FOR *Perspectives* AND *Oxford Magazine...*

A COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON 'LEADERSHIP' IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This Paper arises from attendance at the April 2008 St George's, Windsor, seminar on Leadership in HE and it considers several historical texts on university management to see what concept of Leadership (and indeed of the related concept of Governance) may have prevailed in early-twentieth century Cambridge and Harvard, and in mid-twentieth century Britain. The prime texts are: Cornford, 1908, *Microcosmographia Academica: Being a Guide for the Young Academic Politician* ; Eliot, 1909, *University Administration ;* Dundonald, 1962, *Letters to a Vice-Chancellor ;* Lindsay et al, 1931, *The Government of Oxford* ; Bailey, 1977, *Morality and Expediency: The Folklore of Academic Politics*; and Ashby, 1963, *Technology and the Academics: An Essay on Universities and the Scientific Revolution*. (Incidentally, it may say something about the attitude of Oxford Dondom towards university administration and still more towards the concept of management and leadership in universities that the 1909 copy of Eliot when I discovered it in the stacks of the New College Library still had its pages uncut after 95 years - and recall that Cambridge's Lord Annan (1999, p 256 of *The Dons*) noted 'The word 'administrator' sounds so dingy'!)

What comparisons, if any, can be made between the concepts of Leadership in these texts and the state-of-the-art thinking about Leadership in HE as we understand it in the early-twenty-first century, in the age of The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE)? Are there seemingly similar concepts, but expressed differently in that, say, the word 'Leadership' is used sparingly or even not at all in the texts, although the Vice-Chancellors, the Deans and the Registrars of long ago might readily have recognised the managerial concepts that are being explored using the management-speak of the LFHE? Or would these authors have been bemused, even amused, had they participated, courtesy of a time-machine, in the 2008 St George's seminar on Leadership in HE, perhaps seeing us as dressing up and labouring the obvious and the routine?

Is the concept of heroic leadership ('the Great Man' transforms the organisation – and hence, of course, must be well worth the ever-inflating VC salary of £200K-plus) a bit out of place in UK HE, and talking more in terms of effective management and decision-making, while less glamorous, is closer to the culture of the university? And anyway does the recent emphasis on 'leadership' mean that all those who dutifully attended staff development courses a decade ago on being 'a reflective manager', or becoming 'an empowering manager' or even 'an emphatic manager', now must pursue yet more management/leadership development to be a fit person to lead (not just manage) the HEI – or bits of it - in 2008? Let's try and put all this in a historical context, and get beyond the hype and jargon of the airport bookstall approach to instant managerial success...

So first up, CORNFORD (a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Professor of Ancient Philosophy; writing at the age of c35 in 1908 or so): Cornford is writing about the conservatism of the aging leaders of most organisations in most eras, not just about the reluctance of oldie academics to embrace change for Edwardian Cambridge, and hence if 'the management of change' is a (the?) key aspect of Leadership, whether in HE or elsewhere, Cornford speaks to us across the intervening century. What does he say to us? To make progress Cornford's 'Young Man in a Hurry' must acquire *influence* as a sound chap, as 'a Good Business Man', and then develop patience to thwart the many blocking tactics of his opponents as well as negotiating over projects (*jobs*) in a suitably oblique way to bring folk onside (*squaring*) – nothing quite so blunt as declaring 'you scratch my back...'.

Thus, Leadership is a steady process of building consensus for a project/plan, of achieving consensus by wearing down conservative-minded opponents and obtaining the support of influential colleagues by in turn backing their projects/plans. This is Leadership as organisational politics, as power-broking, as horse-trading, within constitutional corporations (the college and the university). Does the management of the modern HEI no longer need such an approach because the 2008 VC is now also a Chief Executive and has direct power and authority not available to Cornford's players of the game? Or was Cambridge even then (and now is still more so – along with Oxford) an exception in terms of HEI governance in that it was an academic democracy and hence time-consuming effort was needed to

persuade and convince co-equals as voters in the Regent House or at a College Governing Body? No need for that in the era of modern HE Leadership, despite, of course, paying due lip-service to engaging in a decent period of consultation with relevant stakeholders before imposing change? Needless to say Cornford does not use the word 'leadership', and to him 'Chief Executive' just might be barely an acceptable term in municipal government for the Clerk to the Council or perhaps for the General Manager of the Great Western Railway, but surely never in a university!

What of DUNDONALD in providing guidance to a new VC some fifty years later? The VC must be tolerant of the academic mind's enjoyment of debate, of exploring all sides of the issue; the matter must not be brought to the vote prematurely, nor should the VC be putting proposals from the chair: all of this is again leadership via patient consensus-building, the leader as 'the good non-committal listener'. There is much in Dundonald about the role of the VC in providing academic leadership of the process for determining the university undergraduate curriculum (general education, liberal studies, a foundation year, etc): does the 2008 VC closely involve himself/herself in directing the nature of 'the student experience' as part of the institutional leadership expected? Similarly Dundonald advises his VC to attend some admissions interviews as an observer. Again, nowhere does Dundonald use the word 'leadership'...

Could this be because within his generation it might be readily assumed that those reaching the ranks of VC were already well familiar with 'leading men', through shared backgrounds by way of having been prefects in their public schools, serving a stint as captains of sports teams and as presidents of student societies in their Oxbridge colleges, and their wartime experience as officers in the forces? Note also Dundonald's assumption that there is voting as part of the constitutional governance/management of the HEI as a corporation: is the taking of a vote now for the twenty-first century HEI leader to be seen as a sign of poor leadership? Should the effective HEI leader always get his/her way (or its way as a Senior Management Team), and the taking of a vote indicating either that there is not sufficient trust in the wisdom of the leadership or that the leadership is too weak to force through a proposal? Or might a rediscovered concept of voting be a usefully healthy way of legitimising institutional (or faculty, departmental) leadership? Perhaps the University that votes together rows better together?!

The Dundonald style of VC can be seen in the description of Sir James Mountford as VC of Liverpool (1945-1963) in Kelly, 1981, *For Advancement of Learning: The University of Liverpool 1881-1981* (Ch 8, 'The Mountford Era'): 'a man who throve on problems, and had the classical scholar's firm belief in the power of reasoned argument... a shrewd appreciation of political realities, and a quick and firm grasp of administrative and financial detail... his particular skill was as a chairman [where] he was specially good at sensing and summing up the feeling of the meeting, and even when controversial issues arose, his patience, wisdom, and good humour often enabled an agreed solution to be found... '. Similarly, in Ives, 2000, *The First Civic University: Birmingham 1880-1980*, we get Ch 12 on 'Charles Grant Robertson' as its VC in a slightly earlier period, but here it is noted that chairing was not his forte: 'His great failing was prolixity; on one occasion his opening remarks when chairing a committee were timed at fifty-two minutes and were only that brief because of an interruption.' One benefactor said that GR was 'intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity', and, on making a large gift to the University to which the VC responded by declaring 'Sir Charles, you generosity leaves me speechless', the benefactor replied 'A miracle'! That said, Ives sees him as 'a real academic leader' in finding the money to expand facilities in the 1920s, in his 'creativity' and 'vision and ability'.

On Sir Robert Aitkin as Birmingham's VC in the 1960s, Ives notes that his 'fundamental commitment was to collegiality and to what would today be called 'ownership'... a firm proponent of the view that decisions must be taken bottom up, that is at faculty meetings...'; via, in Aitkin's own words, 'machinery for arriving at major decisions after due discussion... [and 'machinery' which] must be operated by academic people because it concerns academic matters or academic persons'. Aitkin put much effort into ensuring that, in his words again, he 'had the votes when it came to Senate'; as Ives adds, it was 'Aitkin's belief that it was vital for a vice-chancellor to carry his staff with him' as 'a determined proponent of academic consensus'. Also, Aitkin 'would back ability and commitment and he wanted and could pick winners' (in one academic year 'he attended every academic appointment board, even for assistant lecturers' – and, if an internal candidate got the chair, 'he would find the vice-chancellor bringing the news in person').

Thinking ahead to Eliot as discussed below, for similar material on Harvard's three Presidents between the 1930s and the 1980s (Conant, Pusey, Bok), and on Harvard's Deans, see Keller & Keller, 2001, *Making Harvard Modern: The Rise of America's University*; and for how things can go very wrong when collegiality breaks down in the context of a different style of Harvard President (Summers), see Lewis, 2006, *Excellence Without a Soul.* On the truly world-class success of interestingly tiny Princeton, and the contribution of its long-serving twentieth-century presidents (Hibben, Dodds, Bowen), see Axtell, 2006, *The Making of Princeton University.* (On Oxford's recent institutionally painful experience of a non-academic VC appointment, see Tapper & Palfreyman, second edition of *Oxford and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition* (forthcoming, Springer); and, by the same authors, for a wider discussion of collegiality in universities/academe (also Springer, forthcoming), see *The Collegiate Tradition in the Age of Mass Higher Education.*)

In LINDSAY et al (1931), when commenting on governance/management at 'Modern Universities' in contrast to the medieval 'direct democracy' of Oxford and Cambridge, the VC is portrayed as rather more powerful than by Dundonald some thirty years later: 'The authority of the Vice-Chancellor is, of course, very great. In ordinary routine matters, in practice even where not by legal right, he is supreme... [perhaps because he] is in constant and intimate touch with every aspect of university life... [and] is a member of the Senate as well as of the Council... [so that] his voice carries very great weight in either body. ' This is the power of position and knowledge, of mastery of detail; but the VC 'is not so promptly influential in the Senate as in the Council... [for] University teachers are notable for their sometimes excessive individualism, and are far less likely to accept without argument an authoritative pronouncement than is an executive body many of whose members are professional business men... [and anyway] the professors are far more closely in touch than the members of Council with the details of university affairs'. This is the problem of managing professional groups: doctors in the NHS, social workers in local government, lawyers in law firms; and raises the concept of collegial decision-making. It also raises the issue of the role of external/lay members in university governance, as discussed further below.

For a fictional exploration of power in an HE context (a Cambridge college), see Snow, 1951, *The Masters* (Ch 8, 'Three Kinds of Power'): Brown 'wanted

to handle, coax, guide, contrive, so that men found themselves in the places he had designed; he did not want an office or title to underline his power, it was good enough to sit back amiably and see it work'... whereas Chrystal wanted 'to be known as a man of power... needed the moment-by-moment sensation of power... needed to feel he was listened to, that he was commanding here and now, that his word was obeyed'... and Jago 'enjoyed the dramatic impact of power... longed for all the trappings, titles, ornaments, and show of power... in every act of formal duty, there was a gleam of magic... [and] he believed that there were things only he could do... he had dreams of what he could do with his power... [while having] nothing of the certainty with which, in humility, accepting their limitations, Chrystal and Brown went about their aims...' Jago, desiring the Mastership so/too much, does not get elected. A command-and-control Chrystal is unlikely to fit a collegial culture, and he too is duly eliminated – see below for more on organizational cultures in HE. And read the book to see who wins – it is not Brown; it is 'a man of justice and fair-dealing' who is 'good-humoured and self-assured', with a sound academic reputation as 'a distinguished man of science' (even if some felt 'scientists are too bumptious'), although he is also described as having 'no feeling and no glow', nor 'a scrap of imagination'…

In similar vein, Amis, 1954, *Lucky Jim*, gives us a glimpse of stultifying departmental academic life and hierarchy as 'led' by Professor Welch; while Bradbury, 1975, *The History Man*, gives us a wonderful description of 'the elaborate social construct' that is the chaotic departmental meeting presided over by Professor Marvin, assisted by his Administrative Assistant with her 'small alarm clock' that 'pings' to signify the start of the meeting and precisely three-and-a-half hours later its predetermined end (pp 152-161). In Davies, 1986 & 1988, *A Very Peculiar Practice* and *A Very Peculiar Practice: The New Frontier*, the world of the post-Jarratt Report (1985) CEO-VC of the entrepreneurial university is dissected; while Bradbury (1987, *Cuts*) and Parkin (1986, *The Mind and Body Shop*) explore how chalk-face academics try to respond to exhortations from their business-like VCs to sell themselves in the Brave New World of income-generating 1980s HE.

Next, in terms of our central historical texts, and way back from 1909 is ELIOT (sometime President of Harvard): he begins by considering the crucial role of the trustees/regents in university governance (such lay influence did

not exist at Cambridge, and Dundonald makes only passing reference to the lay majority on Council and Council's ultimate control of all financial matters - and hence also of the academic resources deployed by Senate to deliver teaching and research). Moreover, through the Harvard Board of Overseers there is the additional input of alumni influence as a set of stakeholders utterly ignored in UK HE (or at least until very recently): the Board is both 'a brake' on the 'too experimental' activities of the academics, and also the source of 'the needed stimulation' where the academics have become 'inert or too conservative'. Here we perhaps see the US love of constitutional checks and balances to diffuse power: a lesson for the UK with its current emphasis on the Chief Executive VC?

Thus it is Chapter III before Eliot gets to 'The University Faculty', and here he warns against aging conservatism ('To have its administration fall chiefly into the hands of elderly men is a grave misfortune for any university') – what is the age-profile (and indeed the gender profile) of the average SMT in today's UK HEI?! Eliot sees 'the faculty' as a collective, 'the agglomeration of university teachers', that is the essence of the university as an institution; and only if that body is energetic and committed will the university thrive: 'Nothing can take the place of vitality in a faculty, no one-man power in a president or dean, no vigor and ambition in a board of trustees, and no affection or zeal in the graduates of the institution... A wise president will dread nothing so much as an inert and uninterested faculty.' In terms of the chairing of the departments that a large faculty must inevitably be divided into, the President or a special committee should select a rotating head who need not be a professor (to avoid 'dangers from the domination of masterful personages'!).

And only by Chapter VI does Eliot get to 'The President', although this topic is shared with others within this sweeping-up chapter: 'The president of a university is in the first place its chief executive officer [sic]; but he should also be its leader and seer... and inspirer'. He will proceed using 'selective discretion' in the context of the government of a university being 'neither autocratic nor democratic, but constitutional'; his 'most constant duty is that of supervision', a role notable for its 'universality and comprehensiveness' – involvement in all faculty appointments and presiding at faculty meetings, but never exercising 'an autocratic or one-man power'. The President is 'an inventing and animating force, and often a leader; but not a ruler or autocrat': 'His success will be due more to powers of exposition and persuasion

combined with persistent industry, than to any force of will or habit of command. Indeed, one-man power is always objectionable in a university, whether lodged in president, secretary of the trustees, dean, or head of department.'

So is the 'inventing and animating' university president what today we would label as an empowering manager, but is being a leader something else again? Not clear from Eliot, and not very clear in today's literature: what in HE is an administrator, as opposed to a manager; what is a manager, as opposed to a leader; what does a leader do that even a successful manager does not do and hence is still not seen as a leader? And it can get very jargon-ridden: what exactly is 'distributed leadership' and how is it different, if at all, from the lawyer tracing delegated power and authority through the decision-making levels of the HEI as a chartered or statutory corporation? In exploring below a little of the recent literature on leadership generally and within HE specifically, I shall try to answer these questions…

As for the Dean: Eliot back in 1909 sees him as the chief administrative officer of the department/faculty, needing 'good judgment, quick insight, patience... thoroughness in inquiry, promptness and clearness in decision, and assiduity' while being 'alert, attentive, sympathetic, and hopeful... frank, considerate, and cordial'; he will 'inspire confidence and win regard, and be capable of exerting a good influence without visible effort, and without self-consciousness'. Would the modern Dean's academic colleagues ask for much more when drawing up 'the person spec' for the post, and would the modern Dean's boss (the VC?) in the management team hierarchy stress disproportionately 'promptness and clearness in decision' over those other valuable attributes and traits?

Clearly, Eliot is fairly close to describing 'the person spec' of the modern HEI leader ('head-hunters' might usefully consult Eliot's text when charging us excessive fees for finding our management talent!), but he notes the need to operate within a constitutional context: the university, as has been said, is a corporation (chartered or statutory), subject to the law of corporations (not the same as company law) combined with charity law and the law of agency. This is the legal context of leadership in HE, to be comprehended and respected alongside understanding and valuing the organisational culture of the HEI and also mastering its political processes. The successful HEI leader will

recognise how much power and authority has been delegated to him as the agent of the corporation and within the HEI's constitutional committee structure. He will avoid acting ultra vires, utilising both formal power as invested in his office and as delegated to him in order to command and control, and also using informal sources of power and influence in order to cajole and convince. The truly successful leader may be the one who very rarely relies on the former and who prefers the latter as his modus operandi, while leaving the led to conclude that they achieved progress by way of reaching a collective and rational consensus...

A similar constitutional analysis is to be found in Moodie & Eustace, 1974, *Power and Authority in British Universities* : the 1970s VC has little formal, direct power within the corporation, but can achieve much via informal routes – how much has really changed for the contemporary VC in the-VC-as-CEO, post-Jarrett era? In Warner & Palfreyman (eds), 2003, *Managing Crisis*, the case-studies of mis-governance and mis-management in UK HEIs reveal that problems often arise where over-bearing HEI leaders over-ride the constitutional checks and balances within the corporation; there is a breakdown in institutional collegiality, a lack of transparency, a failure of fiduciary duty on the part of the SMT and/or the Governing Body. Much the same point is made in Shattock, 2006, *Managing Good Governance in Higher Education* and also in his *Managing Successful Universities* (2003).

Bowen explores governance from a US perspective, and from the experience of having been both the President of Princeton University and of the Mellon Foundation (as well as of having been a non-executive director of such companies as American Express, Merck and NCR), in *The Board Book: An Insider's Guide for Directors and Trustees* (2008): governance is all about 'power and accountability' ('who exercises power, on behalf of whom, and how the exercise of power is controlled') and effective governing boards are needed to provide 'checks and balances by adding layers of judgment and protections against abuse of power, self-dealing, favoritism, and just plain foolishness' (even if that means 'the exercise of collective responsibility through the mechanism of a board can slow down decision making'); and anyway, 'more positively, the existence of a board encourages the development of a shared sense of institutional purpose and an awareness of the broader social, economic and political context within which decisions are made'. But the university board should not become 'too "business-like"...',

mimicking too closely how the board might function in a commercial entity: 'Simple transplants of what are thought to be best practices may not work well'; and indeed 'well-run nonprofits have much to teach their profit-making cousins', including about 'the advantages of collegial decision making'. And, above all, the simplistic application of the 'CEO-centric model of governance has little relevance' to HEIs where 'the central importance of academic freedom and of academic judgments constrain the roles played by the president, other officers, and trustees'.

Bowen quotes at length Hanna Gray (onetime President of the University of Chicago), who perceptively explains the crucial significance of institutional context for the effectiveness of governance, leadership and management in the university, a culture with which the successful HEI leader-manager just has to be empathic and indeed content: 'There are basic reasons why academic institutions are organised and governed as they are, in the service of education and research and of excellence in these pursuits. Faculty are not just 'professionals' with a commitment to their professions outside the institution as well as to the institution... or odd types who tend to want collegial and complex decision-making. They are individual talents and intellectual entrepreneurs, demanding developers of their disciplines... who have in fact certain constitutional rights in the process of governance and who hold the most important authority that exists in a university, that of making ultimate academic judgments. And boards exist in part to ensure this freedom and creativity and to protect the processes and the health of the environment that make them possible. In short, they exist for the sustenance of a mission, for the perpetuation of an institution in which it is embodied over time in such a way that the future is not mortgaged to the present and, by fiduciary obligation, for the direct care and preservation of corporate assets entrusted specifically for the pursuit of a particular mission and its related goals'.

Hence, bearing in mind this wise guidance from those who have really 'led' truly serious world-class US universities, on this side of the Atlantic HEI 'boards' – councils, senates, governors, academic boards, etc – should be very concerned when the Association of Heads of University Administration (AHUA), via its 'governance group' which has been 'working with' the DIUS on 'freeing' HEIs from 'unnecessary constitutional bureaucracy', sets itself the task of commissioning lawyers to review 'the minimum provisions' required in

'amended' university instruments of governance and to propose 'model articles' that remove 'unnecessarily burdensome and out-of-date provisions': this is far too important a matter to be left to bureaucrats and lawyers!

As opposed to organisational culture, there is then, as noted just immediately above, also the legal context: the law of corporations, charity law and the fiduciary duty of HEI trustees-governors and of HEI officers, and the law of meetings and of delegation/agency, are discussed in Farrington & Palfreyman, 2006, *The Law of Higher Education* - it is argued that, as against the distracting glamour and excitement of managerial involvement in entrepreneurial activities, the need for formal and proper decision-making that is properly recorded becomes a lost art amongst HEI leaders/managers, despite being one that a generation or so back both Dundonald and Moodie & Eustace saw as essential to the sound conduct of university business: sometimes, sadly, good leadership (or, less ambitiously, sound management) means also having a focus on rather boring, dry and dreary matters and not just concentrating on inventing and implementing vision, mission and strategy! Also it might be worth reminding ourselves that the very word 'university' stems from the medieval term in Latin for a corporation, for a collective body ('universitas'): the university originally was the formal gathering together of an academic community. Now in legal terms it may well be technically a lay-dominated 'board' that is the personification of the corporate entity which controls the assets, but, as already stressed by Eliot, such a board is presiding over merely and only a shadow of a university if there is not 'vitality' within the academic collective. In Eliot's terms an 'inert and uninterested' academic body, perhaps bruised by poor management, is unlikely to be at the cutting edge of research, keeping up its scholarship, and ensuring the delivery of what is truly higher education by way of its commitment to teaching – for a discussion of just what 'higher' means in *higher* education (as opposed to, say, tertiary education) see Chapter 1 of *The Oxford Tutorial* (Palfreyman, second edition 2008 forthcoming; Chinese translation, 2008, Peking University Press).

Bruce Truscot (1943, *Red Brick University*; and, 1945, *Redbrick and these Vital Days*; combined and revised as a1951 Pelican, *Red Brick University*) firmly stresses the same 'universitas' point: the university as 'a body of teachers and scholars – nothing less and nothing more'. And hence, when later discussing university governance, he sees the VC burdened by 'a very

great load of responsibility' in being the interface or the intermediary between the lay-dominated Council and the academic Senate, the latter as the 'universitas' housed and financed by the former as the controlling trustees of the university's infrastructure and budget: 'Very few Vice-Chancellors have succeeded in being equally persona grata to both [Council and Senate]. The first question one asks about a newly-appointed Vice-Chancellor is generally, 'Will he be a Council man or a Senate man?' That remark reveals the weakness of the dual-government system more vividly than many pages of argument.' Arguably the (re)assertion of Council power and authority since the mid-1980s Jarratt Report as the harbinger of 'New Managerialism' – matched by the financial impoverishment, cultural diminution, professional proletarisation, and political emasculation of academe – explains our present HE governance and management malaise: most VCs, and their (perhaps over-loyal) SMTs, are, in Truscot's terms, clearly perceived as Council-men, and more so in some 'managed' HEIs than in others that cling on to their collegial culture.

BAILEY (1977), writing about universities in the 1960s and 1970s, gives us the perspective of the anthropologist: the book is 'about institutional facades, make-believe and pretence, lies and hypocrisy, and other performances' as the university and the political actors within it struggle to balance the three contradictory and conflicting goals of 'the pursuit of learning for its own sake' (scholarship), 'the benefit to be derived from belonging to a community' (collegiality), and the seeking of power (organisational control). Myths, confusions and role-play abound: for example, the academics see the academic-administrator as 'autocratic and authoritarian', becoming 'devious and manipulative' if checked; the academic-administrator sees academics as 'lazy and cynical and cunning and evasive', raising 'a facade of scholarship to escape doing the job they have been paid to do'! Thus, there are 'two partly opposed myths': the senate/academe wants 'to preserve the standards of scholarship by controlling an executive which has an imperfect understanding of these standards and is always likely to be corrupted by power'; while 'the administration' seeks 'to preserve the standards of scholarship by adapting those standards, in the teeth of an unrealistic and obstructive senate, to the realities of the world outside'. The two 'are locked in a continuing contest to impose on each other their own version of the reality in which they live'. Another analysis of the university from the 1970s notes also the lay member factor: the Council-Senate dichotomy, 'the division of university affairs into

financial and property matters, which on no account must dreamy, impractical academics get their hands on, and purely academic affairs, from which ignorant outsiders must be excluded at all costs' (Livingstone, 1974, *The University: An Organisational Analysis*, p 51 – see also Dunsire, 1973, *Administration: The Word & the Science*, who, in a university context (pp 48-50), saw the senior ranks of 'the administration' as enjoying equality of status with the professors, but the latter as jealously guarding their monopoly over the direction and control of 'production' as teaching and research).

Bailey's 'actors' divide into: 'elder statesmen or founding fathers' as 'men with great personal credibility' but who are also 'cronies of one another' and 'the advisors of those in power', working behind the scenes as 'courtiers'; others 'believe that the right kind of political competition is that which is conducted in the open', and they are 'soap-box people'; and, thirdly, there are 'essentially shy men, who have systematic minds, believe in the rules and subscribe to the doctrine of rational solutions'. And the successful actors utilise a variety of 'masks' for commanding, cajoling, convincing or plain bullying: the deployment of the mask of 'reason', or of money/resources ('buck'), or of principle via 'sermon', or of personal manipulation ('stroke'), or of humanity and goodwill ('saint'), or of blunt intimidation as a 'baron', or of process and procedure ('formula'), or of discussion among reasonable men seeking the collective good ('rational'), or of cronyism ('patron'), or of championing the oppressed ('rock'). The clever leader/manager (or indeed manipulator) of academic men can deploy a (limited) range of these ten masks: 'effective competitors have a wardrobe containing several masks and some appreciation of how masks must be fitted to context'. The range is limited, however, because otherwise the actor doning all the masks inter-changeably lacks credibility by being too chameleon-like and untrustworthy; yet the actor 'with just one mask is a political cripple' unable to adapt to changing circumstances (the best mask for managing change, according to Bailey, is 'stroke' – note also Cornford's 'squaring').

It all goes wrong when the leaders develop 'an elite mentality and a paternalistic outlook', when they become 'willing to listen more to themselves and less to the voices of those on whose behalf they are acting': 'They lose sensitivity and they lose their ability to stay in touch with reality.' The way to avoid this 'decline and fall into insensitivity' is to build into organisational politics and the university's constitution 'systematic checks and balances

between committees or between committee and officials', and to accept that it is all a really a rather depressing and messy business where 'the ship seldom contrives to steer a straight course' between Scylla as 'the rock of principle' and Charybdis as 'expediency': 'Usually, if there is progress, it is achieved by bouncing from one rock to another' (presumably without actually and fatally holing the good vessel 'uni' beneath the waterline!). Indeed, the dustjacket declares that 'It is impossible – and therefore wholly unwise to try – to run such organisations [of 'irresolvable contradictions'] in a wholly open and wholly rational fashion: without an appropriate measure of pretence and secrecy, even of hypocrisy, they cannot be made to work'.

Bailey is sympathetic to the head/chair of department as on especially unfortunate, and often press-ganged, sailor on board this ship as it veers between the rocks of decision-making, as 'The Man in the Middle' (pp 184-192): he is 'expected to run his department as a participatory democracy' while also being 'the lowest rung of management, a member of an authoritarian bureaucracy, allowed to funnel advice and suggestions upwards, but certainly expected to implement the commands which come down to him'; he risks being 'neither a bureaucrat nor a colleague, and therefore an abomination' which is bound 'to induce a nervous breakdown'! The way to survive as a chair is 'by keeping to a minimum public confrontations with others over matters of principle', by not publicly facing up to 'the contradictions inherent in the chairman's position' ('his incapacity to meet and satisfy simultaneously the demands of an impersonal bureaucracy and the collegial obligations of departmental leadership'). Instead, the canny chair/head succeeds 'by going behind the scenes and dealing, on an entirely personal level, both with administrators and with his departmental colleagues'.

Turning to the last of our historical prime texts, in ASHBY (1958; revised 1963) we again get discussion of the HEI as a corporation in which there are constitutional procedures, and also both formal and informal processes, for reaching decisions (although to many his analysis will seem rather more dated than that of the others in terms of readers' recent experience of the functioning of most HEIs, and it certainly seems to suggest a passive role for the VC that does not tally with the descriptions given by the likes of Kelly and Ives above): 'The government and organisation of British universities is a remarkable phenomenon... for policy is not dictated from above and there is

no descending chain of responsibility and authority... In essential matters business flows upwards as proposals to be approved, not downwards as directives to be obeyed' (in fact, technically there absolutely must be precisely that 'chain' in legal terms, by way of delegated authority through the committee hierarchy and through the serried ranks of HEI officers/administrator-managers, otherwise the HEI's decisions could be declared ultra vires and void). Ashby sees 'university government' essentially as 'a sort if inverted hierarchy', where 'policy-making begins – in a healthy university at any rate – at the level of departments, among the teaching staff'.

And within this 'inverted hierarchy' sits the VC: 'Far from being a man charged with the responsibility of creating policy, he finds himself obliged to feed in ideas (if he has any) at the level of departments or faculties, and then patiently to watch them from the chair at numerous committees, percolating upwards towards the Council. A large proportion of his time, and the bulk of his reserves of moral stamina, are spent in persuading committees of the virtues of unanimity, guiding ideas from one committee to the next...'. It is crucial, as Ashby sees things, that 'members of the academic staff have de facto control of the following four functions': admissions and examinations; course curricula; the appointment of academic staff; and the allocation of resources 'in a way consistent with the traditions of university self-government'.

On this last point, however, he recognises 'the Achilles' heel of academic freedom inside the university' in that 'no degree of self-government within universities could avail to protect them against intervention from their paymasters if the paymasters were minded to intervene' – happily back then Ashby could confidently add that 'in fact in the United Kingdom the paymasters have never intervened, and there is good reason to hope that they will not do so in the future'! He also acknowledged that 'this peculiar system' [of governance] that is 'so essential to the stability of universities' is 'so imperfectly understood outside them': 'Men with tidy minds are bound to ask whether universities could not be run more efficiently if there efforts were co-ordinated and planned from above.' But 'the short answer is that a university is a society, not a public service or an industry. Its vitality depends on the maximum opportunity for initiative being distributed among the maximum number of members of the society. You cannot issue directives for scholarship and you cannot devise assembly lines for research. Conformity,

orthodoxy, the party-line, are out of place in the academic world.' Thus, 'in a university where the flow of business is upwards and not downwards through the hierarchy, members of the academic staff are able to determine their own policies and to manage their own affairs, notwithstanding the fact sovereignty formally resides in a governing body composed of layman.'

All this debate in HE about the effective leader and about good governance is, of course, clouded by the context: intellectually healthy academics are going to be pretty sceptical, even cynical, about their academic-managers departing for leadership programmes and returning allegedly equipped to inspire (and lead) their chalk-face colleagues (the led as rather reluctant followers). Academics do not buy instant-management books at airport bookstalls (although some of them might write such texts – the ones travelling Business Class!); for them leadership needs a lot of legitimising. Moreover, the view of HEI leadership/management is coloured by the perception of autonomy in HE: here we must think of layers of autonomy, of autonomy for the HE sector, for institutions within the sector, for faculties and departments inside those HEIs, for degree programme teams, for individual academics, and for the academic collective as a profession nationally or as a professional group of employees within the HEI; and also we must think in terms of autonomy from what. Dealing with the latter issue first: autonomy from Government interference dutifully transmitted (or buffered?) by HEFCE; autonomy from general accountability via metrics, PIs, and league tables; and autonomy from growing student/parental consumerism.

Turning to the former: arguably, sector autonomy is decreasing as student/parental consumerism gathers pace in the context of rising tuition fees; institutional autonomy has probably on average increased if one allows for the freeing of the ex-poly HEIs from the close control of local government, even if ever more data needs to be supplied to one Government department or another or to a myriad of quangoes infesting HE; autonomy for academic units (faculties, schools, departments) within HEIs will vary hugely with the organisational culture of the HEI and the style of the VC/SMT, but overall has probably declined; autonomy for the most basic of academic units, the degree programme delivery-team might, however, have been left intact as the focus of institutional management/leadership is on supposedly more important matters - perhaps less so, however, for the research team; and, finally, the autonomy of individual academics within the HEI and of academics as

professionals collectively, whether in a local or national context, has declined as they have been 'deprofessionalised' and 'casualised', and have become just one other element of the HEI labour force in HR terms. And that also shows in academic pay – other than for the RAE-star, or member of the SMT! On all this, see Annan, 1990, *Our Age* (Ch 23, 'The Dons Learn Bitter Realities'); Annan, 1999, *The Dons* (Ch 14, 'Down with Dons'); and Halsey, 1992, *Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century* (Ch 6, 'Guild, Union, Profession, and Proletariat' – 'prestige, salaries, autonomy, and resources have been much humbled').

It is perhaps the decline in the relative status of being a university lecturer, not least when everywhere seems now to have a 'uni', that leaves academe feeling devalued, undervalued and grumpy, and perceiving all aspects of HE autonomy as being under threat and uniformly in decline. And this depressed and frustrated core of the academic collective, this recently created professional lumpen proletariat awaiting its Lenin, then blames the HEI management for all ills, especially where the high-profile and expanding management team has pretensions to be offering leadership to this disgruntled posse of cats that, even in the best of times, are difficult to herd. It has been remarked that this particular kind of cat is best herded by dangling a red-herring in front of it – perhaps by adding 'car-parking' to the agenda as a distraction while other issues slip through. Others see HE leadership/management as getting the butterflies to fly in formation! In short, discussing leadership in HE is inseparable from getting to grips with the big issues of just where HE and academe fit into the great scheme of things, and not least whether HE is any longer a public service or is now effectively a private consumption good; also whether the scale of the modern HEI, compared with a Birmingham or a Liverpool in Aitkin's or Mountford's day, means that the role of the VC is incomparably different.

Moreover, it may just be that one can no longer simply talk of leadership in terms of any and all HEIs; that in practice there is now such diversity of mission among UK HEIs as to make meaningless the comparison of the management style appropriate to running the differing types of HEI (from the 'training' and 'employer-engaged' vocational and local 'uni' at one extreme of the spectrum to the 'research-led' global-player at the other, from Coketown to Camford). And this even assumes that 'leadership' is the right concept and construct. Perhaps we should really aspire only to the rather unglamorous

and unexciting idea, and ideal, that HEI business can be conducted, and the efforts of our (generally well-meaning) HE colleagues can be harnessed and focused, with tolerable efficiency and with reasonable economy: to produce effective results by way of churning out employable graduates that also make good citizens and by way of sustaining the integrity of scholarship (as the common parts of the mission of all HEIs); and also contributing effective outputs to Society and the Economy by way of some combination, varying amongst types of HEI, of the university fulfilling its duty of broad civic and community engagement, of consultancy support for local/regional business, of facilitating technology transfer, of adding to human knowledge through research.

Of course, that may mean renaming 'The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education' (LFHE) as the rather less catchy and less impressive sounding 'Organisation for Facilitating Incremental Improvement in the Effective and Routine Management of Higher Education' (OFIIERMHE)... Or, in contrast and assuming we do want to sign up for the exciting concept of heroic leadership, try the 'Organisation for Furthering and Facilitating Innovative, Constructive and Inspirational Alpha Leadership in Higher Education' (OFFICIAL HE)!

Finally, by way of 'further reading', for a refreshingly short review of the latest management school thinking on leadership, see Western, 2007, *Leadership: A Critical Text;* and for the interesting analogy of managing professionals in heath-care, see a text that is better than the average usual over-simplistic 'instant-manager' offering (albeit from a US perspective): Mannion, 2005, *From Management to Leadership: Practical Strategies for Health Care Leaders.* Specifically on UK HE see two texts from the Warner-Palfreyman 17-volume 'Managing Universities and Colleges' Open University Press series: Chapter 6 ('Managing staff development for leadership, management and administration') in Partington & Stainton, 2003, *Managing Staff Development;* and Chapter 4 ('Managing for performance – today and tomorrow', by Middlehurst and Kennie) in Hall, 2003, *Managing People*.

Western (Lancaster Management School) reviews the main 'leadership discourses': the leader as 1900s 'Controller' of the organization as a 'Machine'; the leader as 1960s 'Therapist' roaming the organization as an 'Organism'; and the leader as 1980s 'Messiah' operating within the

organisation as a 'Network' and offering 'inspirational motivation' as 'transformational leadership'. Western then explores his new concept of the leader as embracing the ethics and ecology of the workplace to create an emancipatory rather than a controlling organizational culture (the 'Eco-leader'). For Western, management is about seeking greater 'efficiency and control', while leadership is something more: 'moving forward, taking authority, creating change through influencing' (not, I fear, a very deep, meaningful or precise definition!). In terms of the chronology of these 'leadership discourses', therefore, the 'Controller' is an anachronism in the context of a modern educated workforce; the psycho-babble of the 'Therapist' is as credible as a woolly-hatted and be-sandalled peacenik; the visionary and charismatic 'Hero-Messiah' is increasingly just too larger-than-life and one-size-fits-all, just too, well, discredited Blairite and Clintonesque for 2008 (and also the Messiah-leader has too many overlaps with 'religious fundamentalism' for Western, who discuses 'leadership' in religion and grandiose 'totalizing cultures', and he even has a chapter on 'Christian Fundamentalism and Corporate America'!).

In fact, Western comments that the Controller often lurks within the Messiah; that the Therapist is still alive and well in the HR function within parts of the public sector; and that the Messiah discourse continues to attract a following as 'the contemporary dominant discourse in the mainstream literature and practising leaders' mindset'. But, for Western, the future lies with the 'emergent' Eco-leader and his/her healthy stress on such ideas and concepts as: 'connectivity and organic sustainable growth', 'respect for all living things' (sic), 'devolved power', 'dispersed leadership and having the confidence of not knowing'… (by p 207 we get a photograph of the 'Contemplation Pods' attached to the insanely expensive Scottish Parliament - in which, presumably, Scottish MPs contemplate leading a Scotland independent of the yoke of England and also contemplate how then to achieve the dreary management task of balancing the excess of public spending over tax revenues raised within Scotland) – and at this point one recalls the common sense of Henry Minztberg (a Canadian psychology professor) and his brief article in the *Harvard Business Review* entitled 'Enough leadership' (November 2004, pp 21/22).

A thorough academic review, with recent research findings in a UK HE context, is Deem et al, 2007, *Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New*

Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities : a somewhat bleak picture is painted of remote SMTs, of a break-down of trust between the led-managed and their leaders-managers, of growing divides within HEIs – 'our data suggest some lack of congruence between the values manager-academics claim to espouse and those they actually appear to practice', and the future management of the effective HEI 'does not lie in the over-managed institutionalised mistrust that currently bedevils it...'. The UK HE leader-manager may, as they say, talk-the-talk but he/she seemingly fails to walk-the-walk! He/she is really a Controller disguised as a Messiah: a fatal combination for, as Western comments in his text, 'the result of an espoused Messiah leadership discourse colliding with the experience of a Controller discourse creates cynicism and distrust, resulting in low morale' (p 168).

The cerebral, academic HE leader-manager should also be consulting Berquist & Pawlak, 2008, *Engaging the Six Cultures of the Academy* as a 'Revised and Expanded Edition of *The Four Cultures of the Academy*' (1992). We have the original four cultures: 'the collegial culture' that values rationality and the ethos of the university; 'the managerial culture' that focuses on clearly 'specified goals and purposes' while discharging 'fiscal responsibility' and deploying 'effective supervisory skills'; 'the developmental culture' that values 'personal openness' and 'the encouragement of potential'; and 'the culture of advocacy' concerned with 'establishing equitable and egalitarian policies and procedures for the distribution of resources and benefits in the institution' and utilising 'the ultimate role of power' to achieve 'new and liberating social attitudes and structures'. The two extra recent cultures are: 'the virtual culture' based on 'the global perspective of open, shared, responsive educational systems' needed 'to make sense of the fragmentation and ambiguity that exists in the postmodern world'; and 'the tangible culture' that is itself a response to the former, and 'finds meaning in its roots, its community, and its spiritual grounding'. The authors offer 'specific suggestions to engage the six cultures by taking an appreciative perspective and through the ironic management of the paradoxes and polarities that are inherent in the interactions among these six cultures'.

And this issue of organizational culture really is important. Schein (*Organisational Culture and Leadership*, 1992) provides a neat definition: it is a 'pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved

its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.' In linking culture and leadership, this means, says Schein: 'The bottom line for leaders is that, if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead.' As Berquist & Pawlak note in terms of all six cultures that 'live' together simultaneously on the campus (even if, in practice, one of the two key cultures (collegial or managerial) tends to be the dominant one for a given HEI): 'Perhaps these cultural differences are what make the higher education institution so vibrant and challenging to learn in, work in, administer, and lead. The fact that the six cultures exist together is a testament to the value that the academy places on diversity of thought'. For a UK HE version of the Berquist/Pawlak US-Canada analysis, see Chapter 2 ('Organisational Culture', by Dopson & McNay) in Warner & Palfreyman (editors), 1996, *Higher Education Management: The Key Elements*: within a matrix of a 'loose-tight' style of 'policy definition' and of 'control of implementation' (of such policy) HEIs can be plotted as having one of four cultures, 'collegium – bureaucracy – enterprise – corporation'*.*

For non-cerebral and non-academic VCs, Machiavelli, 1513, *The Prince*, remains helpful and short enough to be digested on the next business trip, even within Europe (although the book is unlikely to be found at an airport bookshop). It offers especially wise guidance with regard to the treatment of the Registrar and of the rest of the SMT using the power of patronage (Ch 22, 'Of the Ministers of Princes'): the Prince, with regard to each Minister, 'should bestow riches upon him, and should share the honours as well as the cares with him; so that the abundance of honours and riches conferred by the Prince upon his Minister may cause the latter not to desire either the one or the other from any other source, and the weight of the cares may make him dread a change, knowing that without the Prince he could not sustain it. And when the relations between the Prince and his Minister are thus constituted, they will be able to confide in each other; but if they be otherwise, then one or the other of them will surely come to a bad end'... And then where indeed would the HEI be?

Anthony Jay (co-author of 'Yes, Prime Minister' and 'Yes, Minister')

applies Machiavelli to the business world in *Management and Machiavelli* (1967; revised 1987), with a sub-title of 'Power and Authority in Business Life' that underlines there is, amongst all this hype about the hero-messiah or the eco-leader, perhaps a consistent theme of the simple but skilful balancing of the exercise of power and authority for commanding and controlling, with the use of influence and the credibility of the leader-manager's personality for convincing and cajoling; a balance that varies according to what the organizational culture allows or requires (the leader-manager in the collegial HEI, for example, will clearly need to rely more on the latter than the former). Jay talks in terms of the 'creative' leader of the 'creative' team; this successful individual is 'both Yogi and Commissar': a rare combination of the 'contemplative man, the thinker' and 'the man of action' (what in fact might, in Victorian times, have been described as an entrepreneur – or, using a 1980s term, an 'intrapreneur' for somebody energetic within a company as an employee rather than as an owner). And in Chapter XXV he explores 'Religion and the Corporation': as with States 'most corporations have a faith' and those within them may need 'to fight heresy' as well as worship 'a supreme being'; there may also be a streak of 'Nonconformism' (Chapter XXVI) in the form of unionism. Now, in these terms, it could just be that the university is seemingly so difficult to lead-manage because, as a questioning and intellectually challenging breed, academics don't do God (or gods), but are pretty hot on heresy if not also nonconformism in responding to the will of anybody attempting to become a supreme being!

The VC with cultural pretensions could consider the leadership lessons from the Bard set out in Corrigan, 1999, *Shakespeare on Management: Leadership Lessons for Today's Managers*: Richard II assumes the power of office/title will get him through; King Lear fails to appreciate the need to remain in control of the power of resource allocation; Anthony mixes up the personal power of charisma with the power bestowed by higher authority (the State of Rome – or HEFCE, or DIUS); while Richard III, Macbeth and Coriolanus seek power by manipulation (the rather extreme version of which is murder, and perhaps a tad inappropriate for the modern VC as a management style). Shakespeare also recognises the value of 'strong personalities who provide messages contrary to the company line' (a role here for the Registrar?): notably the Fool (or corporate jester) in *King Lear* and Falstaff (as the wise old-hand) in *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2.*

So, Corrigan/Shakespeare can provide guidance to the lonely and troubled leader-manager: whether the VC needs help with garnering the unstinting commitment of the academic troops for yet another initiative or for heading off in a new strategic direction ('Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more...' from *Henry V*). Or perhaps when experiencing an occasional and fleeting moment of self-doubt ('I had forgot myself: am I not king?... Arm, arm my name! a puny subject strikes/ At thy greater glory...' from *Richard II*). Or maybe for a scheming Deputy-VC or PVC concerned about having been just too devious and manipulative ('By drunken prophecies, libels and dreams, / To set my brother Clarence and the king/ In deadly hate the one against the other... ' from *Richard III*). Or, for the reflective practitioner, on the need to closely observe, so as properly to know and and to understand the motivation of, the many academic tribes inhabiting the HEI ('The prince but studies his companions/ Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain language, / 'Tis needful that the most immodest word/ Be look'd upon and learn'd...' from *Henry IV Part* 2). Or on the value of not being surrounded entirely by yes-men/women in the SMT ('Jesters do oft prove prophets' from *King Lear*).

Incidentally, on 'tribes' in the HEI, see Adams, 1976, *The Academic Tribes* and Becher & Trowler, 2001, *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines.* Adams provides 'good-natured musings' on university management (as an English professor who had served time in US university administration) and stresses that above all 'universities are political in nature' with 'a diffusion of authority' where 'the administrator's role is political rather than executive' and where the power of persuasion/influence is more important than that of direct control. And it is all massively complicated by two 'antimonies', or key paradoxes, of the university: 'The faculty is the university; the faculty are employees of the university' and 'The Administration is the master of the faculty; the administration is the servant of the faculty', and also by a confusion within faculty in that simultaneously 'faculty wish and do not wish strong leadership'. Moreover, the remorseless growth of the university has engendered 'bureacriticism' as conflict between faculty and administration: the former has pathetically retreated from its responsibility for running the university (partly because some faculty are 'cowardly' or 'self-centred' or 'emotionally adolescent' or simply 'deadwood' and partly because bureaucrats are genetically good at 'self-perpetuation' as

they 'opportunistically' fill the 'vacuum in the academic structure'). His ire is especially directed as 'the development of the 'student-'affairs' bureaucracy' (what we would think of as Student Counselling, and, more recently, as those colleagues concerned with the zeitgeist of 'learning outcomes' and 'quality'): these folk 'enter the academic realm under the flag of education as therapy or therapy as education', giving rise to 'the triumph of the therapeutic' where 'the losses have been intellectual values' as 'the academic withdraws from high-sounding assertions [about 'the learning experience'] out of an entirely sensible embarrassment at their naiveté, crassness, and overuse'!

And, as a last example of Shakespeare as management guru, on the desirability of changing the personnel of the SMT from time to time either because some members have been around too long ('I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers; / How ill white hairs become a fool and a jester!', as Hal tells Falstaff in *Henry IV Part 2*); or because the Registrar is simply no longer competent and/or has personal problems (again, Hal to Falstaff): 'Thou art so fat-witted, with the drinking of old sack and unbuttoning thee after supper and sleeping upon benches after noon...' - in which case clearly decisiveness is needed, '...I banish thee, on pain of death, / As I have done the rest of my misleaders, / Not to come near our person by ten mile' (but note the modern VC would, on the advice of the HEI solicitors, incorporate a gagging-clause in the payoff deal!).

In conclusion, is it reasonable to say that the truly 'universitas' university is to be best led by academics for academics? The former will be got-the T-shirt academics with managerial competencies and leadership skills, who will be comfortable operating in a pre-dominantly collegial culture with all its political dimensions, diffusion of power, checks and balances, and frustrating fuzziness. The latter will be prepared to bestow trust on the former once this management group has earned their respect and confidence, and also willing to accept that there just have to be some decisions taken so that anarchy or stasis are avoided – provided of course the decisions are taken with due process and within the constraints of the proper governance of the corporation. The enemy of this collegial governance is the growth of the university well beyond a human scale, and/or the breakdown of trust within the university that comes from an overweening management incompetently flexing its bureaucratic muscles and lazily/arrogantly not bothering to work

within the organizational culture, or from a faculty that abrogates its loyalty and duty towards the university while focusing solely and selfishly on its nationally or internationally mobile careers within the academic discipline. Then comes a sliding scale, even a slippery slope: the increasingly managed university that degenerates into the training/hyper-vocational HEI where the academic staff are seen as just a bolshier version of the rest of the labour force, in need of even greater command-and-control (albeit, of course, thinly disguised as consultation) and certainly not respected/valued as a 'universitas' that should be constitutionally (de jure) and anyway often is effectively (de facto) a hugely significant part of the entity that justifies the label or indeed accolade 'university'. There is no one-size-fits-all definition of a university, still less of an HEI; and there is no one-size-fits-all organizational culture for a university or HEI (except the more there is recognition and understanding of the concept of 'universitas', the greater is the collegial style – and the less faculty are valued, the stronger the managerial style). And, clearly, there can be no one-size-fits-all model for governance/management/leadership in HE.