *micro* levels. Together with the two previous case studies, this chapter provides the backdrop for a full analysis of the impact of institutional change originating from government policy which will be the focus of chapter eight.

A structure for the provision of university education in Ireland was secured following the enactment of the Academical Institutions (Ireland) Act 1845 which provided for the establishment of three Queen's Colleges at Belfast, Cork and Galway. These colleges were founded in the context of reform, opening up third level education to a wider constituency and moving away from elitism (Murphy 1995: 2). One of these three colleges, NUI Galway University was established as a Queen's College in 1845. In 2008, the first year of this research study, there were 14,754 students (11,850 full time students and 2,904 part time students). In 2014, these numbers had grown by close to 20% to a total of 16,497 students (13,818 full time students, 2,679 part time students)[6].

This chapter contends that formal state-based structures and control mechanisms were instrumental in creating a significant shift in the structures, systems, behaviours and values within NUIG. The university was faced with government-imposed changes focused on budgets and NPM reforms. This resonates with the work of Bleiklie (2018) who in citing other scholars (Paradeise et al., 2009 and Seeber et al., 2015), remarks on the concentration on productivity, efficiency and relevancy of academic work, in the context of budgetary restrictions. Increased levels of scrutiny, control and authority within the structural and regulative dimension led to a strengthening of the government and corporate logic. The professional logic made valiant efforts at both the *meso* and *micro* level to maintain academic structures in support of academic integrity and professional autonomy. However, this was a struggle to achieve.

At the normative and cultural level, new language and business behaviours, which set out expectations around targets, delivery and metrics, were keenly experienced. As a consequence, the strength and power of both the government logic and the corporate logic intensified at both the *meso* and the *micro* level. As changes were made which lessened the opportunities open to disciplines and academics to work independently and with increased pressures in the new tough

[6] http://www.hea.ie/en/statistics/overview accessed on 13 November 2016

operating environment, collegiality deteriorated and the status and positioning of the professional logic contracted at the *meso* level.

Meanwhile at the *micro* level, some practices, norms and behaviours within the professional logic persevered, due mainly to the attention that academics continued to give to student learning, despite increases in academic workload and reduced resource capacity. As described by a number of respondents, it became apparent that there were two university models operating in NUIG during these years; the corporate university with its concentration on government and market-oriented values and activities and secondly the traditional academic institution concerned with retaining academic ideals focused on students and academic integrity.

7.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension

Structural and regulative influences initiated by government were instrumental in re-shaping the direction of NUIG. Changes made by government to budget mechanisms were severe and unequivocal in their intent, compelling disciplines to work within a constrained resourcing environment, while at the same time increasing income through creative and market-focused plans to grow postgraduate and international student numbers. Scrutiny from other disciplines increased and university management were subjected to additional pressures as government and the public challenged the university to justify public investment.

In the resource-constrained operating environment, disciplines and individual academics faced expectations to generate resources and grow the reputation of the university both nationally and internationally. Within this setting, insecurity and increased surveillance over academic work were experienced which led to a sense of detachment and isolation. Internally within NUIG, some of those working in disciplines began to identify themselves as strong or weak in their potential to deliver the new metric-based requirements. As a consequence of these developments, both the government and corporate logic rose in prominence while the professional logic struggled to maintain its position, with its scope of influence being limited to a narrow range of structural arrangements such as efforts around the protection of academic standards.

7.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level

The focus of this section is the structural and regulative dimension which encompasses organisational structures and systems experienced at the *meso* level within NUIG between 2008-2014.

Government-imposed budgetary mechanisms and expectations around performance and delivery of state requirements led to a sea change in operating arrangements at the *meso* level. With the introduction of corporate-based management systems, commercial and competitive-oriented engagement in the marketplace became the strategic response to the constrained government resourcing framework. The ability of some disciplines to engage more successfully than others in the corporatisation agenda of the university led to dissonance between academic faculties.

As the strategy towards marketplace performance and deliverables increased, there was an inevitability around the growth in management-led procedures and systems. Collectively, these developments impacted on traditional decision-making structures and processes and led to a deterioration in the role of the academic faculty in university operations. As a consequence, the government and corporate logic strengthened in their positioning while the professional logic experienced a weakening in the power of formal traditional collegial structures.

7.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: doing more with less

During the period 2008-2014, the operating environment changed in NUIG. The university Strategic Plan 2009-2014 stressed "the urgent need to reposition Irish society as a Knowledge Society and Smart Economy" (NUIG, 2009, p,12). Thoenig (2012 as cited by Diogo et al., 2015) points to the structural forces which influence institutional life such as economic and political agendas and pressures nationally. A business-based academic noted that the economic and political system within Ireland and beyond had changed, with the turning over of institutions such as the university sector by the state to the marketplace (C2). This resonates with the views of Engwall, (2007) who notes that increasingly the university is governed by state and business considerations.

The government budgeting process as a structural tool both conditions and shapes behaviour within the university system. A senior business-based academic described the continued pressure experienced in light of declining centralised funds from government and how the budget was "carved up for individual schools and colleges to pull in more numbers and pull in more directly usable income" (C1). Scott (1987, p.508), in describing the structural and regulative dimension refer to rule-setting, monitoring and sanctioning activities and highlights that "those who can shape or influence them possess a valuable form of power".

A NUIG based questionnaire respondent noted that the "unthinking and anti-intellectual pursuit of new public management methods" created a key pressure for change (#5). The government together with university management became a powerful agent of change. As noted by a senior science-based academic, disciplines were forced to work in a different way (C10). Recurrent budgets did not reflect increased student numbers, falling instead by 2014 to 25% of what they had been pre-2008. For another science-based discipline, a challenging operating environment was created while student numbers went higher and higher. This academic reported that a 40% cut to the discipline's budget between 2008 and 2014 meant having to cope with hugely increased student numbers, with half the budget that had been in place previously and with less support staff (C13). This was a challenging time in NUIG, as evidenced by the publication of the interim report of the 2009-2014 university strategic plan which highlighted the university's need in the face of ongoing government cutbacks, to "redouble its efforts to develop other sources of income" and continue its "efforts to achieve more with less" (NUIG, 2012a, p.1) in the context of the national "economic and fiscal crisis".

Faced with this situation, as described by a senior arts and humanities interviewee, all of a sudden "there was no choice but to become more market savvy and focus on the numbers game" (C5). A science-based academic described how interest developed in growing postgraduate numbers since the university "was basically full in science on the undergraduate side." Postgraduate growth was seen as a way of getting extra money from the HEA, (in that context a PhD student was worth 3 undergraduate FTEs and a taught Masters student was valued at 1.5 FTEs) (C12). However, as identified by a senior science-based academic, the flow of potential postgraduate students was impacted by changes within the national landscape: namely that funding for prospective postgraduates was significantly limited, with a larger number of applications chasing a smaller pot of research funding (C10).

For example, while in the past national Irish Research Council funding had supported MSc students in carrying out research projects, in the current funding environment, available funds would only be supporting strong PhD applications (*ibid*). Within science disciplines, funding mechanisms had the effect of altering the structural composition of the student body, increasing the number of international fee-paying postgraduate students and reducing the number of funded MSc. research students. This was a challenge for the discipline, faced as it was with limited autonomy, in responding to these government-led resourcing measures.

Paradeise et al., (2009 as cited by Christensen, 2011) states that following university reform, scrutiny increases, as evidenced by more reporting to central state authorities. As remarked upon by a senior science-based interviewee, a key driver behind many of the performance-based system developments implemented, was the need felt by the university to justify to government that resources put into the university were delivering value for money, that those employed within the university were both necessary and useful (C10). The HEA was clear in setting out the state's expectation that "public investment" was "being used to best effect" (HEA, 2013b, p.6). In NUIG, as described by a science-based academic, there was a sense that people from outside were looking at these "institutions with walls around them and asking what is it they do?" (C11).

In the literature Parker (2011), describes how organisations seek acceptance and resources from within the political, social and economic environment because this is seen as critical to its ongoing existence. While within NUIG, as noted by a science-based academic, it was acknowledged that there was an obvious need for particular disciplines such as engineering, science and medicine, in parts of the arts and humanities some areas felt vulnerable to the increased scrutiny taking place externally (C11). Henkel (2004) describes the dynamic which is at play between what she describes as "weak" and "strong" disciplines, where those that are strong have the potential to generate resources and enhance the university's reputation, while those that are weak have limited capacity to do so. She asserts that both the stability and wellbeing of a discipline is dependent on its ability to withstand the scrutiny and expectations of university management. Within NUIG, there was an unmistakeable sense of some weaker disciplines experiencing more pressure than others and this created a divide between areas at the *meso* level.

While the focus in NUIG prior to 2008 had been on research excellence, an arts and humanities academic noted that the priority moved during these years towards income generation through research excellence (C7). As described by a science-based academic, some colleagues found the new research operating environment very difficult because the areas in which they specialised, did not lend themselves to the type of funding that was available. This was in a context where the university appeared to be asking in relation to every academic activity "what's the financial gain at the end of this" (C13).

Neave (2012, p.21) references the role of the state as an enabler, focusing on university output, performance and productivity in delivering on government-led objectives which include

enhancing national standing in university international league tables. Whereas previously in NUIG, prior to 2008, the university had been largely focused on the local region, between 2008-2014, as noted by a senior business-based academic, there was a significant change in emphasis towards becoming more internationally focused (C1). Being seen as a global university, its priorities moved towards seeking and maintaining accreditation and attaining prominence in international rankings (*ibid*). This was confirmed from the questionnaire, where 95% of respondents strongly agreed that a key focus of NUIG in 2014 was maintaining its competitive position in world rankings, while 20% considered this had been the key focus of the university in 2008.

The reform agenda as led by government also prompted the university at the *meso* level to become more outwardly focused because of requirements to increase activity and collaborative projects between institutions. In NUIG, as noted by a senior business-based academic (C1), the creation of these inter-institutional arrangements was undertaken in an effort to stave off some of the scrutiny, expectations and demands being made by government following the publication of the Hunt Report. A benefit which came from this new activity as described by a business-based academic was the creation of new cross-institutional collegial relationships (C2). Clark (2000) describes how "collegial entrepreneurialism" provides a mediating, counter force to the negative effects of the modernisation agenda as it seeks to support and encourage academic autonomy. Arising from this work, as acknowledged by a senior business-based academic, there was also a sense within the university of starting to "look outside of ourselves a little bit more" which was seen as a positive development (C1).

With a clear focus on building internal resources to develop future investment in NUIG, as remarked upon by both junior and senior academics within arts and humanities and science, the built environment within the university went through a significant transformation during this time (C6, C10). The irony of this situation was that, as noted by an academic working in arts and humanities, the constraints of the Employment Control Framework (ECF) meant that these buildings couldn't be filled with new staff members (C6). There was some frustration that this building work continued despite the budgetary cuts experienced. While it was suggested by academics in arts and humanities disciplines, that construction work was cheaper because of the crisis (C6, C7) it was difficult to observe what was estimated as a 20% increase in the campus-built environment, while investment in staff came to a standstill (C7).

As government-led structural changes took effect within NUIG, it is evident that political pressures were formidable in moving university disciplines to adapt and work within new economic parameters. These state-led changes were powerful in bringing about transformation at the *meso* level. Having examined experiences of the structural and regulative dimension in the context of the government logic, the next section looks at this dimension through the lens of the corporate logic.

7.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: KPIs and the rise in "academic capitalism"

At the organisational level, the attention which had formerly been shown in NUIG towards teaching and learning activities now turned towards creating income. Høstaker (2006, p.109) describes how arising from government policy and the increase in the corporate focus of the university, the 'financialisation of academic relations' takes place. With pressures and increased expectations coming from government, as noted by an academic based in science, those working within the university "lost this innate sense of undeniable security that we all had and very much started to behave in a more corporate manner" (C11). As acknowledged by another science-based academic, it became more evident that the university's mission had changed with the appointment of people with business backgrounds who endeavoured to apply business philosophy (C12). An arts and humanities academic shared the commonly held view that influences imported from the private sector created an organisational context where university management was expected to be driving staff to be more productive (C8). As identified by Henkel (2004) in this corporate domain, visible procedures and systems focused on explicit and transparent performance are implemented to evaluate academic work. Those in leadership positions within NUIG became increasingly preoccupied with the management of performance. This brought with it the creation of productivity goals and targets and, as noted by a senior business-based academic, the importance of meeting these requirements (C1).

Gumport (1997 cited by Gumport, 2000, p.69) claims the "assessment paradigm" has had a vast influence "imposing an organizational and individual performance metric on every aspect of higher education with profound consequences for the academic workplace". As remarked upon by a senior business-based academic in NUIG, "you couldn't see them [these requirements] changing week by week or day by day but they were – it was all about KPIs, meeting the metrics – it was becoming far more about sales and far more about performance" (C1).

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p.182) describe how disciplines that engage in business activities will "either be pushed by resource constraints or pulled by opportunities offered". Some areas of the university were better placed to capitalise on the market-based opportunities which this developing situation presented. The term "academic capitalism" as coined by Slaughter and Leslie, (1997), references the situation where some disciplines are considered important to the economy and can readily engage in commercial activities. Within NUIG, medical and scientific disciplines generally did well while other areas including arts and humanities suffered a decline in their financial fortunes.

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) also identifies how some disciplines encounter difficulty engaging in the marketplace and this creates a distance between academic disciplines. For an academic working in arts and humanities in NUIG, it was evident that their discipline had been impacted more than others. She considered that it was easier to justify expenditure in other areas, for example in science where laboratory equipment was required to move into a position where the discipline could then operate "at the top of their game" (C7). It felt that other requirements in arts and humanities where, for example, travel costs were needed for accessing an archive or to buy out teaching to allow more time for research, were not taken seriously (*ibid*). An academic working in science, described how as a contract staff member, the setting up of a postgraduate programme and "getting the numbers to justify an appointment" resulted in being offered a permanent post (C12).

For an academic working in arts and humanities, while there was a tendency for managerialism to be portrayed as a negative development, the internal drive to improve quality and drive quality outcomes was viewed as a positive development (C8). There was evidence across NUIG that a number of managerial-led system changes were welcomed. As identified by a senior business-based academic, things (that should have been done more efficiently anyway) at the operational level were done "far more sensibly and leaner" than in previous times (C1). For a science-based academic, in reflecting on this, it was clear that those taking action to rationalise expenditure in the university were "actually behaving responsibly" in trying to ensure that the books were balanced (C13). The value of managerial systems and structures is similarly promoted by Gumport (2000, p.71) who asserts that economic challenges and marketplace competition merit "better management".

In the view of an academic in arts and humanities, decisions which had previously been made informally and without transparent processes became formalised (C7). According to another academic in arts and humanities, paperwork also increased, creating a focus on quality, transparency and additional levels of professionalism which often accompanied them (C8). The way in which decisions were made also changed during this time. In the literature, Dowling-Hetherington (2013) describes how collegial decision-making declines with the increasing dominance of management and executive decision-making approaches. A senior science-based academic highlighted that the "days of academics sitting around debating endlessly what to do" disappeared and were replaced by professionalised decision-making (C10). Despite these institutional drivers, transparency in decision-making was not experienced by academic faculty as decisions were handed down and the academic community were told "a decision has been made" (*ibid*).

The development of business-led structural developments directed towards the delivery of performance and profit in NUIG was a powerful force in changing the operational environment at the *meso* level. The final view of structural and regulative mechanisms at the organisational level is through the professional logic which is examined in the following section.

7.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: conflicts in the marketplace

While budgetary matters described above created significant challenges on the ground, they also reasserted the academic motive in particular areas of the university. Maguire et al., (2004) identify the struggles which can arise where two distinct systems are in place, one featuring "the old guard", intent on maintaining the status quo with a second, the "new guard" which takes an interest in transforming and creating new ways of working. This was evidenced in a science-based discipline within NUIG, where a desire was articulated to retain the quality of the degree being offered, so that the student experience was not negatively impacted by the budgetary situation, and was left "as undiminished as possible" (C11). This example illustrates the presence of institutional ambidexterity, a collaborative approach, which takes into account both corporate and academic-based considerations, described by Jarzabkowski et al., (2013, p.44), as vital to organisational success.

Mouwen (2000) notes the potential for conflict which can arise between the academic task and marketplace structural arrangements. For a science-based academic, what was noticeable during this period was that decisions were being made by "people who were not at the coalface" (C13). Another science-based academic described how "lots of holes were developing in

various units" while at the same time the university "was pushing hard to increase the student intake and still offering the same product to students" with students being told "this is high quality education you're getting, ...but we [the discipline] were being given fewer resources to do this" (C11). According to an arts and humanities academic, this constrained environment translated into fewer courses being provided, leaving students with less choice (C6). A science-based academic described how some student classes grew so big during this time that there was insufficient room and equipment to facilitate them (C11). There were concerns at the "ridiculously high student to staff ratio" (C13). While ideally the ratio should be 15-20 students per staff member, it was close to 30, which translated into a concern that "we were not providing as good a product as perhaps we should" (*ibid*).

The capacity for professional decision-making changed. Prior to 2008, as noted by a business-based academic, there was more academic autonomy arising from the simpler structures in place at that time (C3). Since 2008, according to academics based both in business and arts and humanities, professional autonomy had eroded with the growth in formal accreditation requirements and new rules around learning outcomes and assessment processes (C4, C7). As described by an academic working in arts and humanities with exam papers having to be submitted many months in advance, there was no leeway if the course developed in a particular direction. The course content had to be more controlled and rigid than would be ideally the case in "an academic freedom, encouraging critical thinking way" (C7). There was a view expressed that the "over- bureaucratizing of education" had disadvantaged students and the learning process (*ibid*).

As evidenced in this section, the professional logic was particularly challenged arising from the pressures from managerial structures to increase student numbers and work with less resource capacity. These changes led to a demise in peer-led academic structures which weakened the professional logic within the structural and regulative dimension at the *meso* level.

7.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level

The following section sets out an analysis of the structural and regulative landscape as experienced at the *micro* level in NUIG between 2008 and 2014.

At the *micro* level, a number of dimensions came together within NUIG which transformed experiences on the ground. At the level of government and corporate logic, as managerial requirements took hold, these developments were powerful in re-focusing the work at the

individual level. As a consequence of the transformation that took place at the *micro* level, the status of the professional logic declined as opportunities for self-directed, self-regulated, peer-led scholarly work and the effective operation of collegial structures deteriorated.

7.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level

Between 2008 and 2014, rules and procedures became more visible, rigorous and labour intensive and those working in the university across business, arts and humanities and science disciplines, became more conscious of them as the university intensified efforts to communicate them (C1, C3, C4, C7, C13). Three quarters of NUIG respondents in completing the questionnaire agreed that NUIG changed during this six-year period, with an increasing focus on rules and procedures. The driver for this development as noted by a senior science-based academic, was the expansion of the university which necessitated a new systems approach and increased compliance with external regulations and legislation (C10). In the past as this senior academic observed, many of the university systems in place were "indigenous, home grown" practices which worked when the university was smaller. These were no longer fit for purpose in 2008 and beyond when, much larger and more complex with its activities under increased scrutiny, the university needed to deliver at a different level (C10).

Greenwood et al., (2011) and Jarzabkowski et al., (2013) describe the institutional complexity which can arise where conflict emerges between the goals of different logics. Two academics working in a business area questioned the merit of the government-led massification which put pressure on the university to increase its student intake. According to both senior and junior academics based in business and arts and humanities, this state-led policy change came at the cost of having to run programmes which accommodated lower points; and as a result, the integrity of academic standards was put under strain (C2, C5). Concerns over academic standards were also felt in the science area, where a science-based academic observed that students were enabled to move more readily than before from undergraduate programmes to higher level programmes (C13). It was clear that there were two sides – the university was endeavouring to maintain a balance between "keeping the numbers up and therefore keeping the revenue coming in, but at the same time maintaining academic standards" (*ibid*). This was seen as a difficult balancing act, particularly considering the level of government pressures experienced.

Respondents described the significant impact of the government-led employment control mechanism put in place to control staff numbers. The ECF had a considerable impact on some

at the individual level. A staff member working in science on contract in 2008 detailed how in the months prior to the economic collapse she was advised that a permanent position would be advertised in her discipline. However, within days of the position being advertised, the permanent post changed to a ten-year contract arising from the embargo from government on filling permanent posts. In describing the significant personal effect on her and approximately 20-30 academics in similar positions in NUIG in 2008, she described when appointed to a contract position, how she had to "fight" her way to become involved in particular activities within the role - for example budgetary decisions-making and postgraduate supervision - because she was not a permanent staff member (C12). As a direct consequence of government-imposed resource constraints, the opportunity for involvement in academic activities, as well as academic autonomy at the *micro* level, was not afforded to this academic and a number of individuals within NUIG and elsewhere.

While the changes experienced within the government logic sought to establish legitimacy through resourcing constraints and encouraging growth in student numbers, these developments were seen as a challenge to professional autonomy and integrity at the *micro* level.

7.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: changing roles and management systems

Business-focused procedures were developed in a number of areas, demonstrating demands for greater accountability and control. For some, as remarked upon by a business-based academic, the development of procedures was viewed positively such as the provision of quality assurance in areas such as examining and the assessment of applications for postgraduate programmes (C3). This development was also seen as inevitable and welcomed in some quarters for providing much needed direction and clarity in university processes and bringing increased professionalism and confidence within the university system. However, electronic systems developed for payroll and travel expenses and the introduction of online systems to create business efficiencies, streamline processes and reduce paper, were not regarded in a positive light, as they changed the nature of personal interaction and created more administration for the academic community (C2, C6, C11, C13). There was a general sense, as remarked upon by a science-based academic, that "a lot seemed to happen in a small space of time - we were asked to make an awful lot of changes" (C11).

Deem et al., (2007) recognise the considerable adjustment to the work of the academic which accompanies managerialism. Within NUIG, half of those who completed the questionnaire

stated that their role as academic staff member changed between 2008-2014 due to factors such as additional workload and increased focus on research-funding and outputs. Added to this was the reality that the academic role had become less about being a member of an academic community and more about performance and the marketplace as defined by management goals and outcomes.

A senior academic in arts and humanities recalled the haphazard manner in which a number of managerial systems were introduced and that much of the organisation of these processes and schemes which should have been led by central administration was left to the academic (C5). In addition, with the increased level of centralised automated systems, interactions between academics and administrators changed in nature. As remarked by a senior science-based academic "we don't know who to call anymore – we just know what button to push" (C10). Across disciplines, workloads increased due to the impact of budgetary measures, where staffing cuts were made locally and at the level of central administration (C4, C6, C13). What emerged overall was less administrative support for more administrative work. This resonates with the views of Henkel and Askling (2006) who note that academics spend an increasing proportion of time working with demanding administrative procedures and rules in order to adhere to institutional requirements.

The individual academic experienced a new focus on performance management. A visible change took place in the approach adopted after 2008, from the informal method previously employed where as described by a senior science-based academic, "everyone comes in and does something and someone hopes it's all good" (C10). A new raft of requirements in the form of workload models, outcomes and metrics was introduced in the context of reforms to drive productivity. Within NUIG, a business-based academic in describing the views of colleagues remarked that the framework used to report annual output and workload was not viewed favourably for "bringing the marketplace into the hallowed halls of the university", a place where it was felt that academics should not be forced to record their outputs (C2).

In NUIG, a senior science-based interviewee described the arrival of formal definitions of appropriate performance at different levels and efforts made to bring performance clearly into the appointments and promotions processes (C10). This resonates with the findings of Musselin (2013b,) who describes the increase in managerial control which brings with it additional linkages between the measurement of performance, promotion and reward.

Key to ongoing activity during these years, was the improvement of research performance. A business-based academic described how senior management put in place expectations requiring lecturers to have a specified number of research outputs per annum (C2). One arts and humanities interviewee recalled an announcement 'from the top' that publishing journal articles was viewed as significantly more valuable than publishing books (C8). In response to this an academic colleague said "that's what we're going to have to do", and he stopped writing books. This and similar drivers sought to refocus academic work and to create a structured, performance-driven system.

However locally there was a concern that work wasn't evenly spread across colleagues, that as described by a business-based academic, those academics who were very research active with high impact publications in high ranking journals could refuse administrative work (C2). There was also a view from a senior academic based in business, that administrative work was given to those who wouldn't have the strength to say no, particularly those on contract (C1). This example highlights the influence of the corporate logic on individual roles where new rules have the potential to empower one set of actors while taking away power from another group (Leach and Lowndes, 2007).

7.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the demise of academic decision making

Henkel and Askling (2006) describe how the introduction of formal corporate organisational structures influences the allocation of decision-making and position power within the university. Restructuring in NUIG at the *meso* level created a new school structure which according to a business-based academic, brought with it a new layer of management and slowed down the functioning of the university, making it less efficient (C3). For a science- based academic, the extra layer of hierarchy led to some individuals feeling more isolated. Because the school structure had grown so big according to a science-based academic, it became difficult to have a school meeting where everyone sits around (C13). This led to a select group being put in place which formed the school executive and filtered information "which had already been through a few levels of hierarchy on the way down" to the individual staff member (*ibid*).

Whereas previously at disciplinary level colleagues enjoyed a good collegial atmosphere, with the creation of school structures and the larger numbers of colleagues working within the structure the atmosphere became more formal. Within the university as one research participant based in business observed, disciplinary areas became siloed. There were fewer

opportunities for contact outside the discipline, no time to meet colleagues even to have a coffee or lunch, and without the prospect of collegial engagement, inter-collaborative working became more restrictive (C4). As Henkel (2005) describes, where academics are required to work within externally defined structures and rules, the professional privileges previously enjoyed in their work around self-regulation and self-determination diminish. As a science based questionnaire respondent remarked, his role changed in the period 2008-2014 from "a member of an academic community to an employee pursuing management defined goals and outcomes" (#5). However, despite these challenges, 85% of NUIG based questionnaire respondents noted that the autonomy and self-determination they enjoyed in carrying out research remained unchanged between 2008-2014.

7.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension

This second part of the chapter examines the normative and cultural changes experienced between 2008-2014. As a consequence of the change in values, the dominance of the government and corporate logic increased at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. 75% of all questionnaire respondents agreed that the value system within the university changed and pointed to the increase in focus on rules and procedures, internal economic and efficiency metrics, new management structures together with increased competition and market share indicators. As the introduction of business practices and efforts to embed a neoliberal ideology within the university progressed, the professional logic declined at the *meso* level.

At the *micro* level, with the increasing division between the power of corporate, managerial focused practices, the values aligned to the professional logic weakened. The university appeared to separate into two distinct entities; the corporate university and the academic university and it became a struggle for the professional logic at the *micro* level to survive where individuals made noble efforts to retain their academic identity.

7.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level

This section describes the normative and cultural dimension at the *meso* level which include values, practices and focus of activities experienced by academics working in NUIG between 2008-2014. At this *meso* level, as the following section demonstrates, while the government and corporate logic increased in prominence, the professional logic was particularly challenged by a weakening in the influence of scholarly values and difficulties in preserving disciplinary expertise. Traditional values promoting collegial and disciplinary peer engagement diminished

while values within the managerial and corporate logic promoting competition and performance took a firmer hold.

7.3.1.1. Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: the changing public view of the university

Within NUIG, as noted by a business-based academic, those appointed to leadership positions were seen as aligned to the agenda crafted by government influences, and so many of the messages and directives which originated at the level of the state were filtered down through them to ground level (C4). As noted by the questionnaire outcomes, 65% of NUIG based respondents noted that the influence of university management as a source of authority in the university increased between 2008-2014.

Parker (2011, p.438) describes how government policy promoting neoliberalism and market managerialism focuses on a "commodified commercialisation redefinition" of the role of the university. A science-based academic described how at student recruitment open days, he was increasingly asked what jobs a degree from his discipline would deliver (C13). As articulated by the Minister for Education and Skills in the context of the higher education reform agenda, the role of the sector was to prepare "people for work as well as for life" (DoES, 2014b). The responsibility of the university was seen to provide vocational training and as a consequence, many programmes sought to enable the student become work-ready for a narrow set of possible occupations. This is in keeping with Kogan and Marton's (2006, p.84) view that government places a value on knowledge that "is useful and likely to appeal to the market".

All these changes, as noted by a business-based academic, brought in a new ideology, seeking to boost productivity, create efficiencies and get more value for money (C2). An academic working in arts and humanities referred to the "hard, hard time" that was experienced by the academic community (C6). This came from two separate quarters. Firstly, hostility came from government where various groups and sections of society were "played off against each other" (*ibid*). Secondly, the public perception of the university was that while private sector workers were suffering, public sector workers weren't having similar experiences and this angered and upset the public at large. As Spender (2016, p.144) has identified, traditional scholarship within the profession has "become tricky to evaluate as an investment project – especially where taxpayers are paying the bills". Within NUIG, as remarked upon by an arts and humanities academic, it was evident that the public no longer supported the university as it had done previously and following this societal change, the gap in funding had to be filled by sources other than government (C7).

The experience of the government logic at the *meso* level, deriving from the messages and public discourse coming from government, state agencies and the public, had the effect of redefining the purpose and expectations of the university. These normative and cultural-based changes were impactful in reorienting the corporate and the professional logic as will be evidenced in the following sections.

7.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: competition and promotion

All NUIG based questionnaire respondents were clear that competition and market share indicators increased in focus between 2008-2014. Shore (2010) describes how the corporation has been introduced into the academic arena through professional managers who bring with them practices and business language from the corporate sector. The new orientation in NUIG towards generating income changed the focus of discussions and decision-making, as noted by a business-based academic, so that when submitting a new programme proposal, the main interest moved to assessing the numbers of international students the programme would attract (C3). A respondent based in science recalled how colleagues in arts and humanities were worried that university management would look at the discipline and decide that it was just too costly and while it would damage the reputation of the university, "it would save X as opposed to costing Y" (C11).

A senior academic based in science, remarked how competition for students, research, reputation and funding had collectively changed the culture of NUIG (C10). An interviewee based in a business discipline recalled how the concept of competition had entered the lexicon of the university and he considered that for some people, the word 'compete' should not ever be used in a university and saved instead for "hamburger makers in the marketplace" (C2). A senior academic based in science experienced more competitive pressures between areas for funding, so that if your area needed a new machine you had no option but to justify your needs and in so doing, compete with peers from other disciplines who also needed resources (C10).

A senior science-based academic noted that there had been an obvious push towards creating the conditions for competition where NUIG could readily measure up at both national and international level (C10). This view was supported by the outcomes of the questionnaire where 95% of NUIG based respondents agreed that the introduction of a new template for success, arising from an increasing focus on global league tables had been a driver for change between 2008-2014. As noted by another science-based academic, it also became a top priority to bring

in more top-level research-active staff into NUIG which was seen as critical in attaining more funding (C12).

Efforts were made during this time to present NUIG differently despite the fact that behind this promotional activity, as remarked upon by a respondent based in arts and humanities, things had largely remained the same on the ground (C6). There was a sense that increasingly management concerns came down to the income generated. An example was given by an arts and humanities academic, of academics being feted on being awarded research awards for large projects and while everyone knew the sum of money involved, not many people could relay what the project was about (C8). As noted by Spender (2016), knowledge had become valuable where it delivered measurable results – such as student numbers and research funding.

In the literature Billot (2010) describes how in a bid to address economic priorities, intensive marketing activity is engaged in by universities competing with other universities to attract fee paying students. NUIG appointed a marketing manager and student recruitment officers in the emerging context where education had been turned into a commodity. As remarked upon by a science-based academic, open days were introduced and there was a noticeable drive felt to sell the university to students (C13). A business-based academic reported that he felt like a salesman and, while not against this development, he did acknowledge the growth in vocabulary around 'income' (a business term) and students being referred to as 'customers' (C2). For a science-based academic the vocabulary of the university changed – this could be seen in the brochures, in the corporate offering of the university (C11). Within the brochure as described by this respondent:

> There were always pictures of sunny Galway and students laughing, a lovely mix of multicultural students laughing away and pristine, great computer suites. The perception was that the university was left staring at huge red numbers in their account books and saying ok we have to deal with this. We have to offer something that is marketable, that is clear and will attract students and that will attract money…(*ibid*).

Meyer and Rowan (1977) describe how the actions of institutional actors may be ceremonial in nature, arising from a desire to create or maintain legitimacy in the institutional environment. NUIG, according to a science-based academic, like any business pitched the best image to external stakeholders, while on the ground academics were left saying "we're patching things up to keep things going" (C11). In conveying the contrast between the academic experience and the corporate experience within the university, this respondent outlined how his discipline

was located adjacent to a modern senior management office. However, while his office carpet was "only ever patched…you went through a door and walked from a battered carpet and paint falling off the wall, you had to step up as the carpet on the other side was so high" (*ibid*).

In setting out its objectives, the NUIG strategic plan 2009-2014 commented on the cultural shift which was envisaged where it stated:

> We owe it to our many stakeholders, including our students, employers, research partners, philanthropic benefactors and the public exchequer, to foster an organisational culture which is performance-oriented, and which facilitates, recognises and rewards achievements and promotes accountability (NUIG, 2009, p.16).

Lynch (2010, p.55) describes how within the university, evaluation and performance management have become "institutionalized and normalized in everyday life". Within NUIG, as remarked upon by a business-based academic, performance, internationalisation, workload models and postgraduate student numbers featured more and more in the university's vocabulary (C2). This shift was also acknowledged in the questionnaire where 70% of NUIG based respondents noted the growth in management structures, rules and procedures within the university between 2008-2014.

According to an academic working in arts and humanities, everything had to be quantifiable and an obsession with measurements developed (C7) to the extent that "no one dared to write a book anymore" since pushing out small ten-page articles was more conductive to promotion or a positive performance review. This resonates with the views of Kwiek (2016), who notes the change in work carried out by academics, where that which no longer benefits the university or is not seen as adding to its reputation ceases, while work which is valued continues. Similarly, Reihlen and Wenzlaff (2016) identify the shift from monographs and book chapters, to the delivery of journal articles in the context of the changing value system for research. In NUIG the decision to go down the articles' route was considered a worrying development from an academic perspective (C7).

7.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: emerging divisions in the academic endeavour

The value system within the university was communicated through interactions which took place during this time. According to an arts and humanities academic, while collegiate values continued to be shared, managerial values were increasingly experienced as decisions within the university were made in a "very managerial, top down, borderline dictatorial style" (C6). Winter, (2009) draws attention to the central role which collegial governance and institutional

autonomy play in defining academic identity. With the growth in management-based values, professional values were impacted.

Henkel (2005) describes how with the struggle which has taken place between the academy and other groups, the academic community has been seen to identify less with the university. The view expressed by an academic working in arts and humanities was that the university could be perceived as two separate entities; the world inhabited by management and the world inhabited by the academic (C8). This opinion resonates with the work of Winter (2009) who in accepting the experience of the university where conflicting professional and managerial principles are in play, acknowledges its hybrid identity.

In observing the greater focus on a target-driven culture Deem et al., (2007) assert that a transformation has taken place in the university where communities of scholars have developed into academic workplaces. In NUIG, while this change occurred, a gulf remained between the management agenda and the academic endeavour. As remarked upon by an academic working in arts and humanities, while university rankings may have been the focus and priority of management, the attention of the professional academic was primarily on academic work and undertaking stimulating and helpful educational work (C9). According to a science-based academic, this situation heightened the binary aspect where on the one hand there was this corporate vision while on the other, the actual reality of the university and the situation on the ground (C11). While traditionally the university had a very collegial feel, it became very obvious during this time period that it had changed in becoming "structured and run as a business" (*ibid*).

Work practices changed and administrative tasks came to be part of the expectation of academic work. As remarked upon by a senior business-based academic, such tasks were generally viewed as activities which added no value to the academic endeavour (C1). In completing the questionnaire, half of NUIG respondents which predominantly comprised academics working in arts and humanities, stated that their roles changed between 2008-2014 arising from increased focus on income generation, the influence of university procedures and regulations, time spent dealing with university offices, marketing and promotional activities together with the impact of government policy. Bryson (2004, p.192 as cited by Teelken, 2012) notes that engagement with the academic role has been curtailed for many academics, arising from the increase in business-focused assessments and administrative duties, which lead to significant time being spent on these secondary duties. For an academic working in the arts

and humanities, in the context of 30% fewer staff and 50% more students, they could only deliver on the most necessary parts of their role and the opportunity for more "blue skies thinking" was significantly curtailed (C7).

Tapper and Palfreyman (1998) acknowledge how change at the *meso* level is likely to have a direct impact on the working environment and work experiences. However, for some individuals the impact may be felt less than for others. A business-based academic shared the view that while there was a sense that things had changed, much had also remained the same. The university for example was still recognisable as the university and could still be considered an ivory tower with some justification. Similarly, a number of meetings of internal academic bodies continued as in the past (C4).

The division between groups became more pronounced during this time. In the literature Henkel (2004, p.27) acknowledges that in the allocation of work amongst faculty, disciplines will differ in their approach to equality. An academic working in arts and humanities outlined her view that gender equality declined between 2008-2014 (C7) while another academic was clear that gender issues "were simmering during this time" (C6). While a detailed analysis of gender issues is outside the scope of this study, concern was expressed by an arts and humanities academic, that much committee work and administrative work was left to women in the discipline (C7), which created tension between academic staff.

It became evident that research became more valued than teaching. For two academics based in business and science, this shift towards research impacted the university culture, leading in some quarters to students becoming informally regarded as enemies of the system (C4, C11). Where posts were being taken up by strong research-active appointees, a number were excused teaching responsibilities to allow them to concentrate on their research, a development which did not feel right to this science-based academic (C12).

Henkel (2004) acknowledges the value placed by disciplinary leadership in the context of sustaining the discipline and seeking to ensure that the social, moral and intellectual qualities held within the discipline were maintained. Within NUIG, reference was made by a senior academic based in arts and humanities to the support of line management within the discipline, which made efforts to keep university management happy with the figures, while also endeavouring to keep people happy at the level of the discipline, through the provision of support (C5).

Having explored experiences of the normative and cultural dimension at the organisational level, the following sections set out the experiences of research participants of this dimension at the *micro* level.

7.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level

This section focuses on an analysis of the normative and cultural dimension which includes values, beliefs and practices at the *micro* level. As this examination reveals, the increased attention on the university by the government placed additional pressures on the individual academic. Competition between academics increased and collegial relations deteriorated. Despite efforts to safeguard student learning and engagement and preserve academic identity, the professional logic was increasingly challenged by the strength and influence of the government and corporate logic.

7.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: public perception and the changing research landscape

67% of NUIG based respondents noted that the university as an agent of the state increased between 2008-2014. In referring to his status as a public servant, an interviewee in business was clear about his willingness to assist the university in pursuit of the goals and efforts to deliver for the government (C2). At the *micro* level, as described by an interviewee in arts and humanities "we [academics] were getting a lot of grief...in terms of lots of comments about overpaid underworked public-sector workers...lots of hostility… the idea that we weren't working and had massive holidays" (C6). Individual hardships experienced as a consequence of public sector pay cuts and additional hours with little prospect of promotion and recognition were made more difficult with the messages coming from management and external stakeholders that "we were lazy and didn't know what an easy life we had" (*ibid*).

Kwiek (2013) draws attention to how the changing research policy landscape within Europe which has brought new flows of research funding, are increasingly influencing the strategy of the university, which in turn affects the nature and purpose of academic work. In NUIG, as noted by an arts and humanities academic, autonomy in carrying out research activity as well as the general research operating environment changed significantly during this time where individuals were constantly being asked to link their research to the strategic plans of the university (C7). Within NUIG, undertaking research was difficult terrain, as individuals were obliged to always consider how their proposed research would "play out in the funding community" (C7). For some, applying for grants felt like a futile exercise given that the success

rate was miniscule. For a science-based academic, the individual academic with basic research ideas (whatever the discipline) no longer felt supported (C12).

A science-based academic, reflecting on whether his identity had changed, suggested that due to the growth of larger academic units and research centres since 2008, the role and input of the individual academic from the perspective of the university was probably not as important as previously (C11). This development is described by Bleiklie (2018), who describes how increasingly academic work, which used to be carried out by individuals, is being undertaken by groups. This development has been encouraged by funding arrangements which require work to be undertaken in cross-institutional and/or cross-disciplinary teams

Having explored experiences of the normative and cultural dimension at the individual level in the context of the government logic, the next section sets out the experiences of interviewees of these elements through the lens of the corporate logic.

7.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: pressures and unease

Close to 70% of questionnaire respondents within NUIG agreed that the identity of the university as they had experienced it within their working environment had changed in the period 2008-2014, with the growth in the view of the university as a commercial entity and business organisation. For those in contract positions, as described by a senior academic based in business, there was no security and during this time the work practices of newer academics were very different to those who had security of tenure (C1). These more recent appointees were always the cohort that would volunteer for work to develop their profile and experience and build their CV. But the hunger manifested by the early-stage contract academic, while positive, could also be viewed as competitive and negative (*ibid*). The environment became "visibly far more cut-throat" when towards the end of this time period, a permanent position was advertised in a business discipline. Lynch, (2015, p.199), describes the development within a corporate-based university environment of "an actuarial and calculative mind-set" where relations become "transactional and product led. An academic in business admitted that, conscious of adding to his list of outputs for inclusion in his workload submission as well as for progression purposes, he became quick to volunteer for work that would help him in achieving these objectives (C2).

Two academics in arts and humanities recalled being told continually during this period of the need to do more with less and the sense that "we were fire-fighting a lot of the time" with "a lot of work and not a lot of us to do it" (C6, C7). As described by a senior academic based in

business, the environment became more confrontational and aggressive with the mantra "upwards and onwards and push and push and squeeze and drag and pull", demands being made, often negative in tone and sentiment which became very unpleasant (C1). For a science-based academic, the university became more adversarial while the academic/management divide became much more apparent (C11). As noted by an academic working in business:

> There was a sense of people being squeezed from both ends – those who would be squeezing from below because they needed something from you and in turn you would be squeezing those above you to give it to them – there was a feeling of being stuck in the middle of it all and this situation created strain and difficulty (C1).

While for an academic and his colleagues in science it was felt that university management would "either let us wither or else say [to us], well if you can manage to keep going yourselves, that's great" (C11). In the literature Gumport (1993, p.67 cited by Gumport 2000) notes the discomfort and pressures experienced by academics, particularly those working in areas that may be considered "of insufficient centrality, quality or cost effectiveness". Across all disciplines surveyed in NUIG, academics experienced pressures and unease as a consequence of the requirements set out by university management. A NUIG based questionnaire respondent noted how the university environment had become "more competitive, ruthless and less human" (#66).

For a science-based interviewee, it felt as if there were two universities co-existing within the same entity – firstly, the institution that comprised the scholarly endeavour and the student-facing university and secondly, the corporate university. The corporate university positioned itself at a high level in projecting itself to the world armed with big goals, while within the other version of the university, the focus was on teaching, engaging and bringing students along (C11). As noted by a NUIG questionnaire respondent, universities were "increasing been seen as training institutions rather than educational institutions" (#34). For another academic in science, the university in its search for reputation was seeking to benchmark itself "often unrealistically against other universities" and while the university strategy was there for everyone to read, the beliefs and values as stated in this strategy document were not being felt. The disconnect was obvious particularly in the context of teaching, where the strategy talked about promoting good quality teaching, but it was not "really there on the ground" (C12).

According to a respondent in business, this segregation was very pronounced. In her view these two universities, the corporate and the academic, ran parallel to each other along what appeared to be a very hard line whereas previously both entities had merged into each other (C4). As

remarked upon by this academic, a hard line separated these two universities and this division became starker and more pronounced in NUIG during the six-year period from 2008-2014.

Having explored the experiences of research participants of the normative and cultural dimension at the *meso* level, through both the government and corporate logic, the following section details the perspective at the individual level through the lens of the professional logic.

7.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the changing academic identity

When discussing whether academic identity had changed over this time, one NUIG academic based in business put forward the notion that "as the university changed, all those working within it also changed a bit as well as they adapted to survive in the context of the new environment" (C3).

Kwiek (2013) questions the impact of public sector reform on the continuity and enduring nature of the academic profession. As noted by a business-based respondent, their role during this time became a very different one from that on joining the university several years previously (C4). Job expectations became more intense on all fronts. For one academic based in arts and humanities, this translated into an environment where working relationships became strained (C7). There was a sense that prior to 2008, when everyone was less busy, there had been more time to prepare or tweak a course, but that with increasing workloads there was less opportunity for this.

At the same time everyone was in the same boat, aware that there were fewer colleagues and certain courses that had to be taught; so it was a case, as described by a business-based academic, of "just stepping up and doing your bit and saying well I'm in the army so I'll wear the boots" (C3). A respondent based in science described how difficult it was for the academic who was seeing students every day "who were wondering why their practical classes were being cut, why the discipline did not have enough demonstrators, and why they were not getting to do things that students in previous years got to do" and how it was difficult for academics to have to face students in these circumstances (C13). As highlighted by questionnaire responses, more than half of those surveyed agreed that within the university value system, the quality of the academic endeavour decreased in focus during this time.

According to a senior business-based academic, academic identity did change significantly with the diminishment of academic freedom (C1). It was appreciated that perhaps there was probably a bit too much academic freedom prior to this period in the sense that academics could effectively "do anything they liked almost, go off and research anything they wanted, for as

long as they wanted" (*ibid*). The change came with expectations being raised within the university that academic activity needed to be valuable to more than just the individual academic – it needed to be valuable to the discipline and the wider university (*ibid*). This finding concurs with the questionnaire outcomes with 65% of respondents agreeing that the influence of the academic as a source of authority declined in NUIG during this time. Bleiklie (2018) outlines how academic freedom has become significantly constrained arising from the change in approach by university leaders in considering the interests of a wider stakeholder group, who command more influence and power than the "independent scholar".

A senior interviewee based in a business discipline suggested that despite all the changes that had taken place during this time, a lot of the traditional beliefs held within the university at the individual level stayed intact (C1). He noted that despite all the changes "at the heart of the university and at the individual level", people remained student centred and motivated to provide a good student experience and continued to do the best job possible even to the point of not letting students see the pressures which were building up. At the academic level, according to another business-based academic, while there was a focus on providing students with the service they were paying for, the view was taken that the university was less interested in students than it had been before 2008 (C3). A senior academic based in arts and humanities offered his view that the university had become less personally engaged with students than in previous years (C5).

A science-based academic noted that his identity had not changed on the basis that he did not define himself by his work activity but instead by what he was – an academic (C11). An arts and humanities academic was unequivocal that his identity had not changed during this time. He confirmed that his primary focus was the world of the intellectual where his role was to develop intellect, produce ideas and knowledge and help students to develop their intellect (C8). For this academic, there was a view that for those on ground, within the university sector there is a rooted culture which resists change (*ibid*).

An arts and humanities academic highlighted that the role of humanities-based academics was to be a "counter balance to the driving forces of society" and in challenging the development of capitalist values, they had been perceived as "trouble makers" instead of being left to carry out their professional role of "providing society with a critical voice" (C7). A NUIG based questionnaire respondent commented that they had noted the discourse having become "almost solely one of business" between 2008-2014 (#13). Gumport (2000) asserts that with the arrival

of the corporate discourse which has dominated contemporary organisations, the legitimacy and scope of the individual academic is no longer valid. For her, managerialism removes the idea of the university as "a place for dissent and unpopular ideas, for creativity and the life of the mind, for caring relationships, except as inefficiencies that will likely be deemed wasteful or unaffordable" (*ibid*).

7.4. Conclusion

This chapter provides an analysis of the changes which took place in NUIG during the period 2008-2014. In examining the case study findings, we observe the influence of government expectations together with the corporate developments which occurred as a response to the changing environment context of the university.

Internally within the university the culture has shifted with the move towards a corporate operating environment. Arising from this, concern is felt in the context of emerging values as to whether disciplines and particular areas of research work will survive in the future. In NUIG, we also observe in this time period, a move from being regionally focused towards being more outwardly and competitively focused together with a dichotomy between the picture of the university as presented outwardly and the reality of the situation which exists on the ground.

As procedures and systems develop, it is recognised that these developments impact on academic autonomy and academic freedom. More generally during this six-year period, a division emerges between the new business-focused corporate university and the traditional collegial academic institution and these two entities become increasingly identifiable as two discrete and separate bodies. As a consequence of the changes impacting on the university, it becomes challenging to preserve the professional logic, in particular the traditional practices and values of the university, which cherish the academic endeavour, academic integrity and student learning.

7.5. University Institutional Analysis Framework - NUIG

The findings from this case study which examines the experiences of academic staff working in the National University of Ireland, Galway (NUIG) are summarised below in Table 11, using the framework presented originally in Table 3.

Table 11 University Institutional Analysis Framework – NUIG

Structural and Regulative Dimensions	Government Logic	Corporate Logic	Professional Logic
Strategy	In pursuit of NPM methods, pressures for change are created. Increased collaborative activity between institutions is encouraged. There is a clear drive in delivering for government to operate within new economic parameters and to enhance profile internationally.	The strategic response to constraints in the government resourcing framework lead to a challenging operating environment. Plans increasingly focus on initiating creative and market-focused plans to grow income through an increase in student recruitment activities.	Challenges are experienced arising from the gap between the management agenda and academic endeavour. Efforts are made to retain academic standards amid concerns of increased student numbers, the introduction of rigid programme requirements and less resource capacity.
Structural mechanism and focus	Government budgetary and funding mechanisms forces disciplines to work with increased student numbers within a constrained resourcing environment. Cutbacks create the requirement to "do more with less". A new systems approach is introduced requiring increased compliance with external regulations and legislation.	Managerial-led procedures and systems are developed. A new procedural framework focused on performance management is created. The drive towards 'academic capitalism' focuses on those 'strong' disciplines identified as capable to deliver commercial activity. A clear drive is experienced in developing marketing and promotion systems.	Collegial peer structures weaken as they are replaced by management systems. Pressures to increase student numbers lead to strain on the maintenance of academic standards. With the development of management-led procedures and systems, the opportunity for self-determination in academic work declines.
Source of regulative and structural arrangements	Expectations are set by government which as a powerful agent of influence and change conditions and shapes	Managerial-led systems create a professional operational framework. Formal processes introduce quality and transparency.	Academic autonomy over student learning deteriorates with the growth in formal accreditation requirements and the

	behaviour within the university.		emergence of new formal procedures.
Normative and Cultural Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Focus of activity	An increased focus is placed on growing postgraduate student numbers to garner additional resources from government. Additional reporting on performance to central state authorities seeks to justify resources and value for public investment.	Activities are predominately market led and competitive in focus. Intensive marketing and recruitment activity takes place. Significant activity takes place in enhancing professional and management structures.	Increased vulnerability experienced in some disciplines arising from increase in external scrutiny. 'Strong' and 'weak' disciplines emerge according to their potential to generate resources and enhance university reputation.
Orientation of value system	An increased focus on delivering within the new research operating environment where excellence is determined according to state-led objectives and access to income. Increased scrutiny in delivering financial outcomes is experienced. There is a new focus shown to enhancing standing in international university league tables.	There is a clear growth evidenced in 'market savvy' values and an increased focus on growing postgraduate and international student numbers. The development of new structures and formal procedures delivers increased professionalism, transparency and quality processes.	Collegiality declines and isolation increases as new management systems bring increased formality and reduced scope for academic participation. Increased competition develops with the identification of 'strong' and 'weak' disciplines. The quality of the student experience of the academic endeavour decreases. The legitimacy of the academic critical voice declines.
Focus of behavioural aspects	The changing and challenging operating environment create pressures to work with significantly increased student numbers with less resources to	Practices demonstrate a clear move towards competitive market-place behaviour at all levels. A strong managerial culture is experienced. Work is	An erosion of professional autonomy occurs with the growth in accreditation requirements and formal procedures.

	support the work. There is a strong sense of having to justify to government that resources are being used effectively and efficiently.	considered valuable where it is delivers research funding and increased student numbers.	Opportunities for self-directed, self-regulated, peer-led scholarly work deteriorates and academic work which is no longer valued declines.

Chapter Eight: Analysis of Research Findings

8.1. Introduction

The overarching research question in this study is to identify whether as a consequence of the institutional change driven by government policy, the government, corporate and the professional (academic) logic have changed in prominence at the *meso* and the *micro* levels during the period 2008-2014. In addressing this question, this chapter examines the shared experiences of UL (chapter 5), TCD (chapter 6) and NUIG (chapter 7). It provides an overall analysis of institutional change on both the structural and regulative dimension and the normative and cultural factors within the government, corporate and professional logic in the Irish university during the period.

In the literature, Campbell (2004, p.19 – see p. 16) describes how organisations within a similar institutional environment tend to adopt comparable approaches and activities over time and become isomorphic. While there are commonalities that exist across all three case studies, a number of distinctive experiences can be identified in each of the universities examined. This chapter will analyse the themes common to all the case studies and will also discuss what was unique in the experiences of each.

8.2. The Structural and Regulative Dimension

The findings of this research study confirm that government policy was highly effective in strengthening the structural and regulative dimension of the government logic and the corporate logic at both the *meso* and *micro* levels between 2008-2014. The combined focus on the economic agenda together with the introduction of government favoured NPM ideologies in this six-year period, was instrumental in bringing about significant changes within the university sector. These developments accelerated the implementation of modern business systems and management principles found in the private sector. The productive relationship between both the corporate and the government logic is evidenced within this study where decisions and actions such as performance and output control systems are seen to satisfy the requirements of both of these logics simultaneously. As a direct consequence of government policy, the prominence of both the government and the corporate logic grew substantially in this six-year period.

As presented in Table 12 below, both the government and corporate logic increased in prominence in all three universities; UL, TCD and NUIG at both the *meso* level and *micro*

levels during the period 2008-2014. During this period the professional logic decreased in prominence at both the *meso* and *micro* levels across all universities.

Table 12 – Impact of government policy within the structural and regulative dimensions at the *meso* and *micro* levels

The Structural and Regulative Dimension	**UL**	**TCD**	**NUIG**
The government logic at the *meso* level	↑	↑	↑
The corporate logic at the *meso* level	↑	↑	↑
The professional logic at the *meso* level	↓	↓	↓
The government logic at the *micro* level	↑	↑	↑
The corporate logic at the *micro* level	↑	↑	↑
The professional logic at the *micro* level	↓	↓	↓

8.2.1. Structures and Regulations at the *Meso* Level

The following section examines the research findings relating to structural and regulative changes at the *meso* level. It is here at the mid-level that the discipline is located, between the *macro* perspective at the institutional university level and the individual at the *micro* level.

8.2.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: new rules, scrutiny and control

From the significant body of policy documents, legislative measures, and reports published between 2008-2014, it is evident that the sights of government were focused on reform of the university sector. The most influential instrument implemented by government was the resourcing mechanisms comprising budgetary restriction and resourcing constraints which were instrumental in significantly shaping and constraining structures within the university at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels.

Government-based agents were focused on imposing on the universities their idea of the 'rules of the game' (Bourdieu, 1971,1984 as cited by Scott, 2013, p.221 – see p.16). Arising from the powerful hold which the state exercised over resourcing the sector, the universities had little choice but to comply with state-defined objectives. The carriers of the government logic

primarily took the form of requirements and mechanisms which created a coercive and constraining influence on the university.

The government held a dominant position during this period arising from the reliance which the universities had on the state for resources, in addition to the myriad of state agents including government departments and the HEA (as detailed in chapter 4) that were extremely active during this time in developing and establishing new expectations of the universities.

During the period under review, the key message from government was focused on reform together with the promotion of an ideology of market-managerialism. This set the scene within all three universities for difficult interactions between university management and academic disciplines. At the *meso* level, the effect of coercive drivers for change which included constraints in exchequer-based funding together with the Employment Control Framework (ECF), was powerful and unyielding as illustrated by the stark operating environment and limited resource capacity experienced by disciplines. As described by a NUI based academic, the ECF "was basically a lottery how much your particular section was affected by things like maternity leave, retirements and sickness…all the things which in the past would be managed internally to ensure that no area was disproportionately affected" (C6).

A significant development was the modernisation agenda which set out requirements for the achievement of greater efficiency and economy. This expectation manifested itself in increased control experienced in varying degrees by UL, TCD and NUIG, as outlined in the case study findings. Interviewees across all universities referred to the increased scrutiny, checking and oversight which occurred. A business-based TCD academic, while acknowledging that there was a need for increased rules and procedures in the modern university described the impact on his own university:

> The problem came when the rules and procedures of the game at large were unclear. And they were unclear with the result that nobody quite knew how to play into it. So people played safe and went to the furthest extreme in order to ensure that they wouldn't get shouted at by some Assistant Secretary, or some acting Chairperson of the HEA or run the wrath of Science Foundation Ireland. So the crisis and kow-towing mentality became the way of operating (B1).

Within the university, governance structures increased in prominence at the *meso* level with increased evaluation, control and oversight of academic work. Scrutiny of work extended beyond the university. Government departments, *Oireachtas* committees and the HEA were all identified as having become increasingly focused on the universities, as evidenced by the

growing level of enquiries made into university activity and outputs. Within each university, measurement of academic performance and the imposition of formal standards and evaluative criteria in assessing academic work became the focus of university management. For heads of disciplines this led to the development of additional reporting mechanisms at the *meso* level and an increased focus on providing "hard evidence to the external environment that the institution was being well managed" (B3).

In TCD there was a sense of increased external control and scrutiny of academic work from within the public sector, leading to sympathy for university leadership because of the pressure exerted to deliver for government. In NUIG the experience was perceived rather as internal control led by management without reference to government influence, while in UL, the prominent message was that university leadership was acting on behalf of government agencies. However, some respondents considered that this was not always the case and that a number of changes attributed to government were actually initiated by university leadership.

As scrutiny over work increased so also did the removal of academic expertise from evaluative processes where professionals had previously overseen academic standards. Examples of this included recruitment and promotion schemes and student evaluation systems. The usurping of academic expertise by processes which marginalised or excluded academics led to a decline in the significance of academic knowledge and capability. While the professional role in determining and upholding academic standards became increasingly redundant, this did not stop concerns being expressed particularly in TCD and NUIG around the way decisions impacting on the integrity of scholarly standards were made during this time.

Not only were disciplines expected to work differently but they were also expected to take on new administrative work activity in compliance with new legislative and regulative policy requirements in recording and reporting on work activities. The emergence of these new accountability requirements placed additional pressures on discipline heads. From the research, the impact of these NPM requirements were experienced particularly in NUIG where arising from the tough approach and style taken by university management, expectations requiring compliance were more explicitly stated.

In responding to economic drivers, each of the three universities sought to strategically reorient their activities and resources towards addressing government requirements to contribute more to economic growth and development. In TCD plans intensified to enable specific macroeconomic deliverables required by government such as the production of job ready

graduates. While in UL, where vocational objectives had always been a goal, this activity continued.

With government research funding increasingly becoming tied to academic work of societal value and economic relevance, the focus of research activity changed. As noted by a TCD science based academic "I guess some people were under pressure to maybe do research that they didn't find particularly challenging or a bit pedestrian but it was associated with money" (B9). The case study analysis illustrates the action taken by all three universities in response to government policy in this area. UL for example took swift action to deliver outcomes sought by government, through increasing targeted research activity and by focusing strategy, resources and key appointments, primarily in scientific areas such as IT and Engineering which were considered to be of particular national importance.

Across all three universities, disciplinary areas outside those prioritised by government funding agencies were left feeling excluded and side-lined at the demise of support for basic or "blue skies" research activity. This included some areas of science and universally across arts and humanities disciplines. In UL the outlook for arts and humanities was particularly stark, with the strategic decision of the university not to continue to support PRTLI activity in those disciplines. In NUIG, with increased scrutiny of activity at the *meso* level, disciplines considered weaker in their ability to generate resources and grow the research reputation of the university experienced pressure to deliver and felt increasingly threatened. These developments across the case study universities created tense relationships at the *meso* level between unsupported disciplines and those who were in receipt of institutional support and resources to support scholarly activity.

As a consequence of all these changes, government-led structures and regulations increased in prominence at the *meso* level during the period 2008-2014. While government was instrumental in enabling the corporatisation of the universities, the combined force and impact of structural and regulative arrangements which developed from both the government and the corporate logic (which is examined in the following section) were key factors in bringing about deterioration in the structural and regulative infrastructure of the professional logic (examined later in this chapter).

8.2.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: reorientation towards the market

A significant development across all universities during the period 2008-2014 was the reorientation whereby academic activities became increasingly viewed in resourcing and

monetary terms. As remarked upon by a TCD business academic "I've seen a perversion of the role of senior academics towards grant seeking, rent seeking and finance hunting, regardless of the academic logic underlining that" (B1). While the strategic priorities adopted by the three universities varied in their direction, all were distinctly market-led. The requirement to raise funds and generate commercial income was articulated most clearly in TCD. There, strong tension was experienced between the requirement to raise funds and become market-led and the preservation of core academic standards. The primary strategic response taken to environmental pressures in NUIG was an increased focus outside the university to develop international markets, grow research capital infrastructure and increase international student income. In UL the main plan in responding to the market was to develop research activity which would grow both research and fee income.

An examination of the structural and regulative dimension in all three universities at the *meso* level provides evidence that the university increasingly saw itself as commercial entity and business organisation. Interviewees across all three universities described the growth in influential hierarchical structures and management practices imported from the private sector. With the growth and increasing dominance of these corporate-based structures, academic collegial decision-making arrangements disappeared. While to an external observer the university may have appeared much the same, internally it was very different. Moreover, the raft of changes did not sit comfortably with established professional norms and structures which had long served academic autonomy and collegial peer-based interaction. The increased internal competition for funding and resources produced fragmentation and the growth of dissonance and disunity at the *meso* level.

Co-operation with the new regulative and structural requirements was observed primarily for the purposes of gaining support and resources from university management. The business-focused resourcing strategy of TCD as noted by a science-based academic during this time was one where "if you want these staff you can have them, but you have to generate the income" (B12). This experience was similar across both UL and NUIG. An examination of the experience of different disciplines would indicate that arts and humanities were limited in their ability to engage in income creation. With the focus on resourcing and in an environment where resources were significantly limited, an increasing gap emerged between disciplines – those areas which were considered worthy of investment and those that were not. A situation emerged where the status of disciplines became defined by potential in the marketplace.

An analysis of the case studies evidences that the development of a new commercial-based strategy brought with it increased polarity at the *meso* level; some areas were able to meet the new structural requirements to generate income and enhance reputation within the marketplace, while others were not effectively placed to deliver on these expectations. Division was created within the university at the *meso* level between those that could readily engage in these activities and those who could not do so. As remarked upon by a TCD business based academic:

> Collegiality has been shattered - collegiality, particularly between STEM and arts and humanities and social sciences. A chasm opened up. And despite everything that we would say about all you know 2 tribes or 2 nations are whatever it was … the reality is that people in arts and humanities and social sciences looked at the vast amounts of money going into STEM and just laughed hollowly (B1).

Driven by administrative priorities, the university became an increasingly controlled environment where work was defined, managed and audited and the traditional university system got turned on its head. The function of university management was viewed primarily as enabling the realisation of the government and the corporate logic. Reacting to the dominating commercial-oriented preferences of administration, a frustrated TCD business-based academic remarked:

> All of the kind of approaches to running a business have now been applied in the University sector from having strategic objectives to meeting financial objectives to competing in a global market around certifications and accreditations. All of the impact of that then trickled down across the whole day-to-day working, which made our focus more outside -in as opposed to inside-out (B3).

As a consequence of the development of corporate-based structures and systems, the input of the professional voice at the *meso* level became severely constrained and the strength and influence of the formal structural and regulative infrastructure within the professional logic in the university weakened considerably. This finding is further examined in the next section.

8.2.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the loss of the academic raison d'etre

Along with the nation-state, Scott (2017, p.857 – see p.30) suggests that the profession is one of the most significant carriers and initiators of rule-based systems. However, this research indicates that the professional logic was largely unsuccessful in safeguarding the stability and continuity of professional structures and regulations during the period 2008-2014. This section will analyse this finding in more detail.

With the introduction of a new set of government led and business focused rules within the university, university management became increasingly empowered while influence was effectively drained from the academic community. A number of dominant forces weakened the ability of professional structures to survive and thrive. The academic workforce across all three universities experienced significant reconfiguration during the period 2008-2014. Structural changes initiated by government in the form of budgetary constraints and the ECF created a deficit in academic leadership across all three universities, which led to a weakening in academic structures. The constraints of the ECF together with the focus on market managerialism also caused academic structures to become more disparate, with an increase in casual and short term positions.

The expanding gap between the profession and the corporation was exacerbated by these changes coupled with the increasing number of academics leaving their professional roles to take up attractive higher paid administrative roles. This led to a deterioration in the influence of the academic community. These developments also helped foster the view that with the growth in corporate infrastructure and the deterioration in the structure of the academic profession at the *meso* level, members of the academic profession had become "second-class citizens" (A1).

Managerial structures and evaluative mechanisms were also highly influential at the *meso* level in overpowering regulative and structural aspects of the professional logic. With the introduction of administrative control in key areas of professional work which had traditionally enjoyed academic autonomy, such as the development of teaching programmes, the potential for peer-led collegial systems to independently oversee this work was removed. A NUIG business academic in describing the deterioration in academic autonomy noted:

> Autonomy has been eroded. Within the teaching area and probably within the research area, you have autonomy up to a point. But then accreditation purposes and new rules, would put limits on that. So there's much more regulation in terms of learning outcomes and assessment processes. And it's become much more rigid in terms of how you do what you do (C4).

One common view as articulated by a NUIG research participant based in arts and humanities, lamented that the new managerial system described as "over-bureaucratizing education" (C7) was now driving academic work and effectively disadvantaging students and academic learning. Disquiet at increased involvement of management in oversight and development of programmes and evaluation of teaching, was particularly marked in TCD. Academic work

moved from being self-determined to being pre-determined. While previously academic disciplines had enjoyed autonomy and governance through peer-led collegial systems, the structural and regulative interface between academia and management imposed a new level of control not previously experienced.

Across the universities, the development of formal assessment criteria in making academic appointments and promotions which mirrored expectations of government and the corporation further removed power and influence from the profession. Career development mechanisms were remodelled to become performance-led and metric based. This was an important driver in destabilising the profession and in creating a new breed of academic across all institutions. As noted by a senior NUIG academic based in business:

> Performance management became more formal. Productivity returns and targets became more formal. And the impact of meeting them or not meeting them became black and white (C1).

The space and opportunity for meaningful structured professional engagement disappeared with the introduction of managerialist structures which transformed academic meetings and removed the opportunity for "staff to have a voice, or critical debate" (A6), leaving a void within the profession. Capacity to preserve and maintain collegial systems was also reduced by the changing nature of academic community, where the size and composition of the profession had deteriorated and where workload and administrative requirements increased. With no real basis of authority and autonomy, professional structures lost their *raison d'etre* and without a solid and strong base of influence, the combined strength of the consensus-based collective dissipated. As a result, collegiate professional structures and systems were no longer a stable and enduring feature at the *meso* level. Across all three case studies, with the demise of traditional consultative structures, academic collaboration, a key identifying feature of professional based work deteriorated.

In the literature while Kwiek (2013, in citing March and Olsen, 1989 – see p.36), refer to the ability of the profession to survive in recent years due to its histories being encoded into "rules and routines", the case study findings do not support this view. The research demonstrates that across the three universities surveyed, internal professional organisational structures significantly altered and as expressed by an academic based in UL the work of academic committees was downgraded:

> The university developed into a more managed institution, so that the feeling was that what we did at faculty board, we just pushed paperwork… I was on Academic Council for part of this time and it grew to be a similar body - the second-highest committee in the University. It's a statutory committee but we were pushing paper. We weren't discussing things such as why are we here? what are we doing? what is our role in Irish society? (A5).

Some heads of discipline were effective however in protecting elements of the professional logic. Examples of this include the continuation of structures which enable collegial activity such as disciplinary meetings promoting scholarly work. The researcher would contend that where the profession has prevailed at the *meso* level, this is due primarily to loose coupling; the ability at the *meso* level for disciplines to remain separate and removed from some of the influences of the government and the corporate logic.

A further factor which contributed to the weakening of the professional logic at the *meso* level was the actions of some disciplinary heads who readily realigned to new government and corporate led requirements, in pursuit of additional resource capacity to progress the development of the discipline. Competition for resources, funding and staffing created an increasing divide amongst disciplines, which furthered the demise of university wide professional peer-led collegial systems.

While the research would indicate that institutional change between 2008-2014 was experienced more at the level of heads of disciplines than by individuals working within the discipline– it was at the *micro* level that the strength of feeling in opposition to structural and regulative changes impacting the professional logic was most powerful. This will be seen in the following section.

8.2.2. Structures and Regulations at the *Micro* Level

The focus of this section is on the experiences of structure and regulations at the *micro* level. The questionnaire undertaken in 2016 asked respondents whether the content and focus of their role as an academic had changed during this six-year period. 64% of all respondents indicated that their role had changed. Of this number;

- 79% of participants agreed that there had been more time spent dealing with university structures and central offices;
- 72% of those who indicated that their role had changed in content and focus agreed that there had been more focus on the influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols;

- 69% of respondents agreed that there had been more focus on income generation opportunities;
- 62% agreed that time spent on marketing and promotional activities had increased.

Furthermore, approximately a third of those surveyed indicated that autonomy in undertaking research and self determination around research activities decreased between 2008-2014 and that choice around teaching areas covered had also been reduced in this period.

However, a significant 26% of respondents indicated that the content and focus of their roles had not changed. There is value in exploring this finding further within this study on institutional change. The greater proportion of respondents (53%) were based in NUIG, with a third in TCD and the remaining 13% in UL.

While direct impact of change may not have been experienced in the content and focus of their roles for this 26%, it is evidence from the research that other changes were experienced by these respondents. Two-thirds of this group experienced more time spent dealing with university structures and central offices while 60% of this group experienced more focus on income generation opportunities and 53% felt that there was greater influence from university procedures, regulations and protocols. In addition, 47% of staff in this category agreed that they had experienced the impact of government policy and regulations during this period.

In addition, almost half of those who experienced no changes in the content and focus of their own roles identified that in their experience, changes in the university value system had taken place; and all of these respondents agreed that the university both as a business organisation and a commercial entity had increased in focus.

As we will observe at the *micro* level, the government and corporate logic within the structural and regulative dimension increased in prominence during the period 2008-2014, while structures and regulations inherent within the professional logic decreased in standing, across all three universities examined during this six-year time frame.

8.2.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: delivering state driven outcomes

An analysis of experiences at the *micro* level confirm that an increase in government-imposed control structures focused on the oversight of academic work was experienced within each of the three universities.

Across all three universities, new structural arrangements led by government requirements created a myriad of rules and procedures with which individuals felt obligated to comply. The new rules-driven environment which saw the introduction of explicit performance measures and workload management, fed into all aspects of academic work at the *micro* level. A significant opportunity to exercise autonomy in choosing research activity disappeared with the implementation of government research-funding mechanisms directed towards specific areas of economic and societal relevance. However, this was experienced less in NUIG than in the other two universities. At the *micro* level, the experience of the government logic was increasingly constraining, a consequence of state requirements for greater accountability, efficiency and "a more managed, value for money environment" (B3).

The research findings reveal the existence of a two-tier research system across all the universities examined, one predominantly based in the sciences addressing economic and societal needs as prescribed by government and the other situated in some areas of science as well as throughout the arts and humanities which, despite creating knowledge and adding to intellectual discovery, is viewed of lower value. As research-funding opportunities became concentrated in particular areas, growing level of unease was expressed particularly in TCD and UL, that as a consequence, academics were in danger of becoming research inactive and increasingly more isolated in the context of their research work.

Experiences of the government logic at the *micro* level vary. While some academics were unaware of the extent of changes led by government by virtue of being protected by their disciplinary heads, others had personal experience of being caught up by chance in the ECF recruitment moratorium or the changed funding environment. Descriptions were presented across the case studies of individuals whose career development was thwarted by the moratorium on recruitment and promotion and the transformed research funding environment. Accounts were also given of colleagues who left the Irish university because of government actions, and other left behind who, because of government-led resourcing changes, felt marginalised and mistrustful of the university and government actors.

Across the universities examined, it was evident too that public enquiry into academic work had increased when, with the deterioration of national finances, the spotlight was placed on value yielded for state investment in public services such as education. A UL based business academic in describing what had taken place remarked:

> I think that there may have been a mind-set change at the top, the HEA and the government, that we better start getting these people to start earning their bread. So there was a lot more talk at least around my colleagues here that we better start producing some research… (A3).

Research participants described being questioned by members of the public and the media as to their own contribution and the value of their academic work in delivering economic and societal outcomes, including the capacity of their academic programmes to create work ready graduates. According to respondents, there was a lot of negatively expressed towards public servants during this period. Faced with this level of interest and enquiry, increasing levels of discomfort were experienced at the *micro* level and many individuals responded to the public attack by avoiding public engagement.

In assessing exposure to the government logic at the *micro* level, the case study data indicates that government-led regulations and structures were most keenly experienced at the *micro* level by distinct groups across the universities:

(i) those encountering the day to day scrutiny of finance and receipts and work activity who experienced the feeling of "being under the magnifying glass" (A8);

(ii) those who were either active or endeavouring to be active in securing government research funding and who in seeking or managing funded research activity experienced greater scrutiny over expenditure;

(iii) those senior academics who held headships or positions of leadership responsibility and who were responsible for managing resources, performance management and the compilation of discipline-based data for reporting up through the university to government oversight bodies and state agencies.

It was evident that at the *micro* level, while the impact of government-led changes was strong for some, the influence of the structural and regulative dimension of the government logic was not universally experienced by academics who, as described by one of those interviewed, had not "stepped up to the plate" and engaged with new performance requirements (B1). In addition, those who remained protected within disciplinary structures by their heads remained less aware of these regulative and structural changes. However, as indicated by the research findings, the greater proportion of those at the *micro* level did experience an increase in the

regulative and structural dimension of the government logic. The following section will examine findings relating to the corporate logic at this *micro* level.

8.2.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: recognition and reward in the new marketplace

The change in direction within the university from the intellectual to the market and from knowledge to money, was accompanied by a similar re-focusing in the systems and structures established to recognise, recruit and acknowledge achievement at the *micro* level. Increasingly in this corporate, business oriented environment, there were indications that the academic role had become less about professional scholarly and collegial endeavours and more about delivering to the market.

The potential for recognition or reward was increasingly identified from the research findings as a stimulus to individual academics to engage with or pursue a particular activity. For example, the implementation of a tenure track appointments process in UL together with the predominance of contract based appointments during this time period, created a singularly competitive and performance driven environment.

The research indicates the emergence of distinct divisions at the *micro* level. Some academics were driven to align their work activities with criteria for advancement and were consequently observed by colleagues "to neglect some of the things that they should be doing" (A11), i.e. work which was not readily recognised for career development purposes. While the work of some academic colleagues was sought after, recognised and readily funded, it was acknowledged that there was a large number of individuals, whose academic endeavour did not meet these criteria. These two separate groups were referred to as 'winners' and 'losers'. Within this increasingly pressurised, performance-oriented competitive environment, tensions emerged amongst individuals as academics became less tolerant of colleagues who they considered to be either less productive or inattentive in carrying out their professional duties and responsibilities. At this *micro* level, this research also identifies how some academics became more ambitious and single-minded - viewing their colleagues not as collaborators but as competitors.

In this new environment, the focus of research activity narrowed towards the generation of income and the production of highly cited publications which enhanced the university's positioning in league tables. The profile given to research activity which was not seen to deliver these outcomes required declined. Without effective resourcing or support systems to

enable this work, many of those whose work was not considered as fund-worthy, were left feeling vulnerable and unsupported. More and more these individuals became frustrated as a result of engaging in work which was regarded as "futile activity" (C7). This study also identifies a small group at the *micro* level who in defiance of expectations, ignored incentives and requirements to adapt to new market-based systems and continued to undertake research work according to their own professional ideals, knowing that this work would not be acknowledged or recognised in the university setting.

The role expectations of the academic changed during this period. A new relationship emerged between student evaluations and performance measurement which re-defined the relationship between the professional academic and the student while also creating pressure at the *micro* level to deliver student satisfaction. This led to some academics to become less focused in their teaching, on developing traditional academic knowledge and skills and, instead inclined to give students what they wanted rather than what they should be learning (B3). While new marketing responsibilities did not sit comfortably with the professional academic, student recruitment activities and conducting external-facing outreach activity, were no longer of little consequence – instead such activities became what were considered key academic tasks and criteria for appointment and promotion purposes.

Among activities identified by many academics across the universities as a recent though unwelcome addition to their work, was the recruitment of students in order to generate income. Nonetheless, those in senior positions described being actively engaged in income-generating activity to benefit both their own work and that of their discipline. On the other hand, individuals who did not hold particular roles of responsibility, demonstrated less awareness of, or commitment to, the commercial expectations brought into existence by the corporate logic. Others at the *micro* level in describing how they had reluctantly complied with or chose not to engage with corporate based endeavours such as outreach and fund raising activity, indicated that their main focus was to continue working in the same manner as they had prior to 2008, while realising that this would possibly jeopardise future access to career development opportunities.

Research findings across the universities indicate that as the reach of the corporate logic extended, resources and promotional opportunities were presented at the *micro* level to those whose work was attractive to the market. This lead to the creation of an uneven playing field with individuals being considered as more or less valuable to the institution, as a consequence

of whether their work was marketable. This in turn led to divisions and a growing dissonance amongst colleagues within and between disciplines. The research specialism and market attractiveness of an academic's work increasingly determined the success of the academic. Reflecting the significance of this issue in the current environment, a number of individual academics participating in the research study readily identified themselves as being strong or weak in their capacity to deliver in the changing market place.

Although experiences of the corporate logic varied, it was universally acknowledged that during the period 2008-2014, the structural and regulative dimension within the corporate logic increased in prominence at the *micro* level.

8.2.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: the declining influence of the academic scholar

At the *micro* level a notable proportion of those who completed the questionnaire experienced change in the content and focus of their role as an academic staff member between 2008-2014, with 50% of those in NUIG experiencing change compared to 74% of respondents from UL and 68% in TCD. Respondents in NUIG reference how reform had commenced within the university in the years prior to 2008 – hence the lower figure compared to UL and TCD.

Across all three universities research participants referred to increased workloads, and additional administrative responsibilities. The significant growth in student numbers in NUIG and UL was considered a particularly onerous additional burden in the context of deteriorating resources and reduced staff numbers. The pressure of having to obtain support for research, larger class sizes, increasing numbers of international students requiring additional learning and pastoral supports and the new focus on the student as a customer, were difficulties faced across the universities. While coping with these challenges, concerns were raised in relation to the limited time, support and opportunity available to carry out research work which was seen to be traditionally at the heart of the professional endeavour.

Academic freedom during the period under review decreased, a consequence of the increasing expectations and requirements made of academic work and the declining influence of the academic as a custodian of academic teaching standards. An NUIG arts and humanities based academic outlined how teaching had changed to the disadvantage of the learning process:

> The way the courses are delivered, the way that student records have to be administered, how far in advance course details have to be circulated, books and stuff have to be distributed, that has changed a lot and that has become more restricted definitely than before. For example, exam papers have to go in almost 9 months in advance which I

> find problematic because it does not leave any leeway if the course develops in a different direction. You have to make the course content more strict than you would ideally want in an academic freedom, encouraging critical thinking way (C7).

In a word, the status and influence of the independent scholar visibly had dissipated with the increased authority and control evidenced from the corporate and government logic. Furthermore, there was a strong sense gleaned from this research study that the academic was no longer the trusted, accountable professional of former times, but now existed in a new operational environment which increasingly featured management control over academic work and additional scrutiny and oversight from government agencies. A TCD science based academic described the development of an audit culture as "a 21st century disease" which "brought with it …this idea that we need to be scrutinised and inspected" (B9). Moreover, collegial structures which traditionally operated in support of self-directed intellectual discovery, academic integrity and autonomy, became increasingly redundant during this time as the focus of academic work became re-directed and dominated by corporate and government based requirements.

The level of concern expressed at the changes in academic work varied between the case universities, with the strongest concern raised in TCD around the demise of individual autonomy, the removal of opportunities for self-directed work and independence and the maintenance of academic standards. Within NUIG, there was a general sense of isolation and disappointment expressed at the creation of formal organisational structures, which removed any opportunity for academic discussion and liaison with colleagues across disciplines. Research activity became more important during this time frame in particular within UL, which had previously focused more on teaching.

Within all three universities, the way individuals previously had enjoyed working independently, self-regulating and self-determining their work activity dissipated. There was also a general sense of loss expressed at the demise of the profession's primary focus on teaching and research and a frustration expressed at the growing administrative burden carried by individuals. As remarked upon by a TCD business based academic "when I came into this area of work, I never signed up to spend all my time traipsing round the world to India and China selling degree programs" (B3).

At this *micro* level with the re-direction of academic work, the professional logic, visible in small pockets of the institution persevered due to the determination and concerted efforts of individual scholars, who continued to work actively to support student learning and thereby

validate their academic endeavour. This was in spite of difficulties faced by structures and systems which in the view of the individual academic, did not support this professional activity.

Moreover, the pursuit of research by individual scholars uncovered the presence of alternative, supportive professional networks many of which were external to the universities, based abroad and enabled in many instances through technological means. As remarked upon by a TCD business based academic "I think that my external relations are by far the most important in terms of my identity as an academic" (B3). These peer-led collegial structures were described as the "lifeline" for many individuals in continuing to enable their scholarly work. This finding resonates with Krücken et al., (2013 – see p.54) who has identified how research collaboration amongst peer networks has become particularly valued, as the enduring nature of such relationships have enabled academics to continue to identify and engage with their professional roles.

It is evident from this study that at the *micro* level, the prominence of the structural and regulative dimension of government and the corporate logic grew during this six-year period, while the structures, systems and procedures within the professional logic lost much authority and influence. The following section examines the research findings in relation to the normative and cultural dimension.

8.3. The Normative and Cultural Dimension

In the university, values which comprise a core element of the normative and cultural dimension, legitimise particular actions bringing particular institutional logics to prominence. During the period 2008-2014 new practices and activities came increasingly to the fore as economic and public service-led behaviours and values from the government logic became firmly established in the university and connected with managerial and business-focused values and practices from the corporate logic.

An analysis of the case study universities confirms that the cultural and normative dimensions of the government and corporate logic increased at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels during the period under review. The experience of professional logic varied amongst the case study universities. While professional values, practices and focus of activity declined at the *meso* level in NUIG and UL, within TCD the normative and cultural dimension withstood some of the changes taking place, so that while the professional logic weakened its position within the

discipline, the loss of professional norms and values was limited overall. Table 13 present the findings relating to the normative and cultural dimension.

At the *micro* level, the experiences of professional values, practices and activities offer a different outcome amongst the case study universities. What emerges is while the normative and cultural dimension within the professional logic weakened in part in UL and NUIG, it did retain some of the values system related to professional identity in these two universities at the *micro* level during this six-year time period. Within TCD, practices, behaviours and values at the level of the individual remained stable. The rationale for these findings will be discussed in section 8.3.2.3.

Table 13 – Impact on the normative and cultural structural dimensions at the *meso* and *micro* levels

The Normative and Cultural Dimension	**UL**	**TCD**	**NUIG**
The government logic at the *meso* level	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑
The corporate logic at the *meso* level	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑
The professional logic at the *meso* level	↓↓	↓	↓↓
The government logic at the *micro* level	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑
The corporate logic at the *micro* level	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑
The professional logic at the *micro* level	↓	↔	↓

8.3.1. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Meso* Level

During the period 2008-2014 university disciplines were encouraged by university management generally through their head of discipline, to embrace and adopt the values and beliefs coming from key government and corporate enterprise. Professional cultural and normative elements focused on enhancing scholarly reputation and discovering and imparting knowledge were significantly challenged by the influx of these other normative and cultural influences within the institutional field.

In the questionnaire completed in 2016, 78% of all respondents agreed that the value system of the university changed in the period 2008-2014. The significance of the changes experienced in the university value system is set out below. Of these respondents:

- 98% agreed that internal economic and efficiency metrics increased in focus;
- 89% agreed that competition and market share indicators increased in focus;
- 89% agreed that management structures, rules and procedures increased in focus;
- 85% agreed that operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness as part of the university value system grew in focus;
- 69% agreed that fee-for-service and competitive market deliverables increased in emphasis;
- 57% agreed that the focus on the quality of the academic endeavour reduced in focus.

The questionnaire findings acknowledge that managerial and market-led values and practices developed considerably in this six-year period, initiating a notable change in the university's value orientation away from the professional logic and towards alignment with government and business-focused activities and practices.

8.3.1.1. The Government Logic at the *Meso* Level: changing values for the knowledge economy

It is evident from an analysis of the research findings that as noted by Vorley and Nelles (2008 – see p.47), a new vision of the university was emerging as an engine of the knowledge economy. The emergence of the new value proposition for university education as detailed in chapter four, changed the focus of student learning towards preparing for work and delivering for the knowledge economy. This re-oriented academic disciplines towards the provision of vocational training, a concept which was often at odds with academic values, although UL had always been focused on this endeavour.

This created a situation where across all the universities examined, particular disciplines, primarily those in business and the sciences were considered more valuable to the university and the wider institutional field in carrying out work which was seen as having strategic national importance. Meanwhile other disciplines predominantly those in the arts and humanities, were less valued in their potential to deliver.

The influence of the changing national context was also seen across the three case studies in relation to student recruitment and the composition of teaching programmes. Student recruitment was oriented towards growing fee-paying student numbers, while teaching programmes were shaped to deliver work ready graduates. At the same time, activity directed towards students-as-consumers grew with the emergence of academic consumerism. Arising from such factors as competition for fee-paying students, activity increased around growing the reputation of the discipline, climbing the league tables, participating in accreditation processes and paying more attention to the outcomes of student evaluation and satisfaction surveys. Whereas previously the professional logic had occupied a more prominent position, in the new customer oriented, environment, the student now held a less influential position as learner and recipient of disciplinary expertise.

The research findings confirm that values, practices and behaviours associated with the government logic increased at the *meso* level. The influence of NPM was instrumental in redefining the mission of the university and in shaping changes in values, practices and norms at the level of the discipline. As noted by a business based UL academic, "public institutions had to prove that they were performing...performance evaluation, performance assessment, performance whatever" (A1).

With heightened pressure from the HEA and other state agencies to achieve specific outcomes such as value for money, increased productivity and efficiencies, the organisation and work of the discipline became more constrained and narrow in focus. This requirement to do 'more with less' was experienced particularly in NUIG. In this difficult operating environment, with government constraints on staffing and reduced exchequer funding year on year, disciplines experienced a growing dependency on growing income to enable their survival. While it is the view of the researcher that the application of the government logic was generally consistent across all universities, the particular approach taken by each case study university and within disciplines, in embedding the corporate logic varied somewhat in tone. This will be further discussed in the following section.

8.3.1.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Meso* Level: changing language and business behaviour

At the *meso* level, analysis of the case studies reveals a drive within the universities towards adopting the values and beliefs of others within the wider university sector and institutional field, and following the example of the corporate world. Across all the case studies, it was evident that a key value of the university was to make money. This was particularly the

experience of disciplines in TCD. Disciplines increasingly made more decisions with a commercial mind-set and many senior academics interviewed described being permitted to grow staffing resources by committing to bring in extra income in the form of valuable fee-paying students. The language of the university changed. The following reflections of a NUIG based arts and humanities academic was a common view held across the university case studies:

> The language used in some communications reflected these managerial values focused on metrics and quantity over quality. Also it reflected private sector culture...while the library previously had readers, the library then had users…. It's a depersonalisation in a way… almost a dissonancy thing and it is really the language of metrics as opposed to using terms that describe what people actually do (C9).

In seeking approval for new academic programmes, proposals were pitched to university management in terms of attractiveness to international students, who would bring significant income to the university. There was confidence expressed by a number of heads at the *meso* level that this corporate justification would appeal to university management considerably more than an academic-based approach.

A gap emerged between disciplinary groups as a direct result of this concept of marketplace value. While some disciplines, mainly business and some science based areas, were afforded more attention and support by management, given their potential to deliver commercial and market-based outcomes, others in areas of arts and humanities and science considered they had little potential to offer in the new marketplace. As a result, these areas felt they lost out on management support and consideration. At the *meso* level this situation bred feelings of tension, envy and resentment directed towards both supported disciplines and university management.

The research also indicates that business and science disciplines who had experience of external engagement with industry and business, were more open to engaging with marketplace values and behaviours than other disciplines, having themselves been already exposed to these corporate based principles and practices in their external interactions. Hence these disciplines more readily adopted and adapted to these values within the university setting. In the literature, the suggestion is made that the mind-set and opinion towards any one logic is driven by education and professional experience (Bourdieu, 1980; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983 as cited by Pache and Santos, 2013 – see p.24). This research study evidences how some academics interpreted their role in a corporate and government-based frame of reference, arising from

their socialisation and experience of these logics, while others retained the traditional professional view of the academic.

Experiences of institutional changes varied according to the approach and language used by the head of discipline in communicating the university's values and expectations. Within UL, some at the *meso* level experienced fear while others reported protection from the changes taking place. The approach adopted by university leadership was a key factor in supporting the development of the corporate logic and the sustainability of the professional logic. NUIG was represented by stronger communications which at the *meso* level were viewed as "very managerial" and hard in tone and here the academic/managerial divide became particularly pronounced. The final examination in this section is a review of the professional logic at the *meso* level.

8.3.1.3. The Professional Logic at the *Meso* Level: the new academic, leadership, fear and freedom

An analysis of the research findings evidences some weakening of academic values and practices at the *meso* level, particularly across UL and NUIG, while this was limited in TCD. Across all three universities, professional values, practices and the concept of academic identity was changing during the period 2008-2014 with the imposition of managerial values and government-led ideals which promoted economic and public service-led practices and corporate based, performance-led behaviours.

From the study, it is evident that academic values were changing particularly with the new generation of academic colleagues recruited since 2008. This group held a different view of academic values, practices and behaviours – one that was more consistent with the state and managerial promoted norms around academic work and performance; the delivery of measurable output, together with the focus on marketing and promotion activities, raising income and working in a competitive environment. This development had the effect of creating division at the *meso* level, where some individuals within disciplines had bought into, albeit some reluctantly, the concept of the new academic professional while others were not.

A small number of respondents across the university lamented the demise of the professional voice. This was a due to a fear which developed in speaking out which was acknowledged by a TCD academic who stridently announced:

> I have the advantage of being a fellow so that gives me a formal right to speak out. I am aware that it jeopardises promotions. There is clear evidence of that. You make a choice. I am at an age and a stage where I think I've made my choice (B6).

For those who were in a more vulnerable position, options were limited. As noted by a UL arts and humanities academic:

> There was a lot less choice, you were doing it because we were told to do it. And if you demurred, we have to. And usually funding might be brought up or there wouldn't be funding for your job. And that was brought up at lot of faculty boards. "Well if people don't want to do this, then be no more money to pay your salaries". So it became quite explicit, the level of threat (A5).

However, there was no evidence gleaned from this study that the profession possessed the strength, the will and cohesion necessary to challenge the introduction and diffusion of government and corporate-based values and behaviours at the *meso* level. The professional logic lacked influence in the face of a number of powerful forces. These included management style, conflict over resources, workload pressures as well as the negativity projected from society generally and state actors in particular towards the academic profession. As a consequence, the values, practices and behaviours within the professional logic weakened at the *meso* level.

An examination of the case studies suggests that work in some disciplines primarily in the arts and humanities and some areas in science, managed to withstand a number of the cultural and normative changes that were taking place within the wider university environment and to preserve professional values. This was achieved by maintaining quality standards at the professional/student interface and by continuing to engage locally in disciplinary meetings, which enabled the survival of collegial work practice and professional values. Leadership in these matters, in many instances came from academic heads across all case study universities who prized their role in sustaining the discipline and safeguarding the professional logic. A senior TCD arts and humanities academic was keen to point out the continued work within the profession in the following comment:

> My feeling about all the institutional and professional changes is that we still managed to educate people and we still managed to help students to discover their interests and pursue them but it wasn't because of improvements, it was in spite of improvements (B8).

There was also evidence within the study of some within the profession particularly those in headship positions, exercising institutional ambidexterity, (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013 – see p.23) a tool which enabled preservation of some of the normative and cultural dimensions

inherent within the professional logic to continue, alongside those values and practices originating from the government and the corporate logic. This approach was most evident in the approach taken by senior academics across the three universities in their efforts to "keep university management happy…while also endeavouring to keep people happy at the level of the discipline", through the provision of professional support (C5). This mechanism which enables the co-existence of potentially conflicting logics is reflected in the words of a senior academic in TCD who described having to translate management's message about raising income in such a manner as "not to lose sight of our academic mission" (B12).

For some at the *meso* level, there was a strong sense of isolation and frustration expressed in response to the newly promoted university identity. For an Arts and Humanities TCD based academic:

> There's a feeling that we really in Arts have to push for everything. It's as if we've been denigrated. I would go on to the university website every day because I have to go via it to get into student information. All the stuff that is showcased ... It all seems to be STEM (B7).

Some working in disciplines at the *meso* level, did not readily accept the university in its emerging corporate or state-led frame and sought to continue to exercise aspects of their professional norms and behaviours. As noted by NUIG arts and humanities based academic:

> The direction of my research was very free…our head of department gave us complete freedom in that respect… but I saw a certain pressure in Arts, that models that work for Science had been applied to us…for instance this need for continuous funding (C8).

This approach demonstrates the concept of loose coupling where the university seeks to adapt to environmental influences, while change is not actually occurring in some quarters. Through the influence of loose coupling as these findings show, professional values and behaviours endure in particular quarters of the university, despite institutional change taking place more generally within the institution.

However as evidenced by the research findings, normative and cultural elements comprising values, practices and activities within the professional logic effectively weakened at the *meso* level. A factor which accelerated this development, was the disconnect experienced both within and between disciplines, with groupings at the *meso* level actively moving to identify with the changing university context, while a small group remained behind and continued to exercise professional practices in the shadow of the institution. This finding is examined further in the next section where the experience at the *micro* level is considered.

8.3.2. The Normative and Cultural Dimension at the *Micro* Level

In seeking to examine the impact of government policy within the university, this final section provides an analysis of the experiences of values, practices and behaviours at the *micro* level.

As the research findings reveal, norms and culture originating from government and the corporate logic became embedded at the *micro* level, as a consequence of the new orientation imposed on academic work. As a result, across all the case study universities, the normative and cultural dimension became more prominent within the corporate and government logic.

The experiences of the professional logic at the *micro* level amongst the case study universities differ. While within UL and NUIG practices, values and behaviours of the professional logic were challenged at the *micro* level, some fundamental professional values and behaviours, integral to the concept of personal values and professional identity, remained unchanged within TCD. However, across all universities examined, as shown in Table 13 the weakening of the normative and cultural dimension within the professional logic was less pronounced at the *micro* level than at the *meso* level. This was due to the enduring influence of the individual academic's professional value system.

8.3.2.1. The Government Logic at the *Micro* Level: engagement and reorientation.

Following from the setting of new expectations around academic work and the creation of a new government and corporate-led value system, institutional culture was transformed across all case study universities at the *micro* level. Experiences of the government logic at the *micro* level varied within the case study universities. Some individuals continued to concentrate on their teaching and research work, and were either largely unaware of, or inattentive to the changing focus of government reform, which increasingly directed academic work towards the economic and marketplace agenda. Others understood the changing context and to varying degrees engaged with the values promoted by government, particularly where increased engagement with the new government agenda was embedded in changes made to appointment and promotion criteria and access to research opportunities. The changing value of work was noted by a senior science based UL academic who commented:

> Teaching wasn't recognised in the same way. If you were not doing research, you were not as valuable to the University. Those types of things were very hard for people to work with, particularly if that was the way they had come in into the university (A14).

It was evident that the values, norms and behaviours involved in socialising academics into academic work changed during this time, with heightened value attributed to PhD qualifications and research output. An increased focus was also given to the promotion of

publishing research for the purposes of enhancing the position of the university in ranking league tables. In addition, as new behavioural norms and cultural expectations were set out at the *meso* level, such as developing outreach activity with the potential to raise the university's public profile, there was evidence that these increasingly became understood and accepted at the *micro* level as the way things are done. Such changes occurred despite expressions of resentment and reluctance occurring across all three universities.

With greater attention paid to research productivity and the quantification of research outputs in terms of income or quality publications, and with research activity becoming increasingly a competitive and outputs-oriented process, behaviours at the *micro* level changed. This research study records that while some individuals readily re-oriented towards engaging in these changing activities, dissonance arose amongst others who were either unable or unwilling to link their research to government requirements or available funding sources at the *micro* level.

At the *micro* level, economic and political led values and practices associated with the government logic grew in prominence. The following section considers the positioning of corporate led behaviours, norms and values at the *micro* level.

8.3.2.2. The Corporate Logic at the *Micro* Level: performance measurement, competition and diverse responses

The case study findings describe the re-orientation of academic work at the *micro* level. In the literature, Parker (2011 – see p.44) suggests that institutional actors have a choice in either aligning with or decoupling from a particular institutional practice. For the academic professional, this presents the option of engaging with the managerial system or alternatively in retreating from its influence.

Across all three universities, research participants described the new performance based environment and observing colleagues in varying levels of engagement with new university requirements. An UL academic in science described a colleague who had previously worked in industry and in joining the university "had started to play the corporate game…every opportunity to do that she's in there…this impact thing" (A11). While a TCD science based academic lamented that it was "harder to get along and just do what you're interested in… publishing and trundling along as a middle of the road" (B11).

The working environment became increasingly competitive across all universities (A6, A8, A13, B1, B11, C2, C10), a development which was "demoralising…which killed off a bit of collegiality amongst certain groups" (A8, B10). The atmosphere changed and became more

uncompromising and business focused. While the operating environment was characterised as aggressive in NUIG (C1, C7) during this period, some of those interviewed across UL and NUIG also recorded a sense of fear when encountering university management. Pressures to continue academic work within a deteriorating and pressurised resourcing environment was a particular challenge. Resources required to do even the most basic academic work such as office stationary were in very short supply particularly in NUIG and UL, as was money to undertake research visits and attend academic conferences both within Ireland and in Europe. This new environment created an increasing individualistic view towards resourcing, with some academics who had raised income through increasing fee paying students asking "what is being done with my money?" (A8).

There was a sense expressed particularly in NUIG and TCD of a disconnect between an individual's own scholarly work at the individual level and the focus and approach of the university in managing the individual academic. As noted by a TCD science based academic:

> When you begin to feel monitored like that… a sort of resentment begins to creep in and you become more strategic in your use of time and so levels of collegiality reduce. And that's reflected in terms of things that will be extra-curricular activities that people do. People still do it but there's less people around now doing that sort of stuff because is no credit for it and you have to account for what you're doing. I think when you start to feel that you are being scrutinised… if anything it then makes you want to do less than to do more (B9).

For academics, particularly those at a more senior level in both TCD and NUIG, and for those in UL at all levels, the university performance-focused environment featured significantly in their experiences during this six-year period. As a senior UL arts and humanities academic expressed it:

> We've gone from an extreme where nothing was counted or measured and it was almost a grace and favour thing to a completely quantified model which doesn't allow any possibility of flexibility or downtime or thinking time (A7).

Across all three case studies, research became increasingly more valued than teaching during this time, leading to a division in the status of those who focused on research activity and those whose fundamental focus was on teaching. As described by a science-based academic in UL, there was an expectation within the university for everyone to be seen to be "producing something" (A13).

The work environment changed at the *micro* level across all three universities. Within UL in particular, a competitive workplace culture emerged generated by the pressure placed on non-

research active individuals to develop their research profile and credentials. Pressure was also felt in UL amongst early career academics arising from the development of a competitive tenure track appointment process.

Within NUIG, those in contract positions felt more obliged to volunteer than those in secure employment, when management required staff to take on additional work. At the *micro* level academics were encouraged to carry out particular activities deemed valuable to the university, which might enhance their prospects for promotion, recognition or reward. The experience of some academics across the three universities was that the less valued work which often involved activities to support student learning, was left to other more conscientious individuals to continue.

A number of those who were motivated to engage in research and could readily avail of support to sustain and develop their academic profiles were excused teaching duties. As noted by a TCD arts and humanities based academic "the sign of a decent academic in this institution was that they didn't have anything to do with undergraduates" (B5). Others whose research areas was of less relevance to the government and the market, became disengaged from the university and continued to quietly carry on with their scholarly work despite the lack of institutional support. Another group of academics withdrew completely from research and were observed by colleagues as being research inactive.

At the individual level there was more scrutiny shown towards the work of colleagues and disquiet expressed at those who did not perform adequately, in the growing performance led environment. In addition, there were individuals who chose not to engage with the new corporate environment, as described in the statement of a TCD science based academic who noted that the senior management view of what the university was – "was very different from my view of what a university was as an academic and what it should be" (B9). Another group comprised individuals who were protected by their heads from market-led work requirements as evidenced by A UL science based academic (A11) who described how her "head worked very hard to protect us". Similar experiences were reported in NUIG and TCD.

The move away from valuing disciplinary discovery for its own sake and the inequality metered out from the new government and corporate-based plans which favoured particular academic work over other work, elicited a broad range of responses. These ranged from active engagement to withdrawal. A range of emotions was expressed across all the universities examined, from anger and envy to sadness and resignation, in response to the new university

agenda. As one senior science based TCD academic regretfully noted "there was an increasing trend towards a feeling of being more anonymous …and things becoming more impersonal, less caring" (B10). Across the case study universities, there was a general sense of regret expressed at the deterioration of professional values. These concerns led to a TCD academic raising the question "do we re-calibrate the focus of the university when you have such a powerful system now in place that militates against the academic voice?" (B6).

As a consequence of the operation of two value systems as described in the NUIG case study and evidenced from experiences in the other universities, the research findings show how two universities seemed to co-exist within the same entity. One being the visible hard edged corporate university focused on commercial income and achieving metric-based outcomes and the other, the traditional, increasingly invisible student-facing university, oriented towards students and undertaking scholarly work for its own merits. Within the case study universities, while some academics tended towards buying into the corporate university, others appeared more aligned with the traditional university. As a result, divisions at the *micro* level between individual academics and the institution grew more pronounced during this time.

Finally, this research study confirms that across the three universities, corporate business-focused practices and activities attracted more attention, evident in that this sought after work was acknowledged and rewarded by the university. Moreover, as behaviours and values increasingly became competitive and self-interested, the corporate logic grew in prominence at this *micro* level. Having examined the effect of normative and cultural changes of the corporate logic at the individual level, the following section analyses the impact of institutional change on professional values, practices and behaviours at the *micro* level.

8.3.2.3. The Professional Logic at the *Micro* Level: competition, divisions and dissonance

At the *micro* level, the research findings indicate that the career stage of the individual academic was significant in aligning with a particular logic and greatly influenced the approach, behaviours and values held at the micro level. While individuals at an early stage of their career trajectory were seen to embrace the government and corporate-based culture, those academics closer to retirement or who had reached a level in their career with which they were satisfied, or in which they were resigned to remain, were more expressive in their resistance or resignation and in their concerns in abandoning their professional values and practices. As a UL science based academic acknowledged sadly "I'm retiring in a year's time and one of my

colleagues is retiring this year. We won't be replaced. The students will still have to be taught but there will be casual people coming in" (A11).

These individuals were clear in their commitment to continue their professional endeavours and as far as possible remain student-centred and motivated to carry on with their scholarly work and, as described by an NUIG academic working in arts and humanities, "not chase the metrics" (C8). There was a sense of regret at the manner in which research activity had become increasingly associated with academic identity. A TCD science based academic described "a wonderful colleague and very passionately involved in teaching and in admin…would feel that his identity has been a bit undermined because he hasn't been publishing papers or getting grants" (B10).

However, the research findings also confirm that across all three universities, as described by a business academic based in NUIG and reflected in the research findings, the changing culture could not be ignored or avoided at the *micro* level and "as the university changed, all those working within it also changed a bit as they adapted to survive in the context of the new environment…you adapt to survive" (C3).

Between 2008-2014, resulting from the changes taking place and within this less open collegial environment, the value system altered and professional relationships deteriorated. A UL science based academic in describing how "some colleagues swan around and do their research…some of us were here at the coalface, encouraging people and trying to make sure that they worked hard for their degrees and not just give out degrees, that would be found wanting by employers" (A11).

With the growth in commercial focus and the development of a more output driven mind-set, competition infiltrated the professional logic levels creating dissonance between professionals. With the increase in competition for resources, students, research, reputation and funding, the culture changed and for the most part the professional logic failed to withstand the pressures brought to bear. With the deterioration in valuable internal professional relationships and the fragmentation of the profession, the profession lost some of its key value based underpinnings.

While activities focused on discovering and imparting disciplinary knowledge declined in visible focus, a group of academics sought to re-focus on the professional activity that they enjoyed and felt obliged to continue doing. For some, this meant focussing on their own research activities while for others it was directed towards the guidance and nurturing of

students. As one TCD science based academic noted "if you don't teach and if you don't foster the next generation, you might as well give up (B10).

Much of this work appeared to continue unnoticed within the university. There was a sense as noted by a science based academic in TCD that the "old-fashioned scholar thing is much less valued now" (B11). However, as remarked upon by a TCD arts and humanities academic, this work continued despite being devalued:

> This Dublin based university is still an idealistic place. There is still a respect for sheer curiosity, wanting to find out about your subject and researching those aspects which you find personally interesting. So that is still strong (B8).

While change impacted on the cohesion and shared value system within the profession and led to a weakening of the professional logic at the *micro* level, in some quarters professional behaviours and values remained and continued to function out of sight, to many within the institution.

The research findings confirm that within UL and NUIG while the professional logic deteriorated at the *micro* level, its demise was less than at the *meso* level. In TCD, the professional logic at the individual level generally endured despite the changes which took place. As remarked upon by a TCD science based academic "in some ways identity is forged by this deep love of the subject and what you do. I think that's quite a robust phenomenon" (B10). Where the professional logic managed to withstand the changing environment, it did so as a consequence of retaining professional values and identity. It survived also due to the continuation of hidden activity, focused on fundamental research enquiry and autonomous, self-directed work enabling and supporting student learning at the individual level. As a UL arts and humanities based academic reflected:

> I think my identity as an academic is basically the same. I think the main thing is it's teaching, it's research it's bringing forth your research topics and the things you feel strongly about like enabling your students. That's all the same. The rest does not really matter in the end (A9).

8.4. University Institutional Analysis Framework

The findings from the combined three case studies examining the experiences of those working in the University of Limerick (UL), Trinity College Dublin (TCD) and the National University of Ireland, Galway (NUIG) are summarised below in Table 14 using the framework presented originally in Table 3.

Table 14 University Institutional Analysis Framework – combined case studies

Structural and Regulative Dimensions	Government Logic	Corporate Logic	Professional Logic
Strategy	Government are active in developing and establishing new expectations focused on the delivery of macroeconomic outputs, enabling reform and the promotion of an ideology of market-managerialism.	Strategic priorities are distinctly market-led and focused on generating income. A commercial mind-set is adopted together with the re-definition of new parameters for success within the university which are measurable and performance led.	The strategic focus of the academic role in professional scholarly and collegial endeavours weakens. There is no clear strategy arising from fragmentation of collegial structures and deficit in academic leadership.
Structural mechanism and focus	Resourcing mechanisms comprising budgetary restrictions and resourcing constraints create a coercive and constraining influence and are instrumental in achieving government-led requirements.	Managerial structures and business practices are introduced and these become the dominant structures for decision making. The status of disciplines is defined by potential in the marketplace. Career development mechanisms become performance-led and metric based.	The strength and influence of collegial based systems weakens with workforce reconfigurations and the combined strength of the consensus-based collective dissipates. Academic autonomy and governance enjoyed through peer-led systems recedes.
Source of regulative and structural arrangements	Government departments and the HEA establish additional evaluative and reporting mechanisms seeking evidence that the university is being "well managed". Legislation establishes new regulations and requirements. Selected academic areas are	Increasing growth of corporate-based structures in tandem with ongoing development as a commercial entity and business organisation. The function of management is viewed as enabling realisation of commercial objectives and	Potential for peer-led collegial systems is removed from work which previously enjoyed academic autonomy. Collegiate professional structures are no longer a stable and enduring feature and with their demise, academic collaboration deteriorates.

	identified as having strategic national importance.	government-led requirements.	
Normative and Cultural Dimensions	**Government Logic**	**Corporate Logic**	**Professional Logic**
Focus of activity	Activities are strategically reoriented towards addressing requirements to contribute to economic growth and development. The focus on value yielded for state investment in education increases.	Activities are increasingly viewed in resourcing and monetary terms. Driven by market-based and administrative priorities, the university becomes an increasingly controlled environment where work is defined, managed and audited.	An increasing gap emerges between academic activity considered worthy of support and investment and other work. The influence of the academic as custodian of academic standards weakens. Public engagement is avoided as a consequence of being questioned as to the value of academic work.
Orientation of value system	A new value proposition focuses on student learning to prepare for work and research activity which delivers for the knowledge economy. The influence of NPM is instrumental in redefining the mission of the university and in shaping values and practices.	The status of academic work becomes defined by its potential in the marketplace. The potential for recognition and reward creates a competitive and performance driven environment.	Academic work outside that prioritised by government and management becomes side-lined and unsupported. The market attractiveness of work determines academic success. Participation in externally-based collaborative networks is valued.
Focus of behavioural aspects	Arising from increased pressure from state agencies to achieve national objectives together with value for money, the organisation of work becomes more	Academic activity is viewed through a market-based lens. Relationships with students become re-defined in consumer-oriented terms.	The practice of working independently, in self-regulating and self-determining work activity becomes challenging and

	constrained and narrow in focus.		dissipates in some areas.

8.5. Chapter Conclusion

The research study contends that across the three universities as a consequence of institutional change brought about by government-led reform, the structural and regulation dimension of the government logic and the corporate logic increased in prominence at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. Within the three universities, the structural and regulative dimension, of the professional logic weakened in influence at both levels.

In the context of the normative and cultural dimension, this research study asserts that the government and corporate logic strengthened during the time period 2008-2014. However, the experience of the normative and cultural dimension within professional logic varied across the university case studies. At the *meso* level, while professional values, behaviours and practices weakened in prominence across all three universities, the experience of TCD was less pronounced.

The experience of institutional change at the *micro* level within the normative and cultural dimension of the professional logic was less impactful than at the *meso* level. Here at the *micro* level, while there was a weakening in the prominence of academic values, behaviours and practices within UL and NUIG, the normative and cultural dimension of the professional logic within TCD generally appeared to endure the impact of changes taking place. This was due to the survival of the professional values afforded to academic work and the commitment shown to professional identity at the level of the individual.

During this six-year period, as this research study asserts, the university became characterised by growing divisions and schisms at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels. This occurred as a consequence of the increased prominence, strength and influence of the combined forces of the government and the corporate logic. Divisions emerged between research and teaching, between adequately resourced and under-resourced areas, between celebrated and un-celebrated work and between visible and invisible professional activity. In the literature Zilber (2017 – see p. 18) describes how institutional logics which represent particular ways of thinking and behaving which may be either complementary or competitive when they encounter other institutional logics.

In examining the experiences of both the structural and regulative dimension and the normative and cultural dimensions, it is evident from the research that the characteristics of the government logic and the corporate logic within the institution of the university are complementary and align with each other. This alignment continues at the *meso* and the *micro* levels. With the strengthening of the structural and regulative infrastructure developed by the corporate logic in conjunction with the formal dimensions of the government logic, the capacity for collegial peer-supported structures and systems within the professional logic to withstand the new structural and regulative environment deteriorates. This pattern is evident at both the *meso* and the *micro* levels within the structural and regulative dimension.

However, within the cultural and normative dimension, despite the institutional change which takes place as experienced from the combination of values, behaviours and practices introduced from both the government and corporate logics, the impact of the professional logic is different. Here while there is some weakening of professional values, practices and behaviours at the *meso* level, these are not uniformly experienced across all the case study universities. At the *micro* level, the research study further evidences the ability of the professional academic, (in this case within TCD) to withstand the influence of government and corporate norms, practices and values and to continue to exercise professional values, identity and practices. Arising from the strong professional identity and values held by individuals and despite powerful pressures to change, the professional logic preserved its position at the *micro* level.

Beyond the period 2008-2014 which is the timeframe examined in this thesis, the government logic strengthens as government continues to monitor the performance of the Irish university sector through exercising close financial supervision and seeking an improvement in the sector's "capacity for strategic management and effective utilisation of its their resources" (HEA, 2016b). While the sector continues to enjoy increased student enrolments including growth in international student numbers together with enhanced research performance and improved accountability for public investment (*ibid*), the IUA in representing the universities continues to highlight the urgent need for substantial state investment to be made in the university system.

Two years following the publication of the Cassells Report in 2016 which set out options to address the investment needed in the sector and arising from continuing inaction by government in addressing the recommendations of this report, the IUA launched the *Save our Spark* (2018) campaign. In highlighting that government funding per student had fallen to

almost half of what it was in 2008, this public campaign sought to raise public awareness of the crisis being faced in the sector and to pressure government to take action in addressing the funding deficit (*ibid*). At the time of completing this thesis, the university sector faces growing uncertainty due to ongoing lack of investment and with the re-introduction of the employment control framework, the purpose of which is to control staffing resources within the sector.

In reconsidering the research question posed at the commencement of this thesis, it is clear that as a consequence of institutional change which took place within the Irish university between 2008-2014, changes have taken place within the government, market and professional logics. With the strong alignment of the government and corporate logic, both of these logics have grown in prominence against the backdrop of the strong economic and ideological drivers present in the institutional field influencing change. The combined forces of the government and corporate logic have also been powerful in weakening the influence of the professional logic.

Arising from the analysis of institutional change in the Irish university between 2008-2014, it is of benefit to consider the implications of the developments which have taken place for the future of the university sector nationally. The first implication concerns the changes to impacting student learning. With the changing focus driven by government the student has become an economic input. As noted by a business based TCD academic:

> I can definitely see a very strong pull away from learning for learning's sake and knowledge and intellect and learning to live a good life or whatever you want to call any of that. There's a very strong focus now on that we are part of some bigger macroeconomic structural impetus and that most learning now seems to have to have some explicit, externally oriented objective (B3).

One key theme which is interwoven within the professional logic is the value of student engagement in developing skills in critical thinking and academic enquiry. With the changes that have occurred and the deterioration in the professional logic, widespread concerns have been raised at the quality of the academic endeavour and its impact on student learning. Without, a recalibration towards re-enabling the creation, nurturing and preservation of learning and knowledge within Irish society, there is an uncertain future ahead.

With concern raised within the profession at the deterioration in quality in teaching and academic standards, an opportunity is presented to create meaningful academic engagement and restore the influence of the professional logic through the development of arrangements to return responsibility for academic standards and teaching excellence to the profession. The

introduction of this initiative would re-activate and promote internal collaborative links, collegiality and the opportunity to re-enable the creation, nurturing and preservation of learning within the Irish university.

The second question which arises concerns a more fundamental issue questioning the future of the university as a societal institution, given the growing divisions which have emerged in recent years within disciplines and at the level of the individual academic. From its foundations, the institutional capital of the university has been held within the academic profession, described as "the core of the academic enterprise" (Kwiek, 2013, see p.36). With the changes which have occurred in recent years, the university has moved from being collaborative to competitive and from unified to divided. At the same time many of the traditional widely held, core collegial values which have represented the university as an institution for centuries, have receded with the increasing dominance of the government and corporate logic. With these ongoing developments the question arises as to whether the university, which originates from the Latin word *universitas*, meaning 'whole', can in the face of continuing government and corporate-led pressures, continue to represent itself as a unified and complete institution within society.

A number of recommendation for future research studies can be made from the examination of the university at the *meso* and *micro* level as detailed in this thesis. These include an examination of the impact of the divisions which have been created within the university, particularly with the identification of "strong" and "weak" areas and "winners and losers" based on market-place and economic value which emerged amongst disciplines and individuals within this study. In addition, while this research study has pointed towards the influence of leadership in engaging academic staff, there is scope for a more in-depth examination of this area in investigating the actions and behaviours of leaders at the *meso* level in delivering both to the government and corporate agenda while at the same time continuing to engage at the professional level.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Questionnaire Template

SURVEY ON INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE IRISH UNIVERSITY SECTOR, 2008-2014

Dear Study Participant

I am a UCC staff member and a PhD student in the Department of Government, UCC. My research question seeks to ascertain how institutional change in the Irish university between the years 2008 and 2014 has impacted institutional logics at the level of the academic unit and the university. Institutional logics can be broadly defined as patterns of beliefs, practices, values, assumptions and rules that structure cognition, provide meaning and guide decision making in a given field (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999).

I would appreciate if you would complete the attached survey which invites participants to give their opinion and experience of developments in the university during the period 2008 to 2014. This survey will take less than 15 minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and confidential. Neither your own name or the name of your school/department or university will be identified anywhere in the research findings.

For reliability of analysis you are requested to answer all of the questions in order to proceed through the questionnaire. If you have any questions on this survey, please contact me at agannon@ucc.ie or angannon@eircom.net

Many thanks for your participation

Anne Gannon

1. The University in 2008

The following section presents a number of statements as to the key focus of the university in 2008. Please indicate your agreement with each of these statements by choosing one of the options alongside each statement. It is your opinion about the focus of the university that is being sought

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
A key focus of the university in 2008 was maintaining its professional role in society					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was increasing commercial oriented performance					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was ensuring quality in its public services.					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was the social mission of preparing citizens for society.					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was to enable the knowledge economy through research and development					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state					
A key focus of the university in 2008 was to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management					
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2008					

Pressures for change

This section is concerned with identifying pressures for change during the period 2008-2014. A number of possible factors are identified in the following two questions. From your

experience please indicate the level of your agreement with each of these factors as pressures for change by choosing one of the options which appears alongside each factor

2.Suggested pressures for change during the period 2008-2014

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Increased state oversight						
Additional externally led business processes						
Additional internal management oversight						
Increased competition across the Irish university sector						
Changes arising from technological advancements and globalisation						
Changes in the external funding mechanism for the university sector						
The changing nature of the academic profession						
Global reform impacting the traditional university model						

3.Suggested pressures for change during the period 2008-2014 (continued)

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Changing societal trends in relation to the role of the university.						
Impact of the economic downturn unrelated specifically to the university sector						
Contradictory internal perspectives as to the relative importance of various academic values and practices.						
The introduction of a new template for success arising from an increasing focus on global league tables						

The growth in public sector reform led initiatives						
The growth in professional and management structures and roles within the university						
The increased influence of market forces where goods and services are provided in the academic marketplace						

4. Please list briefly any other factors which created pressure for change in the Irish university sector during the period 2008-2014 which are not listed above and which you wish to mention

_____

_____

Your experiences as an academic staff member of the Irish university in the period 2008-2014

5. Has the content and focus of your role as an academic staff member changed in the period 2008 – 2014? Please indicate by choosing one of the options below.

a) Yes b) No c) Don't know d) Not Applicable to me

6. If you answered "Yes" above please outline how the content and focus of your role has changed in the period 2008-2014

_____

_____

The following section asks about your own personal experience of a number of practices relevant to your role as an academic staff member. Please review each of the following practices and indicate your experience during the period 2008-2014 by choosing one of the five answer options listed.

7. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014?

Focus on income generation opportunities

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Autonomy in relation to carrying out research

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Choice around teaching areas covered

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Self-determination around research activities

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Impact of government policy and regulations

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Time spent on marketing and promotional activities

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Time spent dealing with university structures and central offices

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

8. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014? (continued)

Focus in organisational decision making on budgetary issues

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Influence of changes in the university funding environment as a consequence of state intervention

More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Time spent on entrepreneurial and innovative activities

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Focus in decision making on academic matters

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Working time spent on scholarly activities

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

Influence of university management as a source of authority in the university

i) More ii) Less iii) The same iv) Don't know v) Not applicable to me

9. Has the identity of the university as you have experienced it within your working environment changed in the period 2008-2014*?*

i) Yes ii) No iii) Don't know iv) Not applicable to me

10. If you answered "Yes" above please indicate your experience of how the university has changed in the period 2008-2014 by completing the following four statements. You are asked to indicate whether the options below have increased in focus, reduced in focus or remained unchanged.

The university as a business organisation has

i) increased in focus ii) reduced in focus iii) remained the same iv) don't know v) not applicable to me

The university as a community of scholars has

i) increased in focus ii) reduced in focus iii) remained the same iv) don't know v) not

The university as an agent of the state has

i) increased in focus/ii) reduced in focus/iii) remained the same/iv) don't know/v) not applicable to me

The university as a commercial entity has

i) increased in focus ii) reduced in focus iii) remained the same iv) don't know v) not applicable to me

11. Please detail below any other changes in the identity of the university which you have experienced during the period 2008-2014?

_____

_____

University Values

Please indicate whether in your experience the value system as a whole within your university has changed over the period 2008-2014?

i) Yes ii) No iii) Don't know iv) Not applicable to me

13. If you answered “Yes” to the question above, please indicate how you have experienced changes in the university value system by indicating clearly below. If you gave any other answer please proceed to question 15,

Internal economic and efficiency metrics

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Peer review or academic reputation

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Management structures, rules and procedures

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Competition, market share indicators

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

External government led regulatory controls

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Knowledge as a driver of national economic development

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

The primacy of knowledge for industry application

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Employable graduate output

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Operational value for money, efficiency, and effectiveness

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

Fee-for-service and market competitive deliverables

i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

The quality of the academic endeavour

i) i) Increased in focus ii) Reduced in focus iii) No change

14. Please list below any other changes in the university's value system which are not listed above and which you wish to mention

_____

_____

15. The key focus of the university in 2014

The following section presents a number of statements as to the key focus of the university in 2014. Please indicate your agreement with each of these statements by choosing one of the options alongside each statement

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
A key focus of the university in 2014 was maintaining its professional role in society					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was increasing commercial oriented performance					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was ensuring quality in its public services.					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was the social mission of preparing citizens for society.					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was to enable the knowledge economy through research and development					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state					
A key focus of the university in 2014 was to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management					
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2014					

16. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2014? Please rank 1-7 with 1 being the more important stakeholder and 7 being the least important to the university. Please note that in choosing your ranking you can only use each number between 1 and 7 once

Government	
business community	
academic professional associations	
ranking and accreditation agencies	
society generally	
research and development funding organisations	
the industrial sector	

17. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2008? Please rank 1-7 with 1 being the more important stakeholder and 7 being the least important to the university. Please note that in choosing your ranking you can only use each number between 1 and 7 once

Government	
business community	
academic professional associations	
ranking and accreditation agencies	
society generally	
research and development funding organisations	
the industrial sector	

About you

This section asks about you and your current position

18. What is your current grade?

Professor _____ Senior Lecturer _____ _____ Other _____

If Other, please specify _____

19. What is your gender?

Male _____ Female _____

20. What academic unit/department/school do you work in?

Science __ Business __ Humanities

21. What is the name of your current institution? _____

22. How long have you worked in this institution?

0-5 years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 11-20 years ☐ 21 years + ☐

Final comments and thanks

23. Please expand here on anything which you think might be relevant to my study

_____
_____
_____

24. Thank you for your participation in this survey. As previously advised you will not be identified or named in the research. Please provide your name and contact details below if you would be willing to participate in a follow up interview

Name _____ Contact details _____

Appendix B Questionnaire Respondents Identifier and Method of Completion

University Name	**Questionnaire Numbers**
University of Limerick	#6,#8, #9, #11, #15, #26, #39, #41, #42, #49, #51, #54, #57, **#58, #60, #63, #67,**
Trinity College Dublin	#1, #3, #10, #12, #17,#20, #21, #23,#24, #27,#28,#29, #44, #45, #47, #48, #52, #53, **#61, #62**
National University of Ireland - Galway	#2, #4, #5, #7, #13, #14, #19, #22, #25, #31, #34, #36, #38, #40, #43, #50, #55, #56, **#59, #65, #66, #68**
Unidentifiable/Incomplete	#16, #18, #30, #32, #33, #35, #37, #46, #64

All questionnaires were completed via Survey Monkey except for those highlighted in bold font – which were completed manually

Survey on Institutional Change in the Irish University 2008-2014 - All Findings (Excerpt)

Q1. A key focus of the university in 2008 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
... maintaining its professional role in society	12.28%	45.61%	28.07%	8.77%	1.75%	3.51%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	24.14%	39.66%	18.97%	10.34%	3.45%	3.45%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	18.97%	46.55%	20.69%	8.62%	0.00%	5.17%
... ensuring quality in its public services	6.90%	37.93%	39.66%	10.34%	1.72%	3.45%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	8.62%	37.93%	24.14%	17.24%	6.90%	5.17%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	21.05%	38.60%	19.30%	8.77%	7.02%	5.26%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	17.24%	56.90%	18.97%	3.45%	0.00%	3.45%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	5.17%	29.31%	37.93%	15.52%	5.17%	6.90%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	12.73%	58.18%	9.09%	14.55%	1.82%	3.64%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2008	1.82%	5.45%	18.18%	40.00%	25.45%	9.09%

Q5. Has the content and focus of your role as an academic staff member changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	63.79%
No	25.86%
Don't know	3.45%
Not applicable to me	6.90%

Q7. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014?

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus on income generation opportunities	68.97%	18.97%	1.72%	1.72%	8.62%
Autonomy in relation to carrying out research	3.45%	56.90%	32.76%	0.00%	6.90%
Choice around teaching areas covered	5.26%	56.14%	33.33%	0.00%	5.26%
Self determination around research activities	5.17%	58.62%	31.03%	0.00%	5.17%
Influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols	72.41%	13.79%	8.62%	1.72%	3.45%
Impact of government policy and regulations	67.24%	18.97%	3.45%	5.17%	5.17%
Time spent on marketing and promotional activities	62.07%	29.31%	1.72%	1.72%	5.17%
Time spent dealing with university structures and central offices	79.31%	17.24%	0.00%	0.00%	3.45%

Q8. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014 ? (continued)

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus in decision making on budgetary issues	41.38%	29.31%	12.07%	3.45%	13.79%
Influence of changes in the university funding environment as a consequence of state intervention	47.37%	19.30%	7.02%	10.53%	15.79%
Influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university	5.17%	20.69%	62.07%	3.45%	8.62%
Time spent on entrepreneurial and innovative activities	33.33%	35.09%	8.77%	3.51%	19.30%
Focus in decision making on academic matters	15.52%	34.48%	36.21%	6.90%	6.90%
Working time spent on scholarly activities	13.79%	20.69%	58.62%	1.72%	5.17%
Influence of university management as a source of authority in the university	51.72%	20.69%	10.34%	12.07%	5.17%

Q9. Has the identity of the university as you have experienced it within your working environment changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes it has	66.67%
No it hasn't	24.56%
Don't know	8.77%

Q10. If you answered "Yes" above, please indicate your experience of how the university has changed in the period 2008-2014

	Increased in focus	Reduced in focus	Remained the same	Don't know	Not applicable to me
The university as a business organisation has	95.00%	0.00%	2.50%	2.50%	0.00%
The university as a community of scholars has	5.00%	82.50%	10.00%	2.50%	0.00%
The university as an agent of the state has	48.72%	7.69%	30.77%	12.82%	0.00%
The university as a commercial entity has	92.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	0.00%

Q12. Please indicate whether in your experience the value system as a whole within your university has changed over the period 2008-2014.

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	77.59%
No	13.79%
Don't know	8.62%

Q13. If you answered "Yes" to the question above, please indicate how you have experienced changes in the university value system

	Increased in focus	No change in focus	Reduced in focus
Internal economic and efficiency metrics	97.83%	0.00%	2.17%
Peer review or academic reputation	63.04%	28.26%	8.70%
Management structures, rules and procedures	89.13%	10.87%	0.00%
Competition, market share indicators	89.13%	10.87%	0.00%
External government led regulatory controls	80.43%	19.57%	0.00%
Knowledge as a driver of national economic development	40.00%	44.44%	15.56%
The primacy of knowledge for industry application	60.87%	34.78%	4.35%
Employable graduate output	58.70%	30.43%	10.87%
Operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness	84.78%	13.04%	2.17%
Fee-for-service and competitive market deliverables	68.18%	27.27%	4.55%
The quality of the academic endeavour	15.22%	28.26%	56.52%

Q15. A key focus of the university in 2014 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
... maintaining its professional role in society	14.29%	48.21%	25.00%	10.71%	1.79%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	56.14%	40.35%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	28.57%	51.79%	14.29%	1.79%	3.57%
... ensuring quality in its public services	12.28%	19.30%	35.09%	31.58%	1.75%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	7.41%	16.67%	40.74%	27.78%	7.41%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	66.67%	22.81%	3.51%	5.26%	1.75%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	35.09%	54.39%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	28.07%	35.09%	31.58%	3.51%	1.75%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	56.36%	38.18%	0.00%	1.82%	3.64%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2014	7.55%	11.32%	15.09%	35.85%	30.19%

Q16. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2014? Please rank the following stakeholders from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
government	45.61%	28.07%	7.02%	7.02%	8.77%	1.75%
business community	7.27%	12.73%	16.36%	23.64%	25.45%	10.91%
academic professional associations	3.64%	0.00%	9.09%	3.64%	9.09%	40.00%
ranking and accreditation agencies	17.86%	16.07%	17.86%	21.43%	7.14%	12.50%
society generally	12.28%	3.51%	3.51%	5.26%	10.53%	21.05%
research and development funding organisations	10.53%	26.32%	24.56%	17.54%	14.04%	5.26%
the industrial sector	3.70%	14.81%	24.07%	20.37%	24.07%	9.26%

Q17. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2008? Please rank the following stakeholders from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
government	50.98%	17.65%	7.84%	3.92%	7.84%	7.84%
business community	9.80%	9.80%	19.61%	19.61%	11.76%	23.53%
academic professional associations	12.00%	6.00%	6.00%	12.00%	22.00%	16.00%
ranking and accreditation agencies	0.00%	4.00%	12.00%	22.00%	18.00%	18.00%
society generally	17.65%	13.73%	3.92%	11.76%	13.73%	17.65%
research and development funding organisations	9.62%	32.69%	23.08%	9.62%	13.46%	9.62%
the industrial sector	0.00%	18.37%	30.61%	18.33%	18.33%	6.12%

Q18. What is your current grade?

Answer Choices	Responses
Professor	35.09%
Senior Lecturer	14.04%
Lecturer	43.86%
Other (please specify)	7.02%

Q19. What is your gender?

Answer Choices	Responses
Female	34.48%
Male	65.52%

Q20. What academic unit/department/school do you work in?

Answer Choices	Responses
Science	41.38%
Business	24.14%
Humanities	34.48%

Q21. What is the name of your current institution ?

Answer Choices	Responses
TCD	32.76%
NUIG	34.48%
UL	32.76%

Survey on Institutional Change in the Irish University 2008-2014 - University of Limerick Findings (Excerpt)

Q1. A key focus of the university in 2008 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
... maintaining its professional role in society	5.26%	36.84%	36.84%	15.79%	0.00%	5.26%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	5.26%	52.63%	21.05%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	26.32%	36.84%	21.05%	10.53%	0.00%	5.26%
... ensuring quality in its public services	5.26%	42.11%	42.11%	5.26%	0.00%	5.26%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	10.53%	31.58%	26.32%	15.79%	5.26%	10.53%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	11.11%	38.89%	16.67%	16.67%	5.56%	11.11%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	21.05%	47.37%	21.05%	5.26%	0.00%	5.26%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	0.00%	21.05%	52.63%	15.79%	0.00%	10.53%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	16.67%	38.89%	22.22%	11.11%	5.56%	5.56%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2008	5.56%	5.56%	11.11%	55.56%	11.11%	11.11%

Q5. Has the content and focus of your role as an academic staff member changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	73.68%
No	10.53%
Don't know	5.26%
Not applicable to me	10.53%

Q7. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014?

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus on income generation opportunities	73.68%	15.79%	0.00%	5.26%	5.26%
Autonomy in relation to carrying out research	5.26%	47.37%	42.11%	0.00%	5.26%
Choice around teaching areas covered	5.56%	55.56%	33.33%	0.00%	5.56%
Self determination around research activities	10.53%	52.63%	31.58%	0.00%	5.26%
Influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols	84.21%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
Impact of government policy and regulations	68.42%	21.05%	0.00%	5.26%	5.26%
Time spent on marketing and promotional activities	68.42%	21.05%	0.00%	5.26%	5.26%
Time spent dealing with university structures and central offices	89.47%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%

Q8. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014 ? (continued)

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus in decision making on budgetary issues	36.84%	26.32%	15.79%	10.53%	10.53%
Influence of changes in the university funding environment as a consequence of state intervention	44.44%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	5.56%
Influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university	10.53%	10.53%	63.16%	5.26%	10.53%
Time spent on entrepreneurial and innovative activities	42.11%	31.58%	10.53%	5.26%	10.53%
Focus in decision making on academic matters	15.79%	26.32%	36.84%	15.79%	5.26%
Working time spent on scholarly activities	15.79%	15.79%	57.89%	5.26%	5.26%
Influence of university management as a source of authority in the university	36.84%	21.05%	15.79%	21.05%	5.26%

Q9. Has the identity of the university as you have experienced it within your working environment changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes it has	63.16%
No it hasn't	21.05%
Don't know	15.79%

Q10. If you answered "Yes" above, please indicate your experience of how the university has changed in the period 2008-2014

	Increased in focus	Reduced in focus	Remained the same	Don't know
The university as a business organisation has	84.62%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%
The university as a community of scholars has	7.69%	76.92%	15.38%	0.00%
The university as an agent of the state has	61.54%	7.69%	15.38%	15.38%
The university as a commercial entity has	84.62%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%

Q12. Please indicate whether in your experience the value system as a whole within your university has changed over the period 2008-2014.

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	84.21%
No	10.53%
Don't know	5.26%

Q13. If you answered "Yes" to the question above, please indicate how you have experienced changes in the university value system

	Increased in focus	No change in focus	Reduced in focus
Internal economic and efficiency metrics	94.12%	0.00%	5.88%
Peer review or academic reputation	94.12%	0.00%	5.88%
Management structures, rules and procedures	88.24%	11.76%	0.00%
Competition, market share indicators	88.24%	11.76%	0.00%
External government led regulatory controls	88.24%	11.76%	0.00%
Knowledge as a driver of national economic development	31.25%	62.50%	6.25%
The primacy of knowledge for industry application	35.29%	58.82%	5.88%
Employable graduate output	64.71%	35.29%	0.00%
Operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness	94.12%	5.88%	0.00%
Fee-for-service and competitive market deliverables	50.00%	43.75%	6.25%
The quality of the academic endeavour	29.41%	17.65%	52.94%

Q15. A key focus of the university in 2014 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
... maintaining its professional role in society	5.56%	44.44%	27.78%	22.22%	0.00%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	36.84%	57.89%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	16.67%	61.11%	11.11%	0.00%	11.11%
... ensuring quality in its public services	10.53%	15.79%	36.84%	31.58%	5.26%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	0.00%	10.53%	52.63%	26.32%	10.53%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	47.37%	31.58%	0.00%	15.79%	5.26%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	31.58%	47.37%	5.26%	15.79%	0.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	36.84%	26.32%	31.58%	5.26%	0.00%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	61.11%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2014	11.76%	5.88%	11.76%	35.29%	35.29%

Q16. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2014? Please rank the following from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Total	Score
government	47.37%	9	31.58%	6	15.79%	3	5.26%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	19	6.21
business community	11.11%	2	5.56%	1	11.11%	2	33.33%	6	33.33%	6	0.00%	0	5.56%	1	18	4.06
academic professional associations	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.11%	2	0.00%	0	5.56%	1	33.33%	6	50.00%	9	18	1.89
ranking and accreditation agencies	10.53%	2	26.32%	5	10.53%	2	21.05%	4	5.26%	1	21.05%	4	5.26%	1	19	4.32
society generally	15.79%	3	5.26%	1	5.26%	1	5.26%	1	10.53%	2	26.32%	5	31.58%	6	19	3.05
research and development funding organisations	10.53%	2	15.79%	3	26.32%	5	21.05%	4	21.05%	4	5.26%	1	0.00%	0	19	4.58
the industrial sector	5.56%	1	16.67%	3	22.22%	4	11.11%	2	22.22%	4	16.67%	3	5.56%	1	18	4

Q17. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2008? Please rank the following from 1-7 (1=most important).

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Total	Score
government	56.25%	9	18.75%	3	6.25%	1	0.00%	0	12.50%	2	0.00%	0	6.25%	1	16	5.81
business community	11.76%	2	5.88%	1	17.65%	3	23.53%	4	17.65%	3	17.65%	3	5.88%	1	17	3.94
academic professional associations	6.25%	1	6.25%	1	6.25%	1	18.75%	3	12.50%	2	18.75%	3	31.25%	5	16	2.94
ranking and accreditation agencies	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.76%	2	17.65%	3	17.65%	3	29.41%	5	23.53%	4	17	2.65
society generally	18.75%	3	18.75%	3	12.50%	2	12.50%	2	12.50%	2	6.25%	1	18.75%	3	16	4.25
research and development funding organisations	5.88%	1	35.29%	6	29.41%	5	11.76%	2	0.00%	0	17.65%	3	0.00%	0	17	4.82
the industrial sector	0.00%	0	18.75%	3	18.75%	3	18.75%	3	25.00%	4	6.25%	1	12.50%	2	16	3.81
															Answered	17

Q18. What is your current grade?

Answer Choices	Responses
Professor	36.84%
Senior Lecturer	26.32%
Lecturer	26.32%
Other (please specify)	10.53%

Q19. What is your gender?

Answer Choices	Responses
Female	26.32%
Male	73.68%

Q20. What academic unit/department/school do you work in?

Answer Choices	Responses
Science	31.58%
Business	42.11%
Humanities	26.32%

Survey on Institutional Change in the Irish University 2008-2014 -Trinity College Dublin Findings (Excerpt)

Q1. A key focus of the university in 2008 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
... maintaining its professional role in society	16.67%	55.56%	27.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	36.84%	26.32%	21.05%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	15.79%	57.89%	21.05%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
... ensuring quality in its public services	5.26%	31.58%	52.63%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	0.00%	47.37%	26.32%	21.05%	5.26%	0.00%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	31.58%	42.11%	15.79%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	21.05%	57.89%	21.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	5.26%	26.32%	42.11%	15.79%	5.26%	5.26%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	5.56%	77.78%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2008	0.00%	5.88%	23.53%	29.41%	41.18%	0.00%

Q5. Has the content and focus of your role as an academic staff member changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	68.42%
No	26.32%
Don't know	0.00%
Not applicable to me	5.26%

Q7. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014?

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus on income generation opportunities	78.95%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%
Autonomy in relation to carrying out research	5.26%	36.84%	47.37%	0.00%	10.53%
Choice around teaching areas covered	5.26%	57.89%	31.58%	0.00%	5.26%
Self determination around research activities	5.26%	36.84%	52.63%	0.00%	5.26%
Influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols	63.16%	15.79%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%
Impact of government policy and regulations	63.16%	15.79%	5.26%	5.26%	10.53%
Time spent on marketing and promotional activities	68.42%	21.05%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%
Time spent dealing with university structures and central offices	73.68%	21.05%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%

Q8. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014 ? (continued)

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus in decision making on budgetary issues	57.89%	31.58%	5.26%	0.00%	5.26%
Influence of changes in the university funding environment as a consequence of state intervent	68.42%	21.05%	0.00%	5.26%	5.26%
Influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university	5.26%	31.58%	57.89%	0.00%	5.26%
Time spent on entrepreneurial and innovative activities	38.89%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%
Focus in decision making on academic matters	21.05%	31.58%	36.84%	5.26%	5.26%
Working time spent on scholarly activities	10.53%	15.79%	68.42%	0.00%	5.26%
Influence of university management as a source of authority in the university	52.63%	31.58%	5.26%	5.26%	5.26%

Q9. Has the identity of the university as you have experienced it within your working environment changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes it has	68.42%
No it hasn't	26.32%
Don't know	5.26%
Not applicable to me	0.00%

Q10. If you answered "Yes" above, please indicate your experience of how the university has changed in the period 2008-2014.

	Increased in focus	Reduced in focus	Remained the same	Don't know	Not applicable to me
The university as a business organisation has	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
The university as a community of scholars has	7.14%	85.71%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
The university as an agent of the state has	21.43%	14.29%	57.14%	7.14%	0.00%
The university as a commercial entity has	92.86%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Q12. Please indicate whether in your experience the value system as a whole within your university has changed over the period 2008-2014.

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	73.68%
No	10.53%
Don't know	15.79%

Q13. If you answered "Yes" to the question above, please indicate how you have experienced changes in the university value system

	Increased in focus	No change in focus	Reduced in focus
Internal economic and efficiency metrics	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Peer review or academic reputation	35.71%	50.00%	14.29%
Management structures, rules and procedures	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%
Competition, market share indicators	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%
External government led regulatory controls	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%
Knowledge as a driver of national economic development	35.71%	35.71%	28.57%
The primacy of knowledge for industry application	71.43%	21.43%	7.14%
Employable graduate output	50.00%	28.57%	21.43%
Operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness	78.57%	14.29%	7.14%
Fee-for-service and competitive market deliverables	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%
The quality of the academic endeavour	7.14%	28.57%	64.29%

Q15. A key focus of the university in 2014 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
... maintaining its professional role in society	15.79%	47.37%	31.58%	5.26%	0.00%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	68.42%	26.32%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	31.58%	47.37%	15.79%	5.26%	0.00%
... ensuring quality in its public services	10.53%	21.05%	36.84%	31.58%	0.00%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	11.11%	27.78%	33.33%	22.22%	5.56%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	57.89%	31.58%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	31.58%	63.16%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	21.05%	31.58%	42.11%	0.00%	5.26%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	55.56%	38.89%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2014	11.76%	23.53%	17.65%	23.53%	23.53%

Q16. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2014? Please rank the following stakeholders from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
government	47.37%	36.84%	5.26%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
business community	0.00%	22.22%	22.22%	11.11%	22.22%	16.67%	5.56%
academic professional associations	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	11.11%	0.00%	50.00%	33.33%
ranking and accreditation agencies	33.33%	5.56%	27.78%	16.67%	11.11%	0.00%	5.56%
society generally	10.53%	0.00%	5.26%	10.53%	15.79%	15.79%	42.11%
research and development funding organisations	10.53%	31.58%	21.05%	21.05%	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%
the industrial sector	0.00%	5.88%	17.65%	23.53%	35.29%	11.76%	5.88%

Q17. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2008? Please rank the following stakeholders from 1-7 (1=most important).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
government	50.00%	11.11%	11.11%	16.67%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
business community	0.00%	11.76%	5.88%	11.76%	17.65%	47.06%	5.88%
academic professional associations	17.65%	5.88%	11.76%	11.76%	17.65%	17.65%	17.65%
ranking and accreditation agencies	0.00%	5.88%	23.53%	17.65%	23.53%	5.88%	23.53%
society generally	22.22%	22.22%	0.00%	22.22%	5.56%	5.56%	22.22%
research and development funding organisations	11.11%	44.44%	22.22%	5.56%	11.11%	5.56%	0.00%
the industrial sector	0.00%	0.00%	31.25%	12.50%	25.00%	6.25%	25.00%

Q18. What is your current grade?

Answer Choices	Responses
Professor	52.63%
Senior Lecturer	5.26%
Lecturer	42.11%
Other (please specify)	0.00%

Q19. What is your gender?

Answer Choices	Responses
Female	36.84%
Male	63.16%

Q20. What academic unit/department/school do you work in?

Answer Choices	Responses
Science	63.16%
Business	10.53%
Humanities	26.32%

Survey on Institutional Change in the Irish University 2008-2014 - National University of Ireland, Galway Findings (Excerpt)

Q1. A key focus of the university in 2008 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
... maintaining its professional role in society	15.00%	45.00%	20.00%	10.00%	5.00%	5.00%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	30.00%	40.00%	15.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	15.00%	45.00%	20.00%	15.00%	0.00%	5.00%
... ensuring quality in its public services	10.00%	40.00%	25.00%	15.00%	5.00%	5.00%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	15.00%	35.00%	20.00%	15.00%	10.00%	5.00%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	20.00%	35.00%	25.00%	0.00%	15.00%	5.00%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	10.00%	65.00%	15.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	10.00%	40.00%	20.00%	15.00%	10.00%	5.00%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	15.79%	57.89%	5.26%	15.79%	0.00%	5.26%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2008	0.00%	5.00%	20.00%	35.00%	25.00%	15.00%

Q5. Has the content and focus of your role as an academic staff member changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	50.00%
No	40.00%
Don't know	5.00%
Not applicable to me	5.00%

Q7. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014?

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus on income generation opportunities	55.00%	30.00%	5.00%	0.00%	10.00%
Autonomy in relation to carrying out research	0.00%	85.00%	10.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Choice around teaching areas covered	5.00%	55.00%	35.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Self determination around research activities	0.00%	85.00%	10.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Influence of university procedures, regulations and protocols	70.00%	15.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Impact of government policy and regulations	70.00%	20.00%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%
Time spent on marketing and promotional activities	50.00%	45.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Time spent dealing with university structures and central offices	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Q8. What has been your experience in your role during the period 2008-2014 ? (continued)

	More	The same	Less	Don't know	Not applicable to me
Focus in decision making on budgetary issues	30.00%	30.00%	15.00%	0.00%	25.00%
Influence of changes in the university funding environment as a consequence of state intervention	30.00%	20.00%	5.00%	10.00%	35.00%
Influence of the academic community as a source of authority in the university	0.00%	20.00%	65.00%	5.00%	10.00%
Time spent on entrepreneurial and innovative activities	20.00%	30.00%	15.00%	5.00%	30.00%
Focus in decision making on academic matters	10.00%	45.00%	35.00%	0.00%	10.00%
Working time spent on scholarly activities	15.00%	30.00%	50.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Influence of university management as a source of authority in the university	65.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	5.00%

Q9. Has the identity of the university as you have experienced it within your working environment changed in the period 2008-2014?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes it has	68.42%
No it hasn't	26.32%
Don't know	5.26%

Q10. If you answered "Yes" above, please indicate your experience of how the university has changed in the period 2008-2014

	Increased in focus	Reduced in focus	Remained the same	Don't know	Not applicable to me
The university as a business organisation has	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
The university as a community of scholars has	0.00%	84.62%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
The university as an agent of the state has	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
The university as a commercial entity has	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Q12. Please indicate whether in your experience the value system as a whole within your university has changed over the period 2008-2014.

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	75.00%
No	20.00%
Don't know	5.00%
Not applicable to me	0.00%

Q13. If you answered "Yes" to the question above, please indicate how you have experienced changes in the university value system.

	Increased in focus	No change in focus	Reduced in focus
Internal economic and efficiency metrics	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Peer review or academic reputation	53.33%	40.00%	6.67%
Management structures, rules and procedures	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Competition, market share indicators	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
External government led regulatory controls	73.33%	26.67%	0.00%
Knowledge as a driver of national economic development	53.33%	33.33%	13.33%
The primacy of knowledge for industry application	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Employable graduate output	60.00%	26.67%	13.33%
Operational value for money, efficiency and effectiveness	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Fee-for-service and competitive market deliverables	78.57%	14.29%	7.14%
The quality of the academic endeavour	6.67%	40.00%	53.33%

Q15. A key focus of the university in 2014 was ....

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
... maintaining its professional role in society	21.05%	52.63%	15.79%	5.26%	5.26%
... increasing commercial oriented performance	63.16%	36.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
...delivering on government requirements to source quality graduates for the economy	36.84%	47.37%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%
... ensuring quality in its public services	15.79%	21.05%	31.58%	31.58%	0.00%
... the social mission of preparing citizens for society	11.76%	11.76%	35.29%	35.29%	5.88%
... maintaining its competitive position in world university rankings	94.74%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
... to enable the knowledge economy through research and development	42.11%	52.63%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
... reform and the modernisation agenda as led by the state	26.32%	47.37%	21.05%	5.26%	0.00%
... to deliver on the university strategic plan as set out by university management	52.63%	42.11%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%
There was no clear focus evident in the university in 2014	0.00%	5.26%	15.79%	47.37%	31.58%

Q16. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2014? Please rank the following from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
government	42.11%	15.79%	0.00%	10.53%	21.05%	5.26%	5.26%
business community	10.53%	10.53%	15.79%	26.32%	21.05%	15.79%	0.00%
academic professional associations	10.53%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%	21.05%	36.84%	21.05%
ranking and accreditation agencies	10.53%	15.79%	15.79%	26.32%	5.26%	15.79%	10.53%
society generally	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%	21.05%	57.89%
research and development funding organisations	10.53%	31.58%	26.32%	10.53%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%
the industrial sector	5.26%	21.05%	31.58%	26.32%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%

Q17. Who in your opinion were the principal stakeholders external to the University in 2008? Please rank the following from 1-7 (1=most important)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
government	47.06%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	11.76%	5.88%
business community	17.65%	11.76%	35.29%	23.53%	0.00%	5.88%	5.88%
academic professional associations	11.76%	5.88%	0.00%	5.88%	35.29%	11.76%	29.41%
ranking and accreditation agencies	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	31.25%	12.50%	18.75%	31.25%
society generally	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	23.53%	41.18%	23.53%
research and development funding organisations	11.76%	17.65%	17.65%	11.76%	29.41%	5.88%	5.88%
the industrial sector	0.00%	35.29%	41.18%	17.65%	0.00%	5.88%	0.00%

Q18. What is your current grade?

Answer Choices	Responses
Professor	15.79%
Senior Lecturer	10.53%
Lecturer	63.16%
Other (please specify)	10.53%

Q19. What is your gender?

Answer Choices	Responses
Female	40.00%
Male	60.00%

Q20. What academic unit/department/school do you work in?

Answer Choices	Responses
Science	30.00%
Business	20.00%
Humanities	50.00%

Appendix D Consent Form – Qualitative Interview

PhD Research concerning Institutional Change in the Irish University 2008-2014

Student Name: Anne Gannon

Department: Department of Government, UCC

Interview Consent Form

In the next 25-30 minutes you will be asked questions regarding your experience and opinions in the university in the period 2008-2014.

Your comments will be recorded to ensure that an accurate record is kept of your statements. Your name and place of work and participation in this interview will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. While specific comments may be reported if they illustrate a theme of this research study, your name will not be linked to any statement. Neither will the name of your school/department or university be provided in the research outputs.

The recordings from this interview will be stored under lock and key by the researcher until completion of the transcripts and analysis of the interview. Once this analysis has been completed the recording will be destroyed.

You are welcome to view the transcript of your interview. If you have a query or concern about any comment you have made please contact me at **105136326@umail.ucc.ie** and your comment will be removed from all records if you wish to do so.

Please sign to confirm your content to participate in this research project

I note the scope and aims of this research project and understand that my participation is voluntary. I understand that I may decline to answer any question or cease my participation at any time

_____ Signature Date _____

_____Print Name

Appendix E Qualitative Interview Template

INTERVIEW ON INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE IRISH UNIVERSITY SECTOR, 2008-2014

Interviewee No: _____

University Location: NUI _____ New Univ _____ Dublin Univ _____

School: Humanities _____ Business _____ Science _____

Length of service in current institution: _____ years

Current post: _____ Male/Female: _____

My research is about institutional change in the Irish university in the six-year period between 2008-2014. It is about Institutional logics which are the practices, vocabulary, values, beliefs and rules that are socially created and that determine thinking and behaviour

Experience of change at the level of the academic staff member and antecedents of change,

1. Thinking about your role (encompassing, research, teaching and administration) in 2008 and again in 2014 did the content of your work as an academic change in the period 2008 to 2014?

Yes/No/Don't know/Not Applicable to me

If answer is No or Not applicable, go to question 3

2. If yes what key changes did you experience?

3. Why do you think these changes took place? What were the drivers for these changes?

Change as experienced – values, practices, rules, beliefs - de-institutionalisation and re-institutionalisation

4. Thinking about what your experience of the university was generally in 2008 and how it was in 2014 in terms of what was going on around you, did your experience of the university in 2014 feel the same or different as in 2008?

5. Did your identity as an academic change?

6. How? Why?

7. Did the focus of your work change?

8. How? Why?

9. Did the nature of your interactions inside and outside the university change?

10. How? Why?

11. Did the values of the university as you experienced them change in the period 2008-2014? Yes/No If **no, go to question 5**

12. If yes, how did values of the university as you experienced them change in your opinion?

13. Why do you think these values changed?

14. Thinking about practices, approaches and the way things are done in your university, did these change between 2008-2014? Yes/No **If no, go to question 6**

15. If yes - how did practices, approaches and the way things are done change between 2008-2014?

16.Why do you think these changes in how things are done came about?

17. Thinking about rules and procedures in your university, did these change between 2008-2014? Yes/No **If no, go to question 7**

18. If yes - how did rules and procedures change? Why do you think these changes in rules came about? *What was the origin of the changes?*

19. Thinking about beliefs in your university, did these change between 2008-2014? Yes/No **If no, go to question 8**

20. If yes - how did beliefs change? Why do you think there was a change in beliefs?

21. In your view, did the focus of the university change and where it was directing its efforts?

22. How did the focus of the university change?

23. Did the identity of the university change?

24. Did the basis of the university strategy change?

25. Did the vocabulary used in the university change?

(Experiences of and adapting to change – dynamics of de-institutionalisation and re-institutionalisation i.e. frames, hybridity, layering, ambidexterity – FOR THOSE WHO EXPERIENCED CHANGE)

26. In terms of those changes you experienced in practices, values, rules and beliefs during 2008-2014, what was your general experience of change?

27. Do you think others working in the other parts (academic and professional areas) of your university similarly experienced these changes? Yes/No

28. If no – why do you think this is the case?

29. Were these changes spread equally across your university in your view? Yes/No

30. If yes – what were the factors that enabled change to be spread equally across your university in your opinion?

31 If no – why in your opinion were changes spread unequally across your discipline/school and university?

(Opinions/Experiences – FOR THOSE WHO EXPERIENCED NO CHANGE)

32. Do you consider that any colleagues in the university experienced change in the content and focus of their role in the period 2008-2014?

33. Why do you think others experienced change and you did not?

ALL – Any other information

34. Did the vocabulary of the university change?

(ALL) 35. Is there any other information you would like to add about your experience of change in the university during this time?

Appendix F Interviewee Detail

Code	
A1	UL Senior Business female interviewed 13 April 2017
A2	UL Business male interviewed 27 April 2017
A3	UL Business male interviewed 3 May 2017
A4	UL Business female interviewed 3 May 2017
A5	UL Arts and Humanities female interviewed 28 April 2017
A6	UL Arts and Humanities male interviewed 28 April 2017
A7	UL Senior Arts and Humanities female interviewed 28 April 2017
A8	UL Arts and Humanities male interviewed 28 April 2017
A9	UL Arts and Humanities female interviewed 15 May 2017
A10	UL Science male interviewed 24 April 2017
A11	UL Science female interviewed 28 April 2017
A12	UL Senior Science male interviewed 28 April 2017
A13	UL Science female interviewed 24 May 2017
A14	UL Senior Science female interviewed 24 May 2017
B1	TCD Senior Business male interviewed 12 May 2017
B2	TCD Senior Business male interviewed 16 May 2017
B3	TCD Business female interviewed 16 June 2017
B4	TCD Business male interviewed 7 June 2017
B5	TCD Arts and Humanities female interviewed 12 May 2017
B6	TCD Arts and Humanities female interviewed 12 May 2017
B7	TCD Arts and Humanities female interviewed 19 May 2017
B8	TCD Senior Arts and Humanities male interviewed 19 June 2017
B9	TCD Science male interviewed 10 May 2017
B10	TCD Senior Science female interviewed 12 May 2017
B11	TCD Science female interviewed 6 June 2017
B12	TCD Senior Science male interviewed 6 June 2017
C1	NUIG Senior Business male interviewed on 9 March 2017
C2	NUIG Business male interviewed on 9 March 2017

C3	NUIG Business male interviewed on 9 March 2017
C4	NUIG Business female interviewed 30 June 2017
C5	NUIG Senior Arts and Humanities male interviewed 9 March 2017
C6	NUIG Arts and Humanities female interviewed 3 April 2017
C7	NUIG Arts and Humanities female interviewed 5 April 2017
C8	NUIG Arts and Humanities male interviewed 6 April 2017
C9	NUIG Arts and Humanities male interviewed 26 April 2017
C10	NUIG Senior Science male interviewed 9 March 2017
C11	NUIG Science male interviewed 31 March 2017
C12	NUIG Science female interviewed 6 April 2017
C13	NUIG Science male interviewed 7 June 2017

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALVESSON, M. and BENNER, M. (2016) Higher Education in the Knowledge Society: Miracle or Mirage? *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.

ASHWORTH, R., BOYNE, G. and DELBRIDGE, R. (2007) Escape from the iron cage? Organizational change and isomorphic pressures in the public sector. *Journal of public administration research and theory,* 19**,** pp.165-187.

BASTEDO, M. N. (2008) Sociological Frameworks for Higher Education Policy Research. *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts***,** pp.295.

BAXTER, P. and JACK, S. (2008) Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report,* 13**,** pp.544-559.

BILLOT, J. (2010) The imagined and the real: Identifying the tensions for academic identity. *Higher Education Research and Development,* 29**,** pp.709-721.

BINDER, A. (2007) For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society,* 36**,** pp.547-571.

BIRNBAUM, R. (1988) *How colleges work.*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

BLEIKLIE, I. (2018) New Public Management or Neoliberalism, Higher Education. In: Teixeira P., Shin J. (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions*, Springer, Dordrecht

BLEIKLIE, I. and KOGAN, M. (2006) Comparison and theories. *Transforming higher education.* Springer.

BLEIKLIE, I. and KOGAN, M. (2007) Organization and governance of universities. *Higher Education Policy,* 20**,** pp. 477-493.

BLEIKLIE, I. and LANGE, S. (2010) Competition and leadership as drivers in German and Norwegian university reforms. *Higher Education Policy,* 23**,** pp.173-193.

BLOMGREN, M. and WAKS, C. (2015) Coping with contradictions: hybrid professionals managing institutional complexity. *Journal of Professions and Organization,* 2**,** pp.78-102.

BOITIER, M. and RIVIÈRE, A. (2016) Changing professions? The professionalization of management in universities. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.

BOXENBAUM, E. and JONSSON, S. (2017) Isomorphism, diffusion and decoupling: Concept evolution and theoretical challenges in Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Meyer, R.E. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism – (*2nd Ed). London: Sage Publications.

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION, (2011) *BERA Ethical Guidelines: British Educational Research Association Ethical Guidelines*, British Educational Research Association.

BRYMAN, A. (2008) *Social research methods*, Oxford University Press.

BULMER, S. and BURCH, M. (1998) Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British State and European Union. *Public Administration,* 76**,** pp. 601-628.

BÖGNER, I., PETERSEN, J. and KIESER, A. (2016) Is It Possible to Assess Progress in Science? *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.

CAI, Y. and MEHARI, Y. (2015) The use of institutional theory in higher education research. *Theory and method in higher education research.* Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

CALHOUN, E. M. (2006) Academic freedom: Disciplinary lessons from Hogwarts. *U. Colo. L. Rev.,* 77**,** p.843.

CAMPBELL, J. L. (2004) *Institutional change and globalization*, Princeton University Press.

CAMPBELL, S. (2010) Comparative case study. *Encyclopaedia of case study research,* 1**,** pp.174-176.

CANHILAL, S. K., LEPORI, B. and SEEBER, M. (2016) Decision-Making Power and

Institutional Logic in Higher Education Institutions: A Comparative Analysis of European Universities. *Towards A Comparative Institutionalism: Forms, Dynamics and Logics Across the Organizational Fields of Health Care and Higher Education* Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 45 *Emerald Group Publishing Limited,* 45**,** pp.169-194.

CHRISTENSEN, T. (2011) University governance reforms: potential problems of more autonomy? *Higher Education,* 62**,** pp.503-517.

CHRISTOPHER, J. (2012) Tension between the corporate and collegial cultures of Australian public universities: The current status. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting,* 23**,** pp.556-571.

CLANCY, P. (2015) *Irish Higher Education: A Comparative Perspective,* Dublin, Institute of Public Administration.

CLARK, B. R. (2000) Collegical entrepreneurialism in proactive universities: lessons from Europe. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning,* 32**,** pp.10-19.

COHEN, L., MANION, L. and MORRISON, K. (2013) *Research methods in education,* Routledge.

CRESWELL, J. W. (2007) Five qualitative approaches to inquiry. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches***,** pp.53-84.

CRESWELL, J. W. (2009) Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches. *London and Thousand Oaks:* Sage Publications.

CROTTY, M. (1998) *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process,* Sage Publications.

CURRIE, G. and SPYRIDONIDIS, D, (2016) Interpretation of multiple institutional logics on the ground: Actors' position, their agency and situational constraints in professionalized contexts. *Organization studies, 37*(1), pp.77-97.

DACIN, M. T., GOODSTEIN, J. and SCOTT, W. R. (2002) Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of management journal,* 45**,** pp.45-56.

DEFEND THE IRISH UNIVERSITY webpages, (n.d.), Available: http://defendtheuniversity.ie/.[Accessed]

DE ZILWA, D. (2007) Organisational culture and values and the adaptation of academic units in Australian universities. *Higher Education,* 54**,** pp.557-574.

DEEM, R., HILLYARD, S., REED, M. and REED, M. (2007) *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities,* Oxford University Press.

DELMESTRI, G., OBERG, A. and DRORI, G. S. (2015) The unbearable lightness of university branding: Cross-national patterns. *International Studies of Management and Organization,* 45**,** pp.121-136.

DENZIN, N.K. and LINCOLN, Y.S., (2008) *The landscape of qualitative research* (Vol. 1) Sage Publications.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCTION AND SKILLS (2009) *Policy Options for New Student Contributions*, Dublin

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2011) *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 - Implementation Plan,* Dublin.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2012a) *Speech to EUA Study Visitors* by Ms Brigid McManus, Secretary General on 24 January, Dublin.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2012b) *RE: Speech on Higher Education Reform* by Minister Ruairi Quinn, TD. on 22nd November, Dublin

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2013) *RE: Letter to the Chair of HEA* 16 July, from the Minister for Education and Skills, Minister Ruairi Quinn, TD.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2014a) 11 June 2014, Press Release.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2014b) *Address by the Minister for Education and Skills to Union of Students in Ireland*, Minister Ruairi Quinn, TD. USI Conference, Athlone.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2014c) *Education and Skills webpages (2014),* [Online]. Available: http://www.education.ie/en/The-Education-System/Higher-Education [Accessed].
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2014d) *Expert Group on Future Funding for Higher Education, Terms of Reference* [Online]. Available: https://www.education.ie/en/The-Education-System/Higher-Education/Higher-Education-Expert-Group-on-Future-Funding-for-Higher-Education.pdf [Accessed].
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2014e) *IUA Funding Symposium Address* by Minister Jan O'Sullivan, TD, 29 September 2014. IUA Funding Symposium. Dublin.
DEPARTMENT OF JOBS, ENTERPRISE AND INNOVATION (2006) *Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation*. Dublin.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND REFORM (2010). Public Service Agreement 2010-2014 (Croke Park Agreement).
DIMAGGIO, P. and POWELL, W. W. (1983) The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review,* 48**,** pp.147-160.
DIMAGGIO, P. J. (1991) Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: US art museums, 1920–1940. in W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
DIOGO, S., CARVALHO, T. and AMARAL, A. (2015) Institutionalism and organizational change. *The Palgrave international handbook of higher education policy and governance.* Springer.
DJELIC, M. L. (2010. Institutional Perspectives—Working towards Coherence or Irreconcilable Diversity? in G. Morgan; J. Campbell; C. Crouch; O. Kaj Pedersen; R. Whitley (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Institutional Analysis*, Oxford University Press.
DOWLING-HETHERINGTON, L (2013) The changing shape of university decision-making processes and the consequences for faculty participation in Ireland. *Tertiary Education and Management,* 19**,** pp.219-232.
EASTERBY-SMITH, M., THORPE, R. and JACKSON, P. R. (2012) *Management Research*, Sage.
EISENHARDT, K. M. (1989) Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review,* 14**,** pp. 532-550.
EISENHARDT, K. M. and GRAEBNER, M. E. (2007) Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of management journal,* 50**,** pp.25-32.
ENDERS, J., DE BOER, H., FILE, J., JONGBLOED, B. and WESTERHEIJDEN, D. (2011) *Reform of higher education in Europe*, Springer.
ENDERS, J., DE BOER, H. and WEYER, E. (2013) Regulatory autonomy and performance: The reform of higher education re-visited. *Higher Education,* 65**,** pp.5-23.
ENDERS, J. and MUSSELIN, C. (2008) *Back to the Future? The Academic Professions in the 21st Century*, OECD Publishing.
ENGWALL, L. (2007) Universities, the State and the Market: Changing Patterns of University Governance in Sweden and Beyond. *Higher Education Management and*

Policy, 19**,** pp.87-104.
EUROPEAN COMMISSION, (2005) Frontier Research: The European challenge. Brussels European Commission.
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION (2014) *EUA Autonomy Scorecard, Ireland 2014 update.*
FAHRUDDIN, Z. (2018) Institutional Logics. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research,* Volume 9**,** pp.25855-25863.
FERLIE, E., MUSSELIN, C. and ANDRESANI, G. (2008) The steering of higher education systems: a public management perspective. *Higher Education,* 56**,** pp.325-348.
FIRESTONE, W. A. (1993) Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher,* 22**,** pp.16-23.
FORFÁS (2012) *Report of the Research Prioritisation Steering Group*. Dublin.
FRIEDLAND, R. and ALFORD, R. R. (1991) Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions in W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
FROST, J., HATTKE, F. and REIHLEN, M. (2016) Multi-Level Governance in Universities: Strategy, Structure, Control. *Multi-Level Governance in Universities.* Springer.
FRØLICH, N., HUISMAN, J., SLIPERSÆTER, S., STENSAKER, B. and BÓTAS, P. C. P. (2013) A reinterpretation of institutional transformations in European higher education: strategising pluralistic organisations in multiplex environments. *Higher Education,* 65**,** pp.79-93.
GORNITZKA, Å. (1999) Governmental policies and organisational change in higher education. *Higher Education,* 38**,** pp.5-31.
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (1997) *Universities Act,* Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2011) *General Scheme of a Universities (Amendment Bill),* Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2006a) *Programme for Government 2007– 2012.* Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2006b) Towards 2016 - Ten-Year Framework Social Partnership Agreement 2006-2015. Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2007) *National Development Plan 2007-2013 Transforming Ireland - A Better Quality of Life for All*. Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2008a) *Building Ireland's Smart Economy: A Framework for Sustainable Economic Renewal*. Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2008b) *Report of the Task Force on the Public Service and Government Statement on Transforming Public Services,* Dublin: Stationery Office
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2009) *Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest* Act. Dublin: Stationery Office.
GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND (2010) *Investing in Global Relationships: Ireland's International Education Strategy 2010-15*; Department of Education and Skills, Dublin: Stationery Office.
GREENWOOD, R., OLIVER, C., SUDDABY, R. and SAHLIN-ANDERSSON, K. (2008) in C. Oliver, K. Sahlim, R. Suddaby (eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, Sage.
GREENWOOD, R., RAYNARD, M., KODEIH, F., MICELOTTA, E. R. and LOUNSBURY, M. (2011) Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *Academy of Management Annals,* 5**,** pp.317-371.
GREIF, A. (2014) Do institutions evolve? *Journal of Bioeconomics,* 16**,** pp.53-60.

GRENIER, C. and BERNARDINI-PERINCIOLO, J. (2016) Strategic and Enforced Logics Hybridization: An Agency View within French Hospitals and Universities. *Towards A Comparative Institutionalism: Forms, Dynamics and Logics Across the Organizational Fields of Health Care and Higher Education* Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 45, pp.109-144. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
GRIX, J. (2004) *The foundations of research: a student's guide,* Macmillan International Higher Education.
GROENEWALD, T. (2004) A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International journal of qualitative methods,* 3**,** pp.42-55.
GUBA, E. G. and LINCOLN, Y. S. (1994) Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research,* 2**,** pp.105.
GUMPORT, P. J. (2000) Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education,* 39**,** pp.67-91.
HALL, P. A. and TAYLOR, R. C. (1996) Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political studies,* 44**,** pp.936-957.
HANSON, M. (2001) Institutional theory and educational change. *Educational administration quarterly,* 37**,** pp.637-661.
HATTKE, F., BLASCHKE, S. and FROST, J. (2016a) From voluntary collective action to organized collaboration? The provision of public goods in pluralistic organizations. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.
HATTKE, F., VOGEL, R. and WOIWODE, H. (2016b) When professional and organizational logics collide: Balancing invisible and visible colleges in institutional complexity. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.
HAZELKORN, E. (2012) Restructuring the higher education landscape. *University World News,* no. 240.
HAZELKORN, E. (2014) Rebooting Irish higher education: policy challenges for challenging times. *Studies in Higher Education,* 39**,** pp. 1343-1354.
HEDLEY, S. (2012) *Universities (Amendment Bill) Universities behaving* badly? Send in the clowns! 9th Level Ireland, retrieved on 7 March 2015 http://9thlevel.ie/university-law/universities-amendment-bill-2012/
HENKEL, M. (2004) The demise of a dominant culture? Higher education institutions in transition. *Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences,* 1(1).
HENKEL, M. (2005) Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education,* 49**,** pp.155-176.
HENKEL, M. (2012) Exploring new academic identities in turbulent times. *Managing Reform in Universities.* Springer.
HENKEL, M. and ASKLING, B. (2006) Higher education institutions. *Transforming higher education.* Springer.
HENKEL, M. and VABØ, A. (2006) Academic identities. *Transforming higher education***,** pp.127-159.
HERMANOWICZ, J. C. (2016) Universities, Academic Careers, and the Valorization of 'Shiny Things'. *The University Under Pressure,* Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 46, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.303-328.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2007) *Strategic Plan 2008-2012,* Dublin
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2008) *Report of the Higher Education Authority for 2007 and 2008,* Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2009) *Annual Report,* Dublin
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2010) *Annual Report,* Dublin
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2011a) *Annual Report,* Dublin
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY, (2011bx) *Sustainability Study: Aligning*

Participation, Quality and Funding in Irish Higher Education. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2012a) *A proposed Reconfiguration of the Irish System of Higher Education*, Report prepared by an International Expert Panel. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2012b) *Annual Report 2012*. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2012c) *Institutional Responses to the Landscape Document and Achieving the Objectives of the National Strategy for Higher Education*: A Gap Analysis. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2012d) *Towards a Future Higher Education landscape*. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2013a) *Completing the Landscape Process for Irish Higher Education*. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2013b) *Report to the Minister for Education and Skills on system configuration, inter-institutional collaboration and system governance in Irish higher education*. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2013c) *Towards a Performance Evaluation Framework: Profiling Irish Higher Education*. Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2014a) *Higher Education System Performance, First Report 2014-16.* Dublin.
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2016a) *HEA Annual Statistics* [Online]. Available: http://www.hea.ie/en/statistics/overview [Accessed].
HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY (2016b) *Higher Education System Performance, Second Report 2014-16.* Dublin.
HININGS, C. R., GREENWOOD, R., REAY, T. and SUDDABY, R. (2004) Dynamics of change in organizational fields. *Handbook of organizational change and innovation***,** pp.304-323.
HOFFMAN, A. J. and WOOTEN, M. W. (2008) Organizational Fields: Past, Present and Future. R. Greenwood in C. Oliver, K. Sahlim, R. Suddaby (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* London: Sage Publications
HOLDEN, L. (2011) An industrious view of higher education. *The Irish Times*.
HOWELLS, J. R., KARATAŞ-ÖZKAN, M., YAVUZ, Ç. and ATIQ, M (2014) University management and organisational change: a dynamic institutional perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society***,** pp.251–270.
HUMPHRIES, J. (2014) 'Colleges in Crisis' *The Irish Times*, 15 February [Online]. Available: https://www.irishtimes.com/news/education/colleges-in-crisis-1.1692000 [Accessed].

HUNT, C. (2011) *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030*. Department of Education and Skills, Official Publications Office, Dublin

HØSTAKER, R. (2006) Policy change and the academic profession. *Transforming Higher Education.* Springer.
INGRAHAM, P. W., MOYNIHAN, D. P. and ANDREWS, M. (2008) Formal and informal institutions in public administration in J. Pierre, B. Guy Peters and G. Stoker (eds.) *Debating Institutionalism*, Palgrave Macmillan
IRISH UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION (2010) *Resource Management and Performance*. Dublin.
IRISH UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION (2014) *Issues facing Higher Education in Ireland*. Dublin.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION (2018) *Save our Spark* [Online]. Available: https://saveourspark.ie/[Accessed].

JARZABKOWSKI, P. and FENTON, E. (2006) Strategizing and Organizing in Pluralistic Contexts. *Long Range Planning,* 39**,** pp.631-648.

JARZABKOWSKI, P., SMETS, M., BEDNAREK, R., BURKE, G. and SPEE, P. (2013) Institutional ambidexterity: Leveraging institutional complexity in practice. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations,* 39**,** pp.37-61.

JAWITZ, J. (2009) Academic identities and communities of practice in a professional discipline. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 14**,** pp.241-251.

JOHNSON, R. B. (1997) Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education,* 118**,** pp. 282.

KOGAN, M. and MARTON, S. (2006) The state and higher education. *Transforming higher education.* Springer.

KONING, E. A. (2016) The three institutionalisms and institutional dynamics: understanding endogenous and exogenous change. *Journal of Public Policy***,** pp. 1-26.

KRAATZ, M. S. (2009) Leadership as institutional work: A bridge to the other side. *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations***,** pp.59-91.

KRAATZ, M. S. and BLOCK, E. S. (2008) Organizational implications of institutional pluralism in C. Oliver, K. Sahlim, R. Suddaby (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* London: Sage Publications

KRÜCKEN, G., BLÜMEL, A. and KLOKE, K. (2013) The managerial turn in higher education? On the interplay of organizational and occupational change in German academia. *Minerva,* 51**,** pp.417-442.

KRÜCKEN, G. and MEIER, F. (2006) Turning the university into an organizational actor. *Globalization and organization: World society and organizational change***,** pp.241-257.

KWIEK, M. (2013) Knowledge Production in European Universities in K. Marek *(ed.) Knowledge production in European universities: States, markets, and academic entrepreneurialism* (Vol. 3). Peter Lang.

KWIEK, M. (2016) Academic entrepreneurialism and changing governance in universities. Evidence from empirical studies. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.

LABOUR RELATIONS COMMISSION, 2013. *Public service stability agreement 2013–2016: The Haddington Road agreement*. Dublin:

LAWRENCE, T. B. (1999) Institutional strategy. *Journal of Management,* 25**,** pp.161-187.

LEACH, S. and LOWNDES, V. (2007) Of roles and rules: analysing the changing relationship between political leaders and chief executives in local government. *Public Policy and Administration,* 22**,** pp.183-200.

LEPORI, B. (2015) Universities as Hybrids: Applications of Institutional Logics Theory to Higher Education in M. Tight and J. Huisman, *Theory and method in higher education research*. Emerald Group Publishing.

LEVY, D. and SCULLY, M. (2007) The Institutional Entrepreneur as Modern Prince: The Strategic Face of Power in Contested Fields. *Organization Studies,* 28**,** pp.971-991.

LINCOLN, Y. S. and GUBA, E. G. (2013) *The constructivist credo*, Left Coast Press.

LOK, J. (2010) Institutional logics as identity projects. *Academy of Management Journal,* 53**,** pp.1305-1335.

LOWNDES, V. (2001) Rescuing Aunt Sally: taking institutional theory seriously in urban politics. *Urban studies,* 38**,** pp.1953-1971.

LOWNDES, V. and ROBERTS, M. (2013) *Why institutions matter*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

LYNCH, K. (2010) Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education,* 9**,** pp.54-67.
LYNCH, K. (2015) Control by numbers: New managerialism and ranking in higher education. *Critical Studies in Education,* 56**,** pp.190-207.
LYNCH, K. (2017) New managerialism in education: the organisational form of neoliberalism. Abraham-Hamanoiel, A., Freedman, D., Khiabany, G., Nash, K.(eds.*) Liberalism in Neoliberal Times: Dimensions, Contradictions, Limits.* Goldsmiths.
MAASSEN, P. and STENSAKER, B. (2011) The knowledge triangle, European higher education policy logics and policy implications. *Higher Education,* 61**,** pp.757-769.
MAGUIRE, S., HARDY, C. and LAWRENCE, T. B. (2004) Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Fields: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal,* 47**,** pp. 657-679.
MARCH, J. G. and OLSEN, J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering organizations: The organizational basis of politics.* New York.
MARCH, J. G. and OLSEN, J. P. (2006) Elaborating the "new institutionalism" *The Oxford handbook of political institutions,* 5**,** pp.3-20.
MAY, R., STRACHAN, G., BROADBENT, K. and PEETZ, D. (2011) The casual approach to university teaching; time for a re-think. *Research and development in higher education: Reshaping higher education,* 34**,** pp.188-197.
MAY, T. (2011) *Social research*, McGraw-Hill Education (UK)
MERRIAM, S. B. (1998) *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Revised and expanded from," Case Study Research in Education.".* Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
MEYER, C. B. (2001) A case in case study methodology. *Field methods,* 13**,** pp.329-352.
MEYER, J. W. and ROWAN, B. (1977) Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology,* 83**,** pp. 340-363.
MEYER, J. W. and ROWAN, B. (2008) The structure of educational organizations. *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education***,** pp.217-225.
MEYER, R. and HAMMERSCHMID, G. (2006) Public management reform: an identity project. *Public policy and administration,* 21**,** pp.99-115.
MEYER, R. E., EGGER-PEITLER, I., HOLLERER, M. A. and HAMMERSCHMID, G. (2013) Of bureaucrats and passionate public managers: Institutional logics, executive identities, and public service motivation. *Public Administration* 92, no. 4, pp. 861-885.
MICELOTTA, E., LOUNSBURY, M. and GREENWOOD, R. (2017) Pathways of Institutional Change: An Integrative Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management* 43(6), pp.1885-1910.
MILES, M. B., HUBERMAN, A. M. and SALDANA, J. (2013) *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*, SAGE Publications.
MIR, R. and WATSON, A. (2000) Strategic management and the philosophy of science: The case for a constructivist methodology. *Strategic Management Journal,* 21**,** pp. 941-953.
MOSES, J. and KNUTSEN, T. (2012) *Ways of knowing: Competing methodologies in social and political research*, Palgrave Macmillan.
MOUWEN, K. (2000) Strategy, structure and culture of the hybrid university: Towards the university of the 21st century. *Tertiary Education and Management,* 6**,** pp. 47-56.
MURPHY, J. A. (1995) *The College: A History of Queen's/University College Cork, 1845-1995*, Cork University Press.
MUSSELIN, C. (2007) *The Transformation of Academic Work*: Facts and Analysis. Research and Occasional Paper Series: CSHE. 4.07. Center for Studies in Higher Education.

MUSSELIN, C. (2013a) How peer review empowers the academic profession and university managers: Changes in relationships between the state, universities and the professoriate. *Research Policy,* 42**,** pp.1165-1173.
MUSSELIN, C. (2013b) Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their university. *Higher Education,* 65**,** pp.25-37.
NEAVE, G. (2012) Change, leverage, suasion and intent: An historical excursion across three decades of change in higher education in western Europe. *Managing Reform in Universities.* Springer.
NOKKALA, T. (2007) *Constructing the Ideal University-The internationalisation of higher education in the competitive knowledge society*, Tampere University Press.
NOORDEGRAAF, M. (2015) Hybrid professionalism and beyond:(New) Forms of public professionalism in changing organizational and societal contexts. *Journal of Professions and Organization,* 2**,** pp.187-206.
NORTH, D. C. (1990) *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*, Cambridge university press.
NUI GALWAY (2009) *Strategic Report 2009-2014 Learning and Leadership for Life and Work.*
NUI GALWAY (2011) *2010/2011 Presidents Report*.
NUI GALWAY (2012a) *Interim Report on the Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2009-2014.*
NUI GALWAY (2012b) *Towards a Higher Education Landscape 2012-2017.*
NUI GALWAY (2014) *Report of the President 2013/14, Bringing Bold Ideas to Life.*
OCASIO, W., THORNTON, P. H. and LOUNSBURY, M. (2017) Advances to the institutional logics perspective in Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Meyer, R.E. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism – (*2nd Ed.) London: Sage Publications
OLIVER, C. (1992) The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization studies,* 13**,** pp.563-588.
OLSEN, J. P. (2010) *Governing through institution building: institutional theory and recent European experiments in democratic organization*, OUP Oxford.
OLSEN, J. P. and MARCH, J. G. (1989) *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. New York: Free Press.
PACHE, A.-C. and SANTOS, F. (2013) Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal,* 56**,** pp.972-1001.
PARKER, L. (2011) University corporatisation: Driving redefinition. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting,* 22**,** pp.434-450.
PETERS, B. G. (2012) *Institutional theory in political science: The new institutionalism.* Continuum Publishing Corporation.
POWELL, W. (1991) Expanding the scope of institutional analysis in Powell, W.W. and DiMaggio, P.J. (eds.) *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. University of Chicago press.
POWELL, W. W. and RERUP, C. (2017) Opening the black box: The Microfoundations of institutions in Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Meyer, R.E. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* – (2nd Ed.) London: Sage Publications.
REAY, T. and HININGS, C. R. (2009) Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization studies,* 30**,** pp.629-652.
REAY, T. and JONES, C. (2015) Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization,* 14(4)**,** pp.441-454.

REIHLEN, M. and WENZLAFF, F. (2014) Institutional Change of the German Higher Education System: From Professional Dominance to Managed Education. *Handbook on the entrepreneurial university,* Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
REIHLEN, M. and WENZLAFF, F. (2016) Institutional change of European higher education: The case of post-war Germany. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.
RITCHIE, J., LEWIS, J., NICHOLLS, C. M. and ORMSTON, R. (2013) *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers,* Sage.
RUBIN, H. J. and RUBIN, I. S. (1995) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data,* Sage
RUBIN, H. J. and RUBIN, I. S. (2011) *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data,* Sage.
RUEF, M. and SCOTT, W. R. (1998) A multidimensional model of organizational legitimacy: Hospital survival in changing institutional environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly***,** pp.877-904.
RYAN, S. and GUTHRIE, J. (2009) Collegial entrepreneurialism: Australian graduate schools of business. *Public Management Review,* 11**,** pp.317-344.
SAARINEN, T. and VALIMAA, J. (2012) Change as an intellectual device and as an object of research. *Managing Reform in Universities.* Springer.
SARRICO, C. S. and MELO, A. I. (2012) Let the devil choose: frustration or anxiety in the wake of performance measurement in universities. *Managing Reform in Universities.* Springer.
SCOTT, P. (2011) The university as a global institution. *Handbook on globalization and higher education***.**
SCOTT, W. R. (1987) The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative science quarterly***,** pp.493-511.
SCOTT, W. R. (1995) *Institutions and organizations. Foundations for organizational science*. Sage, London.
SCOTT, W. R. (2001) *Institutions and Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
SCOTT, W. R. (2003) Institutional carriers: reviewing modes of transporting ideas over time and space and considering their consequences. *Industrial and corporate change,* 12**,** pp.879-894.
SCOTT, W. R. (2008) *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests,* Sage.
SCOTT, W. R. (2013) *Institutions and organizations,* Sage.
SCOTT, W. R. (2017) Institutional theory: Onward and upward in R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, R. E. Meyer (eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* London,
SHORE, C. (2008) Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory,* 8**,** pp. 278-298.
SHORE, C. (2010) Beyond the multiversity: neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. *Social Anthropology,* 18**,** pp.15-29.
SLAUGHTER, S. and LESLIE, L. L. (1997) *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university,* The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
SLAUGHTER, S. and RHOADES, G. (2004) *Academic capitalism and the new economy.* Baltimore, MD.
SMETS, M., ARISTIDOU, A. and WHITTINGTON, R. (2017) Towards a practice-driven institutionalism in Royston Greenwood/Christine Oliver/Thomas B. Lawrence/Renate E. Meyer (eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* Sage: London.
SPENDER, J.C. (2016) Universities, governance, and business schools. *Multi-level*

governance in universities. Springer.
SPICER, A. (2006) Beyond the Convergence-Divergence Debate: The Role of Spatial Scales in Transforming Organizational Logic. *Organization Studies,* 27**,** pp.1467-1483.
STAKE, R. E. (2005) Qualitative case studies, *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Third Edition,* Sage Publication: London
STENSAKER, B., HENKEL, M., VÄLIMAA, J. and SARRICO, C. S. (2012) Introduction: How is Change in Higher Education Managed? *Managing Reform in Universities.* Springer.
STRAUSS, A. and CORBIN, J. M. (1990) *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques,* Sage Publications.
STREECK, W. and THELEN, K. (2005) Introduction: Institutional change in advanced political economies. *Beyond continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies,* Oxford University Press.
TAPPER, T. and PALFREYMAN, D. (1998) Continuity and change in the collegial tradition. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 52**,** pp.142-161.
TEELKEN, C. (2012) Compliance or pragmatism: How do academics deal with managerialism in higher education? A comparative study in three countries. *Studies in Higher Education,* 37**,** pp.271-290.
THE ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (2006) *Reviews of National Policies for Education, Higher Education in Ireland.* Paris.
THORNTON, P. H. (2004) *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing,* Stanford University Press.
THORNTON, P. H., JONES, C. and KURY, K. (2005) Institutional logics and institutional change in organizations: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations,* 23**,** pp.125-170.
THORNTON, P. H. and OCASIO, W. (1999) Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990 1. *American journal of Sociology,* 105**,** pp.801-843.
THORNTON, P. H. and OCASIO, W. (2008). Institutional logics. in C. Oliver, K. Sahlim, R. Suddaby (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism. London: Sage Publications*
THORNTON, P. H., OCASIO, W. and LOUNSBURY, M. (2012) *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process,* Oxford University Press.
TIGHT, M. (2003) *Researching higher education,* The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
TOWNLEY, B. (1997) The institutional logic of performance appraisal. *Organization Studies,* 18**,** pp.261-285.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2009a). *Annual Report 2008/09*. Dublin.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2009b). *Strategic Plan 2009-2014*. Dublin.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2010) *Annual Report 2009/10*. Dublin.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2011) *Annual Report 2010/2011*. Dublin.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2012) *Annual Report 2011/12*. Dublin.
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN (2014) *Strategic Plan 2014-2019*. Dublin.
TROCHIM, W. M. (1989) Outcome pattern matching and program theory. *Evaluation and program planning,* 12**,** pp. 355-366.
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2006) *Strategic Plan 2006-2011*.
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2008) *Annual Report: 2007-2008.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2009) *Annual Report: 2008-2009.*

UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2010) *Annual Report: 2009-2010.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2011a) *Annual Report: 2010-2011.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2011b) *Strategic Plan, Pioneering and Connected, 2011-2015.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2012) *Annual Report: 2011-2012.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2013) *Annual Report: 2012-2013.*
UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK (2015) *Strategic Plan - Broadening Horizons 2015-2019.*
UPTON, S. and WARSHAW, J. B. (2017) Evidence of hybrid institutional logics in the US public research university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 39**,** pp. 89-103.
VAIRA, M. (2004) Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education,* 48**,** pp.483-510.
Von PRONDZYNSKI, F. (2014), Irish Higher Education and the quest for something better, *A university blog,* 29 September [Online]. Available: https://universitydiary.wordpress.com/ [Accessed]

VORLEY, T. and NELLES, J. (2008) Institutional Development of and beyond the Third Mission. *Higher Education Management and Policy,* 20(3), p.119.

WALSH, J. (2014) *A contemporary history of Irish higher education, 1980–2011*. *Higher Education in Ireland.* Springer.
WALSH, J. (2018) *Higher Education in the Twenty First Century. Higher Education in Ireland, 1922–2016.* Springer.
WALSHE, J. (2014). *An education: How an outsider became an insider-and learned what really goes on in Irish government*, Penguin UK.
WEIHERL, J. and FROST, J. (2016). Professional and Organizational Commitment in Universities: from Judgmental to Developmental Performance Management. *Multi-level governance in universities.* Springer.
WINTER, R. (2009) Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of higher education policy and management,* 31**,** pp.121-131.
WINTER, R. P. and O'DONOHUE, W. (2012) Academic identity tensions in the public university: Which values really matter? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 34**,** pp.565-573.
YILMAZ, K. (2013) Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education,* 48**,** pp. 311-325.
YIN, R. K. (1984) Applied social research methods series *Case study research: Design and methods,* (ed.) L. Bickman, Vol 5
YIN, R. K. (1994) *Case study research: design and methods.* Thousands Oaks.
YIN, R. K. (2002) *Case Study Research,* (3rd Ed). Sage publications, CA.
YIN, R. K. (2009) Case study research. In L. Bickman and DJ Rog (Eds.), *Case study research: Design and methods,* Sage publications
YIN, R. K. (2014) *Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.),* Sage, CA
YLIJOKI, O.-H. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher education,* 45**,** pp.307-335.
ZHENG, Y. C. G. (2016) University academic promotion system and academic identity An institutional logics perspective. *Organizing academic work in higher education: Teaching, learning and identities***,** pp.243.
ZILBER, T. B. (2017). The evolving role of meaning in theorizing institutions in Royston

Greenwood/Christine Oliver/Thomas B. Lawrence/Renate E. Meyer (eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* Sage: London.