

Managerialism or Collegialism? The evolution of these approaches and perceptions thereof in Higher Education in South Africa.

**Gopalkrishna Chetty, gopsc@dut.ac.za
Durban University of Technology (DUT) South Africa.**

**T. Louw,
University of South Africa (UNISA), South Africa.**

South African higher education institutions have not been immune from worldwide developments which include changes in the geo-political order, globalization of society, the technology revolution and the loss of monopoly of higher education institutions in creating and disseminating knowledge. The latter in particular has led to significantly diminished public resources for higher education. The corporatization of higher education in South Africa has been a response to these pressures. Equally restructuring of the sector by the State has contributed to a shift towards a managerial approach to the governance and management of higher education institutions. This paper examines the changed environment within which universities have to function with a view to establishing whether collegialism and managerialism can coexist successfully in a changing higher education landscape.

Introduction

Traditionally universities were generally regarded as communities of scholars researching and teaching together in a collegial environment. Those that were entrusted with the running of the universities were regarded as academic leaders, often first among equals rather than being seen as managers or chief executives. In the last few decades there has been a considerable shift in and erosion of the traditional notion of collegiality in higher education across the world which many scholars see as damaging scholarship and inquiry generally (Deem, 1998; Hambleton, 2006; Lomas and Ursin, 2009). The manifestation of ‘managerialism’ in higher education is simply to control the activities of academics by means of management techniques. Some have described this development as the ‘corporatisation’ of universities or simply treating universities as if they were businesses.

The reason for this development is not hard to find. Higher education is at a crossroads all over the world and this applies equally to South Africa. Dramatic changes in the geo-political order, globalisation of society and the economy and the technological revolution, especially in the domain of information technology, have affected the system of higher education tremendously. Loss of monopoly of the institutions of higher education in creating and disseminating knowledge, the establishment of private higher education institutions and the diminishing public resources for higher education are subjecting the system to critical analysis and demands for transparency and financial accountability (Sanyal and Martin, 1995:1). In addition, the massification of higher education and resulting demands for greater efficiency has resulted in an international trend where governments are looking closely at the structure of their higher education systems – resulting in extensive reforms. (Harman and Harman, 2003).

South African higher education institutions have not been immune from these worldwide developments and face challenges similar to those of other higher education institutions in the world. The recent developments in the South African higher education sector, including the restructuring of the sector early in the century and the demise of technikons in favour of universities of technology, were based on economic rather than academic imperatives – raising the ‘managerialism vs collegialism’ question in the governance and management of higher education institutions. Mergers were, for example, a significant managerialist intervention in the South African higher education landscape and are an extreme example of and a substantial shift towards a managerial approach to the governance and management of institutions at the expense of collegialism. Equally the notion of South Africa as a developing State has seen stronger interventions by Government in higher education to extract maximum return from its investment (Jansen,2002).

This paper examines the consequences of the changed environment within which universities have to function and in particular whether collegialism and managerialism are mutually exclusive or whether these management principles can coexist successfully in a changing higher education landscape with specific focus on the South African Higher Education environment.

The Collegial Perspective

Thomas (in Hambleton, 2006) observed that modern academic life has been a mixture of competition and collegiality. The competitive spirit is well known, for example, in the United States were in order to gain tenure and promotion, the ‘publish or perish’ approach has been widely evident. While the Collegial model has influenced the culture and functioning of academia, one would argue that in its pure form today it has changed dramatically. The collegial model largely owes its roots to the professions. A professional is someone who possesses knowledge shared only with others in the profession. In a higher education institution, historians, sociologists, political scientists and engineers, while not in the same profession but remaining part of their disciplinary grouping within a university, share working conditions, status and functions. These disparate groups are often bonded together into one profession, namely academia, by certain shared values, for example, interest in their students, development of knowledge, interdisciplinary research, etc.

Conceptually collegialism is a practice where a group of scholars work together to their mutual advantage within a self-governing collective. This approach allows groups of academics to preserve the maximum individual freedom to pursue the search for knowledge according to their own values and the demands of their discipline. This model also connotes that there is consensus decision making and that academic freedom¹¹ is a strong feature, as is democracy and

¹¹ Academic freedom can be defined at an individual and collective level. At an individual level it is defined by the American Heritage Dictionary as ‘Liberty to teach, pursue, and discuss knowledge without restriction or interference, as by school or public officials’. At a collective level the Supreme Court of the United States said that academic freedom means a university can "determine for itself on academic grounds:

1. who may teach,

cohesion based on a limited hierarchy of authority making up some of the primary elements. Collegial models tend to emphasise shared common ideals. Leadership arises from committees as well as independent academic activities. Collegialism between academics also manifests itself in the sharing of information, ideas and tasks as well as the professional critique of each other's work (i.e. the notion of peer review) before such work enters the public domain. Equally important is the principle of mutual support in upholding the integrity of the members of the group, an issue we will return to in reflecting on the rise of managerialism.

Leadership in a collegial model was based on consultation and persuasion. Therefore it was not uncommon to have leaders elected from amongst their ranks to head the departments and various structures within the university. Leaders tend to largely represent the group's interest and therefore play a facilitating and encouraging role to obtain collective performance and reach consensus. Since there is no conflict between the views expressed by the leader and those held by the collective, the leader is easily absorbed back into the collective if his/her term of office comes to an end and another leader is elected. If a leader is promoted to a higher leadership position by decision of the collective, such leader continues to promote the ideals and ideas of the collective.

Some observers point out that collegiality is also on the decline in the United States. Frank Rhodes, a former president of Cornell University, devoted an entire chapter in his book on higher education to the importance of restoring community (Hambleton, 2006). He argues that the loss of community undermines the very foundation on which universities were established. This argument in particular establishes that the pursuit of knowledge is best undertaken by scholars living and working not in isolation, but in the challenging atmosphere of the community.

The Managerial Perspective

Today the range of interests, functions and statuses incorporated into higher education is so wide that a 'new professionalism' has been emerging. This 'new professionalism' tends to emphasize qualities more associated with a managerial model rather than a collegial model (Middlehurst, 1993). A managerial model tends to emphasise extensive teamwork, cost consciousness and results orientation. Managerialism, argues Santiago and Carvalho (2004), is a set of identified management processes and instruments whose main goals are achievement of efficiency and the measurement of the performance of the higher education system, its institutions and its professionals.

The managerialist influence is felt at two levels:

- at a macro level there are political strategies oriented to system reorganisation
- at the micro level (institutional level) at governance and management as well as institutional culture and the behaviour of professionals.

Deem (2001) sees managerialism as an instrument, or an analysis path, intended to describe, explain, categorize and understand new discourses and attempts to impose private sector management techniques upon the public sector. Having achieved limited success in the public

-
2. what may be taught,
 3. how it should be taught, and
 4. who may be admitted to study?'

sector, the attention has turned to imposing these management techniques on public higher education institutions.

It is argued by its supporters that the managerial model is a response to the massification of higher education and a result of resource stringency (Santiago and Carvalho, 2004). Equally one could argue that the managerial approach to managing higher education institutions is a result of a competitive higher education environment within which higher education institutions had to behave more like corporations. These competitive pressures, including increased competition for limited public funding and the greater financial muscle of the State in the operations of higher education institutions and the need for greater accountability in the expenditure of public funding, has resulted in the introduction of business-minded management procedures and ethos, which are the traditional preserve of the private sector. Support for the managerial approach is further based on the assumption that the orientation of higher education towards the economy and the market is essential to promote innovation (Santiago and Carvalho, 2004). Innovation being the only way to gain a competitive advantage in the modern market economy and the only way in which higher education institutions can ultimately contribute to the development of a country and the enhancement of its social well-being. Implicitly the managerial approach assumes that there is insufficient innovation in the traditional university for it to survive in the modern economic environment. The managerial culture tends to value competence in managing resources, including people but primarily finance, accountability and evaluation. In this type of approach individual autonomy is more restricted and there are tighter controls and supervision of personnel, including academic personnel.

In the South African higher education environment, the most clearly demonstrated manifestation of managerialism, whether consciously or unconsciously, has been the change of the title of Vice-Chancellors to that of CEO, and the appointment of Executive Deans with hardly any academic role but extensive line authority in Faculties. University Councils have modelled themselves on the Boards of large companies and vie for the attention of the so-called 'captains of industry' as members.

Cloete and Bunting (2000) summarise other key features and attributes of the managerial approach as follows:

- General management tends to have a top-down approach resulting in the development of a core of inner circle managers.
- The better-managed institutions tend to establish a solid second tier level of management who carries out policy.
- It tends to rely on fewer, more focused committees to make decisions rather than the broad consultation that characterises the collegial approach.
- The strong, individualistic type of leader will thrive under this model.
- The power within an academic department, a Faculty and to a large extent Senate of a university is greatly weakened. These bodies operate within the context of the broader institutional goals, which are set by top management.
- Strategic management tools (mission and strategic planning) become the basic tools to overcome uncertainty within the environment.

Those promoting managerialist reforms in higher education often tend not only to view students as 'customers' who 'purchase' a service from the university after taking a rational economic

choice about what to study, but emphasise that universities are in competition with one another for the patronage of these ‘customers’. Consequently this pressure results in universities needing to state and re-state what they do in mission and vision statements – which tend to proliferate to faculties, departments and units. Often these mission statements would be rather obvious if the value of universities to society is widely accepted and uncontroversial. Hence the assumption of tighter centralised control and monitoring to limit deviations from mission and vision statements.

Managerialism manifests itself primarily in the following ways:

- There is a clear chain of command. Academics who previously enjoyed a reasonable level of autonomy find themselves reporting and accounting to non academic administrators – albeit with academic titles.
- The complexity of managing academic departments and units in universities. Financial responsibilities and controls with audits and risk management have become critical functions. Equally linked to these financial controls is a greater emphasis on the measurement of work performance and productivity.
- Academic departments are often kept under permanent review through various statutory and institutional quality audits. A gambit of processes and procedures have been developed and designed to audit and evaluate the entire array of teaching, research and community service activities.
- Describing and treating students as customers. The effect of this development has led to an expectation by the student to receive a product (namely a qualification) at the end of a specified period of time regardless of their performance. This notion is distinct from students that come to universities to be educated as part of an iterative and reciprocal process.
- A shift towards research as a commodity where research is done for paying clients. In many ways this shift has seen the rise of ‘entrepreneurial’ universities where research funds the operations of universities. While this approach may resolve some of the financial woes of universities it may limit the research focus of universities to those areas regarded as relevant to the corporate masters.
- A distinction is made between centres, bureaus and institutes that have independent boards and a clear profit orientation and the academic operations. This despite the fact that these centres, bureaus and institutes are staffed by academics employed by the university.

The South African Perspective

As pointed out earlier the managerialist influence is often decided on and shaped at the macro level i.e. the political strategies employed by cabinet ministers to extract both accountability and compliance from institutions. It is contended that the managerialist approach to higher education was initiated by and has generally thrived as a result of the political strategies employed to control higher education – both as far as access and success is concerned. Unfortunately the same approach has been used in the attempts to transform the higher education landscape in South Africa. The development of higher educational post 1994 supports the above argument. The democratically elected South African government soon realized that it had to play a much stronger interventionist and steering role to ensure that the required changes actually took place. Little can be said in argument challenging the reconfiguration of the sector as an example of a strong interventionist approach by the State.

The African National Congress drafted a policy for education and training in January 1994 (Moja and Hayward, 2000). This policy document formed the foundation of a transformed higher education system and proposed the establishment of a national commission to investigate and make recommendations on the entire Higher Education system. This kick started the formulation of new policy for the sector and a stronger involvement of the State in higher education.

The National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) followed a consultative process to establish a framework for a new higher education dispensation in South Africa. The Commission's proposals rested on three pillars, namely increased participation, greater responsiveness and increased cooperation and partnerships. Increased participation as the first pillar had to address, amongst other things, the needs for equity and redress (NCHE report, 1996). While the Commission strongly supported the process of the 'massification' of the Higher Education System, in order to ensure increased student participation, it acknowledged that this would come at a significantly higher expenditure in higher education. The NCHE strongly advocated that the envisaged increase in student enrolment in the system had to be countenanced by proper quality systems and processes.

The policy of 'greater responsiveness' of the system as the second pillar was in particular to meet the challenges of the post apartheid society that was on a 'change' trajectory, as well as being able to respond to a new world order, namely globalization. In being responsive the higher education system would have to change and adapt its content, curriculum and modes of delivery and develop more participatory forms of governance. The third pillar was 'increased cooperation and partnerships'. This was a very important pillar in that the NCHE envisaged cooperative governance existing both at the system as well as at the institutional level. It did not promote or support State control of the Higher Education sector but rather, given the changes required to move away from the country's apartheid past, saw this cooperative approach as being supervised by the State. Essentially it envisaged a system in which the higher education sector continued to enjoy the necessary freedoms – especially around what and how it taught. In turn the State would give the resources and broad policy directives on national imperatives. Interestingly the State later chose to intervene in the higher education sector when it realized that some of the goals it had set for the system were not being accomplished. This resulted in the decision to restructure through mergers.

The managerial model gained further impetus in South Africa as a result of what Cloete and Bunting (1999) call 'management paralysis'. Their observations point to endemic conflict in some institutions between different constituencies, for example, between management and students or worker leadership. Alternatively this conflict was also evident between Councils and Executive Management, sometimes with the involvement of both union leadership and student leadership at this highest level of governance. These conflicts lead to a fundamental weakening of authority and leadership that resulted in the hardening of attitudes on all sides. Under these circumstances the ability to build a collegial relationship based on trust and accountability disappeared out of the proverbial window.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the method that university leadership saw as a safe haven to get a sense of control for them in what was perceived as hostile conditions was that of managerialism, i.e. to take charge and give orders. The top-down approach became *the* way of doing business in universities and strong disciplinary measures tended to be emphasised. This is clearly not what would have been the case if the collegial approach had been followed.

Are the principles of Collegialism and Managerialism mutually exclusive?

This study does not seek to determine whether the evolution from collegialism to managerialism was a natural process caused by the inherent weaknesses of the collegial model and whether the 'new collegialism' has evolved from the evolution process without the inherent weaknesses of its original model. Given the managerialist pressure for accountability, Harvey (1995) noted that there is a resurgence of collegialism which he terms 'new collegialism'. This new collegialism is characterised by two approaches, the first being an attempt to reassert the centrality of academic autonomy in higher education institutions – which is described as the right to make decisions on academic matters. It is not clear whether this centrality should prevail both at macro (ministerial) and at micro (institutional) level. Having it prevail only at one of these levels will lead to an increase in and possibly intolerable conflict between these levels.

The second approach, while regarding the collegial group as a forum for academic decision making, is prepared to include other groupings such as students in the exercise of this role. This approach is outward looking and is responsive to the changes taking place in the environment (Harvey, 1995). It is about facilitating student learning rather than the tradition of teaching and encourages students to acquire a wide range of skills and knowledge – implying cooperation between academic and support services at various levels. The new collegialism promotes transparency of practices and procedures in higher education and an academic shift away from being concerned with a narrow discipline to an interdisciplinary systems approach. As Harvey(1995) observed, this requires placing trust in the professionalism of academics.

It can be argued that the rise of managerialism internationally and in South Africa gained momentum because of a perceived lack of academic discipline and accountability inherent in the traditional collegialist approach(Davies and Thomas,2002). In the modern academic environment, however, academic autonomy is counter balanced by a transparent process of continuous quality assurance and improvement. The collegial approach that is built around continuous quality improvement is viewed as a bottom up approach and consequently is more likely to flourish for the following two reasons:

- Firstly administrators will have sufficient evidence of checks, balances and accountability without imposing additional administrative systems on academics.
- Secondly, academics will buy into the system because the continued renewal it requires is inherent in all three pillars of the role of an academic – teaching, research and community involvement.

The new collegialist approach does not see a disjuncture between the managerialist principle of accountability and its principle of peer scrutiny. In effect the widely accepted principles of continuous quality improvement and renewal shift of the emphasis from external scrutiny to a self-driven system with full participation by academics that set their own explicit quality agenda(Harvey,1995). This does not imply that there will be no need for external scrutiny, but such scrutiny will work in harmony with the new collegial approach. The bottom up quality improvement approach will see academics identifying quality targets, developing action plans and reporting against these plans, hence

improving the lecturer-student interface. In this approach the academic at the centre will involve all relevant stakeholders, team leaders and managers. This effectively means that academics take full responsibility for continuous improvement whilst simultaneously monitoring their discipline and operational environment. This will include teaching and learning, curriculum content, research, barriers to learning, employability of students and external relations (community service). Academics reclaiming a collegial mindset through continuous improvement will develop procedures and practices that are explicit and transparent and will engage in critical self assessment and evaluation. This new professionalism is what re-unites the collegialism approach to well-managed universities. Academic status and quality is derived not from management or managerialist controls, but from reputation earned from students and to a greater extent the academic community, observed Davies and Thomas(2002:181).

In many ways the quality assurance processes external to the university become the university's own account of its overall quality, destined to monitor the student experience, the professionalism of managers or even the quality of research output. External monitoring and auditing serves to further strengthen the collegial approach to reporting on academic quality and confirms the empowerment of the student. The positive impact of this open approach contributes to building trust in the higher education system as a whole.

A Study Exploring the Prevalence of Managerialism and Collegialism at South African Universities

A limited exploratory study was undertaken to establish staff perceptions on the prevalence of managerialist and collegialist approaches to the governance and management of higher education institutions in South Africa. A questionnaire comprising 22 statements on a five point Likert scale from 'strongly agree to strongly disagree' and a section for general comments was distributed to a sample of employees at higher education institutions. The sample was determined by means of convenience sampling. The questionnaire was administered electronically as well as manually. Sixty (60) respondents from two institutions participated. The results are reported collectively and not per institution. In terms of key biographical details, 45.40% of respondents were academic members of staff. 52.73% comprised executive management, middle management (academic and administrative) and other administrative staff. If academic heads of department were to be counted with the rest of the academic respondents the overall response rate will climb to 58.13% for the academic sector. This study was limited to only two universities given the time to complete this research. The findings arising from this study should not be seen as absolute, but rather as a contribution to the understanding about how staff and academic staff in particular would like to be governed and managed in higher education institutions in South Africa.

Results

For ease of reading Table 1 sets out the responses to the 22 statements. Although a few respondents provided written comments, these are not reported here.

TABLE 1: STATEMENTS AND PERCENTAGE RESPONSE

STATEMENTS	% SA	% A	% U	% D	% SD
1. Collegialism is the dominant approach to the management of my institution.	9.09	16.36	20.00	43.64	10.91
2. Managerialism is the dominant approach to the management of my institution.	25.45	45.45	20.00	9.09	0.00
3. Higher levels of academic productivity have been achieved at my university, as a result of the managerialist approach.	5.45	10.91	36.36	36.36	10.91
4. Higher levels of administrative and support services productivity have been achieved at my university as a result of 'managerialism'.	5.45	25.45	30.91	32.73	5.45
5. The collegial management approach at my university impacts positively on the institution's teaching, research, and community service.	10.91	23.64	40.00	20.00	5.45
6. The new generation of academic managers employ the managerial approach because of the lack of resources available to institutions.	9.09	38.18	30.91	20.00	1.82
7. The new generation of academic managers employ the managerial approach because there is a low toleration by the State for wastage of resources.	14.55	21.82	32.73	27.27	3.64
8. The managerialist approach leads to a more sustainable institution.	10.91	18.18	27.27	38.18	5.45
9. The quality of academic output is enhanced by a collegial model of managing a university.	25.45	45.45	18.18	9.09	1.82
10. Academic freedom only thrives when a collegial approach to managing university exists.	27.27	47.27	14.55	10.91	0.00
11. Staff perform at their best when managerial approach to managing is employed.	7.27	18.18	25.45	38.18	10.91
12. Mergers of institutions have contributed to the demise of the collegial model of managing institutions.	14.55	30.91	16.36	3.64	34.55
13. Staff perform at their best when a collegial approach to managing is employed.	27.27	45.45	18.18	9.09	0.00

14. Management approaches associated with 'for profit' limits academic freedom and autonomy.	25.45	36.36	16.36	16.36	5.45
15. The ability to create new knowledge is facilitated by a collegial approach to managing universities.	32.73	45.45	14.55	5.45	1.82
16. Academic team work is stronger under the collegial model to managing universities.	36.36	40.00	10.91	7.27	5.45
17. The advantages of managerialism are not fully understood by academics	18.18	25.45	36.36	14.55	5.45
18. The negative impact of managerialism on 'academic renewal' is not fully understood by university managers.	16.36	50.91	21.82	10.91	0.00
19. Students demand a well run university and this can only be achieved with managerialist approach.	12.73	21.82	20.00	30.91	14.55
20. Managerial approach has resulted in the elimination of duplicate and overlapping programmes/course, which has had the effect of improved efficiencies at my university.	12.73	23.64	27.27	30.91	5.45
21. Collegial approach to managing a university has no place in the current day higher education arena.	3.64	18.18	18.18	32.73	27.27
22. The managerialist approach to managing has limited an academic's ability to fully contribute to the development of the university e.g. student related matters, finance.	30.91	45.45	10.91	10.91	1.82

The overwhelming response is that collegialism is not the dominant approach to the management of these universities. Approximately 70% of respondents felt that managerialism was the dominant approach whilst 25.45% who felt that collegialism was the prevailing culture.

The perception of staff was that the managerialist approach did not bring about tangible benefits to the institution when measured against certain key organisational indicators or factors. The first of these factors relates to levels of academic productivity and administrative and support services productivity. In respect of academic productivity, 47% of the respondents did not feel that the managerialist approach contributed to higher levels of productivity and a further 36% remained unsure. In the case of administrative staff 38% of the respondents felt it had no or little impact but 31% agreed that managerialism contributed to higher levels of productivity in the administrative and support services. When the influence of managerialism on the sustainability of an institution is examined, the results point to 44% of the respondents feeling that it did not

contribute to a more sustainable institution while 29% did feel that there was some influence. 49% of respondents did not agree with the statement that staff perform at their best when a managerial approach to managing a university is employed while a further 25% remained unsure. 36% of respondents did not agree with the statement: 'the managerial approach has resulted in the elimination of duplicate and overlapping programmes which has had the effect of improved efficiencies at my university', while a similar percentage thought it did improve efficiencies.

Given that the respondents see managerialism as the dominant approach, the reasons for the strength of this approach are reported on as follows:

- at least 47% of respondents thought that academic managers employed this approach because of the lack of resources available to the institutions while 22% did not agree.
- A further 36% saw academic managers employing the managerial approach because of the low toleration by the State (government) for wastage of resources. However 33% were unsure about this being a reason for managerial dominance while 31% did not agree with the statement.
- In respect of the statement 'students demand a well run university and this can only be achieved with a managerialist approach', 35% agreed, while in contrast 46% did not agree that a well run university demanded by students can only be accomplished by a managerial approach.

In contrast with the above, the respondents' preference for the collegial model is underscored by what they see as a number of advantages of this approach to managing a university. Nearly 71% of the respondents agreed that quality of academic output is enhanced by a collegial approach. Equally 75% of respondents agreed that academic freedom thrived under a collegial approach and this was well correlated with the statement 'management approaches associated with *for profit* limits academic freedom and autonomy'. Furthermore nearly 73% of respondents thought that staff members perform at their best when a collegial approach is employed and 78% of respondents reported that the ability to create new knowledge is facilitated by a collegial management approach. A further 76% of respondents agreed that academic team work is stronger under the collegial model. Approximately 60% of the respondents indicated that the collegial approach still had a place in the modern day higher education arena, while 22% disagreed. Given the earlier high positive scores in the 70s, one would have expected a similar high score for the statement that a collegial approach still had a place in the modern day higher education arena. The only plausible conclusion for the drop to 60 % is that a group of 18% is ambivalent about these two approaches. A cursory examination of the impact of the age factor, certainly points to the preference of the collegial approach by older staff members to managing the university.

The negative impact of the managerialist approach on managing universities is further evidenced by the responses to the statements on this matter. Nearly 62% of respondents indicated that the negative impact of managerialism on 'academic renewal' was not fully understood by university managers and a further 76% indicated that the managerialist

approach to managing universities has limited an academic's ability to fully contribute to the development of the university.

Discussion

It can be concluded from these results that there is strong support for a collegial approach to managing the universities amongst university staff and that they believe that there are positive benefits to be gained from this model. In reality the dominant model is the managerialist one, with an emphasis on running universities on business principles. There is some evidence of the 'new collegialism' at the universities surveyed but a more extensive study will have to be undertaken to determine whether it has gained ground more broadly in South African universities.

The appropriate starting point for a discussion on which model will dominate the future of higher education in South Africa is to examine the imperatives of the South African higher education environment. The major imperatives can be summarised as follows:

- (1) The participation rates, especially of previously disadvantaged students, must continue to grow in critical vocational areas where the lack of skilled personnel is hampering growth of the economy and country as a whole. While it is acknowledged that there have been increased enrolments particularly of black students, the same cannot be said of the throughput and graduation rates in fields such as engineering, technology, key areas of commerce, etc.
- (2) To develop a consistent number of enrolments at postgraduate level. This must be seen to be taking place in critical disciplines, for example science, engineering and technology. Simply put, universities have to contribute the development of knowledge in those areas.
- (3) The throughput rates in South African universities pose a special challenge. This in turn affects the ability of the nation to always have the right quantity and quality of people to match the development needs of the country.
- (4) A more representative cohort of academics for South African universities, not only as role model and mentors, but to ensure a better understanding of the real issues affected the country.
- (5) Research output must grow, especially applied research that will resolve key issues and national priorities such as poverty, primary health care, jobless growth, employment patterns and economic development.
- (6) Curriculums that not only meet the needs of a global economy but also those of a developing economy. The rural urban divide should also be addressed by South African higher education curriculum and course design.
- (7) Embedding the country's value system of democracy, tolerance, openness and transparency, together with ethical conduct, as core values within higher education. Hence the need to find new ways of managing these institutions by ensuring that these values can thrive in higher education rather than by controlled and suppressed under the guise of efficiency and limited resources.

Despite the multifunctional nature of these imperatives all signals seem to point at a continuation of the managerialist approach to higher education in South Africa to realise these. The period after the restructuring of the South African higher education landscape and the resultant mergers has seen discussions at ministerial level of developments such as demergers. The current demands on the higher education sector will however not be met by a purely managerialist approach. South African higher education institutions must explore the possible coexistence of managerialism and collegialism. This can only be done if the proponents of the managerialist approach to managing higher education institutions are not dogmatic in their approach and will allow the development of a 'new managerialism' which will acknowledge the advantages of including aspects of collegialism into managing a university.

A dogmatic managerialist approach limits the holistic involvement of academic staff members in a number of issues affecting the management of a university. There is an increased risk of this occurring as more and more specialist managers are appointed to manage the various academic and specialist administrative ambits of a university. The growing distance between the academic and the student on matters other than teaching and learning becomes a concern in the development of the student as a whole person. As an example one may look at the manner in which student protest action is resolved at many universities in South Africa. The responsibility for this critical issue is left in the hands of senior management and other administrators. There is very little, if any, involvement of the general university academia in resolving these issues or understanding of the issues underpinning student protest action. This in reality can be directly attributed to the notion of 'managerialism' in that the prevailing attitude of academia is that it is the responsibility university management to resolve such student protest action. In a hierarchical university management structure the roles and duties of staff are neatly parcelled out. And that of academic staff is limited to primarily teaching and learning – and it excludes the mentoring and coaching in life skills and problem solving that could prevent or limit protest action in many instances. This is certainly not the way to go in maintaining and nurturing a university community. This is not a position that the South African higher education sector wants to find itself in, given how staff have responded in this research survey.

Conclusion

This research sought to get a perspective on the evolution of managerialism and perceptions of the prevalence of these approaches as the preferred approach to managing higher education institutions in South Africa. The possible co-existence of these management principles in a changing higher education landscape was also explored. This question remains important to the South African higher education sector given that there has been substantial and increasing involvement of political policy makers seeking to extract higher levels of accountability from universities. Their main argument has been that the public is funding these universities and therefore universities cannot claim to enjoy unfettered institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The quest to ensure that taxpayers' money is spent well in the higher education sector and the call for greater accountability is fair in principle. However a dogmatic approach leads to the

strengthening of the managerialist approach at the expense of the equally important collegial approach to managing universities. This imbalance is not in the best interest of any aspect of university management and may ultimately lead to the overall weakening of universities.

References

- Chliwniak, L. (1997). *Higher Education Leadership. Analysing the Gender Gap*. George Washington University.
- Chetty, G. (2010). *Transformation of the South African Higher Education sector through Mergers. The Case Study of the Durban University of Technology*. Doctoral Thesis. Durban University of Technology.
- Cloete, N. and Bunting, I. (1999). *Higher Education Transformation. Assessing Performance in South Africa*. CHET Publication.
- Cloete, N. and Bunting, I. (2004). *Developing Performance Indicators for Higher Education. A South African Case Study*. CHET Publication.
- Davis, A. And Thomas, R. (2002). *Managerialism and Accountability in Higher Education: The gendered Nature of Restructuring and the Costs to Academic Service*. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 13, 179-193.
- Deem, R. (1998). *'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom*. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. Vol. 8, No.1. 47-70.
- Hambleton, R. (2006). *Purpose and Collegiality in Planning Education: An International Perspective*. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 26. 107-117.
- Harman, G. and Harman, K. (2003). "Institutional Mergers in Higher Education: Lessons from International Experience". *Tertiary Education and Management*. Jan 9 (1): 29-44.
- Harvey, L. (1995). *The New Collegialism Improvement and Accountability*. *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol 1, No 2. 153-160.
- Jansen, J.D (Editor) (2002). *Mergers in Higher Education- Lessons Learned in Transitional Context*. Pretoria. UNISA Press: 1-190.
- Jensen, H. S. (2010). *Collegialism, Democracy and University Governance - The Case of Denmark*. Working paper 15. Danish School of Education, University of Aarhus. June. hsj@dpu.dk
- Kruss, G. (2008). *Opportunities and Challenges for Teacher Education Curriculum in South Africa*. HSRC Press.
- Kogan, M. (2004). *Managerialism and Evaluation in Higher Education*. UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series Paper No. 7. Paris, Francis, 4-5 November.
- Kogan, M.; Moses, I. and El-Khavas, E. (1994). *Staffing Higher Education – Meeting New Challenges*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lomas, L. And Ursin, J. (2009). *Collegial or Managerial? Academic's Conception of quality in English and Finnish Universities*. *European Education Research Journal*. Vol. 8 Number 3. 447-460.
- Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Open University Press.
- Ministry Of Education. (1997). *Education White Paper 3 – A Programme for Higher Education Transformation*. Government Gazette No 18207, 15 August 1997. Pretoria Government Printers. (White Paper 3).

- Moja, T. and Hayward, F.M.(2000). *Higher education policy development in contemporary South Africa*. Higher Education Policy, 13: 335-359.
- Report on the Stakeholder Summit on Higher Education Transformation. 22-23 April 2010. Department of Higher Education and Training – South Africa.
- Santiago, R.A. Carvalho, T.(2004). *Effects of Managerialism on the Perceptions of Higher Education in Portugal*. Higher Education Policy, 17: 427-444.
- Sanyal, B.C. and Martin, M. (1998). *Management of Higher Education with Special Reference to Financial Management in African Institutions*. International Institute for Educational Planning. Contribution No.28. UNESCO.
- Stratton, M. (1983). *The Structure and Governance of Higher Education*. Society for Research into Higher Education. Surrey.
- Suwanwela, C. (2007). *The Complementarity of Competition and Collaboration in Shaping Higher Education's Contribution to Research and Knowledge*. UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge. 18-19 September 2007. Hangzhou, China.