Emerging Ideas of 'New Governance' in Higher Education

Jari-Pekka Kanniainen, Tampere University

Elias Pekkola, Tampere University

Jussi Kivistö, Tampere University

Abstract

Higher education systems are currently being influenced by the ideas of new public management. In publicly-funded higher education systems, the pressure for marketisation reforms has mostly— and quite paradoxically— emerged from the global trends in state governance. New public management has been the strongest fad in public governance after the crises found in the post-World War II welfare states in the 1970s and 1980s. In most European higher education systems, there has been mainly a government-driven development to introduce product-dominant logic in higher education, and here, New public management has challenged the traditional higher education system logics. However, the golden years of New public management are now gone, and governments are looking for new approaches to organise their public services. These new approaches are also evident in public higher education. Here, we are interested in how the new conceptualisations of public services have reached the higher education landscape and how market impacts are conceptualised in light of these new scholarly discourses. In this chapter, we map the use of post-new public management (post-New public management) governance concepts in the higher education context. By conducting a systematic literature review, we study the alternative conceptual approaches for neoliberal critiques in an attempt to better understand the environmental changes and their impact on higher education. The reviewed publications focus on governance of

the higher education institutions and systems. The implications for managers, research and marketisation are widely discussed. Consequently, recent research approaches toward higher education and the new marketised environment from the steering perspective are analysed. According to the findings, the concepts of network governance and the neo-Weberian state are mainly used in the research of higher education systems and policy and decision making.

Keywords: post-New public management, higher education, governance, marketisation, network governance, neo-Weberian state, public service system

1. Introduction

For three decades, there has been an ongoing discussion about the marketisation of higher education (See Dill [1997], Jongbloed, [2003], and Brown [2010], for example.). Researchers have been worried about the deteriorating effect of private sector management initiatives and methods in higher education settings. In particular, some have voiced concerns over the commercialisation of higher education, and how this can be seen as a violation of academic values. Unfortunately, the debate has largely been one-sided, and regardless of the harsh criticism, no constructive options for 'hard managerialisms' have been proposed. Meanwhile, many of the aims of newer higher education policies, such as internationalisation, the acquisition of external funding, educational export, lifelong learning, stakeholder relevance, and student-centredness, call for new types of management practices in higher education.

Pinheiro *et al.* (2019) discussed recent higher education trends, and how a strong transnational process and policy convergence is taking place in new public management reforms, for example— the introduction of performance-based funding and governance and management structures which emphasise efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability, for example. Pinheiro *et al*. (2019) summarised these reforms, including the similarities in international policy promotion within the field of higher education, for example, the proposals and agreements of the Bologna process, and the 'Modernisation Agenda' of the European Commission. Although the setting is Nordic in Pinheiro *et al*. (2019), the changes regarding new public management are also promoted by global actors, such as the OECD and the World Bank, thereby making these changes a global phenomenon (Pinheiro *et al*., 2019). Pressure for international excellence drives the higher education sector to participate in international markets, and new public management-type policy reforms and tools have been introduced to higher education. At the same time, universities at the

national level have been working locally with many stakeholders, collaborating with each other, and following the expectations and regulations of national steering instruments.

To date, the new types of management practices in higher education settings have been approached mainly from the perspective of managerialism. The (critical) analyses of these practices have focused mainly on performance, efficiency, and accountability. The 'new' in new public management, however, is no longer new, and the societal structures and demands around higher education institutions are changing. Consequently, in recent years, 'post-new public management' management paradigms have been offered in the public administration literature.

Indeed, multiple conceptual and empirical attempts have been made to illustrate the successes and failures in new public management reforms. Greve's (2015) typology, for example, organises these attempts into three variations: digital governance, collaborative governance, and public value management. Reiter and Klenk (2019) recently analysed 84 publications which discuss the concept of post-new public management, arguing that public administration has entered an age of post-new public management, even though the new post-new public management ideas have been conceptualised and used in various ways. In higher education settings, for instance, Pekkola and Kivistö (2016) described the changes in higher education policy, and how they are aligned with new management ideas. Reale and Primeri (2015) have argued that major changes in the narrative of public administration regarding higher education after new public management are taking place through network governance and new public governance types of models (See Osborne [2006], for example.). Nevertheless, there have not been systematic attempts to analyse the higher education literature to map the development of the governance discourse.

We are interested in higher education from the viewpoint of the core university activities: education, research, innovation, and third mission-related services. According to Harisalo (as cited in Laitinen *et al.*, 2013, p. 35), services, such as education or research, is abstract and processual.

They are consumed during use, and fundamentally different than goods. Griffiths *et al.* (2013) have discussed public services extensively, and argue that modern public services include the co-design, co-productions, and co-creation of value.

Services in the public sector— and in higher education— are complex in their goals, expectations, and pluralist value creation. In other words, higher education systems are service-dominant networks in which the actors coproduce learning, new knowledge, and innovations. Conceptualising higher education core activities (education, research, and third mission) as services helps in discussing these abstract activities with a more common vocabulary. And consequently, we are especially interested in the service dimension of higher education, and which kinds of implications this might have for public higher education as an international 'business'. Thus, we find a major topic entering the academic discussions of higher education governance: the meaningfulness of seeing national higher education systems as public (and private) service systems. Public and private services are based on different goals and logical assumptions, and this view might also refer to the traditional debate of commercialisation, which juxtaposes higher education as a service type of product versus being a citizen's right.

The objective of this chapter, therefore, *is to trace the emergence of post-new public management paradigms in higher education based on systematic literature review.* Understanding the latest conceptualizing of post-new public management paradigms is fundamental in comprehending how internationalising higher education systems are changing. We explore the use of the post-new public management vocabulary which is utilised in higher education research, by analysing the applications of the latest emerging paradigms of public administration, such as new public service (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007), public value management (Stoker, 2006), managing publicness (Bozeman, 2007), and new public governance (Osbourne, 2006, 2010). According to Greve (2015), all these emerging paradigms emphasise the creation of public value, the

collaboration and inclusion (involvement) of different stakeholders, and the digitalisation and transparency of administrative practices. In summary, these emerging paradigms emphasise the changing role of managers, customers (citizens, students), and stakeholders, along with a new way of understanding public services. We aimed to reach our objective of the chapter in two-fold way: we conducted a systematic literature review and partook in the wider discussion of these paradigms by shining light on the findings of the review in the Discussion chapter.

2. Public Administration and Governance Reforms

Higher education has a strong public administration base because almost all the activities of universities are based on legislation, are societal, and are within the public domain, even if universities have a unique role in society and have increasingly been under new public management and marketisation reforms. It is important to widen the aperture during these reforms and inspect higher education systems in their complexity of public and private interests in providing higher education services to society and their many stakeholders. To understand the context and steering forces of public higher education in the era of marketisation, a brief introduction of public administration reforms is presented. Both concepts— public administration and public management— are often used in public administration research, with public administration focusing more on the system level, and public management focusing more on the institutional level, although they do overlap.

The typical categorisation of public administration ideological models— or paradigms— starts with traditional public administration from the industrialisation period, new public management in the 1970s, and the post-new public management paradigms, such as new public governance, in the 2000s. The characteristics and differences of these models, such as the values,

goals, focus, ideal organisational form, resource allocation and theoretical base which influence the managing, governance, and decision making in public service have changed over time, and depend on the framework which is used. During these phases, there has been a processual change from government to governance. Several authors have already successfully analysed the key elements of these models, especially new public management (Hood, 1991; Osborne, 2006; Diefenbach, 2009; Vedung, 2010), and the traditional form of public administration with its transition from government to governance (Hood, 1991; Rhodes, 1997). According to Thomas (as cited in Rhodes, 1997), public administration was a "means of attaining a higher form of society… service to the community— supplying the public with quality goods and services… and a means of providing for the happiness and welfare of the worker through the supply of noneconomic incentives" (p. 167).

Rhodes (1997) also categorised at least six different uses of governance: governance as the minimal state, as corporate governance, as new public management, as good governance, as a socio-cybernetic system, and as self-organising networks. Extensive analysis and criticism of Rhodes' categorisation has been made by Hughes (2010), who also provides an ontological overview of the concept of governance. Indeed, he highlights governance as focusing on running public and private organisations, steering and solving societal problems. Here, governance is a socially constructed activity of governing patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and so forth, or as Kooiman (1993) defines governance, the patterns or structures which emerge in a system of the interaction and intervention of many actors. We discuss governance, management, and steering broadly as models or concepts of governance, because these terms often overlap in higher education research. When we mention governance, it refers to the administration and management of higher education, and in some cases, if mentioned in the context of policy and decision-making, governance refers to the steering of a higher education system or institution.

Some authors (See Pollitt [1990], for example.) have warned of the over-generalisation of these management ideologies. Even though the most dominant management ideology is not the mindset of every manager in public administration, the most common management ideologies are nevertheless seen as normative aspects of managing. Osborne (2006, 2010) supported this view by emphasising the overlapping nature of normative management ideologies in public administration. In addition to public administration, new public management and new public governance, several other concepts have been introduced to describe the changes in public management, including in higher education systems. In the next section, we provide an overview of new public management. Additionally, we briefly discuss new governance paradigms in the context of higher education and public administration before introducing the method used in the literature review and then progressing to the findings.

3. New Public Management

New public management has provided the ideational background of many recent public administration reforms which focus on intra-organisational effectiveness and competitiveness. Pollitt (1990) and Hood (1991) have provided comprehensive views on managerialism and new public management in European and Anglo-American contexts, respectively. Pollitt (1990) suggested that the British and Americans have changed their perspective of running public services significantly since the 1970s, introducing managerialism as the (then) new ideology entering public administration. This approach which was referred to as neo-Taylorism by Pollitt (1990) includes ideals on productivity, new technologies, division of the workforce in accordance with the ideal productivity rates, professionalisation of managers and management, and the empowerment of managers. Criticism of this paradigm has been strong both in public administration in general, and in the field of higher education management in particular. Hood (1991) suggested that new public

management emphasises certain values such as frugality, austerity, and input-output efficiency, at the expense of other traditional public administration values such as rectitude, legitimacy, resilience, safety, and reliability.

Rhodes (as cited in Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011, pp. 23-33) presented new public management as entering the public administration domain in three waves: 1. using managerialism and business administration tools in public administration, 2. introducing competition and creating (quasi-) markets in which public institutions can compete, and 3. introducing citizens' choice as consumers' choice which thereby emphasises service effectiveness. Diefenbach (2009) provided a comprehensive view of the core elements of new public management: business environment and strategic objectives; organisational structures and processes; performance management and measurement systems; management and managers; and employees and corporate culture. Overall, new public management has been recognised as having a high level of common sense, meaning that many of its elements are taken for granted as basic truths. Indeed, it has become the norm in management to have increased concern over results, performance, and outcomes, and to have room for managers to manage public services regarding these concerns.

In the higher education literature, new public management is used as a contextual concept to describe the overall changes in the steering of higher education, and the changing managerial practices in universities. Marginson (2008, as cited in Siekkinen *et al.*, 2019), for example, described the uses of new public management techniques in universities. Marginson's list includes multiple examples of both external and internal governance, as well as performance management and related measurement, and contracting and productisation as mediating techniques between steering and management.

INSERT FIGURE 2.1 ABOUT HERE

4. Decline of New Public Management and Emerging Alternatives

Reale and Primeri (2016) argued that major changes in the management of higher education systems and institutions are taking place, and with them, the replacement of new public management elements. Several new models have been introduced and discussed, such as network governance and new public governance, and others such as the neo-Weberian state, joined-up government, and whole-of-government. New public management, despite the introduction of these new models, remains a part of the reforms in higher education systems. The post-new public management age and emerging ideas of new governance, therefore, must be properly reviewed. We shall present the main models of the post-new public management age, by applying the reviews of the post-new public management literature of Greve (2015) and Reiter and Klenk (2019).

The concept of the neo-Weberian state has emerged to challenge the inadequacies of new public management. Dunn and Miller (2007) based some of the key principles of the new-Weberian state on the OECD's principles of *Acquis Communautaire* and traditional European Weberian bureaucracy. They critically reviewed new public management and the neo-Weberian state, showing how they share similarities with each other.

Joined-up government offers a managerial and technical, yet political, perspective for horizontally- and vertically-connected policy (Pollitt, 2003). Pollitt defined joined-up government through four main goals: 1. eliminating contradictions and tensions, 2. looking for better use of resources at the policy level, 3. improving the flow of good ideas and cooperation between different stakeholders, and 4. creating seamless end-user one-stop-shop services.

According to Christensen and Lægreid (2006), joined-up government and whole-of-government belong to a similar ideational source, and provide a more holistic approach to public

administration. They argued, for example, that whole-of-government is a conscious reorganisation of government entities with the aim of promoting cooperation, networks, and collaboration between organisations. What is common for all three models— the neo-Weberian state, joined-up government, and whole-of-government— is their focus on solving the problems of public administration which are caused by the extensive application of new public management.

According to Greve (2015), the emerging public administration approaches of public value management, including digital-era governance, collaborative governance, and new public governance, emphasise the creation of public value, the collaboration and involvement of different stakeholders and the digitalisation and transparency of administrative practices. New public governance was presented by Osborne (2006) as an alternative to the new public management paradigm. Indeed, Osborne presented the concept of new public governance as a discussion starter to question whether or not public administration and new public management are being followed by a third stage of evolution which focuses on a governance network which is plural (multiple actors) and pluralist (multiple processes informing the policy system and governance). Stoker (2006) discussed public value management, emphasising networks and partnerships in networked governance. Dunleavy *et al.* (2007) presented the concept of digital-era governance in concert with the technological development in public administration. They argued that new public management has stagnated, and declared dramatically that new public management is dead, and that digital-era governance is the new public administration paradigm. In discussions of collaborative governance and public network management in public administration, Agranoff and McGuire (2001) and Agranoff (2007, 2008) emphasised that public management networks collaborate to produce public value, because, in contrast to traditional public administration, they focus on interagency problems, tasks, and differences.

New public service was introduced by Denhardt and Denhardt (2007), who advocated on behalf of democratic governance and civic engagement, instead of public services being run as if they were businesses. Public value is a fundamental, recurring theme in public adminstration, and accordingly, Bozeman (2007) promoted the notion of 'managing publicness, which places public value as the very starting point for public management, not one criterion among others. Much like Denhardt and Denhardt's (2007) new public service, he argued that public administration ought to focus on public values rather than dominant new public management values. Other recurring concepts in the post-new public management discussion include the co-production, co-creation and network governance.

In Table 2.1, we summarise the post-new public management administrative models. They all emphasise the changing role of government, service structures, networks, and collaborations, and also the changing technological context and impact of these changes for the management of public organisations. The neo-Weberian state, joined-up government, whole-of-government, and managing publicness, however, also emphasise the role of the state. New public government, new public service, and public value management emphasise the importance of value creation in complex service systems. Collaborative governance and public network governance emphasise the role of network management. And variations of the terms digital and e-governance emphasise the role of new technology in the public sector.

INSERT TABLE 2.1 ABOUT HERE

5. Systematic Literature Review

The systematic literature review was conducted according to Fink's (2014) literature review method, with a focus on post-new public management models. The systematic literature review is

summarised in Figure 2.2. We completed the literature collection process in September and October 2019. Technical support was provided by Tampere University Library. The main phases of the literature collection process were:

- choosing databases and search terms as per the preliminary review and the research question
- assessing the search terms within the governance theories (preliminary review)
- piloting the search terms in the selected databases
- screening the pilot search findings and refining the search terms
- gathering quantitative publication data, and continuing screening based on the data
- applying methodological quality screening
- selecting publications for analysis

INSERT FIGURE 2.2 ABOUT HERE

The databases *EBSCO Academic Search Ultimate* and *Scopus Elsevier,* which are widely used and which cover an extensive number of journals, were used to locate publications of interest. Although often overlapping with their results, we wanted to ensure that we would not miss any relevant publications.

As mentioned, the search terms are based on a preliminary literature review of post-new public management models which have been presented by various authors, mostly since 2000. The typologies which were offered by Greve (2015), Reiter and Klenk (2019), Reale and Primeri (2015), and Osborne (2006) were used as the initial search terms. During the search, the focus was to find publications in whose titles the search terms appeared. In some cases, however, the search terms were also found in the publications' abstracts.

The pilot searches were conducted with the publication titles and abstracts, using the search terms 'New Public Governance' and 'Higher Education'. We then added 'Post-New Public Management' and 'Post New Public Management'. These pilot searches resulted in few hits, and consequently we added several new search terms: 'Neo-Weberian State', 'Joined-Up-Government', 'Whole-of-Government', 'New Public Service', 'Managing Publicness', 'Digital-Era Governance', 'Network Governance', 'Digital Governance', 'Collaborative Governance', and 'Public Value Management'. These searches were conducted using the operators 'OR' and 'AND' with 'Higher Education'. The result with these additional search terms was 25 hits in Scopus and 22 hits in EBSCO. We used practical screening moving forward for more precise searches and narrowed the oldest publication year to 2000.

The next phase included the term 'Universit*' in the author search field. Indeed, the abstracts of publications traditionally mention the universities at which the authors work. This resulted in 17 additional publications, thereby totalling 38 in Scopus and 26 in EBSCO. We added more alternate search terms: 'Public Network Governance', 'Public Network Management', and the common and relevant post-new public management concepts of 'Co-Production' and 'Co-Creation' because of their relevance for network governance theories. 'Co-Creation' was dropped because it resulted in hundreds of hits from outside of the focus area. 'Public Network Governance' and 'Public Network Management' resulted in no additional hits, but Co-production increasing the number of hits to 118 in Scopus and 78 in EBSCO. It is noteworthy that hyphens, as in 'Joined-Up-Government' had no effect on the search results.

In summary, the literature collection process involved 4 distinct searches: two searches in EBSCO (1. 'Public Governance', 'Network Governance', 'Digital Governance', and 'Collaborative Governance' using the operator 'OR' with ' Higher Education'; and 2. 'Co-Production', 'Whole-of Government', 'Network Governance', and 'Collaborative Governance'

using the operator 'OR' with 'Universit*' in the author field), and two searches in Scopus (1. 'Digital Governance', 'Post-New Public Management', 'New Public Governance', 'Public Value Management', 'Co-Production', 'Neo-Weberian State', 'New Public Service', 'Network Governance', and 'Collaborative Governance' using operator 'OR' with 'Higher Education'; and 2. 'Public Value Management', 'Public Network Governance', 'Co-Production', 'Neo-Weberian State', 'Whole-of-Government', 'New Public Service', 'Network Governance', and 'Collaborative Governance' using the operator 'OR' with 'Universit*' in the author field.).

After carefully removing duplicates from the search results, the remaining 130 publications and their metadata were collected. We screened these metadata to find publications with a focus on management and governance research in higher education, which subsequently led to 51 publications. We read their abstracts and narrowed down the results further according to our research question. Two publications were not accessible to us at the time of writing this chapter, and one publication was dropped because it was not available in English.

In total, 18 publications were reviewed. Three publications are from the 2000s, and the remaining 15 publications are from the 2010s. We did not find any publications from before the 2000s which fit our criteria. Seventeen publications are articles, and one publication is a book chapter. The geographic locus of the publications is primarily Europe, most often the United Kingdom. The geographic locus of three publications were outside Europe, specifically China, Japan, and the United States.

The journals in which these publications vary, with two publications in *Higher Education*, two publications in *Higher Education Policy*, two publications in *Higher Education Quarterly*, two publications in *European Journal of Education,* and one publication in each of the following journals: *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *Governance and Performance of*

Education Systems, *Oxford Review of Education*, *Public Management Review, Corporate Ownership and Control*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Perspectives: Policy & Practice in Higher Education*, and *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Table 2.2 lists the impact factors of the journals which are represented.

INSERT TABLE 2.2 ABOUT HERE

We analysed the theoretical discussions of each of the 18 publications, noting the governance concepts which were applied in relation to management and steering, the level of governance (system or institution, or both), and the specific parts of higher education (education, research, or third mission). The analysis revealed that 4 publications did not use post-new public management governance concepts or any related concepts whatsoever. Despite the lack of a specific governance concept, two of these 4 publications discussed governance-related themes, such as the widening participation of different higher education actors in policy-making (Zhao, 2018) and the tensions which are found in higher education organisations (Maassen & Stensaker, 2019). Of the remaining 14 publications, 12 defined a governance-related concept in their theoretical discussions. Several publications used two or more post-new public management concepts when introducing the narratives of public reforms.

6. Findings

The main finding of this systematic literature review is that post-new public management paradigms are not widely used in higher education research. Seven publications used post-new public management paradigms from a system-level perspective, and five publications used paradigms at the institutional level— in PhD programme management (Baschung, 2010), for

example. Some publications applied governance paradigms at both the system and institutional level, or at the system level based on an institutional case study. Four publications gave insights into the important themes of higher education. Dollinger *et al.* (2018), for example, researched the value co-creation in student–university relationship, and McCulloch (2009) studied co-production in student–university relationships.

None of the governance paradigms which we found in the publications were in widespread use in other publications. Network (or collaborative) governance was used in six publications— mostly in system-level studies— but with one exception (Baschung, 2010). Network governance was used in the higher education system and policy-level research (Whitty & Wisby, 2016; Donina & Paleari, 2019; Khelifi, 2019).

New-Weberian state was used in four publications in a system-level analysis, except Baschung (2010), which applied it to an institutional case at the system level. Some publications employed new-Weberian state to focus on universities' third mission (Karpov, 2016), system-level reforms in the EU (Ferlie et al., 2008), reforms which are related to the university governance model (Donina & Paleari, 2019), and in the management of PhD programmes (Baschung, 2010).

Other publications varied in their perspectives on higher education, and in their use of post-new public management governance paradigms. One publication discussed hybrid governance in the context of the Japanese higher education system, for example, describing the Japanese system as the result of a collision of many higher education traditions (Christensen, 2011). One other publication discussed higher education systems as public service systems, but the publication was found to only be partially immersed in the context of higher education, although this was only one aspect of the publication (Radnor, Osborne, Kinder, & Mutton, 2014). The four remaining publications (Maassen and Stensaker, 2019; Ross and Woodfield, 2017; Canhoto *et al.*, 2016;

Karpov, 2017) were not related to post-new public management governance paradigms and did not fulfil our criteria. Consequently, they were dropped from the review.

We also found several publications which discussed the concept of co-production in higher education, but it was only loosely related to or completely separate from governance. The concepts of co-production and co-creation refer to new public management in two ways: the role of students as customers versus the role of students as co-creators of public value in higher education, and students participating higher education institutions' decision making, here partially from the perspective of quality assurance management.

Table 2.3 summaries the governance concepts and their applications on the publications which we reviewed. In the first column (in parentheses), the total number of publications which mention the concept is shown. The number of applications in specific contexts is shown in the columns.

INSERT TABLE 2.3 ABOUT HERE

7. Discussion

Due to the relatively small final amount of found and analysed publications, we provided an in-depth, lengthy discussion and perspectives on the found concepts and emerging ideas. Overall, our findings are similar to the findings of Reale and Primeri (2015) in their study in the field of higher education and Reiter and Klenk (2019) in their more general literature review of post-new public management in public administration. We focus on the main findings related to the concepts of network governance and neo-Weberian state and discuss them in from two perspectives: their meaning in internationalising higher education market and in relation to previous studies.

Similar to our focus, a common interest in higher education systems from the point of view of public administration and public services was provided by Ferlie *et al*. (2008). They presented three alternative definitions of state involvement in higher education: 1. a desire for stronger system-level management for higher education, 2. A hollowing out of the state and an increase in network-type of management, and 3. a call for democratic and social function revitalisation in universities. Likewise they explained three narratives — or paradigms in our terms — of public services reforms: new public management, network governance, and new-Weberian state.

Ferlie *et al*. (2008) argued that network governance is presented as a post-new public management type of paradigm. Network governance brings network coordination as a new dimension, with 11 'signs and symptoms', into the hierarchical and market-based governing of new public management and post-new public management age. In their view, new-Weberian state refers to the Weberian and neo-Weberian principles of citizens' participation and democratic revitalisation being applied in higher education systems (2008). The role of the state and markets varies greatly in the three narratives. In the new public management narrative, the state's role is to enforce system-level efficiency through means of measurement, monitoring, and evaluation. Markets are given the role of 'quasi markets' in the form of stimulation of competition between higher education institutions, and diversification of the funding base (the introduction of fees, and commercialisation and productisation of third-mission activities, for example). In network governance, however, states adopt an indirect and looser coordinating role among the different actors, in an attempt to guarantee the public interest. Markets can be one form of exchange, but the exchange is not imposed directly by the state. New-Weberian state, on the contrary, reaffirms the role of the state through representative democracy and the direct involvement of citizens as the main facilitator and caretaker of the higher education system. The role of markets is minor or nonexistent.

Whitty and Wisby (2016) referred to Ball and Junemann's work (2012) while arguing that in England, the whole education system has involved the signs of network governance and different actors' steering policy, setting of directions and influencing of the debate on the subject although "it is unclear how far and in what sense network governance and multiple partnerships have actually replaced, as opposed to complemented, older ways of governing or even the so-called new public management" (p. 325). Khelifi (2019) used the concepts of street-level bureaucracy and network governance in his research of interplay between politics and universities. Khelifi argued that in the network governance narrative, "state agencies' monopoly of policy making has been questioned by the involvement of non-state actors— which now assume key roles in the formulation and implementation of the policies" (p. 672). Both of these studies imply an observable movement from state-driven development orientation towards a more multilateral approach with networked stakeholders. The role which markets play or are expected to play vis-à-vis state involvement, however, remains to be seen.

Karpov (2016) provided a discussion which is related to new public management, network governance, and new-Weberian states. His perspective of the modern university is one of a network-based, creative, innovative, and entrepreneurial "key driver of economic growth" (p. 356). According to Karpov (2016), therefore, higher education takes place in a cross-institutional environment. Donina and Paleari (2018, p. 193) presented Italy and Portugal as case studies from the perspective of network governance and NWS. Their main finding is that reforms in higher education are hybrid (new public management, network governance, and new-Weberian state) and that the structures of the reforms "reflect the Neo-Weberian founding ideas rather than those of new public management" (p. 193). Interestingly, they also referred to network governance through the concepts of post-new public management, joined-up government, whole-of-government, and new public governance. Goldfinch and Wallis (2010) are Donina and Paleari's (2018) main

reference on new public management policy convergence, arguing that the myths of new public management and post-new public management are not as strongly dependent on each other as once believed, and that the progression from public administration to new public management and finally to a network-based post-new public management world, is conceptually messy. Baschung (2010) discussed the changes in the management of doctoral education, arguing that the network governance narrative has emerged "partly on a criticism of New Public Management and partly on empirical observations in Western European democracies" (p. 140). Baschung (2010) also stated that network governance shares similar or even identical ideas with multilevel governance and whole-of-government paradigms regarding the hollowing out of the nation-state.

In the publications, the authors argue that public management narratives, archetypes, paradigms, and/or models, such as new public management, network governance, and new-Weberian state, are conceptually messy, empirically in hybrid simultaneous forms, and existing in a different locus and with a different focus within public administration and higher education research. Two publications (Baschung, 2010; Ferlie *et al*., 2008) presented a definition for network governance and used the same definition:

- A greater range of actors and interactions.
- The central State plays more of an influencing and less of a directing role. It works as relationship facilitator.
- There is a shift from vertical to lateral forms of management.
- There is devolution of power downwards from the centre of the nation-state to lower tiers and also upwards to higher tiers, including European ones.
- Coordinating power is shared among social actors, possibly operating at multiple levels of analysis.
- Knowledge and 'best practices' spread across the network.

- The network develops a self-organising and self-steering capacity.

- Accountability relationships are a way of 'giving account' to local publics and not an ex-post state-driven system of checking" (Ferlie *et al*., 2008, p. 337).

Additionally, new-Weberian state often overlaps with network governance, but with a focus on the modernisation of democratic principles of public administration and higher education, for example, when it comes to enhancing citizens' participation and democratic revitalisation (Ferlie *et al*., 2008). Moreover, in higher education systems, network governance and hybrid reforms have been interpreted as reflecting NWS ideas in state reforms (Donina & Paleari, 2018). In Khelefi's (2019) perspective of state and EU-level reforms, non-state actors' participation is a sugar-coated New public management strategy of adopting neoliberal, top-down reforms. At the programme level, Baschung (2010) explained that there are two processual episodes of change in the management of doctoral programmes, in which the first is shaped by constraining New public management instruments, and the second comprises of 'relatively non-constraining Neo-Weberian-State elements'. Baschung (2010) argued that the change is strongly shaped by the first episode of new public management constraints.

An expanding academic discussion about network and collaborative governance, the post-new public management age, and knowledge economy–related challenges require administrators in higher education, especially in the top level and in the realm of societal affairs, to deepen their understanding of the actor networks in higher education systems. The multiple processes of value (co-)creation and actor network cooperation manifest themselves in the 2010s. Similarly, the plurality was already recognised in the 2000s by Osborne (2006, 2010), for example, and other researchers of public administration. Indeed, Agranoff (2007) proposed a type of management: which is called 'collaborarchy', referring to an open hierarchy type of management which resembles nonprofit organisations' management wherein the networks are self-managing and have

their own structure and processes. This new type of public network management, according to Agranoff, is also taking place because of more general organisational changes in public organisations in the modern knowledge society.

Consequently, the implications when it comes to managerial perspectives— for 'shop-floor' bureaucrats as Khelifi (2019) called them— are various. Managers working with public management networks and participating in its governance ought to pay more attention to inter-organisational relationships, and avoid focusing merely on intra-organisational affairs. For higher education managers, governing networks ought to be about collaboration, focusing on the self-management of networks and common goals, while encouraging network representatives to delve into the technical tasks of the network. The implications of the ideals of new-Weberian state encourage public managers in higher education to be oriented towards meeting the needs of citizens, students, university community members, and society at large. Different research areas of higher education "should be studied at the level of politics (the legislation passed to reform it) and then follow it up at the shop-floor level of universities i.e. how it was implemented" (Khelifi, 2019, p. 677).

What do these findings mean for research of post-new public management and higher education? Goldfinch and Wallis (2010) emphasised the question of 'useful to whom?' regarding academic discussions of governance and management myths or paradigms, such as new public management, or post-new public management. Indeed, this question ought to follow the researchers of higher education systems, not to mention the researchers of other public administration sectors. Similarly, and already early in New public management and public administration paradigm work, Pollitt (1990) warned of the overgeneralisation of management archetypes. Reiter and Klenk's (2019) findings in a public administration post-new public management literature review, along with our findings, converge when it comes to the perspective of post-new public management

paradigms not being institutionalised. One of the challenges resulting from conceptual muddiness, for example, is to understand which role markets play in different modes of new governance, especially with respect to state involvement. In all governance arrangements, it is likely that states will utilise markets in one way or another as an instrument for allocating resources, and additionally for the provision of services. Coexisting governance arrangements involving hierarchies and exchange, cooperation and competition, and citizenship- and customer-orientation will likely be blended with each other.

The same can be also said of the role of the state. In many ways, there is an already three decades-old distinction between the 'facilitatory state' and the 'interventionary state' (Neave & van Vught, 1991) which is still relevant, but only to the extent that it is able to point to two extreme ends of the state's role in higher education system governance. State governance in the area of markets, higher education institutions, and other internal and external stakeholders of the higher education system is more multifaceted than 30 years ago. The complexity of modern higher education systems requires that the state is able to take a more active role in one area of governance and, at the same time, exercise a more passive role in another.

8. Conclusion

Our interest in the current chapter was to map the use of post-new public management governance concepts in higher education context based on literature review. We analysed 18 articles which fit our criteria related to post-new public management concepts regarding public administration reforms and paradigms. Based on the review, no single post-new public management paradigm is widely used in higher education research. According to the publications found, the most commonly theorised post-new public management paradigms in the governance of higher education are network governance and the concepts close to it, such as collaborative

governance and NWS. They are mainly used in the research of higher education systems and policy and decision-making. No single governance paradigm has yet risen to replace or describe post-new public management governance, even though the various paradigms seem to have a relation to new public management and post-new public management. Indeed, they have been used within the frame of new public management critique. But many of the post-new public management governance paradigms in which we were interested were not found in the systematic literature review. According to our findings, the paradigm which are used in public administration areas other than higher education, such as new public governance, joined-up government, whole-of-government, new public service, public value management, digitally-enabled government, digital governance, and managing publicness, are not used in higher education governance research.

Greve (2015) summarised the themes of recent governance approaches in the creation of public value, the collaboration and inclusion of stakeholders, digitalisation, and the transparency of administrative practices. In our findings, the co-creation of public value and network governance were recurring themes, but the perspectives of digitalisation and transparency do not seem to be trending. Private market interests in co-creating public (and private for-profit) value, perhaps through networked participation, might explain these results. Moreover, it seems that the increasing overall interest in higher education and access to innovation services have brought new and more demanding actors to the field, while simultaneously increasing the focus on network governance in the academic literature. One of the publications (Ferlie *et al*., 2008) discussed international and global higher education markets as 'coopetition', where, perhaps in the future, multinational universities both "cooperate and at the same time compete on the same markets" (p. 342). Coexisting governance arrangements involving hierarchies and exchange, cooperation and competition, and citizenship- and customer-orientation will likely be blended together.

The most often used paradigm of network governance includes the ideas of the changing roles of managers with inter-organisational skills, students with more than simply a customer role and the widening participation of different actors in the higher education system. Unsurprisingly, because post-new public management ideas are often based on new public management critiques, the publications focused on the public aspects of higher education, rather than on the aspects of private higher education institutions which provide services to a consumer-student.

Higher education systems are currently changing and are influenced by the ideas of new public management. Pressure for reforms are found to emerge from the traditional public administration discourse, network governance–related ideas, and new public management. As Reiter and Klenk (2019) argued, public administration has entered an age of post-new public management. We confirm that in higher education public administration research, there is evidence of post-new public management ideas and concepts, although no single institutionalised paradigm is in wide use. Nevertheless, the emerging signs of network governance and new-Weberian state have implications for changes in the role of the state, public administration, and governance in higher education.

Our findings have relevance for policy with respect to the emerging interest in network governance and a neo-Weberian emphasis. Discussions about the marketisation of higher education ought to take place, with higher education systems considered as networks, and markets viewed as structured networks. This reflects the dual role of universities as both cooperative and competitive actors. From the point of view of the conflicting dimensions of public and private interests, the varying roles of the state and public services should be considered from both network governance and neo-Weberian perspectives. Post-new public management paradigms are a recent, emerging interest in the field of higher education research, and there is a great need for more systematic

research of post-New public management age governance, management, and the steering of higher education systems and institutions.