

**A CASE STUDY OF THE TENSIONS BETWEEN POLICY-MAKING AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES THAT AFFECT
THE PROFESSORiate AT TWO ARGENTINEAN UNIVERSITIES**

by

Gabriela Judith Silvestre

BA in History /History Teaching, Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 1990

Master of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 2001

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Education,

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2008

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Gabriela Judith Silvestre

It was defended on

April 8th, 2008

and approved by

Dr. Silvia Borzutzky, Professor, Carnegie Mellon University

Dr. Don Martin, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies Department

Dr. John Weidman III, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies Department

Dissertation Advisor: Dr. Consuella Lewis, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Department

Copyright © by Gabriela Judith Silvestre

2008

A CASE STUDY OF THE TENSIONS BETWEEN POLICY-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES THAT AFFECT THE PROFESSORiate AT TWO ARGENTINEAN UNIVERSITIES

Gabriela Judith Silvestre, Ph.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 2008

The Argentinean higher education system suffered an overarching reform since the mid 1990's. The literature for the study of higher education reform policies in Argentina focuses mainly on broad reform policies and on issues of university autonomy. This dissertation reveals the impact of global trends on higher education reform policies in Argentina and it explores the goals of the Argentinean national state in the design of the higher education reform policies, plus the tensions and misalignments between policy goals and implementation at two universities, and the outcomes of the policies on professors' work and academic professionalism.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the tensions and impacts initiated by the Argentinean higher education reform policies of 1995 (and subsequent policies) on the ways in which professors and academic staff perceive the roles of the professoriate at two Argentinean universities.

This research is designed as a policy case study complemented with the method of focused synthesis. This study is sustained by different type data such as archival data, and interviews. Policy actors, such as policy makers, as well as academic staff, and professors working at two Argentinean universities were interviewed using open-ended interviews. A coding schema rooted in the theoretical framework was the research tool utilized to construct the research findings.

The research findings reveal that the Argentinean state intended the modernization of the higher education system in the context of state reform. The improvement of quality of both the system and the professoriate was also among the goals of the reform movement. Different system stakeholders influence both the design and implementation of the policies. Their perceptions about academic professionalism have a weak impact in the process of policy implementation. Nevertheless, professors' work has been deeply affected by the implementation of these policies.

This study will contribute to the scholarship of higher education reform policies from a global scope. The focus of the policy outcomes on the professoriate opens an unusual topic that will ultimately be the source of further comparative analysis of the effects of these policies on professors' lives and work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xix
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 EDUCATIONAL POLICIES: TENSIONS AND ISSUES	1
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	4
1.2 TENSIONS AND MISALIGNMENTS.....	5
1.2.1 Tensions and conflicts around policies and their implementation at different levels.....	5
1.2.2 Different policy interpretations from different stakeholders of the system	8
1.3 LAW ON HIGHER EDUCATION.....	9
1.3.1 The context of the Law on Higher Education	9
1.3.2 Climate and ideas of the reform in higher education in the 1990's.....	10
1.3.3 The content of the Law on Higher Education	11
1.3.4 Specific sections and provisions of the Law on Higher Education.....	12
1.3.5 The policy framework regarding the professoriate	12
1.3.6 University autonomy within the Law on Higher Education	16
2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED LITERATURE.....	20
2.1 POLICY ANALYSIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN OVERVIEW	20

2.1.1	Analysis of policy change in higher education systems	21
2.2	HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN ARGENTINA.....	23
2.2.1	The inceptions of the Argentinean Higher Education System.....	23
2.2.2	The first law regulating Argentinean higher education: The “Avellaneda’s Law”	24
2.2.3	The Reform movement of 1918 and its outcomes	26
2.2.4	The policies towards academic professionals	26
2.3	EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION: BASIC UNDERSTANDINGS AND DILEMMAS	28
2.3.1	Policy studies in higher education	32
2.4	GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES	34
2.4.1	Globalization, states in transition, and higher education reform policies.	37
2.4.2	Globalization as rationale behind higher education reform movements and role of national states.....	42
2.4.3	University “accommodation” to global influences.....	43
2.4.4	University restructuring under global influences	45
2.5	PERSPECTIVES ON POLICY ANALYSIS: RATIONAL MODELS FOR POLICY ANALYSIS	48
2.6	STATE AND HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES: DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES.....	51

2.6.1	A model for the analysis of the state’s role in policy formation	53
2.6.2	A system theory approach on the role of the state in policy formation and implementation	58
2.6.3	On the state and higher education policies in Latin America and Argentina	60
2.6.4	The state and higher education reform policies in Argentina	62
2.7	THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION	63
2.7.1	Introduction to the literature on the academic profession.....	63
2.7.2	On the meaning (and meanings) of being a professional	66
2.7.3	Academic professionals: the main traits of the profession from a global perspective	69
2.7.4	The issue of status of the academic profession	74
2.7.5	Different perspectives about the academic profession	75
2.7.6	Features of different perspectives on the study of academic professionals	76
2.7.7	Contributions from the Critical Professionalization literature	78
2.7.8	Contributions from the literature on the relationships between the state and academic professionals	82
2.7.9	Contributions from the perspective on professionalism as an ideology.....	87
2.7.10	Dilemmas and challenges for the study of the academic profession from a policy standpoint	89
2.8	SENSE-MAKING IN ORGANIZATIONS	91

2.8.1	The construction of “meanings” of higher education policies within institutions.....	91
2.8.2	The properties and component of sense-making.....	92
2.9	THE POLICY RESEARCH FRAMEWORK	96
2.10	THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	99
3.0	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	100
3.1	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	100
3.1.1	Macro level: global and national higher education reform policies.....	101
3.1.2	Micro-level: Institutional policy analysis.....	103
3.1.3	Impact of macro and micro-policy dimensions on academic professionals	104
3.1.4	The research questions	106
3.2	METHODOLOGY	107
3.2.1	The case study	107
3.2.2	Focused synthesis	108
3.2.3	Participants.....	108
3.2.4	Entering the field.....	110
3.2.5	Context of the settings	111
3.3	DATA COLLECTION.....	113
3.3.1	Instruments for data collection.....	113
3.3.2	Interviews and the interviewing process.....	114
3.3.3	The interview protocols	115

3.3.4	Description of interviews at the macro-level: interviews to politicians as policy-makers	116
3.3.5	The interview protocol (politicians)	118
3.3.6	The conceptual framework that supports the interviews with politicians.	119
3.3.7	Interviews at the micro-level: interviews to academic staff	120
3.3.8	The interview protocol for the academic staff.....	121
3.3.9	The conceptual framework and the interview protocol for academic staff	122
3.3.10	Interviews with the professors	123
3.3.11	The interview protocol for the interviews with professors.....	124
3.3.12	Conceptual framework revisited from professors' interview protocols	126
3.4	ARCHIVAL DATA	126
3.4.1	Archival data at the macro-level	126
3.4.2	Bill from the commission of Education, Budget, and Economy at the chamber of representatives and Dictum from the majority.....	129
3.4.3	The first bill from the Chamber of Representatives.....	129
3.4.4	Report from the Political Majority on the first project of the LHE	132
3.4.5	Report from the Political Minority at the Commission of Education, Budget, and Economy (March 1 st , 1995).....	133
3.4.6	Message from the President supporting the LHE (final text proposed)	135

3.4.7	The Congressional hearings about the LHE	137
3.4.8	The conceptual framework and the selection and analysis of archival data	145
3.4.9	Archival data at the micro-level	146
3.4.10	Revisiting the conceptual framework from the description of archival data at the institutional level	152
3.4.11	Archival data (private university)	152
3.5	DATA ANALYSIS.....	154
3.5.1	Instruments for data analysis	155
3.6	IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY	159
3.7	LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS OF THE STUDY	160
4.0	THE CASE STUDY	163
4.1	INTRODUCTION	163
4.2	THE CASE STUDY.....	165
4.2.1	The case of policy implementation at two Argentinean Universities ...	167
4.2.2	Presentation of the findings.....	168
4.3	MACRO-LEVEL: GLOBAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES	170
4.3.1	Context pressures: global trends; global demands	171
4.3.2	Role of the state in higher education	177
4.3.3	State (government) and university relationships	180
4.3.4	Autonomy: Aspects	185
4.3.5	Goals of the reform movement globally and in Argentina.....	188
4.3.6	Tensions/ Misalignments between design and implementation	190

4.3.7	Policies towards the professoriate	194
4.4	MICRO-LEVEL: INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS	198
4.4.1	Specification of national broader policies.....	199
4.4.2	Participation in policy making at the institutional level.....	205
4.4.3	Goals of policy initiative (university level).....	207
4.4.4	Comparison between state policies/ institutional policies	211
4.4.5	Quality improvement and role of academics.....	215
4.4.6	Academic staff and the professoriate	219
4.5	IMPACT OF MACRO AND MICRO POLICY DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS	225
4.5.1	Description of the professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals	225
4.5.2	Professional Status	229
4.5.3	Role/ Roles if the professoriate	233
4.5.4	Professional Autonomy.....	243
4.5.5	Work of academic professionals.....	251
4.5.6	Concursos.....	251
4.6	RESEARCH QUESTION #1: MACRO-LEVEL: GLOBAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES	252
4.7	RESEARCH QUESTION #2: MICRO-LEVEL OF INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS	256
4.8	RESEARCH QUESTION #3: THE IMPACT OF MACRO AND MICRO POLICY DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS	260

5.0	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	269
5.1	REVIEW AND REFLECTIONS ON THE CASE STUDY.....	270
5.2	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	278
5.3	IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	282
	APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCCOLS.....	286
	APPENDIX B: CODE BOOK	292
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	308

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Findings.....	264
----------------------------------	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: REPORT ON NODES FROM Tree Nodes '~/'	157
--	-----

ACRONYMS

CONEAU	National Council of Evaluation and Accreditation
SPU	Secretariat of University Policies (Secretaria de Politicas Universitarias)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing the dissertation is one of the most demanding and enduring sojourns I have ever embarked on. This process has been both an academic and an emotional challenge. Many times along this journey, while writing the dissertation, I was overwhelmed by difficulties. Thus, this product is the result of long hours of work and the enormous support of many people without whom, this would not even have been imagined.

First of all, I would like to thank all the members of my committee for their patience and support in this endeavor. Dr. Lewis, my advisor, to whom I am deeply indebted. Her patience, guidance, and care guided me through my inconsistencies, my lack of strength, and my doubts. She was always there to handle my questions, the obstacles I encountered, and my weaknesses. Dr. Lewis was always insightful, caring, and supportive. She has been there as a generous soundboard of my questions as a scholar. I consider her not only as my advisor, but as one of the most important mentors of my life.

Dr. Martin has been another lighthouse in my academic life. He introduced me to critical education issues and guided me with his knowledge and kindness. Our exchanges, in which he has been always interested in educational issues both nationally and internationally in Latin America, have been a source of academic breakthroughs for me.

Dr. Weidman has been pivotal in the design of the research questions of the study and in the final design this work achieved. His thoughtfulness, rigor, and academic generosity have been strong supports in the quests of my inquiries.

Dr. Borzutzky is and will be one of the most important resources in the construction of my academic knowledge through all the years in graduate school and beyond. Her endless support and thoughtful guidance have channeled me through troubled waters. I cannot express enough gratitude to her. I am honored to have her as a mentor in my life.

There are many others to whom I am grateful and thankful. My husband Phillip, has been continuously there listening, and providing me the emotional support that I needed. He is my rock, because without him, this dissertation would not have happened.

My parents, Martha and Norberto who believe in me blindly and always encourage me to pursue my academic dreams and my goals. I will be forever grateful to them for raising me with the beliefs that being a woman was not an obstacle to become a professional and to pursue an academic career. Their care and support through the distance and in person have been my strength. My sisters and I have been through the years as “the four musketeers”. Mariana, Cecilia, and Vicky have always expressed their support, and pride about what I do. Their love has been the wind beneath my wings in difficult times. Additionally, my grandma Amelia to whom my being in America is a source of sorrow, but who always shows pride in my accomplishments and endless love. Finally, Juan and Justo, my nephews, because we miss each other a lot but they do not stop loving me and caring for me.

My friends in Argentina have been present in their phone calls, emails, letters, and chats. I know about their love and care towards me. So, to all of them, I am extremely grateful because

of their company, support, and warmth. My conversations and discussions with colleagues and friends at the School of Education have always been a source of knowledge and discovery.

I have special thanks to my friends from the ALLIANCE OF URBAN SCHOLARS (“All of Us”). Their love, advice, and example have steered my dissertation sojourn.

My supervisors at the University of Pittsburgh have taught me and mentored me. Working for them allowed me to pursue my doctorate. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Yeager, the “Core Instructional Team”, Dr. Coburn, Dr. Stein, and Dr. Sutin. I have learned from all of them and their insights on educational issues have become the basis for many of my inquiries. I want to give special thanks to Dr. Coburn with whom I learned qualitative research “hands on”. Our conversations on research methodology have been a source of enlightening. Dr. Sutin, with his care about Argentina and his deep knowledge on community colleges, has opened to me new avenues to explore profound educational concerns to include in my analysis and in my future research agenda.

I would also like to thank all the administrative assistants and academic staff from the School of Education at large and at the Administrative and Policy Studies Department in particular. Their continuous help and kindness have been crucial in many aspects of my doctorate studies.

Lastly, I am grateful to all the professors, and academic administrators in Argentina, who allowed me to collect data and have opened their hearts to my inquiry. Everyone I contacted was generous and helpful with their time. Their gentleness and generosity were crucial during the data collection for my study and afterwards.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The process of policy formation or policy-making and implementation of educational policies are two facets of any educational policy phenomena. There are tensions between the declared intents of educational policies and their actual implementation. New issues emerge when educational policy gets implemented at different institutions. The conflict between what is intended by educational policies and what gets actually implemented are revealed in the distinctive perceptions of those who are the stakeholders at different levels of the educational system, because the strands get intertwined with matters of control of power and resources.

In this chapter, the context of reform policy formation and implementation is analyzed with special focus on the Law on Higher Education (1995). Additionally, this section presents the general purpose of the study and the research questions that guided the inquiry.

1.1. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES: TENSIONS AND ISSUES

Since 1995, the Argentinean government embarked on a progressive and overarching project of reforming the higher education system. At the inception of this reform movement the Argentinean government passed a general policy (the Law on Higher Education) (1995). The Law on Higher Education (from now onwards LHE) established the major policy lines for the reform of the system.

The Law on Higher Education (Law number: N*24521) was passed on August 7th, 1995. This law contains articles that regulate the functioning of both university and non-university institutions and their articulations. Mollis (2003) and Fernández Lamarra (2003) posit that the law marked the inception and reification of a different government approach toward higher education in general. Most specifically, the law's foremost landmarks refer to the autonomy of the universities, the funding system (autarchy), and the structure of government within the system by proposing the autarchy of each institution (Mollis, 2001, p. 22-26). According to Suasnabar (2002), and Mollis (2001), the law was very specific and detailed about the roles of different actors in the system and their relationships. The law introduced a high degree of specification and information about the components of the system and the regulation that was historically unprecedented (Mollis, 2001, p. 22).

The LHE of 1995 would introduce changes in the ways in which the system operates. Additionally, the "Deus ex machina" behind these changes emerging from the policy was a rather different approach of the Argentinean state towards the sector. This policy shift would entail transformations in the relationship between state, public, and private universities, in terms of management and funding within the system. Ultimately, this shift would involve the enactment of processes of quality evaluation, quality assurance, and particular views about the relationship between institutional quality and the role of academics within institutions.

After the LHE, which operated as a "general act", more specific and detailed policy documents were passed by both the Ministry of Education and each university. The Ministry of Education produced a document for the creation of the CONEAU (National Council of Evaluation and Accreditation) (McyE, 1998). This council was mentioned in the text of the LHE without any specific detail regarding its functioning and scope. The mechanisms of evaluation

and accreditation were not specified in the LHE. The document that established CONEAU also provided specific details for the internal and external quality evaluation and accreditation processes for the universities.

By the late 1990s', universities started to develop meticulous policy documents, in order to specify, or set up, the changes proposed by the LHE, to "translate" the policy messages to their institutional actors, and to establish detailed procedures for policy implementation. These documents were published at different times (e.g., Millennium Program, 1999-2000) and they targeted different issues. One illustrative case is the Millennium Program. This document outlined an agenda and schedule of reform initiatives for one university, as well as the pace of professional demands and requirements that its professoriate should embark on.

The process through which these policy documents came to life as well as the implementation of them was marked by tensions, uncertainties, and contradictions between the state and universities, among the politicians who produced the policy, and between academic staff and the professoriate. The content of the policy documents themselves anticipated a primordial conflict paradigmatic to educational policy reforms: between the declared intents of the policies and the actual implementation of them.

Among the most disputed and controversial issues within both the different policies and their implementations, was the role and features assigned to the professoriate during the reform and the achievement of educational quality. The LHE proposed changes in the position and status of the professoriate within institutions of higher education as well as new demands and requirements of professional development for professors (LHE, pp. 5-6).

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to analyze the tensions and impacts initiated by the Argentinean higher education reform policies of 1995 (and subsequent policies) on the ways in which professors and academic staff perceive the roles of the professoriate at two Argentinean universities. In order to explore this main purpose, it is crucial to propose the following research questions:

1. How are the goals of the State in the design of the Law on Higher Education of 1995 perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators/academic staff) in the higher education reform movement in Argentina?
 - a. How does each group characterize the nature of the reform movement?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences between groups?
2. How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) characterize academic professionalism:
 - a. What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences among groups?
3. How-if at all- do the stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?

1.2 TENSIONS AND MISALIGNMENTS

1.2.1 Tensions and conflicts around policies and their implementation at different levels

The aforementioned research questions capture landmark tensions between what was intended with the policies and what got implemented at different levels of the system. These questions also exposed the role of different actors within Argentinean higher education reform, such as, the state, policy-makers (politicians and academic staff at the university), university administrators, and the professoriate. Each of these stakeholders perceive both the initial policy priorities (more specifically the content of the LHE), and later ones, in different ways. Each of the different policies get in different hierarchical levels the policy demands and urgencies to be tackled within the reform movement.

The LHE (1995) locates at center-stage the improvement of educational quality within the system. The LHE framed the role of the professoriate as intrinsically connected with the improvement of educational policy. By identifying the professoriate as a key component of quality improvement, the LHE introduced a problematic target for the reform of the system. The claims about the need for quality improvement of the professoriate as well as the need to provide opportunities for their professional development were highly questioned and debated by the professoriate at its different ranks. Notwithstanding, the academic staff at universities, appropriated of the general statements of the law related to academics professional development, and detail ranks, credentials, and demands in further policy documents (Millennium Program, 2000). The professoriate expressed resistance and opposition to the rather imposed role of the professoriate in relationship with the improvement of educational quality.

The LHE manifests the contradictory views of the Argentinean state towards the higher education system and the alliances and tensions between policy-makers from different political parties within the process of its formation. The Argentinean state remained the initiator of the reform movement, and the LHE became its primordial instrument to guide the reform process. Nevertheless, the law (LHE, 1995) proposed changes in the role of the state in terms of funding which contradict the historical trends that it played towards the system. The LHE proposed a more “detached” role of the state towards universities.

The LHE presents specific statements about how the autonomy of universities is warranted by the state and the policies themselves, there are contradictory assertions in this respect in both the text of the law and the further actions developed by the state towards different institutions of higher education. Furthermore, the law mentions that the Argentinean state will provide funds to the support of universities both public and private, situating this as one of the landmarks of the policies themselves. At the same time, the same law allows universities both private and public to create private foundations and or cooperatives to financially contribute to support the institutions.

University autonomy has been a vital feature of Argentinean higher education since its inception. The Law on Higher Education re-states the degree of autonomy of institutions, when it proposes the creation of a national council of quality evaluation and accreditation namely CONEAU. The law describes CONEAU as linked to the national Ministry of Education, in terms of its regulations and decisions but not under the supervision of the national university council or the universities themselves. The haziness surrounding the university autonomy that resulted from the creation of CONEAU generated debates, and demonstrations from different actors of the system: students, professors, and academic staff.

Several scholars have studied in depth the impact of the so-called “international agenda for the modernization of the higher education system” (Tyler and Mollis, 1997, pp. 5-11), and the paradoxical role that national states played in its implementation. Since the 1990’s, this compound of policies (Tyler & Mollis, 1997, pp. 5-11) has been implemented in Argentina, as well as in other countries, such as Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Russia, and Bulgaria (Mollis, 2001, p. 15). This international agenda has been promoted by the World Bank, by the Inter-American Development Bank and many other international lender organizations (Mollis, 2001, p. 15; Mollis, 2003, p. 309). According to Mollis, this agenda proposed

The reduction of state subsidies and investments to science and education, the selective control of the state in the distribution of financial resources [for the universities], the expansion in number and enrollment and private universities, and the introduction of a new Law of Higher Education (Mollis, 2001, p. 15).

This combined process of internationalization and modernization of higher education also entails “evaluation and accreditation processes, and the search for alternative sources of financing in order to improve the efficiency in the management of institutional resources” (Mollis, 2003, p. 209). In other words, the international agenda represents one of the foremost features of the so-called “institutional globalization” (Astiz et al., 2002, p. 67).

New management and financial practices in higher education have channeled changes in the historical role of the state toward this education sector in Argentina (Mollis, 2001; Fernández Lamarra, 2003; Balán, 1998; Chiroleau, 2001). This new role of the state towards higher education could be synthesized by the state’s detachment from the mechanisms of governance and control of the system (Balán, p. 16; Seoane, p. 67) while it oversees quality evaluation and accreditation processes through the creation of central offices, such as, the Secretaria de Políticas Universitarias (Secretariat of University Policies) and the Comisión Nacional de Evaluación y

Acreditacion Universitaria: CONEAU (National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation) .

1.2.2 Different policy interpretations from different stakeholders of the system

Different stakeholders in the system interpret policies, and mediate their implementation at the institutional level in particular ways (Weick, 1995). In Argentina, faculty has tended to question and debate key aspects of the policies (autonomy, funding, professional development of faculty, and so forth) which has translated into demonstrations and public opposition to these aspects by the national organization representing the professoriate (CONADU). Since the mid 1995s, academic staff at the universities started to target more specific policies within the institutions such as quality evaluation and accreditation, or mechanisms for professional development of the professoriate, and specification of credentials that they are now required to hold (Millennium Program, 1999-2000). This approach from the academic staff and administrators at the universities has clearly demarcated a particular position of this group in relation with the reform policies.

There are several aspects around which the academic staff and the professoriate develop tensions and conflicting approaches. At the core of these aspects was the reform of curricula. The professoriate resisted and extensively questioned the proposal of “basic curriculum contents” that the law presented (LHE, 1995), which entailed the modification of the plans of studies in place. The LHE stated the need of “basic curriculum contents” to confer national validity to the study plans which should be approved by the Federal Council of Culture and Education (in Spanish: Consejo Federal de Cultura y Educacion). This represents a change from the ways in which curricula and plans of studies were approved and put into practice before. It also transfers

curriculum decisions from the professors at the universities to another decision-making body, which is the Federal Council of Culture and Education. Between 2000 and 2003, the reform of the plans of studies was pushed by the academic staff at the universities as a policy priority as a sine qua non condition for the achievement of educational improvement and quality. Academic staff and professors clashed around the pace, content, and requirements related to the process of curricular reform.

1.3 LAW ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1.3.1 The context of the Law on Higher Education

During the 1990's, during the presidency of Carlos Menem, numerous changes were introduced into the educational policies for the higher education sector. These changes rested upon the complex phenomena of the full insertion of Argentina into the global economy, and the reform movement initiated by the "modernization" of the economy and society. The deep "modernization" that Argentina was experiencing was based on neoliberal ideas and the conditions ruled by the so-called Washington Consensus (Williamson, 1988). The Washington Consensus proposed to modify the functions that the state used to play toward civil society and the roles that the state used to have in different areas of social policy. Drawing on Shaw, Robertson et al. explain that " globalization does not undermine the state, but includes the transformation of state forms" (2002, p. 1). Providing that education is one of these areas where the state projects the transformation of its forms, it is interesting to highlight that the Argentinean state modified the basis upon which its relationships with the educational sector were displayed.

Furthermore, during the same period the country played a stronger role in the global economy, adopting some of what Stromquist and Monkman call the “many faces” of globalization (2000, p. 4). Based on the agenda of the Washington Consensus, the state adopted and supported “practices favoring free trade, private enterprise, foreign investment, and liberalized trade” (Stromquist & Monkman, p. 4). In the global scenario, institutions such as, the World Bank (from now onwards, WB), the World Trade Organization, and the International Monetary Fund (from now onwards, IMF) “set policy for a majority of the world’s nations in the former communist countries and the third world” (Tabb, 2000, p. 59). Daun highlights as outcomes of the process of globalization the “restructuring in the relationships between nation-states and companies, national as well as international ones, but also within countries between the central state and organizations, social movements, and so on” (2000, p. 13). These features could be found operating in the case of Argentina in the 1990’s and also reflecting upon educational reform.

1.3.2 Climate and ideas of the reform in higher education in the 1990’s

According to Fernandez Lamarra and Garcia de Fanelli, during the first five years of the 1990’s there were no clear policies about higher education in the country (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003, p. 39; and Garcia de Fanelli, 2001, p. 19 and p. 21). Other researchers (Mollis, 2001, Tiramonti, 1999; and Suasnabar, 2002) contend that the Argentinean government had a “modernization plan” for the higher education sector since 1989 (Carlos Menem had started his presidential period in 1989).

During the early 1990’s, higher education reform policies became a policy priority. At that time, the national government started to show signs of a growing interest in the higher

education sector (Coraggio & Vispo, 2001, p. 61). There were changes within the governmental structure of the Ministry of Education and Culture: in 1993, the government established the Secretariat of Higher Education Policies (in Spanish: Secretaria de Politicas Universitarias, SPU). Juan Carlos Del Bello was assigned as the Secretary of University Policies in 1993. From the Secretariat of Higher Educational Policies (from now onwards: SPU), Del Bello dramatically spotlighted four policy priorities for the sector: external evaluation of quality and accreditation of new and old institutions; introduction of students fees; deregulation of the system introducing institutional autarchy in the provision of funds and more privatization, and the urgent need for a new law of higher education (Coraggio and Vispo, 2001, pp. 60-63; Suasnabar, 2002; Garcia de Fanelli, 2001, pp. 26-28).

A year after the SPU was established its technical staff composed the project of the LHE (Garcia de Fanelli, 2001; MCYE, 1994). This project was sent to the Congress to be discussed, as well as to support and justify the national policies toward the sector as well as to solicit a statement about shifts in state policies toward it.

1.3.3 The content of the Law on Higher Education

One of the cornerstone features of the LHE has been the establishment of processes of institutional evaluation and accreditation of both undergraduate and graduate studies. The law also established the creation of the National Council of Evaluation and Accreditation (CONEAU), which would operate in a rather independent fashion (Mollis, 2001). The law instituted the basic norms for national universities and their organization, governance, authorities, and financial functioning. There are also generalizations regarding the intrinsic

relationship between academic quality and the professional background of faculty at the universities (LHE, 1995, p. 5).

1.3.4 Specific sections and provisions of the Law on Higher Education

The law is composed of a total of 89 articles organized into 14 chapters. The first article in the LHE enumerates all the types of institutions within the system (LHE, 1995, p. 1).

Throughout the text of the law, there are multifaceted goals of the system presented. Accordingly, the LHE posits as goals of the higher education system:

[P]romote scientific, professional, humanistic and technical education at the highest levels; preserve national heritage; produce knowledge in manifold ways; and form responsible human beings, with ethical consciousness, who are able to respect the environment, the institutions of the republic, and the democratic order” (LHE, 1995, p. 1).

1.3.5 The policy framework regarding the professoriate

Article number 4 of the LHE adds other objectives to higher education, which are relevant to the impacts on the role of the professoriate delineated by the LHE:

- a. Prepare scientists, professionals, and technicians characterized by a solid background and commitment to society;
- b. Provide teacher preparation at each level of the system;
- c. Promote high levels of scientific research and artistic expressions, which could contribute to scientific, technological, and technical development of the country; [...]
- d. Promote the full use [in Spanish: “aprovechamiento”] of human and material resources within each institution;
- e. Increase and diversify opportunities for professional development of professors to allow them to “upgrade” their credentials, and conversion of them to equivalent degrees (LHE, 1995, pp. 1-2).

The LHE delineates the rights and duties of the professoriate in chapter III (1995, p. 3).

In this section, article 11 defines and illustrates the rights and duties of the professoriate in all the

different types of institutions within the higher education system. This calls attention to the contradictory policies towards professors. The law proposes a somewhat detailed description of the professoriate roles and rights which acknowledges the crucial role that the professoriate plays in higher education. At the same time, the law actually proposes conditions of access to the profession, and the demand of professional development of the professoriate, which in some ways restrict the autonomy of the professoriate. Additionally, the law shifts the decision and opportunities for professional development on the universities and not in the hands of the professors.

Rights of the professoriate:

- a. Have entry access to the academic profession through an entry exam which is open to the public. To enter into the academic career professors should provide documentation of their credentials and academic background;
- b. Participate in the government of the higher education institutions they work at;
- c. Professors have the right to take up continuing professional development to achieve excellence through their academic careers.
- d. Professors are allowed to participate in unions (LHE, p. 3).

Duties of the professoriate:

- a. Observe and respect the norms that regulate the activities of the institutions where they work.
- b. Participate in their institutions with their teaching, taking up research and service responsibly;
- c. Embark on continuing professional development [in Spanish: “actualizacion en forma permanente”] and fulfill the demands of professional development and excellence required by the academic career (p. 3).

The LHE is also specific with the case of entry exams to the academic profession. In a shift from the system of entry exams that was proposed for professors’ entry into the university, the LHE proposes that “in the case of public higher education institutions, teachers should also pass an entry exam and selection through their credentials, to guarantee their professional knowledge to take upon their specific tasks” (p. 4).

The LHE states that universities should “promote academic excellence and ensure academic freedom, professional development, and a hierarchical order of the faculty; as well as the development of pluralism of ideas and research (freedom of speech and freedom of ideas)” (LHE, 1995, p.7). In this section, the law explicates that “each university guarantees professional development of faculty which should be articulated with the academic career [...].Faculty professional development should follow a format of interdisciplinary courses” (LHE, p.7).

In the chapter on public universities (pp. 9-10) the LHE defines the conditions of entry to the professoriate. The text of the law defines this as “entry into the academic career” (LHE, p. 9). The entry to the professoriate is through an entry exam, which would be judged by a committee of experts (LHE, p.9). In exceptional situations, the university could hire professionals with prestige and credentials on a short-term basis (LHE, p.9). In cases of need of professors, universities can also assign teaching courses to assistant professors (via contract) until a date for the entry exam is set. Professors who have passed an entry exam to work at the university should comprise no less than 70% of the total of the professoriate in each school (LHE, p. 8).

With regard to the academic level of private university faculty, the law explains that in order to become fulltime faculty, they do not have to pass an entry exam. Professors’ academic background, credentials, and experience, as well as research and university teaching are the requirements to be a professor at private universities (p. 11).

The national government should provide financial help to support research projects that could originate at private institutions.

In the last section of the law (“Complementary and Temporary Provisions”) it is explained that each university should “update their professoriate staff” in a period of less than 10 years from the sanctioning of the law (p. 13).

The dispositions proposed by the law regarding the professoriate created tensions among professors from the inceptions of the reform movement. The contradictory messages of the LHE that ignited the conflicts could be traced in its recognition of the vital role of the professoriate in terms of educational quality of the higher education institutions, while it determines where the educational excellence of the professoriate should be constructed. Additionally, while the improvement of academic knowledge is both empowering and respectful of self-determination of the professoriate, a prescriptive detail of it undermines the autonomy of professors which is a key component of their professionalism. Access to professional development provided by each institution could also create paradoxical outcomes to the professoriate. First of all, the institutions will determine priorities, resources, and type of professional development to be offered to professors. Second, the access and achievement of professional development which will be different within each institution and to each professor would ignite ranks and hierarchies among themselves which could diminish their professional shared conditions as supportive of salary claims and demands of resources.

Another aspect that generated conflictive responses at the core of the profession has been the general regulations related to the system of entry exams. The law refurbishes the system which has been a foremost component of the autonomy and professional condition of academics in Argentina. It also reinforces differences between professors working in public and private institutions. The law requires taking the entry exam to become a professor in public institutions but not in private ones. This disposition also generates ranks and differential access to the profession.

1.3.6 University autonomy within the Law on Higher Education

Chapter IV of the LHE refers to “Public higher education¹”. This section includes the functions, a detailed characterization of institutional autonomy, conditions of university work, titles and credentials, universities, “funding and financial regimen”, private universities, provincial universities, university governance and articulation and coordination among different type of higher education institutions (LHE, pp. 5-13).

The scope of university autonomy appears in the section “Public higher education” (LHE, pp. 6-7): universities have the power to reform their statutory rules; they can define their government structure and elect their authorities according to other general provisions of the law; they are allowed to establish new study plans for undergraduate and graduate studies; and individually administer resources and properties. Basically, these specifications refer to academic, administrative, and financial autonomy (LHE, p. 6). It is also interesting that in this section the LHE explains that interventions [in Spanish: intervenciones] at the universities could only be determined by the national congress and could not last for more than six consecutive months (LHE, p. 6). Any intervention could not interfere with the academic autonomy of the universities.

Regarding evaluation and accreditation, the LHE establishes that universities should transit through an internal or “self-evaluation” process as well as complementary external evaluations every 6 years. Both the self-evaluation and external evaluations “would focus on the evaluation of teaching, research, and community service” (LHE, p. 8). According to the law, the external evaluation should be conducted by an organism independent from the universities

¹ The provisions of this section were the ones that generated controversies, demonstrations, and reactions from professors and students organizations.

(either private or public, CONEAU). The LHE authorizes the establishment of CONEAU or any other private organism in charge of conducting evaluation and accreditation. CONEAU is presented as an independent and decentralized council (LHE, 1995, p.8) which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture and Education. CONEAU would be in charge of accreditation of all study plans for both undergraduate and graduate studies according to “standards” provided by the MCyE (LHE, p.8). The final composition of CONEAU should be ultimately approved by the Argentinean President and it should change every 4 years (p. 9).

The LHE also defines the autarchy of the universities, while it also asserts that “the Argentinean government must support and fund all universities” (1995, p. 10). At the same time, in article 58 the law explains that universities could seek other forms of funding by selling services, and by other economic activities (pp. 10-11).

The LHE has re-defined the autonomy of the institutions when it regulates the processes of quality evaluation and accreditation.

In summation, the efforts toward the reform of higher education have conferred more relevance on private universities. The mandated processes for evaluation and improvement of the quality of the program of studies would translate into a high degree of control of institutions by CONEAU. This stricter control transmuted into stricter mechanisms of control and evaluation of teachers, institutions, and academic programs. Mollis (2001, p. 24) contends that these processes evolved into a less firm functioning than had been expected they would become.

In the institutions where these programs or processes of accreditation-evaluation have been implemented, the jobs of university administrators and faculty members have also been affected in particular ways.

The frictions that ignited at the level of the policy-making and implementation, are manifold. Paradoxically, they have been broadened and extended by other policy documents and by the interpretation that of them different actors within the system perform. Other policy documents such as, the “Millennium Program (Santa Fe, Argentina, 2000) and the “Basic documents for a curricular diagnosis-Proposed Program for curricular transformation” (Documentos Basicos Orientadores para un diagnostico curricular. [Seguido de una propuesta de Programa de Transformacion curricular] (Santa Fe, 1996), simply intensify and paradoxically provided details for the implementation of the general policy lines proposed by the LHE.

In order to explore shed light on the research questions, there is a need to explore the changes introduced by the LHE from a historical perspective. Thus, I will analyze the historical development of the system, and I will focus on the specific policies towards academics unfolded from the inceptions of the system. The historical development will contextualize the literature review.

Different literature and theoretical constructs will also illuminate the paradoxes ignited throughout the policy-making and implementation of the reform policies. The views of policy-makers at the state level, academic staff, and the professoriate at the institutional level will illustrate the multiple tensions emanated between the intents and implementation of the policies themselves.

The study of the contradictions and oppositions between the intents of the policies and the actual outcomes of their implementation support the design of a policy case study with a specific focus on the policy dissonances around the professoriate and its roles.

The following chapter tackles down the different theoretical perspectives of higher education policy analysis with specific emphasis on the theoretical constructs on academic professionalism.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the different theoretical frameworks and constructs that will converge for the inquiry of the main research topic. First, this section introduces the theoretical constructs of higher education policy analysis. Second, a description of the historic evolution of the higher education system in Argentina which is crucial for the understanding of policy reform design and implementation in this case is presented. Third, the chapter analyzes basic understandings and dilemmas in policy analysis. Then, this section explores reform policies at the global and national levels (with specific illustrations from Argentina). Finally, the chapter analyzes the literature on academic professionalism, as the catalyst of the policy case study.

2.1 POLICY ANALYSIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN OVERVIEW

The development of higher education reform policies from formation to implementation appear as a conundrum. In order to be deciphered, I need to turn to multiple theoretical concepts to disentangle the complexity of the phenomena. I also need to portray the historical development of the policies that affected the higher education system.

In the path from formation to implementation, tensions arise when higher education policies are created and implemented, especially with regards to the state, the main source of policy making. Higher education policies create tensions within the state (government) as the

main avenue of policy-making. State's bureaucracies and policy-makers discuss and struggle over ideologies and intentions to be represented in the written texts of the policies. When policy documents "reach" the institutional level of the universities, policies are filtered, constructed, and understood by its stakeholders. I intend to examine the tensions intertwined in higher education reform policies in Argentina from design to implementation specifically focusing on the policies towards academic professionals. The ultimate aim is to posit their inquiries as policies of change.

In their seminal comparison between university systems in Argentina and Australia, Marginson and Mollis (2001) propose a theoretical viewpoint for a research agenda in higher education which is to resort to "a plurality of perspectives and approaches including subaltern elements" (Marginson & Mollis, 2001, p. 584). This research angle brings an interdisciplinary flavor to higher education research allowing the analysis of power relations (Marginson & Mollis, p. 583). This overarching theoretical proposal operates as the foundation that supports this study of higher education reform policies from formation to implementation with a focus on the policies that deal with academic professionals.

2.1.1 Analysis of policy change in higher education systems

The selected approach for the analysis of the higher education reform policies and how to explore how they impact and actually introduce changes in the system, stems from a perspective that Mollis (2003) has labeled as "socio-historical analysis" (Mollis, 1998, Mollis, 2000; Mollis, 2003, p. 204). This author contends that there are two approaches to the study of higher education reform policies: organizational analysis and socio-historical analysis. Mollis posits that the organizational analysis approach "is used in the Developed North, and the second one

appears to rule the studies in Latin America and consequently in Argentina” (Mollis, 2003, p. 204). Mollis asserts that the socio-historic analysis sheds light over both the “external and diachronic elements” as well as the institutional dynamics (Mollis, p. 204). The main priority within this analysis is to label the study of higher education policies as “public policies” (Mollis, p. 2004). It focuses on the “university actors (professors and students), conceding relevance to a series of aspects such as macro-processes within specific historical periods, the system itself, and the power relations”.

This analysis also highlights the social, political, and economic contexts, which ultimately operates as an avenue for change within universities (Mollis, 1990, 1995, 1997)” (Mollis, pp. 204-205). Drawing on Mollis, the universities as institutions are defined as a space for knowledge production, control, and legitimation, in a “context of constant tension between the state and civil society, and the market while it delegates [new] duties into the university” (Mollis, p. 205).

Thus, this socio-historic model accounts for the influence of global patterns on higher education systems, the crucial role of the national states in the formation and implementation of reform policies, and the institutional realities of the universities and their roles in socio-economic contexts, by giving voice to the different stakeholders within the system.

To complement this approach, it is important to include another key component to this model. I find that in the analysis of the policy transits from the macro-contexts to the micro-levels of the institutions, where “university actors” struggle over the meaning and goals of the policies, there is a need to also draw upon a specific institutional theory approach to illuminate these processes. Among institutional theory approaches, Weick’s (1995) construct of “sense-making in organizations” constitutes an approach that allows illuminating implementation and

enactment of higher education policies at the institutional level while preserving their linkages with the socio-political and economic contexts from their inceptions to implementation.

2.2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN ARGENTINA

2.2.1 The inceptions of the Argentinean Higher Education System

The Argentinean higher education system had its inception in 1613 when a Jesuits college was established in Cordoba. In 1821, after the revolution of independence, Rivadavia (first president) established the University of Buenos Aires (UBA), which is now a mega-university and the most important university in Argentina (Mollis, 2001; Suasnabar, 2002; Garcia de Fanelli, 2001). Later on, from 1889, different universities were established in the provinces, i.e. Santa Fe and La Plata. The national government transformed these universities into national public institutions after a couple of decades (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003, pp. 25-27). In general, the tendency followed from the inception of the system was that the first universities (Buenos Aires and Cordoba) became mega-universities, while the universities established by the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th century became medium-sized universities (Mollis, 2001; Suasnabar, 2002). Garcia de Fanelli (2001) asserts that the public universities are, in terms of academic tradition and enrollment numbers the “most important actors within the system” (Garcia de Fanelli, p. 19).

The system of higher education in Argentina has shown signs of expansion/differentiation for the last 20 years (Tiramonti, 1999, pp. 8-15). According to Tiramonti, between

the 1960's and the 1990's the number of students in the system grew almost five fold (Tiramonti, p. 14). Furthermore, the number of institutions in the system grew almost 50% in the period of 1980-2000.

Another general tendency in the development of Argentinean higher education has been respect for institutional autonomy in terms of academic and administrative management (specifically in democratic periods); and the “universal access model” of students at the universities (Mollis, 2001, p. 21).

2.2.2 The first law regulating Argentinean higher education: The “Avellaneda’s Law”

The Argentinean higher education system that developed since 1885 was based on one regulatory schema, provided by Law number # 1597, namely Avellaneda’s Law (in Spanish: Ley Avellaneda)². Avellaneda’s Law with only four articles, operated as a general act. It provided the basic norms for the government and organization of the public universities. It also ruled the system with no legal interruptions until 1947 (First Peronist Government). This general act also crystallized some long-term trends in regard to the connections and policies from the national state toward the system. This law also concretized the consecration of the institutional autonomy of universities and the warranty of state funding for the universities, as well as the system of governance in each institution, and academic freedom in determining curricula and plans of studies in each school (Avellaneda’s Law, 1885, p. 1-2).

At the same time, the aforementioned law represents an eloquent illustration of the type of political structure that Argentina had at the beginning of the 20th century, as well as the type of

² The law received this title because it was sanctioned during the presidency of Nicolas Avellaneda, who actively engaged in its design and implementation.

economic development (as an agriculture producer) within the international economy during the same period. Mollis (2001) and Fernandez Lamarra (2003) coincide in finding in this law the reification of the specific societal goals of the times. The “sons” of the massive immigration that the country experienced in that period were able to attend the university and the dream of “my son, the doctor” (in Spanish: “Mi hijo el doctor”) put professional studies at the forefront of higher education (Mollis, 2001, p. 12).

According to Mollis (2001) and Oszlack (1985), this law was guided by another main goal which was the need to provide bureaucrats with the incipient governmental agencies that were developed prior to this process. According to Fernandez Lamarra, this law inaugurated a period of “ideological and political fluidity” between the state and the higher education system (p. 28).

Regardless of its “ductile regulations” (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003; and Mollis, 2001 and 2003), Avellaneda’s Law established specific norms for the hiring of professors at the university. The law stated that the president of the country had to appoint professors to the higher education institutions, after receiving a list of possible candidates from the university. It also stated that the president of the country had the right to dismiss any hired faculty after a request from a university was submitted.

In this context, the basic tenets of Argentinean education were developed, such as the autonomy of the institutions, and the system of access exams (“concursos”) were left to the teaching profession at the universities. It was the UBA that established this system by 1900, and then it was transferred to the other higher education institutions.

2.2.3 The Reform movement of 1918 and its outcomes

Marcella Mollis (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003, p. 25) describes the heritage of the Avellaneda's Law as “ductile”, because it opened the gates to a movement termed “Reforma Universitaria” (“University Reform”). This student-driven movement started in Argentina in 1918, spreading its influence other universities in other Latin American countries. Although the ideas that ignited this political movement were not reified in any official document or regulation, the “University Reform” movement strengthened a public commitment to the notions of institutional autonomy and free student access to the universities (Garcia de Fanelli, p. 21, Mollis;, Fernandez Lamarra.).

2.2.4 The policies towards academic professionals

According to Fernandez Lamarra (2003) “there has been a vital influence of the state in the design or definition of higher education policies, which has happened in democratic periods, and military dictatorships” (p. 44). In addition, throughout the history of the Argentinean university system, the autonomy of the higher education institutions has been the crucial feature that has defined its dynamics. Nevertheless, although a system of entry exams was initially established for the hiring of professors, this system was affected in different historical periods by changes in the political control of the government, and by a somehow permanent suspicion about the roles and activities of faculty working at the university. Thus, national policies on how to hire and how to administer the position of faculty within institutions have changed through the years.

During the Peronist period (1946), Juan Domingo Peron (president 1945-1955) intervened in all the national universities, and all professors that opposed the Peronist

government were laid off (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003; Mollis, 2001). In November 1947, the law 13031 was passed. This law established that the president should designate both the presidents and professors of each university. After the coup d'état of 1955 against Peron, a military dictatorship was established. Policies toward the academic profession at the university changed. The military government “controlled the universities, laying off the majority of the professors, and hired intellectuals from the radical party, the socialist party, and other political expressions that had been against Peron’s government” (Fernandez Lamarra, p. 33). After this, a decree was passed stating that entry exams into the academic profession be required to hire professors. But this decree also established that professors who had supported Peron’s government could not even try to enter into the profession (Fernandez Lamarra, p. 33).

Another military dictatorship also displayed violent antagonistic policies against professors and students at the university. One night in 1966, a group of professors and students were violently repressed by the police in UBA. As a result of these actions, an important number of professors and researchers at the UBA and other universities resigned. Other professors were prosecuted by the military dictatorship (Fernandez Lamarra, 2003, p. 34).

In the 1970’s, there were also prosecutions against professors because of their political beliefs. The country experienced its last military dictatorship from 1976, the universities were targeted, and “thousands of professors were laid off” (Fernandez Lamarra, p. 37). Many were also killed, and others went into exile. Meanwhile, the military maintained somehow a “faked” system of entry exams to the academic profession and highly controlled academic programs and activities at the university.

After the democratic recuperation, the government reviewed the resolutions on hiring professors during the dictatorship and re-established the system of entry exams for the academic

profession. It also eliminated all the restrictive clauses and policies about the administration of academic matters. These policies also guided the re-installation of professors previously laid off by the military dictatorship. During 1984-1989 in all universities the system of “concurso” was re-established and worked in accordance with its rules and regulations. After this period, there were no policies passed towards the higher education system until 1995.

2.3 EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION: BASIC UNDERSTANDINGS AND DILEMMAS

In their study about the theoretical implications and problems of educational policies and change, Taylor et al. (1997) propose a description of basic features involved in the process of policy formation and ultimately, their implementation. Additionally, the authors posit “policy processes are often highly political rather than merely technical in nature” (Taylor et al., p. 11). The importance of their framework relies on how it highlights historical and socio-economic policy contexts, the connections between the contexts and the micro-levels of educational policy, and the broad or un-specific nature of reform policies. The characteristics of the policy process is instrumental for the inquiry of this case.

According to Taylor et al., the basic characteristics of policy making and implementation in educational policies are:

1. The policy context is essential for the understanding of the policies themselves (Taylor et al., p. 11), because “policies do not exist in a vacuum” (p. 11). Any type of policy issues

“[are] embedded in a wider set of pressures or contexts-historical, political, economic-which would need to be understood” (p. 12).

2. Regarding policy making and policy implementation: Taylor et al. contend that in policy analysis it is vital to shed light on the existing “connections between the micro-settings [e.g. universities], and policy-making at the macro-level” (p. 12). The authors highlight that these linkages between macro and micro levels are not “obvious” (p. 12) and they need to be further explored.
3. Taylor et al. explain that policy “is at times ad hoc nature” (p. 12). Hence, policy is written for a special purpose, goal, or objective.
4. The notion of “policy on the run” (p. 12) manifests relevant for higher education policies. Taylor et al. explain that another core theme in the policy literature is the phenomenon of, “policy distortion or unintended consequences of policies” (p. 12). The authors assert that these phenomena are archetypical in both the reality and literature about policy. In addition, “policies on the run” in actuality intensify, and / or influence paradoxical outcomes of policies on the education systems themselves (Taylor et al., pp. 12-13).
5. Policy documents and policy statements themselves, sometimes use a “language and discursive context which is usually broad and general, and not specific” (Taylor et al., pp. 13-15). Hence, each of the stakeholders involved in the process could interpret and construct their own meanings and ideas about the policies themselves.
6. Taylor et al. describe “national policy-making” as a “relatively recent phenomenon” (p. 13) and they propose that “yet another dimension of policy-making: the international context” (p. 13) or globalization (pp. 54-61) is intertwined to the process itself .

7. The linkages between national agendas and global agendas are plagued by tensions (p. 14). Taylor et al. explain that these tensions add complexity to the level of policy-making (p. 14).

An original and fruitful contribution of this work, is that it proposes a series of “dilemmas” (Taylor et al., p. 15) while studying educational policies when they are introducing change. These “dilemmas” compose a constructive framework for the scrutiny of public policies:

a. “Policies are more than the text”: Taylor et al. explain that policies emerge from the “nuances and subtleties of the context which gives the text [of laws, regulations, etc] meaning and significance. Policies are dynamic and interactive and not merely a set of instructions or intentions” (Taylor et al., p. 15). The authors strongly identify with discourse methodologies for the analysis of policy. They contend that in the quest for that analysis, it is crucial to “read behind the lines” of the policy texts and situate policies in this case of higher education in both global and national contexts as well as institutional ones, by revealing light on the “nuances” and discontinuities between the intent of the policies and their actual implementation.

b. “Policy is multidimensional”: “Each of the policy players in some way contributes to the way this policy develops and ‘works’. Not all policies influence this process equally; often there is conflict and contradiction between the perspectives or interests of those involved, and not all the players benefit equally” (p. 15).

c. “Policy is value-laden”: Values “permeate policy processes” (p. 15). Specific reform policies are justified in particular values.

d. “Policies exist in contexts”: when analyzing policies, they cannot be isolated from the historical, ideological, and political climate in which they are embedded (Taylor et al., p. 16). Additionally, the authors highlight the agency of individuals and the particular socio-economic

contexts “which together influence the shape and timing of policies as well as their evolution and their outcomes” (Taylor et al., p. 16).

e. “Policy making is a state activity”: According to Taylor et al., “education policy making...belongs to the realm of public or social policy-a state or government activity” (p. 16). By relying on the state’s role in policy-making, the authors highlight the multifaceted nature of the state, defining it as “not a specific entities, and policies often have to run the gauntlet of the differing agendas” (p. 16). Thus, the state’s bureaucracies, policy makers, or state agents translate to policy documents, the tensions, political agendas, and even conflicts that develop within the state as a non-monolithic entity (Taylor et al., pp. 16-17).

f. “Education policies interact with policies in other fields”: Taylor et al. (p. 16) assert that educational policies are seen as “connected in some ways with broader policy developments” (p. 16).

g. “Policy implementation is never straightforward”: Taylor et al. question the common belief that “implementation of policy is often viewed as the link between policy production and policy practice” (p. 16). The authors contend that the complexity of social developments, official policy agendas, and stakeholders’ ideas, intersect the process of policy implementation.

h. “Policies result in unintended as well as intended consequences”: Taylor et al. define policy making as a “precarious business” (p. 17). The outcomes of policies are unpredictable because they operate under the influence of contextual factors, stakeholders’ actions, and opposing interests, and so forth.

Both the features and dilemmas presented by Taylor et al., albeit general and broad, manifest as a useful tool the style of policy analysis that this study entails. The authors highlight the different levels of policy, plus the tensions and misalignments from policy design and

implementations. This perspective gives room for the study of the impact of different stakeholders within the systems in times of higher education reform policy and implementation.

2.3.1 Policy studies in higher education

The complexity of the policy problem stands from the so-called “politicity” of education (Torres, 1995, p. 263). The study of policy issues calls for a myriad of concepts to encompass the multifaceted dynamics of higher education reform policies in Argentina from the policy formation moment to the implementation. There are manifold reasons why it is enriching as well as instrumental to construct a bridging approach for different concepts:

1. The nature of policy itself and policy analysis: There is complexity and tensions all through the process of formation and implementation. There is a lack of monolithic policy agents and policy formation from the state up to the institutional actors. Thus, there is a need to draw upon different concepts to inquire about the complexity of policy.
2. The impact of global trends/ patterns in Argentina due to its insertion in the global economy (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002, p. 429; Torres & Puiggros, 1995; Taylor et al., 1997; Schugurensky, 2003; Chiroleau et al., 2001). The outcomes of a deeper insertion of the country in the global economy during the mid 1990s, triggered by the so-called “global notions on education” the major educational policy documents that initiated the reform movement for both elementary and higher education.
3. The historical preeminent role of the Argentinean state in the development of the higher education system.

4. The constraints of conceptual frameworks which are useful for the study of higher education policies both in North America and Europe but manifest difficulties when compared to Latin American realities and particularly in Argentina.
5. The tensions that arise as problems for implementation, when tracing specific policies from, the formation stage to their implementation.
6. The specific and multifaceted outcomes of academic professionals as a result of the policies, which are intertwined and are represented in global patterns towards the academic profession (Altbach, 2003; Currie, 1998 ; Kogan & Morton, 2000; Saguier, 2004)
7. The tense nature of the relationships among different stakeholders within the system, and its impact on policy implementation.

Tracing how higher education has been changed by reform policies, the political nature manifests. Kogan & Marton (2000) posit that higher education policies express specifically “theories of the state and the university, and their role in society” (p. 89). In the case of Latin America, this statement targets the intrinsic relationships between the state and higher education in countries where national states have displayed an outstanding role in the construction of society, such as the case of Argentina (Brunner, 2005; Torres & Schugurensky; Torres, 1995-1996; Chiroleau et al., 2001). This statement has also reflected the reality of several European countries where before the 1980’s the model of the national state that had intrinsic relationships with higher education systems, was predominant (Kogan & Marton, 2000).

The inceptions of these global/ neoliberal types of policies for Latin America could be traced in the late 1970’s emanating from Chile (Brunner, 1999; Balan, 1998) and continuing into Mexico, Brazil, and other countries in the region. This translated more critically the relevance of

the state as the place of origin for policies, and changed the nature of the state's relationship with the higher education systems. Kogan and Marton described these policies and the changes they guided as "promoted by national governments" (Kogan & Marton, 2000, p. 89), under the influence of global trends in higher education.

Thus, in order to study higher education policies in Latin America, it is crucial to concentrate on three intertwined levels that exert influence over policy formation and implementation: the global context and its influence in higher education, the role of the national states and their higher education policies, and the transit of policies themselves, from formation to implementation at the universities, while they are interpreted, constructed, and re-constructed by different stakeholders at the institutional level.

Thus, it is also crucial to consider how the literature depicts the trends and impacts of globalization as a multifaceted phenomenon and as an overarching influence over national higher education policies.

2.4 GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES

The linkages between the international economy (or in the international capitalist system) of the last 30 years and higher education systems have been studied in depth in the last couple of decades from comparative educators (Schugurensky, 2003; Torres, & Schugurensky, 1998; Arnove, Altbach, & Kelly, 1992; Currie, 1988). This new stage in the international economy which is termed as globalization appears as the crucial influence over the demands, features, and even structures of higher education systems around the world.

King (2002) and Schugurensky (2003) coincide in using the notion of “intensification” of specific economic, political, and cultural features attached to globalization. Schugurensky explains that globalization is “the intensification of transnational flows of information, commodities, and capital around the world (eroding technical, political, or legal barriers), the development of new trading blocks, and the strengthening of supranational governing bodies and military powers” (Schugurensky, 2003, p. 294).

There are different perspectives over the ways in which globalization impacts higher education systems and the policies that national states develop toward the reform of these systems. These reform movements converge in the goal of adjusting national higher education systems to the demands of the global economy, and they also translate and replicate the reproduction of international capitalist conditions (Morrow & Torres, 1995). Although different perspectives depart from different views of the global phenomena, they delve into its economic, political, social, and financial features, to identify “patterns” that have translated in higher education policies (Altbach, 1988; Schugurensky, 2003; Slaughter, 1988; Weidman & Regsurengiin, 2002;) or “patterns” of political influences over higher education systems which are aimed at strengthening “democratization and economic transition” (Weidman & Regsurengiin, p. 144). They focus on the increased “tensions” or contradictions that arise at different moments of the process itself (Weidman & Regsurengiin, p. 129; Schugurensky, p. 293; Slaughter, pp. 55-58). These authors prioritize with different intensity the role of the national states in the formation and implementation of higher education reform policies. Thus these perspectives identify in their analysis distinctive aspects of globalization (e.g. the contradictory outcomes of globalization in the economic and social realms, the changes that globalization has introduced in the ways in which countries insert themselves into the international economy, the

role of the national states in relationship to globalization, and the labor demands from a capitalist economy).

In this context it is paramount to briefly characterize what a “systemic reform movement” entails. According to Haag and Smith, this approach “rests on several ideas about the nature of higher education and its relation to policy” (Haag & Smith, 2002, p. 2), such as: universities are “complex wholes, that [are] made up of many connecting parts”; they are “hierarchical systems” where the flow of authority and communication is top-down; and as a system it could also function as “more or less rational” (Haag, & Smith, 2002, p. 2). Thus, when policies to change the system emanate from a legitimate authority, in this case, the national state, they are “transmitted through the system to those who implement them in relatively predictable and ordered ways” (Haag & Smith, p. 2).

These views have in common the stress of close connections between globalization and the ways in which higher education reform policies have unfolded through different national experiences. They also recognize “patterns” or common trends within the reform policies themselves (Schugurensky, 2003; Slaughter, 1988; Weidman & Regsurengiin, 2002) that have affected the higher education systems in the last twenty years in different countries. Nevertheless, different scholars do concede that globalization has variable importance over institutions. Of particular interest is how scholars have portrayed the influences of global phenomena on the work of the professoriate across national experiences and institutional dynamics. By highlighting similar trends in policies such as the problems of institutional autonomy, the importance of market-oriented notions, and the growing support of private institutions, the research on higher education reform policies from a global standpoint has situated the impacts of these policies on academics as a subordinate “variable”. It also manifests

distinctive ways in which the policies and their actual outcomes over the work and lives of professors are situated in the context of higher education reforms and systems, that are tied to global trends with different intensities (Schugurensky, 2003).

These different studies propose three different approaches to the analysis of higher education reform policies. A systemic approach (Weidman & Regsurengiin; Haag & Smith, 2002, p. 1), critical approaches, and different neo-Marxists approaches that also delve into systemic views of higher education and stress the role of higher education reform policies as “warranty” for the reproduction of the capitalist dynamics (Schugurensky, 2003; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002; Slaughter, 1988; King, 2003). These major lines of inquiry delve into specific case studies and display ultimately a comparative methodology. The nation-state at center stage in the design of higher education policies is a major convergence of these distinctive perspectives.

It is instrumental in a policy case study to scrutinize the contributions of the aforementioned viewpoints as they are related to higher education reform in the particular case of Argentina. A more in depth scrutiny of the works on globalization and higher education could shed light on the linkages between the higher education reform policies in Argentina and their specificity and their difference from the so-called global trends.

2.4.1 Globalization, states in transition, and higher education reform policies

The work by Weidman and Regsurengiin focuses on the “dynamics of higher education reform in countries undergoing the transition from a command to a market economy and from a socialist to a democratic government” (p. 129). It provides a framework and a heuristic for the analysis of similar transitions experienced by newly independent countries in Eastern Europe and South

Asia, by also bringing to center stage the role of the national state in the formation and implementation of reform policies in higher education. In addition the authors delve into the premises and outcomes of structural adjustment proposals to trace the connections between globalization and higher education reform policies that intend to transform the systems of higher education. The frameworks and conceptual contributions derived from this study could provide conceptual instruments for the study of the reform policies in Argentina in the 1990s, because they place the reform policies as the result of governmental actions. Additionally, in the case of Argentina, the country was deeply connected to the global economy and transitioning from one economic pattern to another with closer dependence on the international economy. This research also sheds light on the connections between global trends and university institutional dynamics. This attempt although incomplete, opens the door to further analysis regarding the tensions between these two realms.

Weidman and Regsurengiin analyze the relationships “between the national government and higher education with respect to institutional vitality and autonomy in the areas of finance, student admission, governance, and accreditation” (p. 129). Most importantly, their work provides different illustrations of the tensions within such a process. The identification of the different types of tensions as well as their intensity in higher education reform processes comprises a paradigmatic contribution of their analysis in the case of Mongolia. The depiction of these tensions could be extrapolated to other cases of higher education reform and the role and perceptions of different stakeholders in the process. Weidman and Regsurengiin portray the movement of the tensions:

[B]etween the central government and Mongolian higher education arising from legislation intended to provide institutions with greater administrative autonomy, not all groups with an interest in the operation of the national higher education system shared a common understanding of what the changes meant in practice. Policies to address

individual facets of university management (e.g., finance, student admissions, governance, and accreditation) were enacted without sufficient attention to the larger consequences of those policies on other aspects of university operations. This led to contradictions and misalignments in policies and uncertainties about what some of the new rules and regulations meant... (p. 129).

The aforementioned “misalignments” and “uncertainties” are tied to the reform policy processes that guided Argentinean reform. These contradictions also relate to different stakeholders’ understanding of the policies displayed (which seems to be a paradigmatic phenomenon in terms of educational reform policy and implementation). According to Weidman and Regsurengiin, “leaders exploited this ambiguity for their own purposes, often these misalignments were a product of well-intentioned individuals and groups moving at different speeds and from different perspectives of what they were trying to accomplish” (p. 129).

The authors use a systemic approach to scrutinize the nature of higher education reform (stressing the “systemic nature of higher education reform”) by considering as one of its foremost aspects “the costs of not anticipating these misalignments in the process of granting (and accepting) greater institutional autonomy” (pp.129-130). This approach appears useful for the study of higher education reform policies in Argentina.

Weidman and Regsurengiin (2002) assert

[T]ransitions in the education sector have been fueled by pressures similar to those mentioned for the political, social, and economic sectors. The education sector is also influenced by structural adjustment policies that tend to place increasing emphasis on improving efficiency and effectiveness of education at all levels through rationalization and decentralization (p. 132).

Mongolia and Argentina both appear to fit the type of market-driven reforms depicted by Carnoy (1995) because they manifest “shifting public funding from higher to lower levels of education, privatization of higher education, and reduction of cost per student at all levels” (p. 132). The case of Argentina is also very specific, e.g., due to the history of the relationship

between the state and higher education, the reform could not advance into a full privatization of the system or to the imposition of student fees (which galvanized strong opposition from different stakeholders in the system). Previously, higher education in Mongolia as well as in Argentina was totally controlled by the state (Weidman & Regsurengiin, 2002, p. 132).

From the representation of the features of higher education reform in Mongolia, we could learn some insights about Argentina. The authors explain: “despite the rapid expansion of postsecondary education ...there have been continuing tensions between the government and higher education institutions over control of resources and decision making...” (p. 137). There are still “unsolved issues” in higher education reform in Mongolia, as well as in other countries in transition (p. 137).

Drawing on the World Bank report, Weidman and Regsurengiin reveal the same criticism over higher education reform, such as:

[S]everal features of higher education systems in Developing countries: adequate and stable long term finance, including system-wide resources; competition; immunity from political manipulation; supportive legal and regulatory structure; well-defined standards, and flexibility...These desirable features have evolved at the same time as the broader social, economic, political, and educational transitions... (p. 140).

While extremely systematic and with land mark contributions, the case of Mongolia is also different from Argentina, where the system’s autonomy has been assured (Mollis, 2001; Garcia de Fanelli, 2001). The policy-making process is drastically defended by the stakeholders of the system at the institutional level. Nevertheless, the case of Mongolia could pinpoint situations where “institutions and systems of higher education in such countries are clamoring for greater autonomy in accordance with the overall movement towards democratization and economic transition, but they often encounter tensions in various forms of resistance from national governments. Governments often have well established patterns of reluctance to relax

controls...” (p. 140)...According to the authors there are four areas that are also problematic in higher education throughout the world: “finance, student admission, governance, and accreditation” (p. 140).

In Mongolia as well as in other countries student fees have been introduced by the policies of reform. In Argentina, the LHE suggests them but in actuality they have not been implemented.

The authors distinguish issues related to the governance of the system in the contexts of higher education reform movements on a global scope. They posit that,

Public higher education institutions have also been accorded increasing autonomy with respect to the management of revenue from student fees and other non-government sources, including responsibility for payment of staff salaries. In fact, academic staff in public higher education institutions have continued to receive salaries even when there have been problems with payment of teachers at the primary and general secondary level who receive their salaries directly from the government. This is a significant factor in the relatively high levels of enthusiasm exhibited by higher education faculty, staff, and administrators for their work (p. 142).

This description provides an illustration very far from the Argentinean case, by highlighting the direct outcomes of policy implementation on the professoriate.

Another influence on higher education from a global perspective has been the introduction of accreditation mechanisms. In Mongolia as well as in Argentina,

[T]here were concerns that the relatively unregulated rapid expansion of private sector higher education had resulted in the establishment of institutions of questionable quality. In addition it was hoped that the accreditation process might cast some light on the relative quality of institutions, both within Mongolia as well as the international higher education community (p. 142).

The law that regulated the reform in Mongolia specified the “creation of a national accreditation agency” as a nongovernmental agency (p. 143). The authors state that “the establishment of nongovernmental oversight bodies is a difficult process in countries accustomed

to state control of all public entities. Mongolia is, however, making progress along these lines in the higher education sector” (p. 143).

2.4.2 Globalization as rationale behind higher education reform movements and role of national states

Following a critical approach to the relationship between globalization and higher education policies, King (2003) describes globalization as the “rationale for reforms” (King, p. III). As Slaughter envisioned in the late 1980’s, King asserts that the goal of reform policies imposed by the global dynamics is to “enhance national comparative advantage in an increasingly economically competitive world”, where “universities are the key” (King, p.IV).

King also explains that the role of the national state is vital in triggering the linkage between globalization and national and institutional reform policies toward higher education systems (King, 2002, p. 10). The author asserts that “national governments still exert considerable regulatory authority over university systems including the fees that can be charged to full-time undergraduate students” (King, p. XX). King also describes that nation states tend to invest in university research when this could derive an enhanced “comparative economic advantage” (King, 2002, p. XXX). The relationship between the state and the global economy does circulate through paths of tension that are translated in the ways in which national states develop and implement policies towards universities. King states: “tensions between the state and global forces and between governments and universities...” (King, 2003, p. XX). These tensions are rooted in the different ways in which national states understand supranational agreements, international regulations, and so on. King does not portray the influence of globalization in a monolithic fashion. In the context of global patterns of influences, for example,

regulatory trends such as the autonomy of universities manifests as problematic and even preventive of global preeminence. In this context is where the national state enters center stage to eliminate or change any factors framed as obstacles to corporate rationales or technologies.

2.4.3 University “accommodation” to global influences

In the early 1990’s, Phillip Altbach (1992, p. 21) asserted that uncovering the trends that higher education development manifested throughout the world after World War II, could be the key to foreseeing the patterns of this development in the forthcoming decades. In his seminal work, this author highlighted that these trends for higher education systems in the new millennium would appear embedded in “questions such as autonomy and accountability, the role of research and teaching, reform of the curriculum and the implications of massive expansion that has characterized universities in most countries...” (Altbach, p. 21). The work by Schugurensky (2003), Torres and Schugurensky (2002), and Slaughter (1988) appears to have its root in the aforementioned research while identifying trends for higher education on a global scope.

The construction of the so-called knowledge society through the avenues of globalization situates universities and university systems as vital actors in these dynamics. The connections between the global dynamics and universities are mediated by the national states and their policies toward higher education systems and institutions (Schugurensky, 2002; Slaughter, 1988, p. 55; King, 2003, p. 7).

Slaughter (1988) links globalization to higher education in “four far-reaching implications for higher education” (p. 55), which are deeply rooted in the economic conditions of the global economy. These are: “the constriction of monies available for discretionary activities” (Slaughter, 1988, p. 55); the “growing importance of techno-science and fields closely involved

with markets, particularly international markets”; the “tightening relationship between multinational corporations and state agencies concerned with product development and innovation”; and the “increased focus on multinationals and established industrial countries on global intellectual property strategies” (Slaughter, p. 55).

Slaughter contends that the funds for higher education are constrained as a result of a preeminence of “supply-side economic policies” which shift public monies from social programs to economic development efforts (Slaughter, p. 56). The author also highlights that the types of programs that receive public attention in terms of policies and investments are the ones related to technology innovation or R & D because they are seen as possibility improving the national conditions to compete globally in the world (p. 56). Slaughter also explains that these types of monetary constraints compose a set of public policies where the only funds available are to sustain techno-science and market-related fields that ultimately strengthen the supply-side economic policies (Slaughter, pp. 56-57). Therefore, corporations, state agencies, and universities appear to be working together to stimulate techno-science in national contexts. The ultimate goal of these close relationships that translate into partnerships between academia and industries is to achieve competition in the global market (Slaughter, pp. 56-57). In the last instance, this phenomenon affects different actors within the system. Ultimately, these tensions influence the work of the professoriate which needs to accommodate to this climate.

The last influential aspect of globalization on higher education is the notion that national states are pursuing techno-science as an avenue to “increase shares of world markets” while simultaneously pursuing “intellectual property protection strategies” (p. 58). Slaughter’s model stresses the importance of specific aspects of the global economy and their connections with

specific activities that higher education systems display in this context which are then interwoven with particular national state policies toward the higher education realm.

2.4.4 University restructuring under global influences

In portraying the ways in which university restructuring takes place and the policies that aim to transform these institutions, the work by Schugurensky (2003) is enlightening because it proposes to “identify universal tendencies” of university restructuring (p. 292) from the many phenomena that compose globalization and affect higher education. Schugurensky highlights the importance of “the globalization of the economy, the retrenchment of the welfare state, and the commodification of knowledge” (p. 292). Schugurensky also stresses the manifestation of neoliberal notions as a rationale “that emphasizes value for money, accountability, planning, cost efficiency, good management, resource allocation, unit costs, performance indicators, and selectivity” (p. 293). The author asserts that this discourse justifies at national and institutional levels, the attacks on tenure systems and the constant requests to the disciplines to “prove their worth by their contribution to the economy” (p. 293).

In Schugurensky's (2003) depiction, the re-definition of the “relationship among university, the state, and the market with a net result of a reduction of institutional autonomy” appears as one of the patterns of the outcomes of globalization on higher education policies and systems.

Schugurensky defines the “retrenchment of the welfare state” as a parallel phenomenon to globalization. The so-called welfare state is being replaced by the so-called “neoliberal state” (p. 294). This new version of the state withdraws from “the commitment to universal provision of public services such as education, health, housing, or social security which are now

increasingly regulated by market dynamics” (p. 294). In developing countries the impact of these policies is dramatic because they are coupled with austerity programs from lending agencies, which are known as structural adjustment programs (p. 295). Schugurensky connects the aforementioned variables to the institutional level of the universities by stating that the historical goals of the university, which include institutional autonomy, are being engulfed in the “three Rs of economic crisis (recession, rationalization, and restraint)” (2003, p. 296). Hence, one of the solutions proposed in manifold higher education reform movements throughout the world is the introduction of “private elements” in public institutions as well as their privatization (p. 297). Furthermore, the author portrays higher education restructuring as an agenda of “powerful interest groups to adapt the university [...] to the new economic paradigm” (p. 296). The author finds that among these groups that support this change for the universities are the ones that produce research developed by financial institutions such as the World Bank (p. 296).

Schugurensky highlights that in spite of the strength of these groups, local actors struggle actively over the policy recommendations from these lending institutions (Schugurensky, p. 297).

The work of Schugurensky recognizes five major tendencies among higher education restructuring policies which are: technology and instruction (p. 300), “the impact of cutbacks” (p. 301-302), “vocalization” (pp. 302-303), “diversification and stratification of student body” (p. 303), and “the academic workforce and accountability pressures” (pp. 303-304). This last trend is distinguished as a mechanism to support the financial cutbacks as well as the “flexibilization of labor”, and the “recomposition of the academic workforce” (p. 303). Schugurensky, following the work by Altbach (1997, 2003), highlights a paradigmatic tendency towards a progressive reduction of full-time faculty, while there is an increase of managerial

staff at the institutional level as well as of part-time faculty (p. 304). The author connects this to the idea that the effects of quality evaluation over universities generate an intensification of the pressures on academic work (p. 304). Other authors have labeled these phenomena as the “withering of the professoriate” (Margolis, 2004, p. 27).

Ultimately, Schugurensky posits that the path that the restructuring of universities traverses, challenges institutional autonomy which suffers “a gradual loss” (2003, p. 305). The author asserts:

Today, in the midst of globalization pressures, market-friendly neoliberal reforms, state adjustment, and calls for accountability, the principle of autonomy is being challenged and drastically redefined. Like most public institutions, the university has begun to suffer the effect of a deep, unrelenting recession...In this context; universities are experiencing a transition (sometimes voluntary, usually forced) toward a heteronomous model (p. 305).

Schugurensky delves on Marx Weber’s notion of heteronomy because he finds that universities are more and more subjected to external controls and impositions more than to their internal governing bodies (p. 305). Heteronomous universities suffer the contradictory effects of two dynamics: “laissez-faire policies and state interventionism” (p. 305). Conceivably, the effects of these contradictory policies over institutional realities compose a new environment at the institutional levels; different actors within the universities could support or resist these policies. Overall, the outcomes of these policies create a climate of uncertainty because the traditional autonomy is threatened and the premises of the relationship with the national state that ruled, in some countries, for centuries have been eroded (pp. 307-308).

Schugurensky’s (2004) analysis, remains still at the macro-level with some insights into the micro-dynamics of the universities. This linkage is complex and plays a crucial role in the development and culmination of higher education reform policies. In this approach, the author refers to institutional actors and stakeholders of the system, but pays little attention to them.

While Shugurensky's work gauges the outcomes of global influences on professor's work, it does not specify the paths that the changes follow and it could manifest as rather mechanical, an exploration of the policy research that focuses on the effects of these policies on the professoriate.

The literature connects globalization and policies of university restructuring over-emphasizing the economic connections of globalization and higher education, or by overstressing the influence of globalization on the policies constructed by the national states that aim to introduce changes in the higher education systems. A systemic approach that stresses the role of the state in the reform process, appears as the broadest method to conduct an inquiry on policies of higher education reform, especially in developing countries.

In addition, the literature teaches the existence of paramount trends in changes of higher education systems in the last two decades which are useful for specific policy studies for the restructuring of specific systems such as the Argentinean. The replication of these patterns in the restructuring of Argentinean higher education as well as in other national experiences manifests as paradigmatic and useful in a comparative methodology for conducting policy research.

2.5 PERSPECTIVES ON POLICY ANALYSIS: RATIONAL MODELS FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

There are different perspectives for the scrutiny of the policy phenomena: from framing them as "rational policy processes" (Taylor, et al., 1997, p. 11) to approaches defined as "critical policy analysis" (Taylor, et al, p. 20).

It is instrumental in this dissertation to utilize a “rational policy process” however illuminated by critical lenses, that bridge towards a “critical policy analysis” (Taylor et al., 1997). The rational policy perspective provides a functional “formal separation” (Taylor et al., p. 11) of three stages within the policy phenomena which are formulation (or formation) (Torres, 1998), policy implementation (at different institutional levels), and enactment (by different actors). The state plays a pivotal role throughout these three stages. By relying on this approach it is contended that we could explore in depth the relationships among key actors in the formation/ implementation of higher education reform policies which are: the state (bureaucracies, politicians), the universities, the academic staff at the universities, and the professoriate. Nevertheless, one of the premises of the “rational policy process” that asserts that “decisions in the public sphere could somehow be made in a value-neutral manner-effectively in a way which could avoid or simplify the political complexities involved in public policy making” (Taylor et al., 1997, p. 18) seems to be questioned by the value charged public policy formation. I contend that the notions of policy making and implementation along with specific goals of the state in terms of political legitimation, reproduction of specific conditions of labor, insertion in the global economy and so forth, are permeated with values and ideology all through. Furthermore, even highlighting the demarcation of three stages in policy, there is a need to shed light on the fluency and transit of policies from one phase to the other. Those aspects are disregarded by the literature.

Taylor et al. (1997) consider at the forefront of policy the investigation of how policies affect the actors who are “at the receiving end of the policy” namely, the academic professionals (Taylor et al., p. 11). Hence, the recognition of this goal in policy analysis appears extremely beneficial for this study.

In addition, such an approach rests upon the vital importance of the state and its key role in the formulation of educational policies in general and more specifically in the context of Latin America and Argentina. The crucial role of the state in the formulation of educational policies in Latin America has been conceptual trends in the work of several scholars (Torres, 1995; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002; Torres & Puiggros, 1995). Albeit the state is vital in terms of policy analysis of higher education, it is also strategic for the analysis of these policy implementations to explore “the context in which policies emerge” (Taylor et al., 1997, p. 11).

In addition, it is vital to scrutinize the linkages between the macro-levels of policy-making and the micro-levels or micro-settings (in this case, the universities). There are several analyses that focus on the macro-level, (Torres & Schugurensky; Schugurensky; Mollis, 2003) attending less to the institutional impacts of them. Additionally, there are other studies that have analyzed in depth the outcomes of higher education reform policies at the university level (Suasnabar, 2002; Tiramonti, 1995). There has been a dearth of studies that has focused on the connections between the macro and micro-levels of policies (Schugurensky, 1996; Mollis, 2001; Garcia de Fanelli, 2001). This study intends to explore these connections and how the connections impact policy implementation at the institutional level.

The inceptions and the reform policies themselves in Argentina are embedded in the context of globalization, the full insertion of the country into the global economy, the reception of loans to support the educational reform at all levels (Elementary, Secondary, and University) (namely, “quality loans”, “FOMECA”, etc), the adoption of neoliberalism as the supporting financial and economic framework for the government (Schugurensky, 2003, p. 294), and its impact in terms of policy recommendations over the Argentinean state. These connections need to be made apparent, because they operate “embedded in a wider set of pressures or contexts-

historical, political, and economic which would need to be understood” (Taylor et al., 1997, p. 12). This research intend to illuminate these linkages and problematize the policies from their formulation to their implementation. To achieve this goal, it is crucial to resort to the role of the Argentinean state in the context of globalization. To enrich the analysis, it is required to contemplate paradigmatic policies towards academic professionals because they illustrate the macro-levels as well as reflect institutional dynamics and realities. As Altbach eloquently explains (2003, pp. 2) the conditions that affect higher education policies in the 21st century, “massification, accountability, privatization, and marketization shape universities everywhere, and those who work at them at different degrees”. Altbach (2003, p.3) asserts,

When the problematic trends described earlier impact academics everywhere, the severity may be especially great in developing countries, where the traditional roles of the professoriate are often less well established, the financial and other resources less adequate, and the pressures greater (p. 3).

From a policy analysis framework, it is vital to examine steps of development for policies from formation to implementation, to expose the tensions between different stakeholders of the system.

2.6 STATE AND HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM POLICIES: DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

Several issues guide the scrutiny of the literature dealing with the relationship between the state and higher education reform policies: Why is it vital to analyze the role of the state towards higher education? Why is the relationship with the state central in the fate of higher education systems? Why do we need to analyze the importance of the state in policy formation?

Apple and Dale explain that the state is essentially “active, and has multiple ‘functions’ that are not reducible to economic ‘necessities’, or being inherently contradictory” (Apple, 1989, p. 12). Taylor et al. define the state as “a complex beast” in order to illustrate its internal contradictions at the level of policy (Taylor et al., 1997, p. 16). The internal paradoxes and complexities of the state and its realms translate to “varied” policies towards education in general and higher education in particular (Apple, 1989, p. 12). The contradictory nature of the state is transmuted into state policies which are “always the result of multiple levels of conflicts, and compromises that stem from and lead to contradictory outcomes” (Apple, 1989, p. 13). Therefore, in the particular case of higher education reform policies, the state constructs policy while mediating the demands of the global economy (Currie, 1998), and the influence of “international development forces” (Torres, 1998, p. 351). Thus, the state is neither monolithic nor mechanic in terms of the responses that it translates in educational policies.

From a critical approach, Apple and Dale contend that the state “is not monolithic, or the same as government, or merely a government executive committee. It is a set of publicly financed institutions, neither separately nor collectively necessarily in harmony...” (Apple, p. 13, Dale, p. 29). Additionally, the state cannot be subsumed in the government. Accordingly, Dale defines that “government is the most visible...part of the state, but it’s not the whole state” (Dale, p. 53). The relationships between the state and educational institutions and how education policies get enacted at the institutions transit different levels. Additionally, they get interwoven with actions of different stakeholders within the system (Apple, p. 14).

A policy research approach enables an exploration and understanding of the effect of the policies on the lives and work of many agents within the system such as professors, academic staff, etc (Apple, 1989, p. 14). The goals of the aforementioned approach should uncover the

tensions and contradictions of the state's non-monolithic condition, and the "conflict, compromise, and mediation" that multiple agents produce about the policies themselves (Apple, 1989, p. 15). Furthermore, there is a need to highlight that:

[T]he state policy that actually enacted may be strikingly different than that originally envisioned, not because [different stakeholders in the system] are 'conservative' by nature or some other simple explanation, but precisely because they do have historically specific interests that are constructed by the local situation. Results, hence, are never pre-ordained, are always constructed (Apple, 1989, p. 17).

In addition, Dale explains that the state power in educational policies is "neither hegemonic nor monolithic" (Dale, 1989, p. 42).

There is a dearth of perspectives that shed light over the linkages between the state and educational policies. Dale calls for policy analysis with a state focus which illuminates its role in policy formation (Dale, 1989, p. 23).

Paying attention to the role of the state in educational policies, allows focusing on educational policies and their stages and circulation (Dale, 1989, p. 25).

Dale summarizes the goals of the capitalist state in education in some points explaining that the state not only intends legitimation but also preservation of the capitalist economy, and to extend and sustain specific values throughout different levels of the educational system (Dale, pp. 47-48). Dale explains that the problems that the state confronts "affect every level of the educational system" (Dale, p. 48).

2.6.1 A model for the analysis of the state's role in policy formation

The work by Torres (1998) is extremely useful for an analysis of the state's policy-making and it opens the gate to the analysis of the particular case study of policy implementation.

The main premise in Torres' piece is that the complexity of public policy-formation or policy-making in the contemporary age needs to be disentangled from a "consistent theory of the capitalist state and politics. This is particularly true with respect to education policies" (p.351). The author asserts that the concept of "state" provides more analytical advantages than other notions such as political authority or political system because it is broad and bridges different perspectives (p.355). The author's concerns are related to the capitalist state in both central and dependent situations within the global economy (pp. 353-355).

Torres refers to the permanent tensions and connections between the state and public policy, in general, and between the state and educational policy in particular. One of the limitations of this approach is that the author focuses mainly on the role of the capitalist state in capital accumulation. He contends that the state plays other roles in terms of legitimation and reproduction of both the social structure and the economic one by constructing policies and implementing them. Notwithstanding, the author also support the notion that the state (in both central or dependent capitalist systems) operates with a specific condition of autonomy in terms of public policy as well as in education policy-making (p. 354). Torres explains that the state neither operates in a vacuum nor is it exempted from other influences, such as historical background, social structure, or the dynamics of the capitalist system in general (pp.352-357).

What constitutes a key contribution of Torres' work (replicated in his collaborated analysis of the Latin American states with Puiggros) (Torres & Puiggros, 1995; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002) is his proposition to overcome the limitations of technical approaches that focus only on internal and external influences regarding educational policies ("international development forces", and "international organizational cooperation, assistance and pressure") (p.351) or the so-called "planning" role of the state and its policies. The author contends that for

a complex analysis of the role of the state and policy-making there is a need to include a “critical conceptualization of issues such as domination, power, rules, and political representation” (p.352). These factors are both behind the scene and at the center of the stage in educational policy making as well as the implementation processes.

Torres explains that such an approach could operate as an umbrella to incorporate structural and individual factors in policy-making, as well as the possibility of tracing the “very complex and rather sophisticated political process of educational decision making in capitalist societies” (p.352). This approach not only broadens the analytical possibilities but also reveals the tensions and disruptions between policy-making and implementation, giving space to the study of different stakeholders’ roles in the educational system. In other words, by conceptualizing the state in its particular form and historical evolution, Torres also overcomes the limits of the relationship between the state and educational policy, which have prevailed in both Marxist and non-Marxist perspectives (p. 354). Additionally, this perspective appears relevant within a policy research that aims to trace the tensions between policy formation and implementation.

Torres situates at the core of policy-making, different essential components of a “theory of the state” (p.352) which he operationalizes in order to include structural and individual dynamics in policy-making and implementation (p.352). The author draws upon Clegg and Weber to explain that policy-making is based on structures where the state combines different modes to legitimate its authority and domination (Torres, p. 353)

The combination of political factors such as rules, power, and domination are intertwined in policy formation and its implementation at different political and institutional levels. They are at the core of the policy-formation and implementation of higher education reform policies.

Furthermore, they could be illuminated through the analysis of different documents as well as testimonies of the participants within different levels and moments.

Torres surveys different approaches of education and its role in education reproduction (from correspondence views to others where the state plays a mediator role) (p.353-354). Torres follows a rather intricate road, to stress tensions and contradictions between policy formation and policy implementation, claiming that they are expressed in the institutional apparatuses of the state and “in the role of the capitalist state (and education) in regard to the process of capital accumulation and social legitimation” (p.354).

Along these lines, Torres defines the state as essentially contradictory or of a “dual character”: “while the state claims to be the official representative of the nation as a whole, it is at the same time the object, product, and determination of class conflict” (p. 355). His approach becomes rather close to a quasi deterministic view about the state and its relationship with social classes. He intends to provide some exploratory hypothesis which could be instrumental for the analysis regarding higher education in Argentina. These problems could be summarized in the following: public policy formation mainly responds or anticipates social threats in a limited scope (pp. 355-357); the state has specific modes and methods of intervention (pp. 357-359); policy-making includes two dimensions rather different: the form and the content (pp. 359-360); the state operates as a problem-solving agent (p. 360); social control is a component of the specific actions of the state (p. 360); and different political regimes are influential in the type of roles that the state plays towards policy making and society (pp. 360-361). Torres responds to these hypotheses explaining that:

The patterns the states' actions include: exclusion, maintenance, dependency, and legitimation. Torres stresses the importance of educational policy formation in terms of providing legitimation in the long run to both the state and social capitalist structures.

The author distinguishes between form and content of policy. Torres crystallizes these ideas by explaining that there is a "gap" between "the state's alleged goals and the practical results" (p. 359) which the author expands by saying that there is a "distinction between rationality and social action..." (p. 359).

He rejects the idea of the state as a problem-solving agent, arguing that it wrongfully limits the state's goals about policy formation as restricted to a more respondent or passive role in social and educational processes. Torres strengthens the idea of the state's autonomy in selecting which policies to construct and which type of issues, specifically, in terms of educational policies (p. 360).

Torres concludes that the state produces policy to resolve the tensions between "consensus-oriented practices and coercion-oriented practices in the planning and implementation of state policies" (p. 361). Furthermore, he contends that the process of policy formation is embodied in the process of public policy formation (p. 361).

The main conclusion that Torres achieves is that "there always will be a gap between the publicly stated goals and targets of state policies and the actual outcomes..." (p. 361).

Torres asserts that it is crucial to analyze the historical and political background of any process of state's policy formation (p. 362).

Torres proposes that any intent of policy formation should consider:

- a. "The state's goals and policy targets" (p. 363).

- b. “Main actors of policy formation, including the bureaucracy, administrative agents and social constituencies and clientele” (p. 362);
- c. “Main systemic elements” (p. 362);
- d. “Main institutional phases, stages and/or units of policy formation”: According to the author this includes diverse levels of policy planning, policy making, and policy implementation (policy operation and outcomes) (p. 362).
- e. The role of “educational policy within the overall state public policy, particularly (although not exclusively) at the level of legitimation practices” (p. 364).

The work by Torres is deeply theoretical and rather detached from the analysis of specific cases. In Torres’ work, there are many aspects that mirror both the Latin American and Argentinean experiences. Furthermore, Torres’ work broadens the scope for the analysis of public policy and the study of policy formation by recognizing the contributions of the mediating role of national states and the international contexts, the political nature of education, the distortions between the declared goals of the policies and their actual outcomes, and the relevance of public actors such as political bureaucracies, to name a few.

2.6.2 A system theory approach on the role of the state in policy formation and implementation

The work by Anderson (1979) has performed an outstanding contribution to the conception of educational policy making as public policy that manifests extremely enlightening for this case study (Anderson, p. 125). Anderson broadly defines policy as: “a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a matter or public concern” (Anderson, p. 3). Additionally, the author characterizes public policies as “those policies developed by

governmental bodies and officials” (Anderson, p. 3). Insights from his work can be exerted in a study that attempts to trace specific public policies from formation to implementation to the particular case of a study of the higher education reform policy in Argentina. Anderson’s conceptual categories are drawn from the analysis of policy processes in the United States. His main contributions are in the examination of different groups of relevant participants as policy actors, as well as the “impossible to demarcate” (Anderson, p. 92) separation between policy-making and implementation, which situate his work as pivotal for the analysis of educational policies from formation to implementation. Above all, his identification of educational policy making and implementation as part of the realm of public policies is relevant for the analysis of higher education policies in Argentina.

Anderson has identified the need to study distinctive sources of policies such as policy statements, policy demands, policy decisions, and policy outputs (Anderson, pp. 4-5). His work was seminal in the broadening for both the methods for public policy analysis as well as in the identification of manifold sources of public policy (Anderson, 1979, pp. 4-7). Anderson, by placing at the center-stage the relevance of the values, actions, and ideas of policy-makers, opens the door to policy studies which could shed light over how policy makers work (Anderson, pp. 4-5). Nevertheless, Anderson’s work still portrays a rather linear path from formation to implementation which does not mirror the tense nature of the educational policy process.

Anderson understands public policy formation and implementation as intrinsically political because “they involve conflict and struggle among individuals and groups having conflicting desires on issues of public policy” (Anderson, p. 24). The author couples this notion with a model that captures different stages in the policy process which he calls “sequential approach” (Anderson, p. 24).

In Anderson's model, policy-makers are key actors who need to be studied because they influence policy and are participants with agency in the process (Anderson, pp. 27). It is instrumental for the analysis, Anderson's idea that official and unofficial participants influence policy formation and implementation in paradigmatic ways (Anderson, p. 27). He describes them as catalyzing influences (Anderson, p.27). Anderson proposes a hierarchy among official policy-makers: "primary policy makers" who "have direct constitutional authority to act" (Anderson, p. 35), and "supplementary policy-makers, such as national administrative agencies" (Anderson, p. 35). The author adds to this distinction, the unofficial participants in the policy process, "including interest groups, political parties, and individual citizens" (Anderson, p. 41). Anderson forms this category because "however important or dominant they may be in various situations, they themselves do not usually possess legal authority to make binding policy decisions" (Anderson, p. 41). The different groups that compose this category are "interest groups" (pp. 41-42), "political parties" (pp. 43-44), and the "individual citizen" (pp. 44-45).

There are some limitations that arise from this work, such as, a rather schematic systemic tone, and the linearity of the view about the different moments of policy making and implementation. Nevertheless, the distinction of different actors and participants with agency in the process of policy making, as well as the identification of educational policies in the realm of public policies, position his work as instrumental for the analysis of the case under study.

2.6.3 On the state and higher education policies in Latin America and Argentina

The vital role and presence of the state in Latin American and Argentinean educational policies cannot be understated. In the context of Latin America, "in the beginning was the state". By focusing on its importance in the moment of inceptions, I do not ignore the importance of tracing

the policies and following them through one focus which has the academic professionals as key stakeholders and “players” in the process.

Furthermore, in Argentina as well as in some countries in Europe, public universities are “major public institutions” as Kogan and Marton (2000, p. 89) label them in their study of higher education reform cases in European countries (Kogan & Marton, pp. 89-108). We follow the authors’ classification of universities as “either subsystems of the state or as independent institutions that nevertheless are strongly affected by the nature of the state” (Kogan & Marton, p. 89). This distinction could be applied to the universities in Argentina.

The specific idiosyncrasy of Argentinean universities (Mollis, 2003; Garcia de Fanelli, 2001; Kogan & Marton, 2000, p. 91) of being public institutions but also having autonomy (Mollis, 1998; Mollis, 2003) positions them in a peculiar relationship with the state (Kogan & Marton, p. 91). As it happened in the case of the 1980’s British reform policies of the 1980’s, the Argentinean state applied the so-called “neoliberal rhetoric” (Kogan & Marton, p. 91; Torres & Schugurensky, 1995; Richmond, 2006) which composed a contradictory environment where new tensions in the relationship between the state and universities threatened their historical autonomy. Neoliberal ideas, propose a “minimal state” in terms of funding for public institutions and privatization of them, while paradoxically the state deploys power to introduce new regulatory schemas to change the university system (Kogan & Marton, p. 91). In the case of Argentina, this shift in the role of the state has been labeled as an “evaluative state” (Garcia de Fanelli, 2001, p. 23) and “subsidiary state”.

According to Kogan and Marton (2000, p. 92), Schugurensky (2003), Marginson and Mollis, universities have different models of governance: from autonomy to dependency in terms of funding, administration, and management. Therefore, there are two basic types of university

management: a “classic model” (self-regulating), and “dependent institutions” (Kogan & Marton, p. 92). In Kogan and Marton’s analysis, as well as Neave and Vaughn (1991), the inquiry about the relationship between the state and universities enters center stage more specifically in times of higher education reform policies. Hence, universities are positioned in a situation of exceptionality as institutions as a result of their relationships with the state. Kogan and Marton (2000) assert: “The nature of higher education institutions has, however, seemed to justify a unique relationship with the state and perhaps to strengthen the case for claiming a degree of higher education exceptionalism” (p. 97).

Thus, the state changes its idiosyncrasy as a result of global economic and political changes and its own political development. Therefore, it impacts the state relationship with the higher education institutions (Kogan & Morton, 2000, p. 105). Drawing on Neave and Vaught, Kogan and Morton, Garcia de Fanelli (2001) I would like to recover the two major models of relationship between the state and universities which are: from state control to liberal supervision (Neave & Vaught, p. 98). Argentinean universities are historically relatively autonomous. Notwithstanding, the changes in their relationship with the state has created a new pattern of relationships that Mollis (1998, 2003), Schugurensky (2003), and Marginson and Mollis (2001) have characterized as moving from an autonomous model to a more “heteronomous” one.

2.6.4 The state and higher education reform policies in Argentina

The changes in the state’s commitment to social policies in Argentina have been embedded in the broad notion that “what is private is now good and what is public is now the root of all evil” (Apple, p.2). In Argentina, the discourses from the government as well as the media

[disqualifying the state's social actions as the manifestations of an "elephant" state] expressed a change in the dominant ideas that ruled this relationship for decades.

As in other countries in Latin America, there has been a clear execution of the "dismantling of the welfare state" (Apple, p.6). Hence, it translated in a shift to a state with an "evaluative" role (Garcia de Fanelli; Mollis, 2003; Suasnabar, 2002; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002) instead of a "supporting" presence in higher education. This happens in the overall context of other reforms operating in Latin American countries (from the late 1970's in Chile, Mexico, Brazil) (Balan, 1988; Kent, 1998; Brunner, 2004) in higher education. These reform policies swallowed the rhetoric of quality improvement, excellence, privatization of the system, and the reduction of state's investment in higher education by the introduction of user fees, and have been designed and implemented to achieve these goals.

2.7 THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

2.7.1 Introduction to the literature on the academic profession

The challenges to the academic profession world-wide in the climate of globalization and higher education reform have been the focus of an increasing array of studies with both a global and national focus (Altbach, 2003; Margolis, 2004). There are different perspectives about the academic profession's definitional traits and the agreement that they have been affected by global trends. There is consistency in identifying the autonomy of academics in their workplace as a defining feature of the profession across national environments and institutional realities. Nevertheless, the literature on the academic profession relies heavily on case studies that focus

on specific policy effects on the profession, general analysis with examples extracted from national realities, and analyses that base their claims on survey data both national and institutional. Additionally, there is a dearth of studies that targets the academic profession in Argentina either nationally or institutionally. Nevertheless, in the recent years, two different pieces expose the realities of the Argentinean academic profession: the chapter entitled “Universities and professors in Argentina: Changes and challenges” by Marquis (2003, pp. 51-72); and an article by Saguier (2004) on research and teaching in Argentina (which was published in Spanish). These two studies rely on limited sources of data and focus on the realities of the universities in the province of Buenos Aires.

Nevertheless, there are a few intriguing claims in both the work by Marquis and Saguier regarding the academic profession in Argentina. Marquis describes that ,

Federal authorities and universities share ambivalence toward academic faculty. While professors are considered crucial for improving the quality in higher education, the system does not provide adequate training to furnish teachers with suitable knowledge and teaching techniques. Moreover, educators suffer from low salaries and poor social and institutional recognition for their work (Marquis, 2003, p. 52).

The analysis presented in chapter four will elucidate the critical aspects signaled by Marquis and will also question the notion of ambivalence of authorities and universities towards faculty.

The study by Saguier (2004) relies in the lenses of networks to explain the ways in which access to research funding and knowledge production operate among faculty in Argentina. Nevertheless, this study relies heavily on official documents and anecdotal data. It is an important piece to explore the limited research productivity and the existence of patterns of clientelism, nepotism, and careerism (p. 2) in the distribution of power and concentration of knowledge production among Argentinean academics. Notwithstanding, this study diminishes

the impact of the higher education reform movement and its policies while highlighting their effects on already existing academic networks (pp. 20-21).

The study of the academic profession has different perspectives that range from organizational/ functional studies to critical and labor/Marxist views. Organizational/ functional studies extensively describe professional features within and across institutions at national and international contexts (Altbach, 2003; Altbach, 1997; Clark, 1983; Clark, 1987; Boyer, 1990; Boyer, et al., 1994; Van Patten, 2000). Critical/ and labor/ Marxist approaches draw attention to the tense nature of the work of academics within institutions, highlight problems of control and determination of knowledge production, stress the outcomes of the global economy demands on the labor structure of higher education systems, and give emphasis to the study of political responses that the professoriate construct in times of change (Aronowicz, 1997; Connel, 1995; Currie, 1998; Currie, 2004; Ginsburg & Spatig, 1988; Harney & Moten, 1998; Hostaker, 2000; Hutcheson, 2000; Larson, 1980; Margolis, 2004; Nelson, 1997; Roadhes & Slaughter, 1998; Smyth, 1998). There are radical differences in the ontology and epistemology that sustain these different approaches. Thus, there is diversity in what these approaches identify as the profession's goals or the traits that are under attack in environments of higher education reform policies. Nevertheless, there are also shared topics or issues, such as, the nature of the academic work, rooted in research and teaching; issues of control and autonomy regarding curriculum, academic freedom, and so forth; the socio-economic and institutional status of the professoriate; the outcomes of changes introduced by the adoption of global trends at the national level that have affected institutions of higher education and more specifically, the professoriate. It is also paradigmatic in the literature, the discussion of policies, and issues of the academic profession as a subordinate variable in the study of other higher education reform policies, e.g. when

investigating quality policies, changes in institutional management models, and accountability policies. Furthermore, the literature draws attention to effects or outcomes of the work of the professoriate without taking notice of the policies themselves from inceptions to implementation that specifically refer to the professoriate.

There is an outstanding dearth of research that exert the ways in which professors themselves and other actors at universities (namely academic staff) understand, construct, and enact policies referring to the professoriate in times of higher education reform movements. The literature also manifests little attempts in underlining the linkages between the state levels of policies with the institutional dynamics intertwined with policy implementation.

In an overview, it is instrumental to clarify how different perspectives have contributed to understanding the profession in a continuum within a case of policy analysis. Additionally, it is extremely constructive to reveal what the literature does not consider about academic professionalism, such as, lack of mention of the relationships between the state (as contradictory origin of the policies), and the dearth of academics' voices about the policies that affect their work. Furthermore, the literature shows the preeminence of two methodological trends: an aim to generalize specific issues of the academic profession which are more aligned with the ones academics face in developed countries, and the preeminence of briefly scrutinized realities within national case studies.

2.7.2 On the meaning (and meanings) of being a professional

The use and definition of the professionalism concept is both controversial and paradoxical. As a word itself, professionalism is rooted in the distinction proposed by Sir B. Shaw when he differentiated professionals from the laity (Ginsburg, 1996, p.133). It implies expertise, a

somehow privileged social status (as viewed by Max Weber), and control displayed at the entry level of the profession. Autonomy and authority play an important role within a particular knowledge field. The concept of professionalism is rooted in the notion that there are specific ways of learning, understanding, acknowledging, and practicing the traits of a type of work. It is noteworthy that Wagner (2004, pp. 13) asserts that the basic traits of the academic professional were first specified by Immanuel Kant in the eighteenth century. Drawing upon Kant's distinction, Wagner explains,

Kant well recognized that education in professional schools...needed to be geared to the application of knowledge in professional practice. However, such professional training in higher education institutions needed to be grounded in the complete freedom and the exclusive commitment to knowledge and understanding in what was then called "the lower faculty", the faculty of philosophy (p.14).

It is a complex task to use and apply the concept of the professional to educators at different educational levels, especially, when the task is to distinguish activities and occupational features of workers across many levels and education institutions. It seems to be easy to conceptualize or to make a clear cut for the so-called liberal professions-such as lawyers, and doctors. Nonetheless, the cuts become blurred when the notions are applied to the academic profession. It becomes "blurred" to specify what determines expertise in particular academic institutions such as universities.

The notion of academic professionalism has been expanded by several different and even contradictory perspectives: a critical political approach that analyses the use (and misuse) of professionalism as a mechanism of control and ultimately determination for professors' work by both the state and the higher education institutions in times of reform (Ginsburg & Spatig, 1988), an institutional analysis with an individualistic scope that defines academic professionals from educational leadership frameworks (Clark, 1983; Boyer, 1990); a descriptive portrayal of the

features, challenges, and characteristics of an academic professional's work (Altbach, 1997, 2003) with both a domestic and an international focus. Other perspectives have linked the impact of the emergence and maintenance of global capitalist phenomena with the work of academic professionals at universities (Marginson, 2000; Slaughter & Roadhes, 2004). It is noteworthy that a recent perspective, namely "new academic professionalism" (Nixon, 2001; Nixon et al., 2001), has emerged. This proposal is rooted in the critique to evaluate and control professors' work, and ideas of a "new scholarship" (Nixon, 2001, and Nixon et al., 2001). A cornerstone line of study is that of labor analyses contributions that highlight the changes in professors' work as a result of the recent trends of higher education reform policies all over the world regarding notions of autonomy, state-academic relations, control, determination, and processes of proletarianization and de-professionalization of academics as well as their actual situation of "managed professionals" (Currie, 2004; Ginsburg, 1998; Roadhes and Slaughter, 1998; Smyth, 1998). Each of these different lines of analysis focus on academic professionals and the features of their work at different levels of analysis: as outcomes of global trends in higher education; in their relationships with the state as a promoter of neoliberal ideas and globalization policies, and ultimately exerting "control" over labor; at the institutional level, and even at the individual level of their work. Each of them provides a plethora of lines of inquiry but also descriptive assertions about academics that could not be deeply examined in one dissertation. It is noteworthy that they refer to domestic (American) or Anglo particularities and some others refer to international peculiarities (mostly in former colonies) operating over academic professionals.

There is agreement in defining a profession by the autonomy of its members. Autonomy has particular scopes when it is applied to educators' work at universities, particularly in times of higher education reform policies. There have been enriching studies about the situations and

paradoxes of educators as professionals during reform processes. These notions have been highly explored in the context of elementary and secondary school's teachers, and, to a lesser extent, in relation to professors in England and some of its former colonies (e.g., Australia, Canada, and the United States) (Altbach, 1977; Altbach, 2003; Ginsburg et al., 1988; Ginsburg, 1996; Smyth, 1995; Roadhes & Slaughter, 1991; Nixon, 1991).

Being a professional means being defined by particular features. The idea of a profession describes a “complex of characteristics” (Lieberman, 1956, p. 1). When applied to educators, the features are difficult to sum up clearly. Lieberman (1956) distinguishes the characteristics of a profession: “a unique, definite, and essential social service” (p. 2), “an emphasis upon intellectual techniques in performing its services” (p.2), “a long period of specialized training” (p. 3), “a broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the occupational group as a whole” (p. 3), “an acceptance by the practitioner of broad personal responsibilities for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy” (p.4), “a comprehensive self- governing organization of practitioners” (p.5), and a “code of ethics” (p.6). There have also been discussions about the accuracy of calling educators professional. There are contradictions and discussions when the notion of professionalism is applied to teaching or when professors are labeled as academic professionals (Hargreaves, 1994; Altbach, 1977).

2.7.3 Academic professionals: the main traits of the profession from a global perspective

The seminal works of Boyer (1990); Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw (1994); Altbach (1997, 2003); Clark (1983), and others has been paradigmatic to the increasing interest in the academic profession globally. The Carnegie Foundation Study by identifying the main traits of the profession world-wide and the survey data perused by it (Boyer, Altbach & Whitelaw, 1994) has

opened the door to further studies about the profession in different national contexts as well as globally introducing issues of appointment, salaries, entry, among others. This study and sections of the data analyzed by it, became the basic framework and source for some comparative research that focused on specific issues talked by the Carnegie Foundation Study. One illustration is the analysis by Gottlieb and Keith on the relationship between academic research and teaching in eight different countries (1997, pp. 397-419).

This seminal research has mostly focused on a descriptive portrayal of the academic profession across different countries (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994; Altbach, 1997; Altbach, 2003), and it has been replicated by other researchers. This type of research has contributed to an understanding of the shared characteristics and challenges that affect academic professionals in a cross-national perspective. These types of analysis have simply disaggregated traits, conditions of work, type of work assignments, and kinds of institutions where professors work. Notwithstanding, these studies do not clearly shed light on the connections between global contexts, institutions or policies and their outcomes on professoriate's work.

Van Patten (2000) explains that being an academic professional is “a bundle of contradictions” (p.19). The most important of them is the quasi-autonomy that academics have inside institutions. The contradictions are embodied in the dynamics of “professionalism within higher education” (Van Patten, p.17). They are also linked to the actual capacity that academics have to determine their work conditions or certain aspects of their work.

Drawing on Van Patten's work, the contradictions of academic professionals are located in both institutional dynamics and the relationships with administrators at this level (p. 16). And these contradictions are implied in the administration and decision-making processes within higher education institutions which highly rest in managerial staff at the universities more than

on the professoriate. Van Patten illustrates this when he explains that the “evaluation of faculty”, both a common policy and practice within universities, has become a dangerous issue for the autonomy of the members of the academic profession because it is in the hands of administrators (p. 16). Administrators make decisions about fund allocation, and personnel hiring. They also decide the opportunity for curriculum changes.

When referring to academic professionals, there is a multifaceted field that is composed of actors of diverse knowledge fields (Altbach, 2003; Boyer, 1990). The characteristics of academic professionals world-wide proposed by Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw (1994) still have relevance in the scrutiny of what it is to be an academic professional, especially because they use survey data from academics to exert the beliefs, concerns, and problems the profession faces internationally. In terms of appointments, Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw, found a predominance of part-time appointments in Latin American professors, as opposed to the majority of full-time appointments in the case of their North American or European counterparts (pp. 5-6). The authors put at the background the impact of globalization upon the conditions of work in the academic profession (Boyer, 1990; Boyer, Altbach, Whitelaw, p. 1), adding as the shared commitments of the profession world-wide: “the commitment faculty feel toward their discipline and toward their institutions” (Boyer, Altbach, Whitelaw, p. 11), and “the commitment to teaching” (Boyer, Altbach, Whitelaw, p. 11). Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw identified other challenges and dilemmas that academic professionals felt which were: the pressures to publish affect the quality of teaching (p. 11), “concerns about research” which is coupled with the identification of research as a definitional trait of the profession (p. 12), frustrations about salaries (“most faculty feel they are not well paid”) (p.13), and faculty dissatisfaction about the “resources available for teaching and research at their institutions” (p. 13).

Most recently, Altbach (2003) has recuperated similar features and has recognized that “the academic profession worldwide is united by its commitment to teaching and the creation and transmission of knowledge” (Altbach, p. 1). In his influential study about the academic profession in developing and middle-income countries through national case studies, Altbach also highlights the tensions and contradictions that challenge professionals in different countries:

Conditions of work and levels of remuneration are inadequate, involvement in institutional governance is often very limited, and the autonomy to build both an academic career and academic programs in the university is often constraint (p. 1).

Altbach (2003) also highlights shared changes that are affecting the conditions of work in the academic profession in developing countries: “a higher proportion of academics work on part-time contracts or are subject to irregular hiring practices” (p. 10), “in many countries, tenure is not guaranteed” (p. 11) which in time affects the possibility of a stable academic career and stability at their job (p. 11), and as it was manifested ten years ago, salaries of academics are low and there is scarcity of funds to perform research activities (pp. 11-13). One of the most controversial topics in the description of the profession in a global scope is the different mechanisms and procedures that are in place to allow entry into the profession in different countries (p. 11). There are differences in terms of credentials, qualifications, and selectivity practices (entry exams, hierarchy or rankings, etc) (pp. 11-12). Altbach loosely stresses the linkages between these traits, and the conditions of academic work to the global phenomena or to national/ public reform policies (Altbach, 2003).

One key feature that is attached to the features of the academic work is the question of academic freedom (Altbach, 2003, p. 16; Altbach, 1998). The author asserts that there are many countries where academic freedom is limited which in fact impact the core definition of the academic profession (p. 16). The case studies of the academic profession in China (Chen, pp.

107-134) and in Singapore and Malaysia, (Lee, pp. 135-166) presented in this volume, illustrate the restrictions to academic freedoms as a result of political or ideological control, as well as corporate dynamics and restrictions in gender access.

The academic profession is also defined by the dynamics of power in institutional contexts. Altbach asserts that in both North America and developing countries there has been a progressive decay in the power of the professoriate “controlling the key governing structure of the university” (Altbach, p. 14). Hence, Altbach explains: “professorial power has weakened everywhere, as academic institutions become larger and demands of accountability mount” (p. 14). Other authors, such as Margolis (2004) following a similar argument for departure, have coupled the reduction of the power of academic professionals within their institutions, with the development of a new type of university “corporate universities” and the progressive use of internet services for courses. Margolis contends that these phenomena contribute to the “withering” of the professoriate by changing trends in the academic profession that ruled it for the last 30 years. In other words, in the absence of the traditional institutional channels, the professoriate has less power and influence over institutional realities and decisions (Margolis, 2004, p. 27).

Altbach recognized the importance of political participation of faculty in previous studies (Altbach, 1994; Boyer, Altbach, and Whitehall, 1994). Nevertheless, in his most recent work about the academic profession in middle income and developing countries, he sees political participation and the political nature of universities (specifically in Latin America) as an endangering challenge to the profession (Altbach, p. 19). The author claims: “the academic profession needs to be depoliticized” (Altbach, p. 19). Overall, the identification of academic professionals as a somehow exclusive group who were very specialized in their conditions of

labor, can also lead to a fallacious view about the political implications of their labor and relationship with the state.

This last perspective is extremely enriching to glean on and shows how professors within higher education reform see themselves and conceptualize their work related to these particular notions of academic professionalism. I also think that this perspective is an avenue to explore the conflicts, paradoxes, and contradictions of the academic professionals in higher education institutions which requires further analysis. It also demands the need to bridge to other constructs to enhance analysis.

2.7.4 The issue of status of the academic profession

From a global perspective, the status of academics varies across different national contexts. The social recognition and attribution of a special social positioning as well as possession of symbolic capital, where academics exert expertise entailed in the notion of status, which differs from country to country. Overall, Altbach agrees with the generalization that there has been a drop in the status of the professoriate, due to salary stagnation, lack of decision-making power in the institutions in favor of managerial staff, faculty evaluation systems, and qualifications and access into the profession (Altbach, 2003, p. 19-20). The changes introduced in the status of academics have been analyzed in depth in the context of policy changes in England and other European countries (Hostaker, 2000, pp. 137-145) by the study of the disruption of the “points of cohesion” that the academic profession has as an occupational group (Hostaker, p. 131) which has impacted their professional status.

This decline in the status of the professoriate in terms of the social recognition of the professoriate and their work conditions has been summarized by the title: “The decline of the

guru” by Altbach (2003) or in the title: “The withering of the professoriate” (by Margolis, 2004). Altbach relies upon the work by Jayaram (2003, p. 199) when this latter asserts (referring to a case study of the academic profession in India):

In India teachers have traditionally been accorded the highest esteem, even if it was not matched by commensurate economic rewards. However, over the past few decades all this has changed: The academic profession has experienced a precipitous decline, and the once-revered guru has fallen (p. 199).

The reasons for this decline could be traced in many factors, be they global, national, or international. Nevertheless, Altbach’s work stresses less on the linkages between globalization and national or institutional policies that could explain the changes in the status of the profession.

2.7.5 Different perspectives about the academic profession

Both the design and implementation of higher education reform policies implicate dynamics of power at different levels (or units of analysis): state-universities, state-academic professionals, and relationships between university bureaucracies and academics. There are different perspectives about the academic profession that can allow the uncovering of tensions, contradictions, and distortions in the process of policy design and implementation. One of the most recent contributions on the analysis of academic professionalism in times of reform, comes from the approaches that link the discourses of professionalism in its close alignment “with discourses of excellence, quality, and productivity circulating in broader society and within institutions of higher education” (Allan et al., 2006, p. 52).

At the phase of policy-making of higher education policies, there are policies that specifically target the work, conditions of work, and status of the professoriate within higher education reform movements. Notwithstanding, the literature on the academic profession (even

from a global standpoint) has briefly intended to uncover these connections or stress the linkages between the policy texts, and the actual implementation of them at the institutional level when they relate to the professoriate.

More than aligning with one approach, there is a need to identify the issues of professionalism in the context of higher education reform from a broader critical approach and intend to converge on different lines of analysis that could allow tracing the tensions and issues between the macro and micro-levels of higher education policy.

Notwithstanding, there is a need to clarify first the concept of academic professionalism. The most shared concept the professoriate are named as a collective is “academic professionals” (Clark, 1987; Altbach, 1997, 2003; Slaughter and Roadhes, 1991, 2004; Tierney, 1991). Therefore, we will refer to professors at universities as academic professionals. We will use the term interchangeably with professorate or professors.

2.7.6 Features of different perspectives on the study of academic professionals

The different perspectives about academic professionals from a global scope could be represented as a continuum where in one extreme of the spectrum we could situate the approaches that describe academic professionals from an individual and organizational leadership standpoint namely from the “traits theories” (Lincoln, 1991, p.8). Within them academic professionals are defined by the type of institutions where they work (i.e. Clark, 1983, and Boyer, 1990).

At the other extreme of the spectrum we could situate the perspectives that conceive at the core of the work and features of academic professionals the so-called collective possibilities of their political responses (Smyth, 1995; Nelson, 1997). At this extreme, we can also locate the

lines of analysis that portray academic professionals in their relationship with the means of production of academic work (Harney & Moten, 1998; Smyth, 1995). Furthermore, within this scenario we could situate several other inquiries that “transition” towards the “power and influence theories” (Lincoln, 1991, p.8): the work that highlights the relationship between the so-called neoliberal state and the academic profession (Roadhes & Slaughter, 1991), the definition and study of academic professionals’ work as “managed professionals” (Currie, 2004; Harney & Moten, 1998; Smyth, 1995), and the perspective that opens the door to the development of the so-called “new academic professionalism” while questioning the conditions and scholarship demands of the current period of university evaluation and quality programs (Nixon, 2001; Nixon et al., 2001; Roadhes & Slaughter, 1998; Marginson, 2000).

It is noteworthy that between these two distinctive lines of analyses, we situate the approaches that describe the features, challenges and problems that the academic professionals face in both the developed and developing countries (Altbach, 2003), and the perspectives that highlight the relationship between the changes in the role of the state toward universities and academics (Roadhes & Slaughter, 1998, Currie, 2004).

In an overview, there is a scarcity of studies that focus on:

- a. The issues and specific policies towards the academic profession from design and implementation
- b. The ways in which different actors and stakeholders at different stages of the policy process conceive, influence, construct, and enact notions about how academics do their work
- c. The linkages between global dynamics and national policies towards the academic profession

- d. How academics themselves perceive their work, their identity, and the traits of the profession in periods of reform implementation.

Thus, I propose to complement the literature about academic professionalism with a policy research analysis framework because it sheds light on the ways in which the policies towards academics are constructed, how they transit from macro state levels and its actors (policy-makers), to institutional bureaucracies or academic staff at universities.

We are poised to turn to some bridging issues, problems, and challenges within the different conceptual frameworks aforementioned. Most importantly, the ones that appear more relevant from a policy analysis standpoint will be highlighted.

2.7.7 Contributions from the Critical Professionalization literature

Roadhes and Slaughter (1991) summarize the issues that critical professionalization literature in general and the academic profession in particular propose for the further studies of the academic profession. The authors explain:

[T]he critical professionalization literature concentrates on the relationships of professionals to external groups. Professions are defined as corporate entities that establish and monopolize marketplaces of work (Larson, 1977). Critical professionalization scholars see characteristics-codes of ethics, certification, technical knowledge, and altruistic ideas of service- identified by functionalist scholars as being at the heart of the professions as facets of professional ideology that mediate relations with external groups, conferring legitimacy and consolidating control over domains of work. As critical scholars suggest, professionals groups are connected to other social structures of power, such as class, acquiring power by serving power (Larson, 1984, Silva and Slaughter, 1984) (p. X).

One of the foremost contributions of this approach is the relevance to issues of power within both institutional environments as well as the importance of control and autonomy in the definition of professors' work. There is a dearth of analyses that highlight these issues of power,

and power struggles among different actors in reform policy implementation (Askling, 2001; Suasnabar, 2002) and their contradictory dynamics in the environment of the professors' workplace.

From this approach, the concept of "being a professional" also involves paradoxical relationships because it implies the accumulation of symbolic capital that is not equivalent to all the members of one profession. Nevertheless, the concept "professional" defines workers with expertise or "high- skilling" in a particular field. According to Braveman (1974), work has evolved in a way in which there has been a progressive bureaucratization while workers acquire higher levels of education (pp. 5-6). Paradoxically, while workers obtain the category of professionals, they are also in a place that is more distant from the means of production in their labor field. This is an interesting dynamic that has theoretical implications for the understanding and explaining of the concept of the professional and the dynamics of labor. The approach that puts professional labor at the center of the stage for analysis comes from labor concepts. This approach situates "the labor process as it takes place under the control of capital" and its accumulative and reproductive processes (Braverman, p. 8). Marx's studies of labor were focused on the capitalist system during the inceptions of the industrial revolution. Different authors propose to make inferences to the dynamics of labor for professional workers today (Larson, 1980; Hargreaves, 1994; Ginsburg, 1995). While highlighting the high level of accumulation of capital in this global stage of the capitalist system, the labor processes grounded on it shows a clear "separation between planning and execution which seems to be in our day a common denominator linking all industrial societies together, however different their populations and structures" (Braverman, 1974, p.15). This separation is apparent in the description of professionals and their conditions of labor within institutions, i.e. academic

professionals working in higher education institutions. They are recognized as professionals although general planning and management of the universities is not under their unique control. Depending on the type of institutions and national contexts, they may still maintain a certain degree of determinacy over curriculum. Nevertheless, global forces over-influence on national and institutional contexts as well. Nonetheless, professors possess the symbolic capital expertise in the area. National ministries of education, as part of state reform packages, conduct and lead education reform movements. Ministry officials make decisions about design, and implementation of policies to be introduced to the teaching and organization of the higher education system. The same degree of separation from planning and execution operates at the institutional level. Drawing on Aronowitz (1997) this complements the fact that higher education institutions have become more complex and bureaucratic decision-making sites in the current context of fiscal control and neoliberal notions (Slaughter; Roadhes & Slaughter, 1998). Aronowicz illustrates these phenomena in the type of decision-making happening at the universities. They are in the hands of bureaucratic personnel or in the boards of trustees (Aronowitz, pp. 203-205). And, he defines this, as one of the causes that supports the “proletarianization”³ of academic labor to these actors and dynamics (pp. 204-205).

In the words of Larson, professionals can be included in the category of “non-manual workers” (Larson, M., 1980, p. 131). Accordingly, Braverman explains that, professionals in general, and academic professionals in particular, are members of the so-called “new working class” (p. 25). The author states: “the ‘new working class’ embraces those occupations which serve as the repositories for specialized knowledge in production and administration: engineers, technicians, scientists, lower managerial and administrative aides and experts, teachers, etc”

³ See the further discussion of this concept in following sections of this work.

(Braverman, 1974, p. 25). From this approach, professionals can be also being recognized as “educated labor, better paid, [and] somewhat privileged...” (Braverman, p. 27). Within this group there are also different degrees of stratification. Therefore, the way professionals from different fields understand themselves and their activities is not homogenous across different professional groups (Braverman, p. 29). In my opinion, this has profound implications for how a profession defines the conditions of its work, can articulate its control, and can defend it from the requirements of outsiders. Furthermore, this also has implications on how the members of a profession could articulate political responses, resistance, and alliances, to oppressive conditions of labor. And, most importantly, this illustrates the paradoxes of being a professional.

Labor analysts have paid attention to the political actions with which professors as workers engage in strikes (Nelson, 1997, pp. 3-31), and overarching alliances with other institutional actors in defense of conditions of work (Nelson, pp. 4-5).

The work by Roadhes and Slaughter (1998) has made intelligible the linkages between the world economy and increasing trends affecting the academic profession such as: “the increasing commodified faculty-graduate student relations” (p. 35), the “inequalities and inequities in people’s material existence in higher education” (p. 34) which the authors trace in the increment of the number of part-time faculty, and the increasing domain of capitalist culture over the academic profession globally (p. 35). For Roadhes and Slaughter, there are intrinsic dependant relationships within the global economy, the reality of academics as managed professionals, and the availability of more people who will be part of the profession in precarious conditions, such as part-time faculty (p. 36).

2.7.8 Contributions from the literature on the relationships between the state and academic professionals

From a policy analysis standpoint, the relationships between the state and academics are at its core. The realities in higher education both in the developed world (most specifically in European countries) and in Latin America, call for a more specific analysis of the role of the state as the origin for reform policies that ultimately affect the work of academic professionals.

The literature from critical analysis has proposed the identification of the state as an employer and somehow “coach” of the academic conditions of labor. The importance of the state and its role in the development of the capitalist system, and the process of capital accumulation, is taken into consideration when paying attention to its relationships with the so-called academic professionals. Furthermore, the use of professionalism as an instrument to control academic workers comes under the umbrella of top-down educational reforms supported and implemented by states’ bureaucracies (Askling, 2001; Suasnabar, 2002; Roadhes and Slaughter, 1998).

The state is a crucial actor in the dynamics and conditions of professional labor in education systems. Connell (1995) articulates that, “governments exert power over educational practice partly by legislation and regulation, partly by promoting ideologies, but above all by the power of the purse” (p. 107).

The aforementioned dynamics are not the only type of control exercised by governments over education. Given that government investment and financial control are exercised over education, both of these controls work as mechanisms with ideological outcomes for the academic profession. This happens in a contradictory fashion: on the one hand, governments claim from professors a higher professional behavior, while increasing workloads, raising credential requirements, or exerting more control over curriculum in the name of education

reforms (Aronowics, 1997; Van Patten, 2000; Altbach, 2003). On the other hand, professors can respond in a professional manner by both acknowledging and resisting the government claims. This literature does not highlight the importance of policy actors, such as policy-makers and academic staff at the university.

According to Claus Offe (1984) professionalization as a process is deeply linked to the type of policies generated by capitalist states and their social policies. In this perspective it is important to bring about two other related and contradictory ideas: massive proletarianization and passive proletarianization (p.92). Offe conceptualizes active proletarianization as the process through which “those individuals who find themselves disposed of their means of labor or subsistence should spontaneously proceed to “active” proletarianization by offering their labor power for sale on the labor market” (pp.92-93). Both notions can be related to decisions through which professional workers become diminished in the autonomy of decision making, and in control over their labor which manifests in the current reform context. Interestingly, Offe also presents another argument to shift the notion of proletarianization as a determined process. He explains that “in theory, a range of functionally equivalent escape routes from passive proletarianization have existed historically, and continue to exist” (p.93).

The capitalist state in the global stage contributes with particular actions and inactions, to the accumulation of capital at a world-wide scope. This also entails the need to uncover interrelations: between “state-economy and state-occupations” (Ginsburg et al., p. 317). The next step is then to explore how these explanations are intertwined with the dynamics of professionalism as both a conceptual tool and as an ideology. Additionally, these relationships acquire other tones in policies of education reform.

During the development of the capitalist system, nation-states performed roles that both nurtured and allowed for the reproduction of contradictions to the system. Nation-states now also deal with the socio-economic contradictions of the system itself, especially in situations of crises (Ginsburg et al., p. 318). Furthermore, the state itself has undergone different “natures” or “ways of being” linked to the development of the capitalist system at both the national and global level. The so-called Welfare State (in the Western hemisphere from the 1950’s to the 1970’s) performed particular roles that helped to lower down the possibilities of an economic crisis, while developing an active role in the economy by being a main source of employment and investment. This active presence of the state allowed for the survival of the system itself (Ginsburg et al., 1988, p.318). The state operates at different levels in both the national and world economy, being the “fuse” that connects the two. Furthermore, the state performs its roles from its autonomous condition. Nonetheless, the autonomy of its condition is not neutral.

This role of the state has other profiles related to the reproduction of the capitalist system because it reinforces the social structure. According to Ginsburg et al., the state “because of the distribution of wealth and power in capitalist societies (and the world system), tends to be more responsive to economic elites” (p.318). The protective role that the state develops towards these elites allows the reproduction of the economic relationships within the capitalist system and the maintenance of a social capitalist system that is inherently unequal. In the context of these relations the state plays out the contradictory dynamics of re-production and accumulation (“two contradictory structural imperatives”) from an autonomous position (Ginsburg et al., p.319).

Drawing on Ginsburg et al. when the state has made possible the process of accumulation, this implies “[maintaining] economic returns to capital in the context of declining rates of profit and a world-wide crisis” (p.319). As indicated by Ginsburg et al., one strategy to

deal with this is to reduce state investment in education and other social sectors making them “more efficient” in terms of economic demands. The other “imperative”, is to construct and maintain the reproduction of the system by structuring and organizing “legitimate social [capitalist] relations appropriate to the means of production” (Ginsburg et al., 1988, p. 319).

According to Ginsburg et al. (1988) there are “four dimensions of state-occupation relations: (1) provision of guaranteed clients; (2) defining which clients will be served; (3) specifying how clients’ needs will be met; and (4) controlling the ‘professional market place’ through funding” (p.332). In particular historical contexts, the state favors certain aspects over others. This has outcomes for the professional status and autonomy of educators given that the immense majority of them are employed by the state in the last instance.

In this context, the relationships between state and occupations (especially with professionals in the educational field) are complex. They ignite the paradoxical dimensions of proletarianization and professionalization (Ginsburg et al., p. 319). The distinctive role of the state towards professions helps to articulate their meaning and to nurture their contradictions. The state performs also clashing actions towards professions: it recognizes officially an occupational worth (legitimizing status) and it restricts the power base from which this professional worth operates (Ginsburg et al., p. 319), basically by imposing economic or financial restrictions. Providing these dynamics, the relationships between the state and occupational groups, and specifically, with professional groups, is highly volatile and variable. They somehow circulate through “bumping” stages that change their meaning over time. Providing this, there is a need to use other conceptual tools to explore them, such as de-professionalization, and proletarianization. As I explained in previous sections, these concepts reveal the changes that the relationships between the state and occupational groups could

experience. Furthermore, drawing on Johnson, Ginsburg et al. say: “this tension between state and occupational groups is embedded within wider and more national and global level political economic dynamics” (p. 321). The mechanisms of control that the state exerts towards occupational groups fuel the clashing pairs of professionalization/ and proletarianization. The state role in preserving and even re-producing the capitalist accumulation process nurtures the proletarianization of professional workers. As stated by Ginsburg et al. (1988), the state exercises indirect control over professional market places, by the funding: “fees, salary, number of positions for practitioners or materials, and support staff”(Ginsburg, p. 320). This is crucial in the case of the public higher education sector in countries such as Argentina where the national government is the main source of funding for the sector. In particular, the claims for an increment of accountability and efficiency at the work-place are examples of this indirect control over professions that the state can exert.

Nevertheless, professional workers within the boundaries of their positions in institutions highly regulated by social policies, manage to negotiate and even paradoxically question the process with many subtle mechanisms. Offe explains that: “‘active’ proletarianization does not follow necessarily from ‘passive’ proletarianization” (p.94). According to Offe’s argument, in a capitalist system, wage-labor is needed as part of what allows the prevalence and reproduction of the system. Offe explains, “basic reproduction functions (especially in the domain of socialization, health, education, and care for the aged) are fulfilled. A range of special institutional facilities is therefore required” (p.94). Offe also discusses the ‘statization’ of these sub-systems or institutions that “makes possible ruling-class control over the living conditions of that segment of the population” (p.94). Here public policy design and implementation come into play. Offe also talks about the political regulation of the state to control wage laborers and non-

wage laborers. This role seems to come out as the primordial role of the state and its relationships with workers and especially with professionals (p.95).

2.7.9 Contributions from the perspective on professionalism as an ideology

The responses that professors can articulate in answering to pressures of professional development, more credentials, are “heterogeneous” and contradictory (Ginsburg et al., 1988, p. 320). In these responses, professors appeal to the so-called ideology of professionalism in a paradoxical manner. On the words of the authors, one form of response is “passive acceptance of an adjustment to the restraints to their work autonomy...perhaps even subscribing to an ideology which legitimates state heteronomy” (Ginsburg et al., p. 320). The passive acceptance position is rooted in a peculiar appropriation to the ideology of professionalism, by accepting the constraints to autonomy in the name of “career aspirations”.

Another way of reacting to the pressures from the state is when professors resist the pressures to their job’s autonomy by adhering to them because they find them compatible with “the way they [teachers and professors] prefer the work done” (p. 320). Nonetheless, there are other mechanisms of resistance that are more actively oppositional to the constraints, i.e. when professors respond “by resisting, challenging, and even mobilizing themselves and the public against increased state control” (Ginsburg et al., p. 320). Connell and Nelson also underline that political responses such as unionization are ways in which academics manifest resistance and challenge the state’s and institution’s control. Sometimes these efforts are catalyzed through endorsing political parties, collective bargaining, or other union activities (Aronowics, 1997; Altbach, 1977; Altbach, 2003; Hutcherson, 2000). Although the latter illustrate a further commitment to change and resistance to the state’s actions, they are successful depending on the

ideological and material resources that these groups have. Interestingly, this is related to the ideology that they can appeal to in mobilizing themselves and in obtaining the recognition of the state to their claims as legitimate (Ginsburg et al., 1988, p. 320). In this context, professors could use the ideology of professionalism as a legitimating tool of their claims and their empowerment (Ginsburg et al., p. 320). This exemplifies phenomena described as the double edged sword ideology of professionalism.

The struggles to protect professors' autonomy are aligned with seeking "to manipulate the perception of the indeterminacy/technicality (I/T) ratio of their work" (Ginsburg et al., 1988, p. 320). While arguing for autonomy, academic professionals appeal to the ideology of professionalism because they are "claiming that the non-routine nature of their work 'can only be handled by extraordinary expertise and judgment'"(Ginsburg et al., p. 320-321). Paradoxically, the state can also manipulate the indeterminacy/technicality of professors' work by defining the specific conditions of services and designing specific policies that regulate and specify this aspect of professors' work. The arguments from the state are usually supported by its own financial control of salaries of academics, and by arguments of efficiency applied to the so-called productivity of the educational sector especially in times of reform or economic crisis; or arguments aimed to introduce quality improvement. The use of these arguments legitimizes the state's control and de-legitimizes professors' claims for their autonomy. In the context of cuts in education expenditures, teachers can argue from the ideology of professionalism by organizing themselves into collective actions.

We are poised to consider several dilemmas or areas that require further exploration that emerge from the literature about academic professionalism and to open new avenues for scrutiny from a policy analysis standpoint.

2.7.10 Dilemmas and challenges for the study of the academic profession from a policy standpoint

For the purpose of policy analysis, it is pivotal to bridge different conceptual notions. Hence, it is instrumental to propose a series of dilemmas that emerged from the main traits of the profession; the challenges academics face in the contexts of higher education reform policies influenced by global trends. These dilemmas can be captured from a policy analysis approach to broaden the scope of the literature about the academic profession:

-The identification of a set of particular traits of the academic profession world-wide tend to diminish national realities as well as tend to propose as the outstanding model, the reality of academia in developing countries. Nevertheless, there are congruent traits/ features shared by the academic profession.

-There is an intertwined relationship between the status of academics in society and the institutional status of academics. The exploration of this relationship appears vital during policy implementation. There is also a need to compare the status of academics before and after the policy implementation. Tracing historical development and linking policies to socio-economic contexts (global capitalism) is another avenue to explore these issues.

-The status and actual conditions of academic work are re-defined by the ways in which higher education reform policies are seen and enacted by other university actors such as managerial and academic staff. There is a dearth of studies that explore that relationship and the effects of how academic staff interprets higher education policies, and its effect on the work of academics.

-The nature of academic work has been found in both research and teaching combined. Nevertheless, the current global policy trends towards academics endanger both activities and

present constraints to them. Some scholars (Nixon, 2001; Nixon & Roadhes, 2001) have claimed the need to re-define scholarship as a way of questioning the constraints. This approach which mostly describes the effects of global trends on the work of professors, inquires in a limited fashion the connections between global trends and the outcomes over professors' work.

-The relationship between academics and the state: needs to be explored and uncovered because it is vital in the realm of higher education policy. The higher education policies not only emanate from the non-monolithic state but also reflect its contradiction. There is a dearth of studies that trace the views about academic professionalism from policy makers to actors who enact and implement the policies within institutional environments.

-Different perspectives and approaches towards the academic profession scarcely reflect the voices of academics or of any other actors with similar or conflicting views.

There are two interwoven options to illustrate these dilemmas. One is to delve into one specific institutional theory which could illuminate the ways in which academic staff and professors construct and enact the policies at the institutional level. Thus, Weick's construct and framework of sense making in organizations (Weick, 1995) help elucidate the connections between macro and micro levels of policy making and implementation. Weick's explain that in the process of sense-making, actors incorporate "action and context" (p.18). Thus, Weick's ideas provide a framework to explore the role of different policy actors in the framing and implementation of the policies.

The policy research framework allows integrating different sources and voices from both the macro and micro level of the policies from design and implementation. Majchrzak's framework of policy research (1984) allows achieving this goal.

2.8 SENSE-MAKING IN ORGANIZATIONS

2.8.1 The construction of “meanings” of higher education policies within institutions

Sensemaking means, literally, “making of sense” (Weick, 1995, p. 4). The ways in which actors within organizations assign meaning to events, situations, and even policies is the result of a unique process in which interpretation is a component of sense making (Weick, 1995, pp. 6-7). Weick’s notions illuminate structuration and re-structuration within institutions. Additionally, one landmark aspect of sense-making is its role of incorporating “action and context” (Weick, p. 18). Different actors in institutions learn and interact around policy messages and in turn, enact policies. In this way, they integrate context to action, by constructing meanings that trigger specific actions.

This approach has been intensively used in studies of how specific policy messages are constructed in school environments by different actors (teachers, school leaders, district leaders) (Coburn, 2001; Coburn, 2004). There are studies that have intended to analyze the interactions of different actors in higher education institutions around and about reform policies, such as Haag’s & Smith’s (2002). Nevertheless, there are unfruitful attempts to conceptualize the process from which policies reach universities and its actors integrating the influences of macro contexts, while utilizing sense-making constructs in policy analysis.

Weick identifies seven properties of sense-making in organizations: “grounded in identity construction”; “retrospective” character; “enactive of sensible environments”; “social”; “ongoing”; “focused on and by extracted cues”; “driven by plausibility rather than accuracy” (Weick, p.17). These features of sense making in organizations appear instrumental for a policy analysis. They elucidate the connections between macro contexts of policy and micro-context.

The properties of sense-making illustrate the ways in which different actors at universities, while extracting clues from specific national contexts, interact and exchange ideas, and construct through their social interactions, the meaning of policies (Weick, p.17). These features of sense-making highlight the collective construction of meaning as well as its development in time and its roots are in the identity of collective and individual actors within organizations(Weick, pp. 22-27).

2.8.2 The properties and component of sense-making

The different properties of sense-making in institutions have implications for actions within organizations. Additionally, there are also components of the dyad of structuration/ re-structuration within organizations. Most importantly, according to Weick, these properties of sense-making landmark the process through which institutional actors make connections between the context and their actions, and construct the bases for their behaviors within institutions. Additionally, Weick describes these properties as steps in an ongoing process where institutional actors “concerned with identity engage ongoing events from which they extract cues and make plausible sense retrospectively, all the while enacting more of less order into those ongoing events” (Weick, p. 18). Weick explains that this chain of events does not operate synchronically, and some of them are skipped or looped through the process of sense-making.

According to Weick, the property of “grounded in identity construction” relates to the notion that each actor as sense-maker “are singular not individual and no individual ever acts as like a single sense-maker” (Weick, p. 18). Thus, actors as sense-makers define themselves and the notions of others in the process of sense-making. In this process, they produce images that associate and disassociate their identities from their institutional ones. This process impacts the

ways in which individuals transact meanings with others within organizations. Actors within institutions “try to shape and react to the environments they face” (Weick, p. 23). The process of sense-making conveys a complex “mixture of proaction and reaction” from the actors involved in the sense-making process (Weick, p. 23).

The retrospective property of sense-making is vital in it because of the role of the organizational history where it happens. According to Weick, the retrospective property is a crucial one because through it, institutional actors recover cues from the past and use them to support their current actions in the institutional past. Actors within institutions, while constructing meaning, also select distinctive events “by stepping outside the stream of experience and directing attention to it” (Weick, p. 25). Weick posits that the creation of meaning is focused in time and “directed backwards from a specific point in time...whatever is occurring at the moment will influence what is discovered when people glance backward” (Weick, p. 26). Additionally, Weick explains that meanings change, as the “current projects and goals change” at the institution (Weick, p. 27). In this process, meanings need to be synthesized. Usually, the actors who produce the synthesis of meaning are at the top of the institutional structure. Finally, Weick explains that this property of sense-making makes the past clearer and rationalizes it to provide structures and actions for the present (Weick, p. 29).

The third property of sense-making, “enactive of sensible environments” relates to the ways in which the perceived environment of the organizational life is produced and reproduced by the people who operate in those environments (Weick, p. 30). Weick illustrates this property with the ways in which people enact laws. He explains that “when people enact laws, they take undefined space, time, and action, and draw lines, establish categories, and coin labels that create new features of the environment that did not exist before” (Weick, p. 31). In other words,

through the process of sense-making, people create and re-create their own environment for actions, and constraint them by the environment. Weick illuminates the process, stating that “people create their environment and those environments create them” (p. 34). In this sense-making, actors display manipulation, interpretation, and framing of certain facts, and events (Weick, p. 35). In addition, the process of enactment allows institutionalization. In other words, allows making actions concrete, and construct lines of action to produce meanings within the institution. Accordingly, in the context of sensible environments, certain meanings are exacerbated and overpower others.

The fourth property of sense-making highlighted by Weick is the feature of sense-making as a social activity. Within organizations, the individual ways in which actors come to know and construct meaning, are intertwined with the ways in which they exchange and transmit those meanings to others. Weick states that “sense-making is never a solitary because what a person does internally is contingent on others” (Weick, p. 40). Therefore, the ways in which actors describe, propose, and frame notions mediate their relationships with others. The social property of sense-making allows actors coordinate meanings, and also allows to the development of dissonances in the meanings circulating within organizations (pp. 42-43).

Sense-making is also described by Weick as an ongoing process. Accordingly, “sense-making never starts” (Weick, p. 43). In other words, actors are the ones who “chopped moments of continuous flows and extract cues from those moments” (p. 43). In actuality, the process of sense-making flows continuously and without disruptions.

The sixth property of sense-making is that operates “focused on and by extracted cues” (p. 49). Weick describes extracted cues as “simple, familiar structures that are seeds from which people develop a larger sense of what may be occurring” (Weick, p. 50). The cues extracted in

the process of sense-making serve as “point of reference”, and because of it, it becomes a “source of power” (p. 50). What and how is extracted as a cue, “depends on context” (Weick, p. 51). The cues could become salient because of the context, and they could get embellished in the social actions around them. What is crucial in sense-making is that within organizations, “faith in this cues and their sustained use as a reference are important for sense-making” (Weick, p. 53). Cues have a double meaning, they evoke actions and situations from the past, as well as they propose lines of actions into the future (Weick, p. 54).

The last property of sense-making is “driven by plausibility rather than accuracy”. Weick describes that the strength of sense-making is not accuracy, but “plausibility, pragmatics, coherence, reasonableness, creation, invention, and instrumentality” (Weick, p. 57). In other words, this property highlights which is useful within the social construction of the future of the organization itself. According to the author “sense-making is about accounts that are socially acceptable and credible” (Weick, p. 61).

Weick’s characterization of sense-making as “an activity in which many possible meanings may need to be synthesized” (Weick, p. 27) appears relevant for the scrutiny of the processes of meaning construction and enactment of higher education policies. According to Weick, actors in organizations create the policy environments and the environments re-create them, while generating new issues, questions, and urgencies in terms of policy demands (Weick, p. 34). Additionally, while meaning construction is developing, actors operate re-constructing new meanings from the cues they obtain from their environment, composing unique framings. This last seems applicable in times of implementation of higher education reform policies. In other words, there is a social construction of the policy messages, and of the meanings of the policies themselves within institutions and as the result of how institutional actors interact about

and around them. The process and activity of sense making in organization is continuous and never ends (Weick, p. 63), and it is triggered by events or messages that “surprise” or “shock” the agents in organizations (Weick, pp. 83-85). Actors in organizations need to construct responses to face these types of events.

Sense-making processes entail enactment, which happen within organizations by creating lines of action, and structures that organize and pattern behaviors and actions for actors at the institutional level (Weick, pp. 36-38).

When reform policies “reach” institutions of higher education, there is a degree of unexpectedness and shock which triggers complex processes of meaning construction from their actors. They select and adjust the events, occasions, and meanings of the policies.

Weick’s work was applied to analyze sense-making in educational organizations. Weick characterized educational institutions as “loosely coupled” systems (1976) where the process of sense-making develop through overlapping meanings and framed linked through the construction of light meanings and framings.

2.9 THE POLICY RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

According to Majchrzak (1984), policy research is “specifically directed at providing policymakers with the options and information they need to solve the problems we face today” (p.11). The author defines policy research “as the process of conducting research on, or analysis of, a fundamental social problem in order to provide policy makers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem” (Majchrzak, 1984, p.12). This kind of research aims to analyze policy design and implementation in two stages: the process by which

policies are both designed and adopted; “and the effects of those policies once adopted” (Majchrzak, p.13).

In the context of policy research, the process of policy design is viewed “as complex as the social problem itself” (Majchrzak, 1984, p.15). This framework stresses the dynamics of how different actors operate and implement policy and how they juggle “a myriad of different policy mechanisms with different intended and unintended consequences” (p.15). Policy research also focuses on the particular organizational or institutional settings where the policies target their actions or inquiry.

Majchrzak proposes different stages or steps in policy research. She asserts that the starting point for policy research “begins with a social problem” (p.12). Then, it evolves into researching the social problem, where it cultivates “alternative policy actions” to both alleviate and overcome the problems which originated the policy quest. In a final stage, the policy researcher communicates these alternatives to the policy-makers (Majchrzak, 1984, p.12).

According to the author (1984), policy research requires “an understanding of the policy-making arena in which the study’s results will be received” (p.14), “including the relevant actors and policy mechanisms” (p.15). The ultimate goal of policy research is to indicate to decision-makers specific actions/ solutions. In order to achieve this goal, policy research needs to explore holistically, and in depth, the policy problem. Policy research delves into 3 different sources: “science, craft lore, and art” (p. 11)⁴ and intends to analyze the distinctive patterns and approaches from the specific stakeholders at each level of the system.

This framework also contributes to the study of the complex relationship between policy and ideology. Additionally, the policy analysis framework will allow me to scrutinize critically

⁴ I will describe policy research and its methodological implications in terms of research in the next chapter.

the information provided by diverse data sources and construct a critical synthesis of it as a way to explore the reform policies and their implementation at different levels (state and universities). In addition, this methodology could allow me to describe and situate different actors operating at different policy making and implementation levels. Most importantly, it would help me shed light on the complexity of a highly contested higher education reform process.

The policy analysis methodology permits describing and analyzing the nuanced fashions in which different stakeholders at the university, in the process of implementation of the same policies, construct different understandings and responses to it. Therefore, it will let me scrutinize the information that the academic staff at the university, professors, and politicians have provided through interviews about the implementation of these policies.

This framework also entails a critical qualitative inquiry over the policy processes. Following Tierney, this type of qualitative inquiry seems beneficial to marginalized groups in higher education because it gives them more attention. Although there have been studies about the situation of academic professionals in a global scope (Altbach, 1997, Altbach, 2003, Ginsburg & Spatig, 1988, Ginsburg et al, 1988, Ginsburg, 1992, Marginson, 2000), there has been also a dearth of studies where the voices of the professors themselves are being questioned and analyzed. This research intends to explore the ways in which academic professionals speak about the reform policies and the outcomes of the implementation process. It also intends to scrutinize the ways in which other stakeholders in higher education institutions, such as politicians have constructed their understanding of the policy problems and responded to it.

This study recovers Tierney's suggestions (1991) while focusing on the effects that implementation of the policies will have on the views and ideas that professors hold about their work and lives during the higher education reform policies in Argentina.

There is an outstanding need for systematic analysis of the outcomes of the Argentinean higher education reform policies that could trace their trajectory from their formation to their implementation or enactment at the institutional level. Therefore, we propose a theoretical model that could bridge or integrate different conceptual instruments to enrich the possibilities of analysis.

2.10 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Several questions emerge from the review of literature and conceptual frameworks investigated. These questions are constructed from the problems both treated and disregarded by the literature:

- 1) How are the goals of the State in the design of the Law of Higher Education of 1995 perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) in the higher education reform movement in Argentina?
 - a. How does each group characterize the nature of the reform movement?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences between groups?
- 2) How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) characterize academic professionalism:
 - a. What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences among groups?
- 3) How-if at all-the stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?

The following chapter operationalizes the research questions within the framework of policy research with detailed descriptions of the methods for research data collection and analysis.

3.0 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter encompasses the major theoretical framework for the case, as well as the research instruments for data collection and analysis. A detailed description of different instruments and methodologies of data collection is proposed. The explanation of the purpose of the analysis of different data sources within the case and its linkages with the policy research framework are specified. Finally, an overall description of the different components of the conceptual framework for data analysis is proposed divided in two levels, micro and macro. The use of the impact of both dimensions on academic professionals is also explored within the case.

3.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework that grounds this study is comprised by three theoretical dimensions within policy research: the macro level of the policies (global and national policies); the micro-institutional policies; and the impact of macro and micro policy dimensions on the professoriate. These three major constructs are interwoven in the processes of policy-making and implementation of higher education reform policies at two Argentinean universities.

1. Macro level: global and national policies

- a. Context pressures: global trends; global demands
- b. Role of the state in higher education: funding; market demands/ state

- c. State (government) and university relationships
- d. Autonomy (aspects)
- e. Goals of the reform movement globally and in Argentina
- f. Tensions/ Misalignments between design and implementation
- g. Policies towards the professoriate
- h. Quality (quality evaluation, and quality improvement)
- i. Other state policies towards the higher education sector

2. Micro-level: Institutional policy analysis

- a. Specification of national broader policies
- b. Participation and policy-making processes at the institutional level
- c. Goals of policy initiatives (university level)
- d. Comparison between state policies/ institutional policies
- e. Quality improvement and role of academics
- f. Academic staff and professoriate

3. Impact of macro and micro policy dimensions on academic professionals

- a. Descriptions of professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals
- b. Status: 1. Before the reform policies; 2. Outcomes on professors' status after reform policies
- c. Role/ Roles of the professoriate: in the reform movement; in the higher education system; at the university (hierarchical positioning and issues of power); roles in quality improvement (evaluation and programs)
- d. Professional autonomy: curriculum; control and determinacy of workload; relationship with university management; faculty evaluation; political participation
- e. Work of academic professionals: appointments/ salary; academic career; entry exam; teaching; research; teaching and research

3.1.1 Macro level: global and national higher education reform policies

The dynamics of transnational capitalism influences the development of the contradictory phenomena of globalization, imposing new constraints and frameworks for national states and their foreign and internal policies. Additionally, globalization encompasses closer connections between national economies and financial lending institutions.

In the case of educational policies, globalization is intertwined with the so-called “knowledge society”, and with national educational reform policies. While countries receive

loans and financial help from international organizations, they also get packages of policy conditions to receive help. These policy conditions include, deregulation of the economy and national markets, free trade, and privatization of social public services. In the case of higher educational services, the packages of reform entail policies to improve efficiency of public investment in education, introduction of students' fees, quality control and accreditation systems, privatization of educational services, decentralization, and labor flexibility for the professoriate with stricter mechanisms of entry into the profession. From a global standpoint, the professoriate has experienced their power weakened under mounting demands of accountability and because of their lack of representation in the governance structures of universities.

States in Latin America had developed a social role that translated into university policies which expanded access to university for the middle classes, provided public financial support, preserved institutional autonomy, and in times of democracy, maintained academic freedom. The new packages of reform, however, have indicated changes in the role of the state towards higher education systems, such as reducing funding, quality monitoring and efficiency control. In Argentina, while the government was implementing the so-called reform of the state, a law to reform the university system was passed, based on the guidelines of global education reform policies. The LHE had multifaceted goals, such as the improvement of quality, financial control, accountability, and privatization of the system. In actuality, this general legal framework introduced changes in the scope of institutions' autonomy, quality evaluation and accreditation programs, and in the so-called "academic career" for the professoriate with new requirements of professional development and credentials.

While the LHE operated as a general framework for the higher education reform movement, universities had to design specific documents and policies to implement the law's

requirements. Argentinean universities, following international counterparts, centered the management, monitoring, quality evaluation, and overall implementation of the reform policies on the academic staff at the universities. The transfer of decision-making to the hands of the academic staff at the universities restricted the power of professors to decide policy implementation. The efforts to translate national policies at the institutional level, translated into misalignments and disruptions in the ways in which universities implemented the broad policies, and in the manners in which institutional actors enacted the policies.

3.1.2 Micro-level: Institutional policy analysis

As aforementioned, universities in Argentina had to comply with the law's content and construct mechanisms to put its requirements into practice. Academic staff, such as, academic secretariat, school deans, and program coordinators, participated in the design of policies targeting institutional quality evaluation, implementation of accreditation mechanisms, professional development for the professoriate, and reform of plans of study.

At the universities, these policies intended the detailing and specification of broader policies, while responding to accountability demands and governmental pressures of efficiency in public expenditure. While the institutional policies were more detailed and precise in their aims and scope, they also re-defined the broad policies of reform adapting them to the history and dynamics of each institution. They also created new tensions at the institutional level between the academic staff who became the controllers and managers of the policies being implemented and the professoriate that basically lacked decision-making power. The pressures of more research, professional development, and a more controlled environment of the work of the professoriate, determined policy design and became an issue of policy implementation. The

academic staff at the universities delineated specific strategies according to national requirements. Professors and their organizations (unions) unwillingly advised in the reform of plans of study, and in the development of institutional quality evaluation. Tensions emerged between different institutional actors under the pressure and urgency of implementation of the reform policies.

3.1.3 Impact of macro and micro-policy dimensions on academic professionals

Professors in Argentina have enjoyed social prestige for their work at the university. During the last fifty years, academics had fulfilled several requirements that defined professional groups, such as a system of entry into the profession (public entry exam), academic freedom, and representation at university governance bodies. Nevertheless, the LHE established the “academic career” as a broad requirement to become a professor.

The LHE defined as a new requirement for the professoriate their professional development. Due to accountability policies, strict controls of public investment, and the endemic financial crisis, professors’ salaries stagnated. Additionally, new demands of research productivity, and professional development, were coupled with cries of quality improvement, which created challenging working conditions for the professoriate. Their prestige and status was lessened under demands of quality improvement at the institutions.

Professors did not participate in the design of the reform policies nor did they have any involvement in regulating their implementation. Professors’ unions opposed the LHE and proposed other alternatives, but their claims were disregarded. Although the LHE insured representation of the professoriate at the university governmental bodies, this representation was

only for professors who have passed the entry exam. Due to reduced investment on higher education, universities had higher numbers of non-tenured faculty who did not have the right to participate in the university government.

When the requirements of the LHE were to be implemented at the institutions, the academic staff of the institutions designed and specified the policies themselves and determined policy priorities. Professors complied with the policies as required by government and by the academic staff at the universities. One of the most problematic aspects of the policies was the implementation of quality evaluation mechanisms at the universities. In addition, professors had to align their curriculum to requirements emanating from the National Ministry of Education. As a result of the new requisites established by the LHE, professors' work became closely monitored and controlled by university administrators. The time invested in teaching and research was also defined and established by different policy documents at the institutional level.

Each of the aforementioned levels of policy, are intertwined in a continuum between the reform policy designs in Argentina, and their implementation at the universities. Certain global phenomena has been revisited in the LHE and sanctioned as reform policies for the Argentinean higher education system. In addition, each institution had to "make sense" of the broad policy messages in particular ways, translating them into specific policies. This study contends that the exploration of the policies towards the professoriate from design to implementation at two universities could illuminate the relationship between these three policy dimensions. This investigation is attainable through the policy research methodology.

3.1.4 The research questions

In light of the conceptual framework, the following research questions were designed to guide and support the research itself::

- 1) How are the goals of the State in the design of the Law on Higher Education of 1995 perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators/academic staff) in the higher education reform movement in Argentina?:
 - a. How does each group characterize the nature of the reform movement?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences between groups?
- 2) How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) characterize academic professionalism:
 - a. What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?
 - b. What are the similarities and differences among groups?
- 3) How-if at all- do the stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?

In order to operationalize these research questions grounded in the aforementioned conceptual framework, a primary methodology was selected to conduct this research is case study, with a secondary method for data collection of focused synthesis. The policy research framework articulates the research questions that guide this comparative study as a case study of the implementation of the policies that affect the professoriate at two Argentinean universities.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 The case study

This is a case study of the implementation of the higher education reform policies in Argentina and their effect on academic professionals at two Argentinean universities. Consequently, it is an “intrinsic” case study (Stake, 1995).

This inquiry is defined as a case study because of its research design and multi-methods for data collection, as well as its research, and stress on particular settings (Yin, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

The case study has entailed a deep examination of the particular problem of reform policy implementation, studying the institutional actors’ involvement and views about the policies at the two settings. Thus, this research has operationalized a “form of empirical inquiry” which defines a case study (Yin, 2003, p. 10).

Additionally, the research design takes into account the provisions of the case study method, such as, the use of manifold instruments of data collection, the explanation of two basic questions: what happened, and why, the analysis of the research problem in its context, the composition of detailed and holistic descriptions of the context and issues within the case, and discussion of themes and issues emergent from the analysis of the case itself, among other aspects (Yin, pp. 13-14; Merriam, 1988, p. xi; Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 363).

3.2.2 Focused synthesis

The method of focused synthesis has been selected to complement the case study method. The method of focused synthesis, which is rooted in a policy research methodology, calls for the use of different data sources to sustain the inquiry of a policy problem. Focused synthesis involves a critical reading, analysis, and triangulation of different informational sources around the same issues. At the end, the method of focused synthesis allows the manifestation of the views and roles of different policy actors, the recapturing of the participants' meanings translated into policy documents, and the researcher's final analysis and interpretations.

This research operationalized the method of focused synthesis. Thus, different data sources were collected and scrutinized. These data included archival data (policy documents at large from both the macro-level, and micro-level), and interviews to different subjects or participants at different phases or stages of the policy phenomena.

3.2.3 Participants

The participants or subjects of this study were: policy-makers; academic staff at the universities; and professors. All of these subjects were involved at different stages of the policy process related to these higher education reform policies.

Seven politicians were interviewed. Each of them participated as members of the Commission of Education, Economy, and Budget at the time of the sanctioning of the LHE, or as members of the Congress at large. Five of them belonged to the political minority (minority parties) and two of them to the political majority at the time the law was passed.

At the micro-level of the policy implementation, the academic staff interviewed could be situated at the middle level of the hierarchy at the universities. In total, thirteen interviews to academic staff were conducted. The interviewees were members of the Academic Secretariat at the universities or at specific schools. In other cases, they are “Directors of Programs of Studies” which make them carry duties of “program coordinators” or “department chairs”. It is noteworthy that two representatives of the academic staff at the public university had been in charge of coordinating and implementing the internal quality evaluation at the public university.

Access to this multifaceted group was achieved through informal contacts at the two universities. In order to diversify the data there was a selection of academic staff according to seniority to have representatives from different groups. In an overview, the academic staff which was interviewed had different positions in the organizational structure at these two universities. It is noteworthy that a couple of academic staffers offered voluntarily to others who had been interviewed to participate in the study.

In the case of professors, fifty eight interviews were conducted. Approximately, 50% of this number worked at the private university. Only one professor worked at both settings.

Access to these subjects was obtained through formal and informal networking. They were selected based on availability and possibility of access to them. Professors were very open and spoke candidly when interrogated. The interviews took different lengths, in at least twenty cases, a couple of hours. There were six professors who had participated in a previous study conducted by this researcher. They became key-informants within this research about the dynamics at the institutional level.

Professors were of different seniority, different areas of knowledge, and different positions at the university. Professors had different credentials, from master degrees to

professional degrees such as architects and lawyers, as well as professors with Ph.Ds. or in the process of obtaining their PhDs. Professors interviewed worked exclusively at each university. There was one case of a professor who worked at both universities. Approximately 52% of the faculty could be labeled as junior (with ten years or less), 48% of the professoriate could be considered senior faculty (with more than ten years as professors).

The main criterion for sample selection was the conceptual framework for the study and the definition of this research as a case of policy research. Additionally, networking with gatekeepers/ key informants and using the “snowball technique” were utilized to both identify and contact potential subjects in the study. Networking with gatekeepers was crucial in establishing connections and interviews with policy-makers. The “snowball” technique entails establishing contacts with key individuals who could introduce the researcher to, or offer contact information about, other subjects (policy-makers, academic staff, or professors) who might be able or interested in participating in the research. Networking with both policy-makers and subjects from the two universities, was vital in accessing data for this study. Due to the political and controversial conditions of the higher education reform movement in Argentina, the technique described ensured access to the subjects, trust to the researcher, and ultimately, availability of participants for this study.

3.2.4 Entering the field

Doing fieldwork was intrinsic to the character of this policy case study. Entering the field settings did not entail problems of access. In preparation for the data collection itself, the researcher communicated with key informants in the field in order to ensure a first round of

participants in the study. Then, while in Argentina, the researcher instrumenting networking techniques, allowed for more participants in the study, expanding their number.

The researcher entered the field bringing about different roles: first, as a former professor at the public university with ties to the institution, and later as a researcher. This double-role was beneficial to develop rapport, ensure trust, and empathy from the participants of the study.

3.2.5 Context of the settings

The primary setting of this study, two Argentinean universities are situated in the capital city of a province in Argentina. The province itself is situated in the region named Litoral, surrounded by rivers both east and west sides. The city itself sits 500 kilometers northwest from Buenos Aires. A year before the process of data collection for this study, the province and the city itself suffered a devastating flood which worsened latent socio-economic and financial problems within both the city and the province. 100,000 people were evacuated and one of the universities in this study had its campus partly flooded.

In the context of Argentina, the city is a middle-sized urbanized area. Its population is of 369,046 inhabitants, as per the national Census Indec of 2001 (Argentina, 2001). The metropolitan area of this city includes a population of about 454,238, making it the ninth largest in the country.

This city is the seat of three universities. There are two public universities and one private. The researcher selected as settings to this study two of the three universities, one public and the private with almost equivalent programs and degrees.

This case study entailed doing fieldwork at two universities, using data collection instruments rooted in the so-called ethnographic methods. It is crucial in doing fieldwork, to warrant the

preservation of identity of the participants and in this case the institutions where they work. Thus, the researcher used pseudonyms to label each setting (as well as the participants). The public university was named *University of the River*; and the private university was labeled *University of the Incarnate Word*⁵.

The *University of the River* (from now onwards, UR) was established first as a provincial university in 1889. Then, in 1919, after the reform movement of 1918, it was transformed into a public national university. The private university was inaugurated in 1959.

The *University of the River* is considered a middle-sized university in the nation because of its student population and the dimension of its campus. This university has been nationally and internationally known by two professional schools: School of Law and the School of Chemical Engineering. Students do not pay fees at this university which is fully funded by the national government.

The *University of the Incarnate Word* (from now onwards, UIW) is a private university affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church. The campus and its population are considered small in the national scope. This university was established to provide “Catholic views in the formation of students in the professions”. The most well known schools within this institution were the School of Architecture and the School of Law. Students pay fees while the university is partly funded by the national government.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION

3.3.1 Instruments for data collection

The policy research framework calls for the support and use of different sources of information to sustain the inquiry of a policy problem. Hence, in this research design, different instruments for data collection were used, selected from the dialogue between the conceptual framework and the methodology of policy research. Following Majchrzak' guidelines of different types of data to support policy research, the following instruments and data were operationalized:

Interviews: to policy makers (macro-level), academic staff, and professors at the university (micro-level).

Archival data: This includes policy documents, debates at the chamber of representatives before the sanction of the law, debates at the Senate before the law was passed, and institutional documents.

Educational policies do not arise in a vacuum. They are born from political conflicts, and agreements. In the particular case of Argentina, they mirror the intensity of the state's goals and role towards the higher educational system. Therefore, this research traced the construction, fate, and "interpretations" of policies from the stage most intrinsic to the role of the state and policy-makers at the governmental/state level, to the institutional level of the universities, where different actors, such as academic staff and the professoriate, interpret and re-construct the meanings of policies. As Majchrzak (1984) states, policies manifest through policy documents, as well as in the ways in which different actors or subjects construct their meaning and enact them. Additionally, as Taylor, et al. (1997) state, "policies are more than the text" (p. 15). Therefore, in order to explore in depth the policies themselves, it is crucial to triangulate the

information provided by policy documents with the ways in which different actors make sense of the policy process.

Archival data reveals the tensions and the policy priorities as expressed by policy-makers. They express the main issues that policy-makers identify as crucial. They also hide other macro-level influences and variables that influence representatives or senators' political choices.

3.3.2 Interviews and the interviewing process

Patton defines the purpose of interviewing simply as “to find out what is in and on someone else’s mind” (Patton, 1980, p. 196). In addition, interviewing is a key source for policy studies, because it allows the researcher to be in contact and to obtain information from crucial actors in the policy arena such as politicians, and policy makers at different institutional levels who could reveal vital details and information about the policy problem under analysis, and the meanings they could construct and extract from such policies (Marshall, 1984, p. 236). Murphy defines interviewing as a key method for data gathering while conducting fieldwork (1980, p. 75).

To overcome barriers and ensure entry, communications were developed with key informants or subjects at each institution and obtained through informal and familiar contacts with politicians. The premises proposed by qualitative interviewing (Patton, 1980) and by Marshall (1984) about establishing rapport and reciprocity with the subject interviewed were followed.

Additionally, open-ended interview protocols were designed to extract meanings and interpretations from different actors at different phases of the policy process.

It should be noted that interviews to all the participants in this study, were conducted in Spanish and consequently translated by the researcher. The researcher is a Spanish native

speaker, who preserved the interviews for analysis in Spanish and later translated them into English.

3.3.3 The interview protocols

The interviews were designed as an open-ended instrument to obtain informants' knowledge and meanings about the main issues under study. In addition, the interview protocols intended to obtain the background and context of both the policy design of reform policies and implementation because of the nature of this research as case study. The study follows Patton's guidelines for a "standardized open-ended interview" (Patton, 1980, p. 198). Thus, three types of protocols were designed: for interviews with politicians, for interviews with academic staff at the university, and for interviews with professors.

The interviews were organized following at large Patton's guidelines for open-ended interviews: "a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions with essentially the same words" (Patton, p. 198). Nevertheless, customized interviews were also set, especially when interviewing key informants at specific institutions while being sensitive to the peculiar dynamics of policy settings (Marshall, 1984).

The nature of each research question, allowed for the inquiry from interviews which were conducted within the notion of "intensive interviewing" (Murphy, 1980, pp. 77-78). Interviewing also permits at further stages of the research, to construct triangulation with the views and information displayed at the congressional hearings through the collective representations by political parties. The first section of each of the protocols was designed to elicit politicians,

academic staff, and professors' views on the LHE and focused on the changes introduced by the LHE either at the system of higher education in Argentina or at the institutional level.

The information that can be extracted from the interviews will also reveal the contradictions and “mismatches” between the aims of the policies at the macro-state level and their implementation at the micro-level of the institutions, through their fate from design to implementation. Furthermore, the interviews specify the specific understanding of distinctive stakeholders of the system. The interviewees illuminate patterns or themes throughout this policy research such as the tensional nature of the policies themselves, or the contradictions and struggles about implementation at two different universities. The interviews also represent the foremost avenue to explore the particular “take” on the policies that different policy actors at either macro or micro levels construct towards the higher education reform policies. The interviews also intend to obtain the actors' views and perceptions about the background, and factors influencing and framing the policies themselves.

One of the foremost sources of information to explore research questions 1 and 2 in a lesser degree is the interviewing of policy-makers (politicians) because of their vital role in the passing and sanction of the law itself and as “communicators” of the contradictory state's goals towards the higher education policies.

3.3.4 Description of interviews at the macro-level: interviews to politicians as policy-makers

Following the policy research framework as a road map to guide the data collection process, politicians identified as policy-makers were interviewed. Policy research indicates that policy-makers represent the foremost informants about the process through which policies were

constructed. In addition, authors such as Murphy (1980) and Marshall (1984) describe the specific and problematic nature of interviewing as instruments for research data collection at policy settings (Marshall, pp. 235-236).

Politicians are crucial in one stage of policy research, the policy design stage, which identifies the social problems that the policies intend to remediate. In the case of the Argentinean reform policies, politicians who participated in the congressional hearings before the law was sanctioned and while the law was sanctioned by both the ruling majority and minority parties, played a foremost role in designing the policies. They established goals and ideologies towards higher education, and translated them into policies for this sector.

Politicians were key informants also of the contested, controversial, and unsettling processes of the inceptions of the LHE (1995). Furthermore, following the policy analysis methodology, policy-makers were interviewed as a way of incorporating other data sources to reveal the complex nature of policy-design. In a further stage of data analysis, the information provided by politicians who participated in the design of the LHE and in the discussions in favor or against it within the congress will be triangulated with data provided by documents from congressional hearings.

Politicians were interviewed with the aim of attaining information to explore research questions #1 (“What are the goals of the state in the design of the Law of Higher Education?”), and research question #2 (“How will I characterize the nature of the reform movement?”) from the perspective of these stakeholders. They also gave essential background information about how the reform policies came about.

3.3.5 The interview protocol (politicians)

The interview protocol for politicians was designed and sustained by the conceptual framework, and the research questions and the first research questions that guide this research.

The interview protocol was also customized when interviewing one of the politicians who first participated as a Representative and after several years, he held a position in the public university (one of the settings of this study).

The first question in the general interview with politicians asked about “the conditions and type of relationships between the Argentinean state and the higher education system”. It also asked about the different steps through which the formation and sanctioning of the law circulated. This question had several sub-questions. The first one asked the politicians’ views about the “political conditions that influenced the design and passing of the LHE”. The second inquiry, requested information about the “goals of the LHE in the context of implementation of the reform policies”. The third question, asked: “what were the policies towards the higher education system used to support the design of the higher education reform?” The fourth asked about the inceptions of the formation of the LHE. The last sub-question was intended as a wrapping question: “what were the features and roles of the state in relationship with the reform policies implemented in higher education?”

The second set of questions within the open-ended protocol aimed to obtain politicians’ perspectives on academic professionalism. The first sub-question asked about the influence of the LHE on the work and life of the professoriate. The second sub-question asked about politicians’ conceptions about the role of academic professionals at the universities.

There was also a final question in the protocol which asked about the specific role of politicians in the case of the ones who were members of the Commission of Education, Budget,

and Economy at the Representatives' chamber. Due to the fact that the majority of the politicians interviewed were members of this commission, this question became not optional.

In general, politicians' interviews were extremely enriching about the background and the "behind the scenes" of the sanctioning of the LHE. These interviews shed light on the controversies, discussions, and agreements between different political parties before the LHE was sanctioned. Additionally, politicians clearly identify several influences or situations that both triggered or fuelled the environment for the sanction of the LHE, such as the influence of World Bank policies and the surprising shift of government's interest in the introduction of the higher education reform policies.

These interviews also provided information about the "trades" around these policies between the ruling party, Peronist Party, and the minority parties. Additionally, politicians speak candidly about their beliefs and goals towards the LHE itself. They also manifested their conceptions about academic professionalism and the role of the professoriate at the university very clearly and articulated with broadened views about improving educational quality. It was intriguing how much politicians also could explain the challenges and problems that universities faced while implementing the policies themselves.

3.3.6 The conceptual framework that supports the interviews with politicians

As it was aforementioned, the conceptual framework sustains the inquiry at different levels and at the stage of data collection the conceptual framework supported the design and selection of different data sources. In the case of the interviews to politicians, the conceptual framework was the backbone of the questions referring to the relationship between the Argentinean state and higher education system as well as the political environment of the state in proposing the

transformation of the system. The conceptual framework also supports the questions about issues of academic professionalism.

The first questions in the interview protocol for politicians articulate specific notions from the conceptual framework, such as the influences on the higher education reform movement of the so-called international agenda on higher education; the role of the national states and the introduction of the reform policies; and the multifaceted goals of the state in the design of the higher education policies. The protocol for politicians' interviews also intended the exploration of issues of academic professionalism from a policy perspective. The conceptual framework articulates these issues as components of the reform policies. Therefore, politicians who played a key role in the design of the policies themselves were interrogated about these problems.

3.3.7 Interviews at the micro-level: interviews to academic staff

Following the policy research framework as a road map to guide the data collection process, academic staff from each university was interviewed. Academic staff "behaved" in the process of implementation in a dual fashion, as "translators" of the broader policies, and as "implementers" or "managers" of the process. The number of academic staffers interviewed was ten.

Academic staff was one of the key actors whose positions and perspectives on the implementation process would be compared with professors' perceptions on the same issues. Additionally, the research-questions that guide this study depart from the premise that the academic staff had had a different role in the implementation process as compared to professors. Thus, a specific protocol was designed to interview the academic staff at the two universities.

The policy research framework indicates that in this case, institutional actors represent vital informants about the process through which policies were implemented. In addition, authors

such as Murphy (1980) and Marshall (1984) describe the specific and problematic nature of interviewing as an instrument for research data collection at settings where there is a policy implementation issue, in this case at two university settings (Marshall, pp. 235-236).

Academic staff at the two universities appear as the actors who formally (University of the River) or less formally (University of the Incarnate Word) were selected to lead the implementation process. In addition, the LHE itself somewhat proposes that role for the academic staff at any universities undergoing the reform process.

Overall, academic staff spoke candidly about the problems and obstacles in the implementation of the reform policies both at the institutional or school level. They also related issues of educational quality with the situation of the professoriate in the country in general and at the institutions or schools in particular. In the case of the private university, a couple of interviewees manifested concerns and asked the interviewer questions about confidentiality (which was explicit in the letter provided to them before the study took place).

The design of the interview protocols with academic staff also followed the guidelines of an open-ended interview (Patton, 1984).

3.3.8 The interview protocol for the academic staff

The interview protocol for the academic staff was designed to obtain information to illuminate the research questions of this study. Question number 1 in the protocol was designed to find information about the LHE as a broader policy and its process of implementation. Thus, it was designed to shed light on the first question in this research. This first question included several sub-questions about: the goals and objectives of the LHE within the goal of higher education reform, the main features of the reform policy implementation, the outcomes of the policy

implementation at the institution in a two-fold scope: at the level of the institution and sub-level of its schools.

The second question in the protocol for academic staff tries to obtain information about the process of policy implementation in a long term perspective. The third one, draws upon the previous one because it interrogates academic staffers about their role and functions at their schools, while implementing the reform policies, as well as the development of their relationship with professors in the context of the reform policy implementation.

The fourth question is rooted in the second and third research question of this study which explore not only how each actor at the institutional level perceives the reform policies towards academic professionals but also how these perceptions may have-if at all- affected the ways in which the reform policies themselves were implemented at the institutional level. One of the sub-questions probes on the relationships between different policies, e.g. with the implementation of accreditation and evaluation processes.

The fifth question in the protocol focuses on the views that academic staff has about academic professionals and their perceptions about the effect of the policies implemented on the current situation of academic professionals at the institutional level.

Finally, there is a question to obtain demographic information in terms of seniority of academic staff at the university and at their position.

3.3.9 The conceptual framework and the interview protocol for academic staff

The academic staff plays roles of mediators or translators of the higher education policies from the macro-level to the micro-level of the institutions. They assumed the role of not only providing specifications of the policies themselves, but also they become the organizers of the

implementation process. They play a key series of tasks within the institutions in their interactions with other actors at this level.

The interview protocols with academic staff at the university aimed to find information about how academic staff understands the LHE (1995) as a policy framework/ reform. Most importantly the interviews to academic staff, tried to elicit administrator's views about how the implementation of the LHE and other policies have affected the work of professors, their position at the university, and how crucial events in the policy implementation process, such as accreditation and evaluation programs, were seen by administrators.

These questions have been developed to obtain information about the ways in which the academic staff construct meanings about the policies as well as how they somewhat "filter" them and then selectively implement them at the institutional level. The protocol formulates questions to academic staff in order to elicit their views about institutional policies.

Academic staff was probed on how they conceive the notion of academic professionals and how they conceived the roles of the professoriate have been changed or maintained within the process of reform implementation.

3.3.10 Interviews with the professors

Professors were interviewed as one of the key informants in this study. Professors were interrogated to scrutinize how the higher education reform policies affected when implemented at the universities.

The point of departure for this study that sets its overall tone is the notion that in the process of policy implementation at the institutional level, there were intrinsic differences in the ways in which academic staff at the universities and professors understood, conceived, and made

meaning of the reform policies. Additionally, this research proposes the importance of “sense-making” within the institutions where different actors are involved and participating. Thus, interviewing professors as well as academic staff at the university shed light over these operations of “sense-making” at the institutional level.

3.3.11 The interview protocol for the interviews with professors

As it was aforementioned, this study follows the premises of open ended interviewing (Patton, 1984). Open-ended interviewing works when the interviewer repeats questions to different participants to obtain common themes that emerge from different participants about the same process (Patton, 1984). In addition, the interview protocol designed for professors shared two questions worded in different fashion, with the interviews with academic staff (questions number 2 and number 3).

The main goal in designing the interview protocols was to explore the distinctive ways in which professors and academic staff could understand the policies and implement them at the institutional level. Thus, this allows the further performance of triangulation.

Question number 1 in the protocol was designed to extract professors’ beliefs and views about the higher education reform policies. Its two sub-questions refer to the goals and objectives of the LHE within the higher education reforms; and the main features of implementation of these policies at the institutional level.

The second question was designed to explore the impact of the policy implementation at the institutional level, and it also probed the program of studies at the schools where professors work. The next sub-question was designed to obtain professors’ descriptions about the changes produced by the policy implementation at the institutional level within the last five years.

Question number 3 was delineated to explore if the implementation has affected the role and function of professors, probing also on their work situation in relation with colleagues. This particular question was also designed in order to explore the institutional relationships among professors in the context of the reform.

The next question specifically intended to obtain information on policy implementation related to accreditation and quality evaluation that have affected professors' work. The sub-question was designed to extract the functions of the professoriate when the reform policies started to be implemented. It also probed the professors' participation in the implementation of the policies themselves.

The next question (question number 5) and its sub-questions focused on professors' notions about academic professionalism. The first sub-question asked professors about the role and features of professors as academic professionals, probing autonomy in their work, decision-making power, curriculum design, political participation, and determination of workload between research and teaching. The next sub-question was developed as a "wrapping" inquiry about how professors understand their roles and how it has –if at all- been maintained, modified, or transformed with policy implementation.

The last question in the protocol was designed to extract demographic information about professors in terms of their seniority, type of courses they taught, and type of appointment.

In relations with each of the research questions, question 1 in the protocol intended to shed light on the first research question. Questions number 2 and 3 were rooted in the first and second research questions of this study. Additionally, question 4 illuminated the second and third research question of the study. Question number 5 in the protocol clarified the last research question that guides this study.

3.3.12 Conceptual framework revisited from professors' interview protocols

The interview protocol with professors was ingrained in the constructs related to the theoretical exploration of academic professionalism, as well as in the study of policy implementation dynamics at the institutional level. The questions intended to clarify issues of autonomy and professional features of academics in times of reform, because these are the features identified by the literature as vital components of academic professionals. In addition, the questions in the protocol for the professoriate were sustained in the construct that referred to the translation of macro level policies into the institutions (micro-level).

The questions for professors also intended to explore the constructs referring to the institutional processes of both the construction of meaning around the policies at the institution, and the implementation of them at the two universities. In addition, they also were designed to explore the views of the professoriate as the major actors affected by the implementation of the reform policies. The questions in the protocol of interviews with professors were designed to explore their role in the implementation of the policies at large, and the outcomes of their implementation on their work and status as professionals.

3.4 ARCHIVAL DATA

3.4.1 Archival data at the macro-level

The process through which laws come to exist in Argentina follows specific paths that need to be explicated. According to the Argentinean National Constitution (1994), for a law to be

considered by the national Congress, the bill could come from: the commission of “Education, Economy, and Budget” at the Representative’s chamber; or the President’s requests and project of a law to the Representative’s chamber. Then, the bill goes to the commission of “Education, Economy, and Budget” at the chamber of Representatives, and then is discussed by the full chamber of Representatives. Once debated, and revised, the project could go back to the commission or if no further changes are introduced to the project, could transit to the Senate. At the Senate, the project is discussed and debated where changes might be made. Then, the document goes back to the Chamber of Representatives and if there is no further debate or discussion, the chamber chooses whether or not to accept the text. After its approval, the project returns to the Senate, and gets finally sanctioned. To become a law and overcome its condition as a project, the project should then be sanctioned by the President of Argentina. The Argentinean President has veto power over the law. In other words the president could partially or totally reject the content of the bill. In the case there is a presidential veto, the law is not sanctioned and it comes back to the representative’s chamber. If the president does approve the law in its entirety, it should be officially sanctioned in no later than 8 days after the president approves it.

In order to explore the process through which the LHE came to life and the controversies and discussions behind its text there is a need to describe different documents, such as, the parliamentary debates surrounding the first version of the project for the LHE (which started in late 1994); the majority and minority dictums at the representative chamber; the debate in the Senate; and the message from the Argentinean President to call for and support one version of the bill. These documents are vital for the exploration of manifold issues about this educational policy document. First, they manifest the controversial and paradoxical features that the policy itself manifests, the goals of the Argentinean government in the design of the higher education

policies, the non-monolithic nature of the state itself and its different actors (policy-makers), and the different political interests that policy makers from the multi-party system in Argentina charged the LHE with. An in depth scrutiny of these documents, anticipate and shed light on specific trends that characterize the higher education reform movement. The main trends are related to issues of autonomy, the role of the state towards the system in terms of funding, the goal of quality improvement (in relationship with the professional development of the professoriate), and accountability and accreditation mechanisms.

The following policy documents were collected and will be analyzed:

1. Bill from the commission of Education, Budget, and Economy at the chamber of representatives and Dictum from the majority

a. The first bill from the Chamber of Representatives

Report from the Political Majority on the first project of the LHE

Report from the political minority at the Commission of Education, Budget, and Economy (March 1st, 1995)

b. Message from the President supporting the LHE (final text proposed)

c. The Congressional hearings on the LHE

Debate at the Representatives' Chamber

The debate of the bill at the senate

Thus, the next section describes the content of each of the aforementioned policy documents.

3.4.2 Bill from the commission of Education, Budget, and Economy at the chamber of representatives and Dictum from the majority

The parliamentary debate started when the “Commission of Education, Budget, and Economy” from the Chamber of Representatives proposed for consideration at the whole chamber the first “version” of the text of the LHE. This project was introduced by the commission on December 7th, 2004. After the bill was introduced there were also dictums from both the majority of the commission and the representatives from the political minority.

3.4.3 The first bill from the Chamber of Representatives

In an overview, the first project introduced by the representative Matzkin (from the political majority, Peronist Party) resembled the final text of the LHE. Nevertheless, there are some areas of difference and similarity that need to be described because they show areas of political tension or contradiction.

The first article of this project describes the coverage that the law provides of the different institutions that compose the higher education system in the country. This is a common theme that gets replicated in the final text of the law itself.

Then, in the second article, the role of the Argentinean state towards the higher education system is defined. This article states: “the national state is only responsible for the provision of public higher education. It is the state the one that recognizes the right to obtain higher education services...” (pp. 986-987). This article is repeated in the final text of the LHE.

The project presents the goals and objectives of higher education in the same way that the final text from the LHE shows. It is interesting however, that this article presents the goal of democracy as the social justice goal of the system.

The improvement of educational quality appears as a cornerstone in this first “version” of the LHE. In this section, there is a reference (which does not manifest in the same fashion in the LHE itself) to the relationship between improvements to the quality of the system with the need to “improve” professors’ development (p. 987). The document explains that the improvement of educational quality would be achieved through measures such as: “to add and diversify the opportunities of ‘actualization’ (‘actualizacion in Spanish) of professors and their professional development, and their “upgrade” (“conversion” in Spanish) and transformation as well as students, graduates, and administrators” (p. 987). Another road to quality improvement in the system is found in the “promotion of research within the system” (p. 987).

In addition, a new component of the system is introduced by establishing a system of statistic and educational information (p.988).

The other reference to professors’ professional development appears to be only linked to the professor’s teaching at non-university institutions (like community colleges). In a very interesting twist, their professional development relies on the “Federal Net for the Continued Professional Development of Teachers” (“Red Nacional de Formacion Continua de Educadores” in Spanish) which is in fact a system for teachers’ professional development. In other words, the system proposed is of professional development for educators working in elementary and secondary schools. Paradoxically, the professors teaching in these institutions are also required to pass an entry exam (“concurso” in Spanish) which is public and open (p. 988). This equates the entry to non-university institutions, to entry into universities. This requirement does not appear

replicated in the final text of the LHE. Furthermore, it is also stated that the quality of non-university institutions would also be assessed by the mechanisms stated in the Federal Law of Education (“Ley Federal de Educacion”, 1994) which was passed to revamp the elementary and secondary education system in Argentina.

The question of autonomy is manifested as “warranted” for all higher education institutions including non-university institutions. University autonomy is defined and specified. Universities are granted the capacity to “define and establish the system of entry to teaching and promotion of their own professors and administrators” (p. 990). Universities are granted capacity to “name or remove professors and administrators” (p. 990). These explicit references appear more defined in this version of the LHE than in the final text of the LHE.

In article number 31, the bill explains that “universities will warrant the professional development of their professors which should be aligned to the requirements of the academic career. This professional development will not be limited to the scientific or professional areas or pedagogical contents of the work. The professional development will be including interdisciplinary knowledge of different knowledge areas” (p. 990). This first version of the LHE mentions the professional development of professors as a component of “the conditions of university functioning” (p. 990).

Accreditation is only described for graduate studies, and that it should be in the hands of a so-called National Commission of Evaluation and Accreditation (p.990). This process will be broadened to undergraduate studies in the final version of the LHE. At the same time, the National Commission of Evaluation and Accreditation is endowed with power to evaluate and provide accreditation to “old and new programs at any university” (p. 991).

The study plans at the universities should be aligned with and should respect the “basic curriculum contents” (“Contenidos Curriculares Basicos” in Spanish) emanated from the Ministry of Culture and Education (p.991).

In the section related to the features and functioning of the universities, the issue of the entry to the academic profession is tackled. In the article number 45, the entry to the “academic career” is explained as: “an entry exam which is both public and open. The jury of the exam should be formed by professors who are “tenured” (by previous passing of the entry exam). Each university can hire people with exceptional academic conditions to teach as professors under exceptional situations. Each institution can name professors “in interim” until the exam gets scheduled and candidates evaluated. It appears also in this section that professors who have passed the entry exam can participate in the government structure of the university.

In this first version, the entry to the academic profession in private institutions does not require the entry exam, and it takes into account professors’ research and seniority working at the universities.

3.4.4 Report from the Political Majority on the first project of the LHE

The leader of the Commission of Education, Budget, and Economy of the Chamber of Representatives, Matzkin, stresses the warranty of institutional autonomy and the state’s role on ensuring educational quality. The representative also reformulates the relationship between institutional quality improvement and the role of the evaluation and accreditation system that this law intends to create (p. 996).

The report also explains that the minority members of this commission have questioned (the dissident minority) the creation of the Commission of Accreditation and Evaluation. The

majority report also mentions that the proposals referring to autonomy and autarchy of the universities was also questioned by the political minority members of this commission because they framed these aspects as “not well assured and depicted” (p. 996).

3.4.5 Report from the Political Minority at the Commission of Education, Budget, and Economy (March 1st, 1995)

The minority dictum about the bill, highlights several controversial aspects of the policies stressing that the bill presents that the role of the state as “warrantor of the social justice feature of higher education” is limited and somewhat restricted (p. 997). The minority also requests the inclusion of an addendum against discrimination in the text of the LHE (p.997).

The minority expresses in this dictum that it is necessary to make explicit the “gratuity and free access to higher education” (p. 997) which does not appear to be explained as such in this bill.

In this dictum, the political minority proposed a more detailed description of students’ rights (pp. 997-998), and a specification of the rights of the professoriate. The rights of the professoriate included “academic freedom” (“libertad academica” in Spanish), “ideological pluralism” (“pluralismo ideologico” in Spanish), “access to the profession by an entry exam (open and public)”, “dignified and fair salary” in accordance to the ranks, and professors’ appointments, “union participation”, and “sabbatical rights” in accordance to their ranks and positions (p. 998). It is noteworthy that the idea of specifically describing the rights of the professoriate will be recuperated in the final text of the LHE. Nevertheless, the “sabbatical rights” did not appear within the rights of the professoriate in the final version of the law.

The duties of the professoriate are not described in the minority dictum nor are their roles within the university. The minority dictum reiterates the need that institutions warrant professional development for professors (p. 1000). Additionally, this dictum makes references to professors and the system of entry exams. The submission of professors' CVs and background checking, appear as other requirements of entry for professors to be (p. 1001).

It is rather noteworthy that the minority dictum proposes the implementation of entry exams for the professors at private institutions. The dictum makes explicit that professors working at private universities need to be “subjected to the same regulations in terms of entry exams as professors in public institutions” (p. 1002).

The issue of institutional evaluation and accreditation is broadly described by the minority dictum (p. 1003).

The representatives from the Radical Party (Partido Radical, in Spanish) added a brief report to this dictum. They stress the need that the text of the law clearly manifests the vital role of the state in the support of public education, ensuring “free access, promotion of democratic values, equal opportunities, and autonomy and autarchy of universities” (p. 1004). The issue of ensuring institutional autonomy is a cornerstone in this report (pp. 1006-1007).

Another intriguing addition from the Radical Party to this minority report is the description of the “academic career” as different from the so-called “researchers’ career” (p. 1002). Again, as proposed in the broader minority dictum, professors need to be subjected to “periodic evaluations which should not affect their job security” (p. 1012).

There was a special report from two minority representatives (Alfredo Bravo and Carlos Alvarez) who manifested their caution to the introduction of the system of external evaluation and accreditation. These representatives also requested that the members of the Commission of

Evaluation and Accreditation should pass an entry exam and scrutiny before they become members of such a commission. These representatives reject the structure of finance and budget delineated in the first version of the LHE. The nature of their request and the tone of concern employed in their report shows also some “nodes” of concerns within the political minority that appear more relevant to specific political groups and not to all of the minority.

3.4.6 Message from the President supporting the LHE (final text proposed)

President Menem sent a bill re-stating a former project sent by the majority in the Chamber of Representatives which would be treated later in the Senate. The president attached a message stressing slightly specific areas of the policy that needed specificity related to the LHE. The presidential message defines the character of the law: “the idea behind the law is not of a law with details to rule about every aspect of the higher education system, but a law that will operate as a framework (in Spanish “una ley marco”). This law is conceived as an instrument for planning (“como un instrumento de planificacion” in Spanish). It provides a framework of basic general norms, allowing each institution to implement and regulate its implementation while reinforcing the autonomy of each institution” (p. 5010). After this, the message claims that “while every institution can regulate the implementation of the law, it must incorporate (“debe incorporar”, in Spanish) ways to introduce the changes proposed” (p. 5010).

This message distinguishes as the main targets within higher education reform the policies that define the system of creation and evaluation of private universities, and the system of evaluation and accreditation (p. 5015). The message also calls attention to the so-called academic career and conditions and requirements of entry to the academic profession (p. 5015). The message presents a brief description of the conditions for the academic career (p. 5016)

which should be developed through the system of entry exams (p. 5016). The presidential message states that the system of entry exams should ensure the quality in the “selection of academic personnel” (p. 5016). The message adds: “the level of quality of higher education depends on the quality of teaching and research at each institution” (p. 5016).

It is noteworthy that the presidential message frames the system of “entry exams” or “concursos” as “defective” (p. 5016) but it is the only instrument that has shown “efficacy and effectiveness in the selection of academic personnel, which gets public warranty” (p. 5016). The president adds that the system of entry exams must be maintained “to ensure the quality of academic careers” and “the quality of education offered by each university” (p. 5016).

This document which appears signed by both the president and the national ministry of Education and Culture, by specifically stressing certain dispositions within the law, signals the types of national policies that the government supports towards the higher education system. It is noteworthy, that the issue of institutional autonomy does not appear in a question replaceable by another governance system (p. 5010). Nevertheless, the presidential report while declaring the full support of institutional autonomy adds that the new law should “establish new and indispensable regulations to introduce changes and innovations that would update the system to the challenges of the current times. These new regulations intend to integrate the higher education system effectively” (p. 5010). Therefore, there is a declared support for the autonomy of the institutions but also a declared duty of the institutions to implement the law’s dispositions and regulations, while respecting the text of the law itself.

3.4.7 The Congressional hearings about the LHE

The Congressional hearings' documents have two sections: the debate at the Representatives' Chamber and the debate at the Senate.

Debate at the Representatives' Chamber

The debates at the Representative Chambers happened during the month of May and June of 1995. They developed after the chamber of representatives received a new bill this time from the Argentinean President (this bill is mirrored in the final text of the LHE). The president of the chamber (Pierri) opened the debate of the LHE where several representatives described their critiques or support for the text of the law itself. The representatives also requested specific addendums or modifications to the text of the law itself.

In an overview, the representatives from the Peronist Party which was the political majority, expressed their support for the first text of the law, e.g., expressing that the law “is a progressive plan to adapt the higher education institutions to the challenges derived from the global economy demands, and the national commitments of social justice that call for the formation of professionals with ethic commitments” (Representative Castro, p. 1113).

Representatives from other political parties claim that there is a need for an in depth discussion of this initiative proposed by the president about the LHE. Representative Bullrich claims that there is an “apparent rush” in getting the law passed to the Senate from the representative chambers without further discussions (p. 1117). From the discussions that follow her intervention, it is clear that there was a previous attempt to treat the project of the LHE a year before but got postponed or dismissed as a policy priority (Representative Mathov, pp.1117-1118). Other representatives explain that they postponed the treatment of different bills because there were meetings and discussions that the commission of Education, Budget, and Economy

had held with national professors unions (CONADU, and FATUM), students' federations, and the National University Council (CIN) (Representative Castro, p. 1121). It is not clear by these discussions if these meetings were actually transmitted into the text of the projects about the LHE. But, one of the representatives stated that "the commission has listened to all the groups and recovered their concerns and requests in the bill" (Representative Castro, p. 1121). Nevertheless, when the representatives requested additions to the bill, there was an addition of the concerns expressed by the CONEAU which were presented in a document.

Finally, different representatives (Bravo, Mathov, Camano, Matzkin, Natale, Alvarez, and Bullrich) raised the need to further discuss the bill and vote on it before being transferred to the Senate (pp. 1121-1137). Representative Alvarez calls for an in depth discussion of the project for the LHE because the situation of this law is similar to other "very conflictive and contradictory laws" (p. 1138). There was a point in the debate that one representative, Galvan, threatened to leave the chamber with all the members of the minority (p. 1139) claiming the need for further discussion of the bill. After this, the debate about the LHE continued.

In an overview, the debate mostly focused not as much in the content of the bill itself, but on issues of political places and preeminence within the chamber itself. There were discussions about previous procedures and ways in which other bills were passed but little discussions on the content of the law itself. What these discussions manifested was the controversial nature of transforming this bill into a law in itself. They also showed a clear division between the representatives who supported the bill itself who belonged to the majority, and the ones who did not support it, who were in the minority (p. 1185).

Representatives such as Natale (from Democrata Progresista Party), and Duranona y Vedia (from Modin Party) from different political parties declared their rejection to the text of

the bill. Finally, from 131 representatives, 114 voted to pass the bill to the Senate, and 16 voted against it (p. 1155).

Finally, the project was passed to be considered at the Senate with minimal changes from the final text that the law acquired.

After this debate, different representatives requested additions to the law sections which were significant and intriguing in the context of this study. These additions were pronounced in areas of policy which were argued as relevant within higher education by the representatives. For example, Representative Acenolaza from the Peronist Party (pp. 1185-1205) criticized the actual work of the professoriate within universities “because at the Argentinean universities there are professors who do not actually teach. They call themselves researchers but they disregard the idea that professors have two obligations: teaching and conducting research in their field” (p.1191). This representative also rejected the notion of tenure and of appointment at one university (“dedicacion exclusive” in Spanish) as a “key issue for the functioning of the university” (p. 1191). He also requested an addendum to the text of the law where it should have been stated that professors’ salaries should have related to only “the amount of actual hours of work teaching at the university” (p. 1191). The same representative later claimed that professors’ salary should have represented their background and their academic conditions (p. 1195). Therefore, he proposed a so-called “differential salary” system (p. 1196), which would increase or decrease according to professors’ productivity (p. 1196).

This representative also requested an addendum about the distinction in the law of “free access” and “free educational services” which are rooted in the notion that the state is the provider of the financial budget that supports the system (p. 1198). Acenolaza explained that these notions did not obliterate the idea that universities “could seek to dispose of other sources

of funding to ensure social equity and free educational services” (p. 1198). In his disposition, it was clear that universities could not request students’ fees but could provide external services to obtain resources.

Another representative, Venesia (Peronist Party), actually requested the addition to the document to be considered in the Senate in a report sent by the National Federation of Professors. This report, stressed the need to ensure autonomy and autarchy in each institution (p. 1206). It also claimed the introduction in the law text, a clear specification of the notion that professors would receive “for equal work, equal salary” (p. 1206). Regarding the law’s requirement of professors’ professional development, the Federation called for the support financially and institutionally from each university (p. 1206). The other vital issue expressed in this addendum was the need to maintain and strengthen the system of “concursos” or entry exams (p. 1207) for the initiation into the academic profession. This report also explained that the “main resource of quality and productivity at the universities are their professors” (p. 1208). In addition, it explained that the so-called academic career should include professional development of professors, and an institutional evaluation to allow improvement within the hierarchical structure of the university (p. 1208).

Representative Blasco asked for additions tackling the issue of governance of the institutions, calling for the direct election of university presidents (p. 1220) instead of being elected indirectly by professors.

Representative Muller requested to consider focusing in the final text of the law, the importance of non-university higher education institutions. She also claimed that there was a need to “decentralize” the university system (p, 1222). She reiterated her support to the system as delineated in the bill which appeared as “open, participatory, and decentralized” (p. 1223). This

representative also called for a deeper connection between the different types of institutions within the system itself (p. 1222),

Representative Bullrich stressed the need to consider the situation of economic and financial crisis that was affecting the educational system from elementary education to the university (p. 1223). She called for the creation of a system of scholarships to help students with no financial means or resources (p, 1224). Additionally, she made explicit the need to articulate to the different institutions that compose the system. Finally, she manifested her support for the creation of a National Council of Evaluation and Accreditation and the support of her party to such an initiative (her party was a leftist oriented party, Alianza) (p. 1225).

Representative Gimenez tackled the issue of teaching as defining the role of the professoriate at the universities (p. 1225). He also made the connection clear between the “reform of the state, and the new social economic model adopted in Argentina which demanded changes in the higher education system to adapt the system to the new economic and financial dynamics” (p. 1226). This representative added that there is a need for introducing “efficiency into the system itself” (p. 1226) to enhance its educational quality (p. 1226). This representative also made explicit his support for the system of “entry exams for the professoriate, the system of ‘periodic teaching’ of courses, and respect for the demands of the academic career” (p. 1227). He also asked to make explicit in the text of the law that educational quality could be improved by “improving scientific research, and by the system of selection of the professoriate” (p. 1228).

Representative Nino called for the “need to articulate the research activities at the university with the national state’s and university goals” (p. 1235). He found that evaluation of teaching and research is a crucial component for the improvement of educational quality (p. 1235).

The debate of the bill at the senate

The debate at the senate started on June 20th, 1995. The senate listened and considered not only the text of the law itself but the dictums from the majority and the minority (p. 2881).

The debate itself was initiated by the members of the “Education Commission” at the senate. Senator Rivas (from the Radical Party) defined the LHE as a “general instrument, a general framework, or a general norm to regulate the higher education system” (p. 2880). He also defined this law as the “continuation or completion [continuacion in Spanish] of the Federal Law of Education” (p. 2881)”. Senator Rivas requested the senate to “accept and not reject the first bill from the chamber of Representatives” (p. 2881). One of the reasons of his support is because “this law focuses on the free cost of the university and its autonomy” (p. 2882). He also stressed the vital role of the national state in the support of the higher education system.

After senator Rivas’ speech, Senator Cendoya (Radical Party) claimed the need to consider before approving the LHE the observations and additions from the national professors’ unions (p. 2886), because, according to Cendoya, the bill itself proposed a “fragmented, dispersed, and diffused law” with an “interventionist state” (p. 2886). He also saw a hidden intent of “introducing students’ fees” as an “option” in the bill which he rejected (p. 2886).

Senator Menem (brother of the President) claimed that the law in fact supported with no confusions, the “gratuity and equity of education” (p. 2887). Senator Cendoya gave another speech expressing that “there is a need to consider the reports and diagnosis from the World Bank about the situation of higher education” as a “line to follow” (p. 2889). Nevertheless, he sustained that the system of “accreditation and evaluation proposed by the bill was negative” and of “negative outcomes” (p. 2891).

Senator Romero Ferris (Autonomous Party in Corrientes) supported the notion that the country needed a law that could provide a general framework (p. 2893). He identified as a cornerstone in the LHE, the free access and “gratuity” of the system of higher education (p. 2893). Nevertheless, he manifested his objection to the bill.

Senator Bordon (Alliance Party) described as an endemic problem in the higher education system, the low salaries of professors (p. 2901) because the main issues in higher education were the problems of its financial structure (p. 2901). Bordon proposed the increment of the percentage of NGP that the country invested on higher education. He also explained that “there is a need to ‘upgrade’ and improve quality within the system” (p. 2906). For that reason, senator Bordon explained, there was a need for a shorter law than the one proposed by the chamber of representatives (p. 2908).

Senator Aguirre Lanari described the new requirements in terms of research and academics as a way to overcome the current “confusion between the exercise of teaching, learning and political activism of both professors and students” (p. 2913).

Senator Menem gave a second speech disregarding the “accusations” of the bill under consideration as the result of a “quick and no careful consideration” at the chamber of representatives (p. 2918).

Senator Villarroel (Frente Civico y Social de Catamarca) characterized the bill as a “precarious normative” (p. 2920).

Senator Cafiero (Peronist Party) defined “the main achievement of the law was the introduction of a system of accreditation and evaluation of institutions and programs to improve the quality of higher education” (p. 2925). He stressed the need to ensure a system of quality indicators and indicators for accreditation “rooted in national historical experiences” (p. 2926),

and not based on foreign systems” (p. 2926). It is noteworthy that this senator called for “passing a different law” (p. 2926). This senator also described the debate at both the representative chambers and the senate as “more aggressive and acrimonious than the debate before sanctioning the new Constitution in 1994” (p. 2924).

Senator Storani (Radical Party) described the bill as a text that assured “academic freedom and autonomy” (p. 2933). Nevertheless, he found that there was still a need in the law text to reflect the demands and “beliefs of the academic community” (p. 2933). He was in fact referring to the various requests and critiques to the bill from the national professors’ unions (p. 2933).

Senator Vaca explained that the bill defined autonomy in a broad fashion and as “autonomy aligned with the type of institutions we currently have” (p. 2936). He also sustained that universities did not currently have financial help or enough resources and that the structure proposed by the bill provided a more resourceful financial structure for the universities (p. 2939).

Senator Storani (Radical Party) claimed that the law had articles that targeted the main issues or problems that only one university in the whole country had, which was the UBA (University of Buenos Aires or Universidad de Buenos Aires in Spanish). Senator Vaca questioned senator Storani’s words claiming that the problems diagnosed by the law are shared by other universities and that the bill contemplated that reality (p. 2941).

Senator De la Rúa (Radical Party) defined the content of the law as a “threat to institutional autonomy”, more specifically by the introduction of a Commission of Accreditation and Evaluation (p. 2945). He also questioned the law because it did not “warranty free access, equal opportunities, and university autonomy” (p. 2946).

Senator Genoud (Radical Party) presented the law as contradictory because “it regulates the autonomy of each institution” (p. 2959). After Genoud’s speech, Avelin declared that he would vote against the bill because it “lessens institutional autonomy” (p. 2974).

A couple of senators requested additions to the law. One of the most noteworthy additions came from senator Massat. Massat asked to have an explicit section in the law that specified that each university should establish the minimal required time and course workload (p. 3042).

The law was finally passed on August 7th, 1995.

3.4.8 The conceptual framework and the selection and analysis of archival data

The conceptual framework composes the backbone for the selection and analysis of the archival data. The constructs that archival data help scrutinize are related to seeing the reform policies as components of the “reform of the state” in Argentina which resulted from the influence of globalization over the national state. In addition, the archival data sheds light on the conflictive processes of policy design and the non-monolithic nature of the state.

The conceptual scaffold also encounters the archival data in the ways in which issues of academic governance of higher education are delineated in higher education reform policies. The constructs related to issues of autonomy of universities or the relationships between the state and universities are informed by the archival data. In addition, archival data illustrated the notions about the role of academic professionals at the time the reform policies were designed.

Most importantly, the policy making process highlights the conceptual framework of policy research within the archival data.

3.4.9 Archival data at the micro-level

After the LHE was passed in 1995, universities needed to “adjust” to a somewhat new policy environment. As it was described before, the LHE became a “framework law” or a “general act” that issued general policy guidelines for both universities and non-university institutions. By the end of 1995 and 1996, while a couple of universities publicly rejected the LHE and initiated judicial causes to declare the unconstitutionality of the law itself, others started to gauge the content of the regulation and planned the steps ahead for the full implementation of its clauses.

This study analyses two universities that were “caught” in this context at different phases of their institutional histories. The public university (UR) had already initiated a process of self-designed institutional evaluation. When the LHE was passed, the university was preparing a document that would see the light as a “Basic document orienting a curricular diagnosis”, which became the first component of the so-called “Millennium Program”. While data was collected for a previous study with only this university as a research setting, all the subjects interviewed found the “Millennium Program” as the main institutional source that guided the reform of the plan of studies at each school. This policy was translated to the professors by the academic staff at each institution as a somewhat “written in stone” policy which needed to be applied by all means. The diagnosis it provided as well as its detailed desegregation of institutional data allowed the Academic Secretariat at the university to compose a document that established guidelines of “reform” priorities. Originally, the diagnosis itself was conceived as an institutional instrument to gauge its resources, personnel, and future lines of action. When the LHE was passed, the instrument provided the basis to articulate the first phase of implementation of specific reform policies. As it was aforementioned, the alignment of the plans of studies to the contents provided by the MCyE was one of the guidelines that emerged from the LHE. Therefore, the “Millennium

Program” acquired that feature as it targeted other institutional areas such as the work of the professoriate, and the improvement of quality at the institutional level.

The “Millennium Program” was defined as a “programmatic proposal for the curricular transformation” (1996). The first version of this document is from July 4th, 1996. The authors of this document are the Academic Secretariat of the university. There is a “lag” between the time when the first version of the Millennium Program appeared, its second version (1999), and its actual implementation (1999-2000).

In an overview, the Millennium Program makes a convergence between the LHE’s general regulations and institutional aims or goals. It also reformulates from an institutional perspective certain policy areas like the plan of studies reform to align the curriculum transformation to national reform policies consecrated by the LHE. It also represents points of inflection of the institutional reform policies to both maintain and strengthen its autonomy and to paradoxically make the institutional policies converge with the governmental requirements. The Millennium Program critiques the plans of studies operating in the mid 1990s at this university. It proposes even new systems to organize the curricula, e.g. through the so-called “curricular spaces” (Millennium Program, 1996, p. 63).

The program provides a lighthouse for university and school political decisions related to the organization of curricula to achieve “efficiency” and “quality improvement” (pp. 49-51). It also proposes to respect the “autonomy of students” while ensuring “efficiency in the management of time and work related resources of the professoriate” (pp. 11-13).

The staff at the Academic Secretariat at the UR, defined what they label as an “operational priority”, “the update of curricular contents”, “new ways to provide professional development to professors and students incorporating new technologies”, and a policy of

“innovation and overcoming the lack of update of curricular contents for undergraduate studies” (no page #). The other “operational priorities” that appear repeated in several sections of the Millennium Program is defined as “flexibilization” in terms of both the programs of studies and the “efficient management of plans of studies at each school”. To achieve all these priorities, the academic secretariat proposed the re-organization of programs and curricula.

The Millennium Program situated the starting process for the curricular reform in 1994, when the academic secretariat at the university with the “Direction of Academic Planning” (Millennium Program, p. 3) embarked into a curricula evaluation at the university. The next phase was the organization of “Ateneos” or meetings organized by the Academic Secretariat. These meetings had guests speakers who focused on specific issues related to curricula transformation (p. 3). The Academic Secretariat from the university invited to the “Ateneos” the Deans and Academic secretaries from each school, members of the Executive Council at each school, pedagogical advisors and members of the Academic Secretariat at the university (Millennium Program, 1996, p. 9).

After each of these meetings, there were written documents describing previous Atones that were sent to each school for further discussion. Nevertheless, the Millennium Program explains that neither the academic staff from each school nor other actors within the school sent any written response discussing the conclusions, or reflections, generated at these meetings (Millennium Program, p. 9). There was also lack of continuity in the presence of academic staff at these meetings (Millennium Program, p. 12).

One of the major critiques and guidelines for a transformation program within the Millennium Program is to introduce “flexibility in the curriculum” which entails several options in terms of both students’ requirements and professors’ work. The document proposes under the

label of “flexibility” the development of plans of studies with no need to attend classes and mostly all courses are electives. In addition, the other aspect related to flexibility of plan of studies should aim to reinforce the “autonomy of students” (p. 11).

This document also described as an obstacle for the development of the curricular transformation the “extreme individualism of the professors within the university” (Millennium Program, p. 18). This feature added to the “independent attitude of some professors” runs against the ones who want to support curricular changes (Millennium Program, p. 19).

After drawing upon the discussions and general critiques from Ateneos, the Millennium Program proposes the guidelines for the development of a successful curricular change. For example, there is a need to develop “efficient plans of studies in terms of time and resources” (p. 21); “minimum demands to students in each course is to at least be able to accurately express themselves in writing or orally”; and “professors need to ask themselves if they are well prepared to teach well” (p. 21).

It is noteworthy that one of the guest speakers at the Ateneos was a representative from the Ministry of Culture and Education. The Millennium Program also recovers the guidelines for the design of curricula proposed by the Ministry’s representative as a requirement for the re-designing of the curricula.

Additionally, the Millennium Program gauges the time that professors devote to teaching, research, working with colleagues, and service (Millennium Program, p. 36). The document questions the type of information provided by each school as “imprecise” (Millennium Program, p. 36). It is claimed that professors do not communicate with the academic staff about the real and actual time they spend teaching, doing research, or exchanging with colleagues (Millennium Program, p. 36).

One of the curricular guidelines defined by the Millennium Program is about the system of correlation between required courses (Millennium Program, p. 47). The document described it as rather prescriptive (Millennium Program, p. 47) because “it limits the autonomy of decision-making of students” (Millennium Program, p. 47). The system is described as “rigid” (p. 48). Therefore, the document suggests that this rigidity also conflicts with the efficient use of “human resources” across and within schools (Millennium Program, p. 49). After this, the Millennium Program explains that each plan of study should reform the hierarchical relationship between courses. The document manifests that the “courses that have a larger number of professors identify the most important courses within a plan of studies” (Millennium Program, p. 52).

The Millennium Program recommends for the new curriculum to be efficient. Thus, it explains that there is a need to transform the course structure into courses where there is no need for students to attend classes (p. 60). The program explains that “the new curricula should choose forms of teaching classes outside classrooms or actually attending classes, but still with professors’ overall coordination” (p. 60). The document clearly establishes that for the senior courses, the new plans of studies should have less hours of class attendance (Millennium Program, p. 60). The document proposes that these courses should even have group evaluations and not operationalized in the regular structure of classes (Millennium Program, p. 61). The document goes beyond that description and states that courses in areas where there is research in labs, the time professors spend in classes should be reduced. The Millennium Program also finds that in Social Sciences or Humanities there is also the need to reduce the number of hours of students’ attendance in classes (Millennium Program, p. 62).

The Millennium Program portrays as a major institutional obstacles for the improvement of educational quality at the institution, the liberal fashion in which professors work in their

teaching, their research, and their service (pp. 61-62). The document describes how this system obeys to “personal or intra-institutional agreements and not to the written norms” (p. 62). The document even criticizes the lack of precise information that the academic staff at each school has related to these aspects of professors’ work (Millennium Program, p. 62). The Millennium Program states that “there is a need of deeper knowledge and control of hours and work of the professoriate at each school” beyond the hours that professors teach (p. 62).

The Millennium Program proposes changes in the system of student evaluations because it identifies them related to “curricular spaces” instead of “curricular courses” (Millennium Program, p. 63). The document criticizes the system of courses and the lack of courses of general knowledge. Therefore, it proposes their replacement by “cycles” or “areas of studies” (p. 64).

Another major problem described by the Millennium Program in the current plans of studies is the long lengths of undergraduate studies (p. 110). Accordingly, the Millennium Program calls for the “optimization” of the duration of plans of studies (p. 110). Additionally, it suggests the reduction of the number of courses, and the lengths of undergraduate studies (p. 110).

Finally, the Millennium Program defines the process of curricular reform as “an autonomous process where the university exercises its autonomy as an institution” (Millennium Program). It also defines political areas for the reform, different political levels of reform, and criteria for the implementation of the reform policies (pace, programming, broad coverage, initial intensity, and correlation of the policies) (Millennium Program).

The program describes the curricular reform as actually lead, designed, and organized by the academic staff at each school (Millennium Program, p. 9).

3.4.10 Revisiting the conceptual framework from the description of archival data at the institutional level

The conceptual framework contends the importance of the institutional dynamics when they construct policy meaning in policy implementation. It is also highlighted in the conceptual framework the misalignments or tensions between policy design and implementation. The conceptual scaffold illuminates the key role of the academic staff as implementers of the policies themselves.

The analysis of archival data from the institutional level, allows the exploration of how the institution planned and programmed the implementation of national reform policies. It is also proposed in the conceptual framework that the national reform policies (namely the LHE) were broad and needed to be specified and detailed at the institutional level. The Millennium Program sheds light on this specific detailing and specification of the national policies.

Additionally, the archival data illustrates that one of the problems selected as an institutional policy priority was the relationship between improvement of educational quality and the role of the professoriate. The archival data also depicts the tensions between academic staff and professors.

3.4.11 Archival data (private university)

The second setting in this study is a private university (UIW) which is located in the same city as UR in a province of Argentina.

By the time the data collection process was conducted, this university was drafting a general document for the process of institutional evaluation and accreditation of plans of studies

(“Guidelines for the accreditation and evaluation of the schools and plans of studies at the Catholic University-DRAFT, 2004”). This document was in fact attached to a working document that was being prepared at one of the schools at the university (School of Architecture).

This draft of a document (with no authorship defined), has only 12 pages of length. Although it is a broad and general document that intends to translate the specific national regulations about quality evaluation at the institutions and accreditation. It is eloquent in other aspects of the policy implementation process under scrutiny. First, it manifests the stage or phase of reform that this university was undertaking. Second, the document is more as a “laundry list” of indicators and guidelines that need to be initially gauged to proceed to the institutional evaluation at the school level. Third, the document intends to combine the centralized lead process with a decentralized aim of allowing each school to continue with a second phase of evaluation and quality assessment.

In the case of the School of Architecture, the document describes as the main obstacles for both the improvement of educational quality and an “efficient management of resources”; the current structure of correlation between courses is horizontal and not vertical. The report also describes the need for more specific courses that would allow students to have closer interactions with professors, an idea which is rooted in the epistemological features of the field of Architecture.

It is noteworthy that while the general/ institutional section of these guidelines are closely related to national policies, the “school-oriented” portion of the report revisits using even the same terminology. The document expresses criticism about the amount of time professors dedicate to research against teaching. Teaching is described as the foremost activity for the professoriate. The report highlights the need to have more professors dedicated to both research

and teaching. It also gauges the amount of professors who are acquiring more credentials, such as PhDs or second Masters which is described as still insufficient to obtain not only an auspicious assessment of quality but also a future accreditation of new plans of studies.

There are references to the academic staff at the universities as the ones who would have “managerial power” in setting the pace and specific provisions at each school. Nevertheless, the university itself designed a group of “specialists” (“especialistas en educacion” in Spanish) to work providing advise and guidance with the groups from each school. In the case of the school of Architecture, several professors were invited to participate and collaborate in this endeavor. It is not clear in the document if professors will have the actual decision-making ability on certain processes such as the reform of a new plan of studies.

It is relevant to the purpose of this study to explain that the private university postponed or was later involved in designing a document to translate the regulations from the LHE. This appears to achieve a rather different situation as compared to the public university. It is also intriguing the short length of the document in terms of the institutional scope of the processes which apparently, UIW “dropped” in the hands of each school.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Within a qualitative case study methodology, the purpose of data analysis is to identify, extract, and analyze the main “themes” or trends that the different data sources provide in light of the research questions that guide the study. The identification of themes from the data has been operationalized in stages. First, while the researcher listened and translated the interview tapes (emergent thematic analysis); second, utilizing the constructs identified in the aforementioned

conceptual framework of the study to specifically translate into codes to categorize the data. The method of focused synthesis will be operationalized to critically analyze the data. Finally, the constant comparative methodology will be instrumented to contrast, compare, and compose conclusions in light of the main issues under scrutiny.

3.5.1 Instruments for data analysis

The use of N*6 (N.U.D.I.S.T 6) as an instrument for data analysis, allows the researcher to revisit the conceptual framework for data analysis as well as a model of categories, and hierarchical relationships between the main notions aforementioned at the beginning of chapter 3 (Huberman & Miles, 1984, pp. 55-56). Huberman and Miles explain: “Codes are categories. They usually derive from research questions, hypothesis, key concepts, or important themes” (Huberman & Miles, p. 56). Thus, the main goal of extracting categories and coding the data is to identify the major themes that different data sources provide in light of the conceptual framework of the study.

The conceptual hierarchical model crystallized in the node tree (N*6) appears at the crossroads of the concepts that support this inquiry and the research questions that guided this work. The main purpose of the node tree is to allow both analysis and systematization of the data as well as their iterative analysis. The hierarchical conceptual model also permits the retrieval, collection, and systematization of information that could ultimately be the foreground for triangulation. The operational searches that the use of this software allows are instrumental for the development of triangulation.

The structure of the node tree replicates the conceptual framework proposed in this chapter. In addition, due to the iterative nature of coding and theme selection, more detailed constructs (smaller in scope) are envisioned in a further stage of data analysis.

Figure 1: REPORT ON NODES FROM Tree Nodes '~/'

REPORT ON NODES FROM Tree Nodes '~/'

Depth: ALL

Restriction on coding data: NONE

(2) /diss
(2 1) /diss/Conceptual coding
(2 1 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional
(2 1 1 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/specificationnational policies
(2 1 1 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/participation and policy making process institutional level
(2 1 1 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/Goals for policy making institutional level
(2 1 1 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/comparison state policies and institutional pol
(2 1 1 5) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/quality improvement and role of academics
(2 1 1 6) /diss/Conceptual coding/Micro-level Institutional/academic staff and the professoriate
(2 1 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level
(2 1 2 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/role of the state in higher ed
(2 1 2 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/context pressures
(2 1 2 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/state university relations
(2 1 2 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/university autonomy
(2 1 2 5) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/goals of reform movement globally
(2 1 2 6) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/Argentinean state goals
(2 1 2 7) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/Tensions missal between design and implementation
(2 1 2 8) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/general policies towards the professoriate
(2 1 2 9) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/quality evaluation and improvement
(2 1 2 10) /diss/Conceptual coding/Macro level/other state policies towards the higher ed sector
(2 1 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession
(2 1 3 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Description of professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals
(2 1 3 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/professional status
(2 1 3 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate
(2 1 3 3 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate/In the reform movement
(2 1 3 3 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate/In the higher education system

(2 1 3 3 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate/Roles in Schools and Universities

(2 1 3 3 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate/Roles in quality improvement

(2 1 3 3 6) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Roles of professoriate/Concursos

(2 1 3 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/WORK of professoriate

(2 1 3 5) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy

(2 1 3 5 1) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/curriculum and pedagogy

(2 1 3 5 2) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/Control and Determinacy of workload

(2 1 3 5 3) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/Relationship with university management

(2 1 3 5 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/Faculty assessment and evaluation

(2 1 3 5 5) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/Political participation

(2 1 3 5 6) /diss/Conceptual coding/Impact of macro-level policy dimensions on academic profession/Professional Autonomy/professional improvement posgrados

(2 1 4) /diss/Conceptual coding/secondroundgral

(2 1 5) /diss/Conceptual coding/miscellonreformandacademicprof.

(2 3) /diss/Base coding

(2 3 1) /diss/Base coding/Policy-makers or politicians

(2 3 2) /diss/Base coding/University of the River

(2 3 2 1) /diss/Base coding/University of the River/Academic staff and administrators

(2 3 2 2) /diss/Base coding/University of the River/Junior faculty

(2 3 2 3) /diss/Base coding/University of the River/Faculty between

(2 3 2 4) /diss/Base coding/University of the River/Senior Faculty

(2 3 3) /diss/Base coding/University of the Incarnate Word

(2 3 3 1) /diss/Base coding/University of the Incarnate Word/Academic staff or administrators

(2 3 3 2) /diss/Base coding/University of the Incarnate Word/Junior faculty private

(2 3 3 3) /diss/Base coding/University of the Incarnate Word/Intermediate Faculty (private)

(2 3 3 4) /diss/Base coding/University of the Incarnate Word/Senior Faculty

(2 3 4) /diss/Base coding/Type of position for academic staff and professors

(2 3 4 1) /diss/Base coding/Type of position for academic staff and professors/Full time

(2 3 4 2) /diss/Base coding/Type of position for academic staff and professors/Part-time

(2 3 5) /diss/Base coding/Miscellaneous and background

There are two kinds of ways (nodes) to organize the data in N*6, which are: base nodes, and conceptual nodes. The first kind, allows the collection of data in specific “buckets”. These nodes, label the data according to demographics, SES information, work assignments, institutional belonging, etc. In this policy case study, the BASE NODES will include the organization of the data from: position in the policy process (such as, policy-makers: representatives and senators; university actors: professors, and academic staff), type of university (public or private), institutional role (academic staff and professors), and seniority (1-3 years, 3-6 years, and more than 6 years).

The conceptual section of the node tree will include core conceptual “containers” which would likely be disaggregated in further iterative analysis. In other words, when coding using the N*6 software. These constructs help us obtain for further analysis what different actors at different levels of the policy process explain, understand, and make-sense regarding these policies.

The data collected through policy documents will be coded manually and analyzed from the same theoretical constructs as the interviews, which will be coded using N*6.

3.6 IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

This analysis could contribute to expand the scope of policy analysis about higher education reform policies, within the global scope and in Argentina.

This research could contribute to overcoming the dearth of studies about the outcomes of the Argentinean higher education reform movement upon professors and their work. It could shed light on how professors negotiate, and struggle over the notion of being an academic

professional in times of university reform with other actors at the university. Additionally, this study could contribute to the literature with a case study that analyzes empirical data to illuminate the issues related to academic professionalism in times of design and implementation of higher education reform policies.

This analysis will also enlighten the tensions and contradictions in the process of transfer of the reform policies from the macro-levels of policy-making to the institutions of higher education. The use of sense-making as a theoretical framework to weave the relationships between the macro and micro levels of policy is also a further contribution of this study.

This study would also shed light over the contradictory and tensional nature of higher education reform policies by gleaning on the ways in which professors see themselves affected and conceptualize their work related to these particular notions of academic professionalism. This perspective is an avenue to explore the conflicts, paradoxes, and contradictions of the academic professionals in higher education institutions.

3.7 LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations to the study need to be highlighted. The point of departure of this study is a rather linear perspective on policy design and implementation. It is important to note that policies follow complex circuits and influences that overlap with one another. Thus, in order to organize and systematize both the inquiry and the analysis of different data sources, the research design followed a rather artificial and schematic structure.

Additionally, the number of professors was selected according to networking and snowball techniques. This might have reduced the sample and it could have been expanded if

additional time in the settings were possible. The fact that the interviews were originally conducted in Spanish and then translated into English also occasions “meaning lapses” due to the impossibility of direct translation of some words, etc. The use of Spanish as the language for the interviews and the way in which the language structure is an avenue for communication also impacts the type of information provided.

The interview protocols were prepared without review of experts. That could have strengthened the sharpness and scope of the interviews.

Additionally, the literature on Argentinean higher education, about the character and dynamics of the higher education reform movement, and on the ways in which the policies affect academic professionals in the country shows a prevalence of theoretical, and descriptive analyses. These types of analyses, highly enriching from a conceptual standpoint, tends to analyze limited empirical data. In addition, the majority of the study focuses on the realities of the universities in Buenos Aires, which reduces the phenomena under scrutiny.

The strengths of the study are supported in the triangulation of different sources of information for the study of a complex phenomenon of policy reform and implementation of higher education policies. The use of interviews as a crucial source of data situates this study at an original place within the literature that investigates the reform movement in Argentina. Additionally, the coding of data (with two experiences of interater-reliability of 97% and 98%) was performed following a careful and systematic approach.

The combination of the sense-making approach with notions related to academic professionalism constitutes another unique perspective instrumented in the study of the higher education reform movement in Argentina.

From the analysis of the scope and implications of the study, next chapter presents the specific components of the case study which are systematized in three levels for data analysis: macro, and micro, with emphasis on the policies affecting the professoriate.

4.0 THE CASE STUDY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the research findings are presented and the data collected from various sources are analyzed according to the three conceptual dimensions within this case study of policy research: at the macro level (global and local policies); the micro-level (institutional policy analysis); and the impact of macro and micro-policy dimensions on academic professionals. In each of the sections, the data provided by each source are related to the constructs within every level, followed by a discussion of each issue at every conceptual policy dimension as a dynamic component of the policy process. Relevant literature will be re-visited and integrated throughout the discussion.

The research questions which guided this study are explored through each of the aforementioned section of the policy dimensions. At the end of the chapter, there is a more meticulous summary of each research questions enlightened by the findings from this inquiry.

Research question #1:

How are the goals of the State in the design of the Law on Higher Education of 1995 perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators/academic staff) in the higher education reform movement in Argentina?

- a. How does each group characterize the nature of the reform movement?

- b. What are the similarities and differences between groups?

Research question #2:

How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) characterize academic professionalism:

- c. What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?
- d. What are the similarities and differences among groups?

Research question #3:

How-if at all- do the stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?

The findings focused on the overall themes and patterns that are constructed from both the use of the conceptual framework depicted in chapter 3 (pp. x-x) and the constructs emerged from each of the data sources. References to specific particularities are noted to illustrate the specific dynamics of the policy implementation process. In other words, features that illuminate the case will be identified and explained. It is noteworthy that one particular set of data, archival data at the macro-level (described aforementioned), will be examined in depth in light of research question #1.

Research question #1 will be elucidated from the analysis of the data provided by the Macro-level; Research questions #2, and #3, due to the intertwined processes of institutional mediation, the specific institutional factors influencing policy implementation, and implementation of the policies particularly affecting the professoriate will be further elaborated from the data analysis of sections 2 and 3.

4.2 THE CASE STUDY

The analysis of the findings defines the policy case study. Thus, the policy case study is grounded in the analysis of data collected from different policy actors at different levels: politicians as policy-makers, and institutional actors from two universities, such as, academic staff, and professors; archival data; and a critical review of the literature. The underlying principle behind this manner of presenting the findings is manifold. First, the case study is a policy case analysis of a particular issue within reform policy design and implementation (academic professionalism), at different levels: macro, and micro. The second underlying principle for this approach is the complexity and scope of the process of higher education reform policies when they transit from macro-levels of design to implementation. Third, the role of different policy actors at different levels plays a vital function in this case of policy design and implementation within the specificity of each institutional context. Additionally, the actual interconnectedness between different policy levels as well as policy actors at each level around academic professionalism will be analyzed.

In reviewing the findings from this research, it is paramount to consider the complexity and uniqueness of the process of higher education reform policy design and implementation in Argentina. This case is rooted in the recognition of the still crucial role of the national state as a propeller of the higher education reform movement and the influence of the global policy context on the state policies. Higher education reform policies are not implemented in a vacuum but in a variety of university and higher education institutions. Institutional actors are at the forefront in the ways in how policies are mediated, read, interpreted, implemented, and even re-designed at the universities. The manners in which the specific policies related to academic professionals were implemented at each university characterize broadly the fate of the higher education reform

movement in Argentina. These policies and their implementation at particular institutions constitute a prism to explore the multifaceted changes introduced to the role and work of academic professionals in the context of the higher education reform policies as well as the interconnectedness with other policies.

As a policy case study, this research strategically sorts the data analysis in three main spheres. They represent the actual areas and actors that not only influence the meaning of the policies themselves, but also impact the implementation of them. The three spheres allow systematizing the data in order to answer the three different research questions.

This case study expands the scope of the analysis while focusing on the policies that affect the professoriate from their inceptions at the state/ policy-makers level, to the institutions where they are implemented, reaching the professoriate and affecting not only their work and endeavors, but ultimately, their identities as academics.

The different data sources analyzed, allow identifying the multifaceted aspects of the policies and their outcomes. The perusing of these data reveals the tensions and misalignments between what the policies “in their letter” state, and the ways in which policy actors at the macro and micro policy levels mediate their meaning and implement them. Thus, Weick’s analysis of “sense-making in organizations” is a pivotal theoretical framework that shows how actors at different institutions do meaningful construction of the policies, select certain aspects of them, deny others, or prioritize certain aspects of them over others. Initially, Weick’s conceptual framework appeared as crucial for the analysis of the interactions of the policies at the university level. However, drawing upon Weick’s notions could also illuminate other “stages” in the policy process.

4.2.1 The case of policy implementation at two Argentinean Universities

Two universities in Argentina were selected to illustrate the complexity of the process of articulation and implementation of the higher education policies in the country.

As it was aforementioned in chapter 3, these universities are located in the province of Santa Fe, Argentina. One of the universities (the University of the River) is a public university and the other institution is a private university (University of the Incarnate Word).

It is crucial for the case analysis, to detail some historical background on stages of policy implementation at these two institutions.

After the LHE was passed in 1995, there was a period of initial resistant and discussion of the LHE at the universities in the country. By the year 1999, different policies which ultimately supported the implementation of the LHE came to life, such as the formation of CONEAU⁶, or increasing processes of quality evaluation and accreditation showed that the reform movement was already in place and generating different dynamics at the institutional level.

By the year 2000, the UR had started a process of evaluation for the plans of studies and prepared the data, resources, and documents to undergo the external quality evaluation. The final version of a policy document entitled the Millennium program saw the light at the UR in 2001. By the year 2004, the UR had experienced the accreditation of all its undergraduate programs, which entailed undergoing both the internal quality evaluation and the external by CONEAU.

⁶ CONEAU is the acronym for National Council of Evaluation and Accreditation. The LHE simply mentioned that it would be created as an autonomous institution to provide the regulations, guidelines, and execution of quality evaluation in Argentina.

Meanwhile, at the UIW, the reform policies were known limitedly by their academic staff and authorities. By the year 1999, the authorities at the UIW designated few members of the academic staff to start reviewing literature and policy documents on quality evaluation in Argentina. In the years 2001-2002, members of academic staff started a series of meetings with faculty from different schools and department to inform them of the basic content of the LHE, the quality evaluation processes, and the need to start organizing processes of data collection for the internal quality report. By the year 2004, few schools at the UIW had initiated the reform of their plans of studies and the actual collection of information for the elaboration of the internal evaluation report.

4.2.2 Presentation of the findings

The findings are presented in the following analysis according to the conceptual framework outlined as it follows:

1. Macro level: global and national policies

Context pressures: global trends; global demands
Role of the state in higher education: funding; market demands/ state
State (government) and university relationships
Autonomy (aspects)
Goals of the reform movement globally and in Argentina
Tensions/ Misalignments between design and implementation
Policies towards the professoriate
Quality (quality evaluation, and quality improvement)⁷
Other state policies towards the higher education sector

2. Micro-level: Institutional policy analysis

Specification of national broader policies
Participation and policy-making processes at the institutional level

⁷ The content of this concept merged with 2.e Quality improvement and role of academics.

Goals of policy initiatives (university level)
Comparison between state policies/ institutional policies
Quality improvement and role of academics
Academic staff and professoriate

3. Impact of macro and micro policy dimensions on academic professionals

Descriptions of professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals

Professional Status: 1. Before the reform policies; 2. Outcomes on professors' status after reform policies

Role/ Roles of the professoriate: 1. in the reform movement; 2. in the higher education system; 3. at the university (hierarchical positioning and issues of power); 4. roles in quality improvement (evaluation and programs)

Professional autonomy: 1. curriculum; 2. control and determinacy of workload; 3. relationship with university management; 4. faculty evaluation; 5. political participation; 6. professional improvement ("posgrados" in Spanish)

Work of academic professionals: appointments/ salary; academic career; teaching and research (relationship)

System of entry exams ("concursos" in Spanish)

In an overview, there were emergent themes that completed the initial conceptual framework as delineated in the literature. The emergent themes were added to the basic definitions and illustrations compiled in the Analytical Code Book (Appendix #2) in which these themes are identified as emergent. The emergent issues complement more thoroughly the prior concepts and capture from the data itself notions intertwined with the conceptual framework. The criteria followed to incorporate them within the code book were when recurrence was found at approximately 90.00% repetition.

Additionally, behind this conceptual framework are the broader notions of the sense-making approach. The distinctive dimensions of both the macro and micro-levels operate with specific functions within the sense-making process.

4.3 MACRO-LEVEL: GLOBAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES

In this section, participants' responses to the first questions in the protocol are analyzed (See appendix). These responses, which are identified by type of participant who provided them, will be compared with information excerpted from policy documents, and institutional documents. In particular, politicians' questions that in general illuminated this general section are the following: "the conditions and type of relationships between the Argentinean state and the higher education system". It also asks about the different steps through which the formation and sanction of the law circulated. This question had several sub-questions. The first one asked the politicians' views about the "political conditions that influenced the design and passing of the LHE". The second inquiry, requested information about the "goals of the LHE in the context of implementation of the reform policies". The third question, asked: "what were the policies towards the higher education system used to support the design of the higher education reform?" The fourth asked about the inceptions of the formation of the LHE. The last sub-question was intended as a wrapping question: "what were the features and roles of the state in relationship with the reform policies implemented in higher education?"

In the case of academic staff working at two universities (University of the River and University of the Incarnate Word) responses to questions 1, 2, and subsections of question 4 of the interview protocol were coded to illuminate this section. Question number 1 in the protocol was designed to find information about the LHE as a broader policy and its process of implementation. Thus, it was designed to shed light on the first question in this research. This first question included several sub-questions about: the goals and objectives of the LHE within the reform of higher education, the main features of the reform policy implementation, the

outcomes of the policy implementation at the institution in a two-fold scope: at the level of the institution and sub-level of its schools.

The second question in the protocol for academic staff tries to obtain information about the process of policy implementation in a long term perspective. Additionally, the interview item of the fourth question: “About the transformations at the university in the last 5 years and how have they affected the role of professors: a. how have these transformations at the university been intertwined with the process of accreditation and evaluation? How if at all have they affected your role and other administrators’ roles?”.

In the case of professors, the responses to the following questions from the protocol were coded to be analyzed to support this section of the analysis: “1. About the LHE and its implementation: a. What were the goals/ objectives of the Law of Higher education in the reform of higher education?; b. What were the main features of the implementation of the higher education reform policies?”.

4.3.1 Context pressures: global trends; global demands

The literature that posits the analysis of higher education reform movements globally stresses a basic hypothesis: the linkages between the global economy, and the changes introduced to higher education systems rooted in that influence (King, 2003; Schugurensky, 2002; Slaughter, 1988). There are different approaches that analyze the transfer of ideas, patterns, and tensions resulting from the influence of specific key economic factors on the higher education systems, and the role of national states as catalysts of these global notions. In the wide array of theoretical studies, the role of international lending organizations such as the WB, or the IMF is described as setting an agenda for higher education reforms to be applied by national states. These studies set up the

context from where we could explore the dynamics of those influences, how the influences of global factors set the stage for specific higher education policies, and to what degrees they actually operate in the arena of policy formation. The case study constructed in this research allows the exploration of the aforementioned dynamics, and it provides interesting insights on more complex phenomena. As a mode of illustration, there are multifaceted relationships between staff from lending organizations and policy-makers at the national level. Additionally, the data from this study reveals the intricate nature of the process of public policy formation even in systems with the national state as the “Deus Ex Machina” of educational policy.

Additionally, the following data analysis illustrates the ways in which the influence of the global context and global institutions operate as framing factors for higher education reform policies in Argentina, through the policy making process and the ultimate implementation of them.

With the passing of the LHE, the relationships of the national state and the university system suffered a change. Politicians who participated in the debate of the LHE at the Senate and were members of the Commission of Education at the Senate, provided interesting insights on the contextual factors that were mediated and framed into the LHE. Politicians from both the Peronist party (at the time of the passing of the LHE this was the ruling party), and from the opposition were interviewed.

Byron, a politician who participated in the debates on the LHE at the Senate and belonged to the opposite party, explained that there were several factors both external and internal to the government that converge to frame the LHE’s text as well as the policies it represented. He described the intertwined influences of external factors and internal ones:

AS: Oh, that law... There were three actors, or better said, three groups of actors that used the LHE... In fact, within the reform movement itself, the LHE was one of the visible

emergent...These groups had intentions that do not show in the law. The groups were: one political group related to the Peronist party in power; another group of technicians and political analysts specialized in higher education issues and politics...And another last group, external to the country, which is the staff from the World Bank...These groups had at a certain point in time a very complex articulation and in a very complex fashion promoted the emergency of the LHE itself...These groups produced leagues and coalitions with each other ...for a while their coalitions remain stable (AS070304, pp. 1-2).

The idea of a coalition of interest between international organizations and specific policy-makers was ratified by other policy makers that succinctly describe that “the LHE was the result of the WB’s influence and the IMF’s” (IM092204; HS081304). Nevertheless, politicians also disaggregate and specify the different influences and actors operating as representatives of these organizations. Byron succinctly described the transformation of staff from the international organizations in almost an internal bureaucracy in the context of the political climate in the country:

AS: The official staff from the World Bank, behave as foreign officials...In fact, they do not operate as foreign, because these are people who settle here [in Argentina] travel frequently, and they are close and well known by the government officials. Thus, they become a factor of internal politics...Their goals are basically loan money, and loan money in a way that it would have strong, and quick impact, to obtain dramatic results in the transformation of Higher Education (AS070304, pp. 3-4).

Weston, a politician who also participated in the debates before the LHE was passed, explains that the changes in higher education had started before the LHE. This politician identified different periods of influence of the IMF and the WB in the higher education reform policies:

HS: The changes in the higher education policies had started even before the LHE. They started from a clear vision of the IMF and the WB. They imposed the tendency that the higher education should be paid by user fees. Other notions supported by the IMF and WB’s model, were the modification of the governance structure of the universities (by introducing sectors of workers more easily managed by the government), the introduction of strong controls and monitoring, and a strong control and evaluation of education

practices. The national government also adhered to this notion of strict control (HS082004, p. 17).

The complexity of the external influence of the WB albeit deeply explored by the literature is also downplayed in its dual complexity: external and internal. In addition, the literature assumes that the higher education policy notions supported by the WB or the IMF are crystal and persist unchanged through the years.

The connections between the government and the international organizations were also described as complex and unstable at times. The convergence of factors such as the availability of money for loans, and the desire of the Argentinean government to borrow the loans, “created a context of application of many ideas that were proved in other situations and international forums...and they were believed to be strong and firm to be applied in Argentina” (AS070304, p.4). According to Weston, the influences in fact resulted in a “‘WB-bish’ (In Spanish: “Bancomundialista”) feature within the LHE” (HS082004, p. 19).

88 % of the politicians interviewed described with slight differences the influence of these groups which marked the political determination of the components of the higher education policy, as well as the political lines of the LHE itself. What appears as the most relevant feature of the influences is the complex interconnectedness between both external and internal factors that filter the policy messages into the LHE itself.

The influence of international lending organizations over the higher education policy making traveled through stormy moments even during the period of the design of the LHE which coincided with the period of economic re-structuring. Meanwhile, the linkages between Argentina and the international financial system were the strongest (AS070304, p.2). Specific political conditions such as a favorable context of international relations, a good fiscal situation

in Argentina, and the policies towards higher education framed the higher education policies with an aura of “prestige for the government and to enhance its power” (AS070304, p. 3).

Another component of the so-called pressures on the policy formation of the higher education reform policies was identified by 66% of the politicians interviewed as the neoliberal ideas which supported new social and public policies (HS081304, p. 2; AS070304, p. 3).

For academic staff working at the university the higher education reform policies were marked by international notions that intended the “quality improvement and quality evaluation, which is the result of the strong influence of the neoliberal ideas from the neoliberal state” (CL070103, p.7). A member of the academic staff at the UIW described that the “culture of evaluation is a culture that comes from the global world. It was an external practice to the Argentinean universities” (CMyotros080204, p.12). According to members of the academic staff at the UR, the neoliberal notions introduced the concept to the university of “free market and it becomes terrible if nobody controls it. This generates competition between professors, courses, etc. It ends up being a bloody contest” (CDL072803, p.10). The idea that the higher education reform policies “came from outside” (CDL072803, p. 8) appeared in the descriptions of several members of the academic staff at the UR in the “new legislation that was created in a much closeted fashion” (CDL072803, p. 8).

Additionally, 45% of members of academic staff mentioned that the reform of the plans of studies was linked to globalization and knowledge society. Rose, member of the academic secretariat at the UR, describes specifically that the reform of the plans of studies “intended to update the plan of studies with the 21st century, with offers of courses and curricula more integrated and diversified” (SRL122303, p. 26).

Members of academic staff at the UR also described the introduction into the policies the influence of models from other countries, for instance, with the system of incentives, and in the accreditation models (IM081304, p. 21).

It is intriguing that professors both from the UR and the UIW identified as a factor influencing higher education policy the weight of international organizations on the type and nature of the policies. Carolyn, a professor at the UR explained that

BCA: In the last ten years, all our educational policy has been highly conditioned by our role of a country absolutely dependant, and borrower and indebted with the IMF. Our higher education system is conditioned by the IMF. We have suffered that dependency...and we've seen this influence in the reform of the plan of studies... (BCA072704, p. 5).

Another professor described a dynamic of multiple conditionality of the structure of the higher education system in Argentina as follows:

TS: The country was disciplined by the IMF, and the Presidency. Both disciplined the Argentinean universities through the Ministry of Education. And then, it trickles down to the institutions, and to us (TS0404, p. 26).

Professors also related the influence of the IMF on Latin America, describing that the reform policies for the region intended-as in Argentina- the transformation of the structure of the higher education system to “an improved situation which in several cases entailed the changes in governance structures, the modification of faculty appointments, enhancing full time positions” (TS080404, p.26). Professors also identified neoliberal notions as an external factor with influence on the higher education reform policies but with contradictory features. Cate described the type of neoliberal ideas influencing the higher education policies as “the result of neoliberalism...but of a neoliberalism at the crossroads between the protectionism and liberalism. The world works this way, and this is why the LHE reflects higher education policies that are a little bit of this and a little bit of that” (BC03, p.5). Professors however described the

type of higher education reform movement as “the reform was what the IMF wanted. We just suffer it” (BCA072704, pp.5-6).

Professors also identified other external factors that impact the higher education reform policies with the broad notion of “globalization” (CMG071003, p. 11). 55% of the professors from the UR highlight the linkages between globalization and some ideas that were filtered into the debate around the higher education policies, such as, the introduction of fees (CMG071003; ESP122103; NDR081904; MLM080504), and the introduction of university models, from other countries, such as Mexico and Spain (DF080604, pp. 13-14).

4.3.2 Role of the state in higher education

The nature of the higher education system in Argentina requires a closer study of the role of the state in higher education. The data provided information on the changes introduced to the role of the state in higher education being launched by the LHE.

Politicians described the LHE as the emergent of the new positioning of the Argentinean State not only in the internal political spectrum but also in the international global economy. Byron described the different variables within the higher education reform policies as expression of the changing features of the state. According to this politician,

AS: There was an interest to modernize the policies towards the university...Those were years of economic stability and economic restructuring of the country with a close insertion in the international global and financial economy. It was a period of huge financial investments. In this context, there was an interest coming from the Argentinean state to complete the central economic project in the area of social policies and related to the knowledge society. Therefore, the bureaucrats that started working in the area of the higher education policies came initially from the Ministry of Economy...There was a need to enhance the prestige of the government through the higher education policies... (AS070304, pp. 1-2).

In this context, politicians portrayed that at the initial developing phase of the higher education reform policies the intentions expressed by government bureaucrats was to follow to the letter “the WB’s goals, applying restrictions to student access, and introducing a new governance system, and giving more representation to non-academic staff at the university governance structure” (HS081304, p. 32).

Politicians also illustrated the interest from the state to solve certain problems within the higher education system that emerged from the diagnosis that the government bureaucrats supported (AS070304; HS081304, DLS). Additionally, the context of policy shift by the national state regarding the higher education system was fueled by the availability of money from international loans for the Argentinean government to support changes in the policies towards the higher education system (AS070304, p. 3).

The Argentinean state also framed the LHE as a component of the public policies. In fact, several politicians identify this identification of the higher education policies as public policies (AS070304; IM081304; DLS) or as a strategic component of the public policies.

The higher education policies appeared also to be expressing a change towards a more centralizing management of the system, which generated contradictory effects. One politician described this shift in the management of the system as it follows:

AS: what the state pursue with the reform...well, the state itself was looking to enhance its centralized position as a manager of the higher education system, to warranty that the main goals of the reform movement were sustained and the autonomy of the universities maintained with limitations... (AS070304, p. 7).

Additionally, the state based its policies towards the higher education system on establishing a system where the universities were dependant on the distribution of resources that the state made available (IM081304; AS070304). This dynamics is stressed by all the politicians interviewed for this study. Vincent explains that the budget structure inaugurated by the LHE,

also articulated a different position of the state regarding the funding structure of the higher education system:

IM: Before the LHE, it was the state which paid for the salary of each professor at the university and everything else. Now, it is a closed system because before we did not realize that 90% or 92% of the budget went to salaries. Now, we have to know, it is not an open system. The whole system has been hardened (HS081304, p. 36).

Academic staff at the UR depicted the state policies represented in the LHE, as basically focused on policies to enhance quality at the institutional level. The state reserved a role of monitoring the process which is a landmark of a historically different positioning of the state towards the system (CDL072803; ASF070304; CM080604; AS080604). The identification of the shift towards enhancing quality was stressed by academic staff from both the UR and the UIW. The other shared notion related to the quality concern is the introduction of a culture of evaluation in which the state reserves a role of final evaluator (CDL072803; ASF070304; CM080604; AS080604).

This monitoring role of the state towards the system which appears in the content of the LHE, also expresses a role of interventionism of the state into the higher education system. 88% of the academic staff at the universities found this shift to a more interventionist modus operandi from the state as a crucial change in the history of the relationships between the state and the universities. Kent-academic staff at the UR- characterized the historical change in the role of the state:

CDL: The intromission of the national state in the autonomy of the universities....it is one of the most striking aspects of the higher education reform movement in the twentieth century. If we look back to the Argentinean legislation in this country on education...Well, one of the typical features was the absence or lack of legislation on higher education for more than a century...and this new law and legislation appears as new and as a very closed process... (CDL072803, p. 15).

A more intruding role of the state towards the higher education system also appears manifested in the creation of new universities in the 1990s. The creation of new national public universities was scarce for more than 20 years. Nevertheless, in the 1990s, the state authorized the existence of 3 universities even before the LHE was passed. Members of the academic staff at the UR saw this as a drastic change in the role of the state towards the system. Kent explained the deep outcomes of this for the whole higher education system:

CDL: The reform movement was a long process even before the LHE was passed. In between, the state established new national universities which definitely modified and shifted the political equilibrium among the universities in the collective governance structure of the system (CDL072803, p. 16).

The state fueled the conflictive nature of the higher education system by not only creating new public universities but also by promoting the same policies for the private universities (SDL, p. 21). Paradoxically, while the state allowed the growth in the number of private universities, the state promoted the enhancing of mechanisms for quality control, evaluation, and accreditation for both public and private universities (DLS, p. 22).

4.3.3 State (government) and university relationships

Under this conceptual construct, the issues related to the changing parameters in university governance structures in times of higher education reform are being explored. At the core of different models of governance, the literature situates the relationship between state and universities. The case of Argentina is of rather exceptionality because of the autonomy of the universities with different degrees of dependency with the state (Kogan & Marton, 2000). The analysis of the data from this section will illustrate the complex relationships between state and universities.

Politicians interviewed for this study referred to the advent of the higher education policies in conjunction with the process of state reform, the changing external conditions favorable to the Argentinean economy, and the high credibility levels of the government. As Byron described, the higher education reform policies were instrumented to enhance the “prestige for the government and to enhance its power in a strategic sector” (AS070304, p. 3). Thus, the Argentinean government in the mid 1990’s “needed to develop organic and strategic policies to fulfill its aim for success” (AS070304, p.1).

Policy-makers describe the LHE as a rhetoric instrument that expressed government goals in the context of global conditions (AS070304; HS081304; DLS082304). They depicted the LHE as a descriptive document that “says little about the actions universities should produce to reform higher education, but does not say much of what the government wanted to do through it.” (AS070304, p.2)

Politicians also described the LHE as an instrument that government bureaucracies used to construct and support what they defined as public policies. In addition, the LHE got ‘engulfed’ in the loans the Argentinean state received, the need to strengthen public policies, and the conditions enhanced by the loans to the national state (AS070304, p.2). Politicians characterize the LHE as a contradictory document that expressed

AS: [...] the limitations of the government’s understanding of the real dynamics and functioning of the higher education system...In fact, with the LHE few changes happened, the principal university actors accommodated to what the LHE said. In relationship with institutional issues within the universities, the LHE was naïf and really couldn’t achieve what the government intended with it. The few things that the LHE achieved were the installation of the system of accreditation and evaluation (AS070304, p. 3).

Politicians portrayed the level of success the government achieved through the LHE as “meager” and “limited, especially if compared with the investment of resources and expectations” (AS070304, p.3).

Politicians described the higher education reform policies embedded in a contradictory nature, based on centralization and decentralization goals proposed by the government (AS070304, p. 4; IM081304, p. 9; HS081304, pp. 12-13). These goals converged with the enhancement of academic professionalism and its control. One politician describes it as follows:

AS: The LHE made the expansion of academic professionalism to the issue of administrative centralization of its evaluation. The LHE condemned the universities to their autonomy or decentralization and to lack the capacity to enhance or even monitor directly the academic production. The LHE did not allow the universities the administration of resources to support the expansion of academic professionalism at the universities. In a way, it liberated universities of that responsibility (AS073004, p.4).

In addition, all politicians illustrated that the government framed through its policies towards the sector the idea that the higher education system was in a constant opposition and conflict with the government (AS070304, p. 5; IM081304, pp. 4-5; HS081304, DLS). Policy-makers explained how the government framing of the conflictive relationship was based on the fact that university politics were lead by the opposition party. Thus, all the politicians interviewed described that through the Ministry of Education and through the distribution of state funds, the government tried to control the autonomy of the universities. In this way, the state’s goal of minimizing or obliterating conflict with the universities, worked by controlling resources available to autonomous universities from either the Secretariat for Higher Education or the Ministry of Education (HS082004, pp. 16-17). This dynamics was portrayed in this politician’s views:

AS: the central hypothesis of the ones who designed the reform policies was that the autonomous universities didn’t share their diagnosis of the problems with them. Therefore, the conflict with the autonomous universities was the central hypothesis for the ones who designed the reform policies...And this was showed in the problems with

the distribution of funding to the universities, because [the government supported the idea that] ‘I am the one who gives the money, not my political adversary’” (AS070304, p.5).

The issue of control from the state was another shared theme among politicians describing the relationships between state and universities. Accordingly, Jack explained that,

HS: The goal of the national policies towards higher education was above all, to make universities subordinated to the government of that time, Menem’s government. This subordinated position was proposed within the stricter mechanisms of control and evaluation of the system, controlled changes in the plans of studies...The government believed that there were schools and plans with more students that needed, so the idea was to restrict access to them by introducing more controls and changes in the plans of studies (HS082004, p. 18).

For academic staff at the university, the foremost aspect of the relationship between the state and the universities was the preservation of university autonomy. All academic staff at the UR situated the issue of preservation and maintenance of university autonomy as located at the core of this relationship. Klaus described the context of this issue:

CLO: The LHE one of the main issues was to clarify with the government what are the things that are strictly under the control of the government as established by the LHE, which is a law that the universities did not like; and what are the things that are competency and component of the autonomy of the universities. In particular, of the academic autonomy of each university....This is where there was the intromission of the government into the autonomy of the universities... (CLO0728004, p. 7).

Another problem related to the control and implementation of the higher education reform policies was the issue of the “style” of reform chosen by the Argentinean government. Members of academic staff at both universities coincided in describing the style of policy dissemination, communication, and implementation as patterned in a top-down approach. Melania who works at the UR, described the outcomes of this type of approach as contradictory because the “goal of the higher education policies was to put in order the higher education system in Argentina. However, with the top-down approach, what they ignited was the decentralization and dispersion of the system” (DLS082304, p.14).

In this context of relations between the state and the higher education system, few members of the academic staff depicted the pace of the reform policies required by the government as quick and speedy. Kent, a junior academic staff at the UR, explained this dynamic:

CDL: The pace of the implementation of the reform policies is like riding a bullet train. And due to its speed, we can't jump from it, even when a lot of us would jump from it...This rhythm was accelerated with the implementation of the higher education reform policies since the mid 1990s (CDL072804, p. 7).

A member of the academic staff at the UIW eloquently depicted the contradictory role of the state supporting the higher education reform policies as “a ghost state, that basically intended to disappear or not to be committed to education...The state says that it cares about education. But it is true only in the political discourses” (CM080604, p.11).

This notion of the contradictory approach of the state towards the universities through the reform policies manifested in the notions shared by academic staff of the universities, and faculty on the inefficient diagnosis of the problem. Staff and professors also described the use of transfer of models from other countries into the higher education reform in Argentina. As one professor depicted it:

DF: They have good intentions, there was an academic base for what they were proposing in the LHE, but as it always happen in our country, with the LHE started hanging the decorations on the Christmas tree before having the tree set up. And then, when the implementation started, the problems arose. We were supposed to have a higher education system like the ones in the first world, to be applying policies from the first world. That is why, the process of implementation was inadequate and the goals and intentions of the policies were not achieved (DF080604, p. 13).

Another theme shared by academic staff at the university is that the state pursues the goal of tightening control of the higher education system. The intention of closer monitoring and control appeared as crucial among academic staff at the UR. One member of the academic staff from the public university differentiated the policy goals towards the public universities with the

ones towards the private universities, explaining that the intentionality of control was “less towards the private universities, allowing them to have a voice in the national policies and the national higher education system, through their participation in national governance structures with the same capacity as the public universities” (DLS082304, p.15).

The issue of control and coexistence with problems of decentralization and centralization appeared as important themes among academic staff at both universities (GP082104; NP082104; NLV072904; DLS; LT072104).

At the UIW, the academic staff identified as key component of the relationship between the state and the universities (from the private university) the “major demand of quality evaluation” (CM080604, p. 10). The pivotal shift on that direction was the passing of the LHE in 1995 (CM080604; AS080604). Additionally, staff at the UIW frames the reform policies as departing from “a state which power was reduced, and therefore, intended the decentralization of the system especially when the economic crisis started” (GP082104, p. 10).

4.3.4 Autonomy: Aspects

Autonomy of the university in the context and as a content of the higher education reform policies and their implementation is linked to many structural aspects of the higher education system and the general regulations. In the history of the Argentinean higher education system, the autonomy of its institutions is a feature of the universities deeply embedded in the system (HS, p. 14). Notwithstanding, the dynamics of university autonomy in Argentina illustrates an exceptional model in terms of governance structure (Kogan & Marton, 2000, p. 97).

In the work by Mollis (2003), Garcia de Fanelli (2001), and Kogan & Marton the condition of autonomy of the universities combined with their dependency with government

funding composes a peculiar relationship between the state and the university. The conditions of university autonomy, as the analyzed data will illustrate, in the context of the implementation of neoliberal notions, trigger paradoxical actions from the state, which introduces regulatory schemas to achieve some degree of control over the university (Kogan & Marton, 2000). The data scrutinized in this section, illustrates the profiles and scope of university autonomy in the context of the higher education reform process.

In an overview, politicians, academic staff, and professors saw the issue of autonomy as intertwined with the tensions between centralization and decentralization of power and governance of the higher education system in Argentina. The linkages of these dynamics were fueled within the policies themselves and in the implementation of them. In addition, the issue of autonomy manifests as a theme in how different policy actors describe the growing controls over academic work.

Autonomy of Argentinean universities was ratified by both the Constitution from 1994, and by the LHE (1995). For politicians, the fact that the National Constitution of 1994 explicitly states that universities are autonomous institutions in Argentina (Argentinean National Constitution, 1994) would ultimately forced the need to state the autonomy of the universities as a component of the policies in the LHE (DLS, p. 11; HS082004, p. 14). Thus, many actors depicted the features of university autonomy in Argentina as rather “contradictory” (IM081304, p. 17). The ways in which the autonomy of the universities was framed by the LHE makes it contradictory because it is in the LHE that the regulations of university autonomy are defined and they are not defined by each of the universities internally (HS082004, p. 15). Additionally, the scope of autonomy was rather restricted. One member of the academic staff at the university explained that “the concept of autonomy was defined as super autonomy but with punishment: if

I spend more, I don't receive the money" (IM081304, p. 18). According to academic staff at the universities, the tensions around university autonomy happened at the intersection of the designed mechanisms of control and evaluation of quality (IM081304; AS070304; DLO), and in the management of the resources available (IM081304, p.18).

Additionally, as it was described in previous sections of this analysis, the issue of university autonomy was in the middle of the storm of political rivalries between the party in power (Peronist Party) and the opposition party (Radical Party). One politician described the issue of university autonomy as the arena where the rivalries were revealed:

AS: the autonomy of the universities was trapped in the notion that universities represented the opposing party and not the official party. The government found the opposition to the implementation of the LHE as interferences from the opposing party. Then, this produced a political conflict where the conflict shouldn't have been. This awoke the political conflict where it shouldn't have been. In fact, it is probably the reason why there political debate and rivalries expressed in political debates that put the issue of autonomy in the middle of them (AS070304, p.2).

Thus, the question of autonomy became a charged political issue within the higher education policies themselves and even more at the stage of their implementation. Other issues related to it, such as the distribution of resources within universities. Several academic staff members at the UR illustrated a problem generated with the reception of funds by the university and the pre-determination of the investment destiny at the university. Academic staff described the contradictions of the system in which

IM: the university couldn't decide where to invest the money. Before the LHE if you wanted to put the money in light bulbs, you could, now it is determined that 85% of the money you receive is specifically for salaries. Now, instead of letting the university make decisions on the money, they establish percentages and amounts to be invested and how to be invested...I call this the centralization of budget management (IM081304, p.18).

The centralized funding structure to which universities are subjected, ignited problems of availability of resources within institutions and even the management of them (BCA072704, p. 4).

For academic staff at the universities, the LHE and other policies were seen and perceived as “intromission of the state into the autonomy of the universities” (CL072804, p. 6).

Academic staff at the public university highlighted that public and private universities had different scopes and boundaries of their autonomy. Academic staff at the UIW paradoxically shared the same perception. At the UIW, the autonomy of the university allowed the universities “to keep producing knowledge” (CM, p. 9). In contrast, for the academic staff at the UR, the autonomy of the university was an obstacle for the availability of resources specifically to support research and knowledge production (IM, pp. 5-6). In addition, for members of the academic staff at the public university, the autonomy of the university was “very controlled and constantly evaluated. We are controlled very closely” (LI, p. 22).

An interesting aspect where the scope of university autonomy appeared as contradictory was the issue of autonomy in the definition of curriculum. For professors at the public university, there were no conditions about what to teach, but, with the introduction of different forms of evaluation with the LHE, the curriculum and the reform of the plans of studies became a problem (TS080404, p. 22).

4.3.5 Goals of the reform movement globally and in Argentina

As it was described in previous sections, the goals of the higher education reform in Argentina coincide and depart from global trends in higher education and the influence of the leading international organizations.

For politicians, one of the shared themes that describe this aspect was the coalition of interest between the Argentinean government and the leading international organizations. The coincidence of interest was expressed in the goal of supporting the higher education reform

movement through loans from these organizations. One politician described that both the international organizations and the government itself through the policies intended to use the loans as the medium to sustain and support the higher education reform movement (AS, pp. 1-2).

Professors and staff at the universities highlighted the introduction of stricter accountability into the life and work at the university by the higher education reform policies (CMG071004, p.4; BCA072704, pp. 8-9; SRN122303, pp. 6-5; IM081304, p. 13). One member of the academic staff described the pressures of accountability of the work within universities as fueling a climate of desperation: “so much needs to be proven, and accountable for, that you get desperate putting everything in paper...” (SRN122303, p. 5).

The policies towards higher education were also framed by both academic staff and professors as the expression of a “disarticulated state” (CMG071004, p. 5), of a reduced state (ILSP070103, pp. 3-4), and of a “a ghost state, that basically intended to disappear or not to be committed to education...The state says that cares about education only in the political discourses” (CM080604, p.11).

Politicians depicted another theme within the reform movement which was the implementation of a neoliberal model into education. Jack elucidated the connection between the higher education reform movement and other areas of state reform in Argentina,

HS: The context for the higher education reform policies was the context embedded in the changes introduced by President Menem. He had assumed the neoliberal model for the political, economic, and social transformation of the country, through the model operating globally. Based on this model, Menem intended the privatization of all state functions, especially the ones with a strategic role. Among those with a strategic place, was education. In particular, higher education was situated in this menu of reform (HS081304, p. 11).

The connection with the strategic areas of social reform as well as the interconnectedness with the notion of the same policies intending the retrenchment of the state from social arenas

was also a theme that appeared in the descriptions from members of academic staff from both universities (CMG071003; CLO072804).

4.3.6 Tensions/ Misalignments between design and implementation

The tensions and misalignments around the policies developed between both the macro-micro levels of the policy implementation, and within the universities. Different policy actors highlighted the sources and nature of these tensions. The work by Weidman and Regsurengiin (2002) illuminates the analysis of the contradictions arising from broad general policies on higher education and the role that institutions fulfill, making their meanings more explicit.

The data analyzed under the conceptual notion of “tensions and misalignments” provided support to the notions proposed by Taylor et al. (1997) in their seminal work on how basic aspects of policy making and implementation of educational policies are: the “connection between micro-settings and policy-making at the macro-level” (p.12); the broad discursive content of the policy documents and discourses (pp. 13-14); and the dilemmas that plagued the whole process which would be exemplified by the analysis that follows.

Politicians stressed the rhetoric nature of the LHE related to the definition of policies and plans of actions for the implementation of them. Byron described the LHE as a legislation that “says little about the actions, about what needs to be done” (AS070304, p. 2). This “declamatory style” of the LHE created needs of specification at the institutional level at the time of its implementation.

Another area of tensions identified by politicians was the system of distribution of resources from both the government to the universities and within each university. Politicians and members of the academic staff at the UR signaled this issue at the core of the tensions and

misalignments. One politician described the problem not as a problem of lack of financial resources for research, but as an issue of lacking infrastructure for the development of research production at the university level (AS070304, p. 5).

The problem of resources clashed with the condition of autonomy of the universities (AS070304; IM081304; LI122203). The tensions arose because

AS: universities depend upon the resources provided by the Ministry of Education...but they also have autonomy. The problem will be solved following more autonomous resource management schema which could support the autonomy of the university actors, and develop resources autonomously (AS070304, p. 5).

Thus, the autonomy of the universities appeared as an obstacle for the improvement of research production, enhancement of quality, etc.

The tensions between dynamics of centralization and decentralization also appeared at the core of both the design and implementation of the policies. The tensions at both the macro and micro levels of these dynamics impacted the programs and development possibilities at the universities because,

AS: The LHE made the expansion of academic professionalism to the issue of administrative centralization of its evaluation. The LHE condemned the universities to their autonomy or decentralization and to lack the capacity to enhance or even monitor directly the academic production. The LHE did not allow the universities the administration of resources to support the expansion of academic professionalism at the universities. In a way, it liberated universities of that responsibility (AS073004, p.4).

The conflictive political nature of the higher education system and the LHE, ignited resistance from the universities against the policies when the legislation was passed, and from the state which reacted towards the universities resistance on the basis of a “hypothesis of conflict” (HS081304, p. 6). This dynamic of conflict fueled tensional relationships between the state and the universities, which intercepted the process of implementation (AS073004, p. 6).

According to academic staff, politicians, and faculty, tensions were intrinsic to the universities because of the salary structure and the financial capacity of the state to support the salaries at the university (AS073004; HS081304; MLM081104; CMG071003; CM080604; ASyotros0800604; CLD072803; CLS072704).

Academic staff at both universities shared the notion that the LHE translated policies which were in fact naturally different to the dynamics and processes already operating at the university level. As one academic staff member described it, this increased the “perversity of the system” (CL072804, p. 10).

The foremost area of tensions and misalignment was both at the policy and implementation of quality evaluation programs at the universities. At both universities, the implementation of quality evaluation programs generated an initial climate of resistance and even opposition (CMyotros; CLD072803; IM081304; ASyotros). The climate of resistance unfolded because of the rather contradictory dynamics of university autonomy versus the monitoring of the quality of the universities from external organizations. Another issue related to quality evaluation was the type of assessment instruments designed to evaluate policies which were, for academic staff at both universities, designed with “lack of knowledge of what goes on at the universities” (CLD072803, p. 13).

Another zone of tension had been the actual availability of resources and funds to support at each university the professional development of the faculty. Academic staff at both universities signaled not only the problems of freedom of budget investment at the institutional level to support the development of programs, but also the lack of institutional infrastructure to assimilate faculty who fulfill the requirements of upgrading their credentials or obtaining graduate degrees. This contradictory dynamic got intertwined with the scope of institutional

autonomy and actual capacity of decision-making at the institutional level. One member of the academic staff at the UR described it as the “schizophrenia of lack of resources, and actual possibilities” (CLD072803, p. 14).

Another area of tension that arose by the LHE was the intensification of “bureaucratic requirements that the university has to fulfill to show quality of teaching, and research” (CLD072803, p. 15). This increment of demands trickled down to the faculty working at the institutions (CMG080604; ILSP070103; TS080404). According to academic staff at the UR, these demands were external to the universities themselves and that is one of the reasons why they have a strong impact on faculty and their work (CLD072803, p. 16).

At both universities, an area of tension and misalignment has been around the processes of reform of plans of studies. Professors at both universities expressed concerns about the manner, about the mechanisms in place to allow faculty to express their opinions in this transformation, and the actual outcomes in terms of both professors’ work and role at the university (CMG07103; ILSP070103; BF080304; TS080404; DF080604). Once again, the issue of the externality of the demands about the reform of plans of studies, as well as the actual operationalization of the reform of it, “generated resistance, personal demands, and everything got entangled with personal career objectives” (CMG07103, p. 20).

Another source of deep tensions was the pace assigned both at the state level and at the institutional level to implement the policies themselves. The pace of implementation has been labeled as “exogenous” (CMyotros; ASyotros; CMG07103) and of a strong speed that was rather inconsistent with both institutional structures and the rhythm of faculty work. As one member of the academic staff at the UR described,

CDL: The pace of the implementation of the reform policies is like riding a bullet train. And due to its speed, we can’t jump from it, even when a lot of us would jump from

it...This rhythm was accelerated with the implementation of the higher education reform policies since the mid 1990s (CDL072804, p. 7).

At the core of the tensions between the policy design and their implementation was the issue of the top-down implementation dynamics of it, and of the mechanisms of monitoring and control of the implementation of the policies at the institutional level. The system of quality evaluation and accountability inaugurated by the LHE put the work of faculty in the middle of the storm within policy implementation. Both academic staff and faculty described an endemic tension around this issue which is described as a “forced situation for faculty because it was not determined and constructed by the university” (HUS081305, p. 46).

4.3.7 Policies towards the professoriate

In the context of the higher education reform in Argentina, the LHE provided general statements about the role, rights, and duties of the professoriate working in the system (LHE, 1995). For the first time in the context of Argentinean’s legislation in education, the LHE provided a rather detailed description of professors’ job aspects. In addition, the LHE stated that each university should provide programs for the professional development of the professoriate. Universities should also “upgrade their professoriate staff” in a period of less than ten years from the sanctioning of the LHE.

The literature on higher education reform movements globally and in Argentina, describes the issues related to the situation and effects of the reform movement on the work of the professoriate in a broad fashion and as a component of quality evaluation. There have been studies (Marquis, 2003; Saguier, 2004) that focus on limited issues related to the work of the professoriate. Nonetheless, these studies do not relate the problems under analysis to the particular features of implementation of the policies themselves and the effects of them on the

professoriate. In these studies, there is also a dearth of the actors' voices to describe the connections and effects of the higher education reform policies in Argentina.

Politicians interviewed for this study, proposed contradictory ideas when describing the higher education reform policies that target the professoriate and the demand of faculty research productivity. For example, they described that the problem of reduced research production is the result of the “lack of professionalism, not the result of lack of decisions to support research production in the country” (AS070304, p. 8). At the same time, 88% of the politicians explained that the state designed policies to enhance knowledge production “based on the fallacy that there was a need to create structures for research” (HS081304, p. 3). Among politicians, they also identified the existence in Argentinean universities of “academic oligarchies which have notions of academic professionalism, and the government appealed only to these groups with the policies designed” (AS070304, p. 3). Politicians described the model of academic professionalism in the LHE and the rest of the policies related to it as following the “model of the hard sciences” (HS081304, p. 14; AS070304, p. 3). Members of academic staff at the UR identified these academic groups with faculty linked to the hard sciences (IM081304, pp. 14-15; AS070304, p. 3).

The LHE proposed the enhancement of professionalization with the proposal of decentralization, leaving to the universities the support of professional development (AS070304, p. 3). However, this policy contradicted the development of incentives for research, which was directly administered and managed by the Ministry of Education. According to politicians, the state with the LHE and further policies based the increment of faculty professional development on the policy of incentives (AS070304, p.2). The policy of incentives converged with the content of the LHE and other policies by allowing faculty to individually apply to research subsidies.

Nevertheless, 68% of the politicians interviewed indicated that in spite of the investment of incentives and their actual growth since 1995, there was not an improvement in the level of professionalism of faculty in the country. At the same time, politicians highlighted that during the same period, the salaries of faculty remained stagnated.

All the politicians interviewed agreed in characterizing that the LHE did not provide a clear definition of academic professionalism. One of them described the notions in the LHE related to issues of academic professionalism as “erratic and not specific” (DLS082304, p. 17). In addition, politicians posit that the LHE proposes different versions of academic professionalism. Both politicians and academic staff at the universities agree in describing that since the LHE was passed, and its policies were reinforced, there was improvement in neither the type of definition of academic professionals, or in the level of professionalism.

Academic staff at the UR and at the UIW depicted the demands towards academics as rather “fictional” (CLO072804, p.10), and “external” to both the universities and faculty. One member of the academic staff from the UR portrayed the demands as requiring a “forced conversion” of faculty. Another member of the academic staff signaled the demands of academic professional development as “illusory without roots in reality” (CLO072804, p. 11). It is also the academic staff at the universities who described the demands of increment of research production or of professional improvement as hard and difficult on faculty. One of them simply depicted it as “a perverse system” (CLO072804, p.12). For academic staff at both universities, the demands on faculty entailed for the universities, the development of programs and structures that the universities did not possess (CDL072803, p. 12; IM081304, pp. 8-9). At the same time, universities because of the structure of decision-making and their autonomy could not provide support for the development of faculty research or for professional development.

In contrast, professors at both universities portrayed the existence of contradictory “versions” of academic professionalism in the LHE and in its implementation at the two universities under study. Carolyn, professor at the UR, found that there was an “imposed academic career...” (BCAO71003, p.7). Other faculty signaled the notion of the “academic career” as rooted “more in research productivity than in teaching”, and the idea of the academic career with an intrinsic contradiction, which is the lack of salary improvement (BCAO71003; ISL072404; CMG071003; MCS081004; DF080604; MLM081104; MAM0811804; ESP122103). One professor described these notions as the “movement of the professor-researcher” (in Spanish: “movida del docente investigador”) as a relatively recent phenomena resulted from the policies (CMG071003, p. 14). Professors also criticized the relationship of the incentives policies with processes of categorization and their ultimate impact on their salaries.

Professors did not perceive the policy of incentives as a trail to achieve neither professional development, nor improvement. Jocelyn describes that “for more than four years I have waited for the incentive. I don’t even remember for which research project that was for” (ILSP070103, p. 5). Nell described the reduced amount of the incentives which “hardly cover the expenditure in books we may encounter while conducting research” (NDR081904, p. 9). In addition, professors perceived contradictory dynamics between the lack of salary increments and the existence of incentives. Professors at both universities agreed in seeing the improvement of salaries as the main bases to enhance academic professionalism.

4.4 MICRO-LEVEL: INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

The concept of sense-making in organizations as it was constructed and defined by Weick (1995) can provide a lens to explore the processes through which higher education reform policies were translated into each institution. The notion of sense-making entails different aspects that represent strategic institutional dynamics which would be highlighted through the following aspects. The properties of sense-making processes in organizations are instrumental for the exploration of this case, because they could identify and explain the ways in which broader state policies were mediated by institutional actors in a social process, and translated into policy implementation. Additionally, they can also elucidate how policies were re-framed, made sense, and enacted; how the policies the LHE were re-interpreted because of the particularities of the institutional environments, and how they were socially embedded in social interactions and constructed implementation practices at the organizational level. Weick characterizes sense-making as “an activity in which many possible meanings may need to be synthesized” (Weick, 1995, p. 27). Thus, academic staff at both the University of the River and the University of the Incarnate Word led and concocted specific meanings from the national broader policies and then, made the broader national policies converge with internal dynamics of change, and enacted particular meanings of them as institutional policies or as implementation of the national broader policies at each university.

Weick identifies seven properties of sense-making in organizations. They were systematized in the following: “grounded in identity construction”, “retrospective”, “enactive of sensible environments”, “social”, “ongoing”, “focused on and by extracted cues”, and “driven by plausibility rather than accuracy” (Weick, p. 17).

In the data analyzed in this section, both the overall process of sense-making as proposed by the literature will be included and questioned, as well as, the components of the process itself.

4.4.1 Specification of national broader policies

After the LHE was passed in 1995 and an initial resistance was expressed by the public universities to it, the progressive governmental demands, as well as the urgency in ensuring budget stability, fueled the context of implementation of the LHE at each of the institutions under scrutiny. The ways in which policies stated in the LHE transferred into their enactment at the institutional level were highly marked by the mediation of academic staff decision-making at the institutional level.

The LHE was framed by a member of the academic staff of the University of the River, as a “point of inflection for the Argentinean higher education system” (CL070103, p. 2). At this institution, other policies and processes were put in place to both specify the broader national policies as well as the support of autonomous processes of change and reform. All of the members of the academic staff at this university described that the University of the River was already embarked in a process of change, focused on quality improvement. Kent, staff member at the university illustrated the process as it follows:

CL: We take the LHE as the point of inflection for the Argentinean higher education system. Even before that...At this university [University of the River] there was a phenomenon...because we were one of the first universities that started quality self-evaluation. For the internal evaluation process, we draw upon a series of documents which were the basis for the way in which we would program the internal quality evaluation. It was also from these documents that the LHE based its proposals on quality evaluation programs. Later on, for our university, the information we obtained by the internal evaluation allowed us to elaborate the Millennium program (CDL070103, p.2).

All the academic staff at the public university described the implementation of the quality evaluation programs as a convergence of processes already in place at the institution, as well as requirements being brought by the LHE. For LI, the internal evaluation performed at the university “converges with the LHE and became a crucial component of the implementation of the LHE at the University of the River” (LI122203, p. 15).

Kent and others described that the UR was already experiencing a “process of re-accommodation” (CDL070103, p.2) which ultimately translates in the elaboration by the Academic Secretariat at the university of another policy entitled “The Millennium Program” (CDL070103, p.2).

Kent depicted that the LHE included policies that were resisted by the public universities, because they were “seen as deciding in areas that are in fact component of university’s autonomy” (CDL070103, p.2). These tensions between what the LHE states framed as endangering university autonomy were expressed by several members of the academic staff and clearly influenced the ways in which the policies at the public university were mediated and understood (CDL070103; IM81304).

Patrick who was also an academic staff member at the UR describes further the aims of the public university in the establishment of specific policies after the passing of the LHE:

ASF: The LHE introduced certain aspects that were firmly disliked by the public universities, because the LHE “put its nose” into areas that are part of the autonomy of the universities. In particular, the areas of academic autonomy of the university which was a typical move from the government policies in the 1990s. At the same time that the government was intruding into university autonomy, it was also trying to get rid of its responsibilities to higher education (ASF070304, p. 2).

Kent explained that the aim to maintain the autonomy of the university triggered its academic staff to put together the Millennium program, and other policy papers in order to specify and make clear the general statements from the LHE regarding quality improvement and

reform of plans of studies. The Millennium program was described by LI as an “important document, because it allowed us to see what was going on with the plan of studies and introduced the changes in them” (LI122203, p. 15). The same person characterized the Millennium program as “the point of departure for the implementation of the reform policies within our university, the Millennium and other policy documents” (LI122203, p. 16). Benita described the millennium program as “the guidelines provided by the academic staff at the university to produce the plan of studies’ reform with specific information on the articulation of courses, their length, and requirements within each school” (SRLTNV1222303, pp. 17-18).

Additionally, at the university level the policies of reform of plan of studies were coupled with policies specifically regulating the work of the professoriate:

CDL: At the university level, we needed to establish a more specific normative to regulate the reform of plans of studies. The university produced a series of individual policies in order to further establish even how many hours professors had to teach and how many hours they had to do service or research (the teaching and research schedule) (CDL070103, pp.2-3).

Other members of academic staff portrayed the reform of the plans of study as the way in which the university “give priority and directionality to the reform and directed the investment of its resources” (HS081304, p.10).

In the case of Jack and other members of the academic staff at the public university the implementation of the policies related to quality improvement were useful to the university as a source to collect information and as “a way to shed light on the ongoing problems and the realities the institution was facing” (HS081304, p. 11).

It was also at the university level that priorities for research and funding of research, which were simply mentioned in the LHE (CDL070103, p.3; ASF070304, pp. 3-4). This policy

appeared as somewhat intertwined with the professional development policies delineated at the institutional level.

In light of the previous data, academic staff retrospectively constructed retroactively the meanings of specific policies mentioned in the LHE. Thus, academic staff performed what Weick described as a synthetic appropriation of the meanings of the LHE (Weick, p. 27). Thus, at the institutional level, academic staff proposed as the major meanings extracted from the LHE, the quality evaluation processes, the reform of plans of studies, and rather specific regulations for the work of the professoriate. They also enacted the LHE policies in the specific “sensitive environments” of the institution (Weick, pp. 30-34). For example, quality evaluation became a priority at the University of the River, because there was an ongoing process aimed to support quality improvement at the university. This policy component in the LHE was framed as vital from it. This process could be explained by Weick’s notion that actors in organizations “create their environments and their environment creates them” (Weick, p. 34). Weick highlights the tensional and intertwined process of meaning creation influenced by institutional dynamics.

In this context, professors at the University of the River received and constructed specific meanings from the policy implementation itself of the major reform policies. Kelly, junior faculty, illustrates the synthetic policy meanings operating at the institutional level:

CMG: When we were doing the reform of the plan of studies, we thought that there will be some freedom in making yearly courses as elective. But, the reform of the plan of studies into courses per semester was seen as something that the LHE demanded... Yes, or Yes! There was a lot of resistance in my department to that idea... (CMG071003, p. 5).

Professors from the University of the River identified the guidelines for the reform of the plan of studies as “coming directly from the school, but contextualized very clearly in the proposals made at the university level” (DF080604, p. 9). Several faculty found the reform of the plan of studies as the main component of the implementation of broader policies (GL080604, p.

12). Nevertheless, several professors portrayed this process as of an unclear nature, with different levels of intensity as triggered by the university or the schools (MLM080504, p. 17)

At the UIW, the transfer and implementation of the policies from the LHE was paced in a less urgent fashion, and in a particular manner highly determined by the institution itself. Accordingly, Maxine described that the UIW created a “pedagogical space that comes to life by the LHE, that also comes to see light because we wanted to create a place to do research on our pedagogical practices to improve those practices and the everyday life at the university” (CMyotros, p.6).

Nevertheless, as in the University of the River, at the University of the Incarnate Word, the decision on the first policies to be implemented and regulated, were the policies related to quality evaluation (both internal and external) (CMyotros 080204, p. 4; GN, p. 13). Jackie and Malcolm described the existence of three steps in the implementation process and the formulation of policies at the UIW (See GPNP, p. 13).

According to Maxine, the UIW initiated the process of quality evaluation both responding to requirements from the LHE but also adhering to a political decision to install quality improvement as an everyday practice at the university:

CMyotros: The implementation of the quality improvement policies also has to do with the process of accreditation, which has two faces: first of internal evaluation, and second of external evaluation. But, we didn't think about this process as a requirement from the LHE or by other external force. Here, there was a political decision of an improvement process... the quality improvement as a permanent process, and with the idea of installing the culture of internal evaluation as an everyday practice. (CMyotros, p. 6).

The academic staff at the UIW described that there are slight differences in the goals of quality evaluation proposed by the LHE, and the goals related to it at the UIW. CMyotros explained that “the LHE proposes quality evaluation with a punishing or sanctioning flavor. We wanted to propose evaluation as a reflexive process for faculty and students” (CMyotros, p.6).

With the advent of the LHE, at the UIW they intended to “organize the previously diversified activities of self-evaluation that had happened at the university level, and updating them with what was designed in the national context” (ASyotros, p. 7). Converging previous processes happening at the institutional level and making their convergence with the policy proposals from the LHE shows similarities with the processes at the UR. Additionally, it could be illuminated with the lens of synthetic meaning construction, as described by Weick.

The ways in which academic staff at the UIW, framed the quality evaluation policies manifest a dual scope: translating policy from the LHE and preparing an instrument to improve its quality beyond the goals of the LHE.

The reform of the plan of studies was also a policy translation from the LHE at the UIW. Nonetheless, the pace of implementation of this specific policy was charged with the specific approach of “adopting the plans to what the LHE required in terms of lengths and features” (ASyotros, p. 7). Regarding this aspect, Maxine described that it was the academic staff who initiated the demand of revisions of plans of studies, working with faculty to achieve this goal:

CMyotros: We wanted to work directly with the actors. We worked with faculty, facilitating agreements on organizing groups to work on specific areas of study, and installing the idea among them that we needed to change the rigidity of the plan of study and replace it by a more flexible format. In the long run, we wanted to initiate the process, and then slowly step up from it, letting faculty work independently on it. (CMyotros 080204, pp. 7-8).

In this context, the reform of the plan of studies and other specifications from the policies delineated from the LHE, such as the quality improvement program, was identified as a process determined by “a group from the Academic Secretariat of the university which follows a particular model. In other words, the model followed was whichever is good for this university” (CMyotros, p. 7). Walden explained that:

NP: The goal of the internal evaluation was to improve quality. In the most recent years, there were more demands on reforming the plans of studies, and these demands translated on the work of the professoriate...There were three instances for the reform of plan of studies, and micro processes happening at the same time. The initial moment was when the LHE came to light, and then, when the university decided to propose the reform of the plan of studies to faculty and students. (NPyotros, p. 12).

The aforementioned characterization of the ways in which the institution proposes the specification of particular policies, strengthened in a particular view of university autonomy, shows similarities with the dynamics at the UR. The notion of the sensitive context of enactment, as well as what the actors conduct on the policy messages reveal these processes at the UIW. In light of the concept of “sensitive contexts of enactment”, it is interesting to highlight that these goals of quality improvement, translated at the UIW in “demands to faculty to participate in the reform of plan of studies as well as in professional development. This generated a collective hysteria, because it was first announced and then explained how the process was going to develop” (GP0704, p.12).

In an overview, at both universities there were specific procedures and policy decisions put in place to allow the implementation of national broader policies at the institutional level. In this context, original policy making processes developed at these two universities.

4.4.2 Participation in policy making at the institutional level

Weick describes sense-making procedures at organizational levels as happening in a social context and as a social endeavor. Additionally, sense-making happens when “active agents construct sensible, sensible events” (Weick, p. 4). In the case of implementation of reform at the two universities under study, the actors or active agents who lead the process of framing and enactment of the broader policies were members of the academic staff. Their construction of the

policies followed specific questions such as “how they construct what they construct, why, and with what effects” (Weick, p.4). Thus, how academic staff constructs policies entails a particular way of framing bringing other institutional actors into the implementation of the policies at the universities.

There were several similarities and slight differences in the ways in which each university embarked in the policy implementation process. The similarities stood from the identification as areas that required specific policies for both the university quality improvement, and the reform of plans of studies. The differences represented the intertwined relationships between policy design and participation at the institutional level, and the privileged role of the academic staff as the actual leading agents of both the policy making process at the institution and the more subordinated role of the professoriate in this process. Thus, at the UR, there were more detailed documents or policy papers that stated the details on the role of the professoriate and their work within the reform processed such as the one happening at the UIW.

At the UR, policy implementation and policy-making at the institutional level was more targeted and directed. It was delineated a priori, and it entailed a rather channeled participation of the professoriate in it, e.g. when the reform of the plan of studies was happening at different schools, external consultants were brought in to lead the process and to work with faculty on it (BCA072704; MLM081104; NDR081904; CMG071003; ILSP071003). While professors worked with the external evaluators, their work was paced and organized in terms of priorities by the academia staff from the university. The reform of the plan of studies was paced in a rather strict fashion guided and lead by the academic staff at the university. Although there was participation of faculty in the reform of plans of studies, the final decisions were in the hands of academic staff.

There were tensions between dynamics of decentralization and centralization at the core of the policy design process and participation at the UR.

In the case of the UIW, there was a political decision that happened at the top of the university hierarchy (CMyotros, p. 7) which decided the pace and priorities of the implementation process, as well as the targeting areas for policy. Although it was the academic staff that organized and initiated the call for the reform of the plans of studies, leading and organizing faculty, they then, “stepped out” of the process, allowing faculty to be further involved in this matter. The dynamics of professors’ participation can be summarized in working by themselves around reform of plans of studies, after being organized by the academic staff. There were no external consultant called to support the process, and academic staff reserved for themselves that advisory role. As two members of the academic staff characterized the process, they organized to happen in a “non-interventionist fashion” (CMyotros, p. 17; ASyotros, p. 16). However, Maxine and Benerice described their role as related to the reform of the plan of studies as “of constant evaluation and re-evaluation” (CMyotros, p. 17).

At the UIW, the pace of the quality improvement as well as the reform of the plan of studies was framed in a rather slower fashion and with less intensity as compared to the similar dynamics operating at the UR.

4.4.3 Goals of policy initiative (university level)

At both universities, one of the broader goals of policy was to specify or detailed the broader notions presented by the LHE. Nevertheless, as it was aforementioned, the LHE fueled certain policy processes operating at the institutional level, such as the internal goal of internal

evaluation and the reform of plan of studies. These processes converged and entangled with the actual implementation and enactment of the policies themselves at each university.

The complexity of the convergence between the implementation of the broader policies extracted institutionally as “cues” (Weick, 1995, p. 17) for policy as well as specific institutional goals differentiate the processes at both universities.

At the UR, under the umbrella of implementation of the reform policies, there was a process of restructuring of both the management and administrative structure at the school level and departmental level. This process was described by faculty and staff as resulting of the governance proposals in the LHE, and in the need to ensure the full implementation of the broader reform policies.

The Millennium Program was identified as the main regulatory policy piece for both the reform of the plan of studies and of the changes introduced in the work of academics by both faculty and academic staff. For 89% of faculty interviewed for this study, the Millennium Program represented the institutional policy source of transformation. For the academic staff, the Millennium Program represented the foremost regulatory document of policy for the whole university:

CLO: It was from the Academic Secretariat at the university that the whole institution could follow the guidelines for the quality evaluation. From the data obtained by this evaluation, the UR elaborated a document which set up the basis for the implementation of the reform policies, the reform of the plans of studies, etc. From that document, the most important program of changes was introduced...The Millennium [Program] was also important as a regulation, and as an instrument of regulation for the whole university...(CLO72804, p. 3).

In addition to the reform of the plans of studies, there is another policy goal at the UR expressed in the Millennium Program and other policies which is the notion of “full use of the

human resources available at the UR, namely, the faculty”. Kent explained further that the preparation of human resources entailed the inauguration of graduate programs,

CDL [...] with strong efforts from the university in terms of investment in bringing visiting professors, and making it attractive to faculty to come and settle here in this city. We are committed... We think the preparation of human resources... is needed... That is why we are trying to make faculty get their graduate degrees (CDL072803, p. 9).

80% of the academic staff from the UR illustrated to the so-called this human resource management goal, the institutional intention of giving faculty at the UR, professional development opportunities (graduate degrees or improvement in their credentials). Several members of the academic staff at the UR clearly established the connection between faculty obtaining graduate degrees, and the availability at the university of a “pool of human resource available for teaching in future graduate programs. The logic expressed by members of the academic staff regarding this was that the investment in preparing human resources (faculty) will entail in the long run resources that would come back to the institutions. Kent described it as a “long term investment in human resources” (CDL072803, p. 9).

For academic staff members, there is a correlation between the information obtained by the internal quality evaluation and professional improvement through research activities. Nevertheless, in the history of implementation of these policies, this goal appears as a rather late goal of the institutional policies. This goal is described by 60% of the academic staff as a goal that was “picked from” the LHE, and a goal that converge with the internal quality evaluation.

The encounter of institutional policy goals and the broader policy goals from the LHE generated peculiar dynamics at the university which one member of the academic staff described as “institutional squizofrenia” (CLO72804, p. 4). Additionally, there are specific goals and intentions at the institutional level that clash with the systemic and institutional limitations. Several members of the academic staff describes these limitations to the achievement of policy

goals, the lack of financial resources to improve the opportunities of faculty to obtain graduate degrees, and solve with this, the so-called professional heterogeneity at the institutional level (CLO72804, p. 9). This limitation affected another policy goal at the university which is, as declared by a member of the academic staff, the “achievement of faculty excellence” (IM081304, p.24). For members of the academic staff at the university, the complexity of the institutional policy goals and their dynamics got compromised with the real problem of availability of resources.

In the context of achieving quickly the institutional policy goals at the UR, pressure was imposed on faculty by academic staff. Kelly depicted it as a “storm that came” (CMG071003, p. 17).

It is expressive of the complexity of the policy goals in the context of the UR that faculty and academic staff clearly presented differences in which ones they identify as such.

At the UR, another major goal of policy was the achievement of the internal evaluation for quality improvement. This policy goal set up a series of priorities in the investment of resources at the institutional level (DLS082304, p.17). Additionally, members of academic staff understood that the LHE makes transparent for the university itself that a major policy goal for the latter is the achievement of quality (CDL072803, p. 3).

Overall, at the UR another policy priority was the preservation of university autonomy which is described by academic staff members as a goal “in tension” with the text and goals which appear in the LHE. Kent explained that,

CDL: When the LHE was passed, the UR was in a process of re-accommodation and change. So, from the passing of the LHE, the issue was which things belonged strictly under the LHE and which things belonged to the realm of the university, because of our autonomy, most specifically, because of the academic autonomy of the university (CDL072803, p. 3).

Similarly, at the UIW, the goal of quality improvement was also captured and constructed from the LHE. Academic staff made references to an institutional “political decision at the UIW to improve quality as a main goal...and to install as a common practice the issue of quality improvement...not to sanction...but as a practice” (CMyotros, p. 12).

There were additional goals that converge with this one in this university environment, such as the reform of plan of studies. At the UIW, the purpose of introducing changes to make students more independent and self-determined in their learning process appeared highlighted by four members of academic staff at this university.

Another endemic problem at the UIW to achieve its policy goals has been the issue of determining the policy goals as needed by the institution. Academic staff and the authorities provided general guidelines of policy goals based on the notion of “what is good for this university”. Based on the “political decision” made by the university authorities (CMyotros, p. 12), the academic staff specified what was relevant in terms of policy goals for the institution.

4.4.4 Comparison between state policies/ institutional policies

The LHE was described by a member of the academic staff of the University of the River, as a “point of inflection for the Argentinean higher education system in general and for the UR in particular” (CL070103, p. 2). At this institution, other policies and processes were put into place to both specify the broader national policies as well as support autonomous processes of reform. All of the members of the academic staff at this university described that the University of the River was already embarked in a process of internal evaluation, focused on quality improvement. Kent, staff member at the university illustrated the process as it follows:

CL: We take the LHE as the point of inflection for the Argentinean higher education system in general, and for the UR in particular. Even before that...At this university [UR] there was a phenomenon...because we were one of the first universities that started quality self-evaluation. For the internal evaluation process, we draw upon a series of documents which were the basis for the way in which we would program the internal quality evaluation. It was also from these documents that the LHE based its proposals on quality evaluation programs (CDL070103, p.2).

Additionally, Kent and other members of the academic staff at the UR described that the LHE in fact was the catalyst for internal quality assessment at the university. Five members of the academic staff explain that the convergence of both the requirements from the LHE as well as the policies already in place at the UR situate specific policy problems such as the need for quality evaluation, the reform of plan of studies, and the need for “improving the condition of human resources” (CDL070103, p. 2). In the context of the UR, the advent of the LHE worked as a powerful environment that allowed the internal justification of policies already in place, as well as, the propitiatory broad context for the specification of proposals not specified in the LHE. Martha and Weston explained in their interviews, how the broad notions that appear in the LHE, generated tensions between two dynamics: the requirements related to quality improvement that pushed the institution to accelerate the pursuit of quality, and the pace and resources available at the institutional level destined also to fulfill other institutional goals, such as, creation of new programs of studies, or provision of support to faculty to obtain new credentials (DRS, p.13; HUS081305, p. 3).

According to the academic staff at the UR, the push to quality improvement, accelerated by the advent of the LHE, acquired the features stated by the LHE. Klaus described it as follows:

CL: When we designed the internal quality evaluation, we took into consideration the components and aspects proposed by the LHE and CONEAU. We saw in light of the quality requirements that we needed to improve the credentials of faculty because that was one of our deficits...the problem for us was the problem of availability of resources to support it...This is the main problem, but not everything is related to the budget...We understand that we needed to increase the salary of our faculty, but we depended from the

budget distribution from the state. The LHE presents this as a requirement, but the problem is that each university has limitations. So, the problem is not if the universities fulfill the requirements from the LHE but if under the circumstances, the universities managed to form faculty and researchers in the way they were requested. (CLO072804, pp. 3-4).

Other academic staff portrayed the LHE as a “globalizing law...because it provides regulations for everything in a general fashion” (CLO072804, p.3). That is one of the sources of tensions and limitations in the implementation of its policies at the institutional level. These dynamics created issues at the implementation stage. The theme of an endemic tension between what was described and stated by the LHE and the actual institutional structures and resources was highlighted by 75% percent of the faculty interviewed. One professor, Kelly, describes these tensions as having effects on the situation of the professoriate:

CMG: The LHE was like a storm that came...I don't know how it was all related, but I think that all the pressures were derived from the reform of the higher education system. Well, for us, then, we needed to get new credentials because of the concursos...We also were pressured to do research. It was hard for many people, people were left out. (CMG071003, p. 4).

Another important feature in the pace and type of policy implementation at the UR was that it was intertwined with the goal of supporting its autonomy. Therefore, certain dispositions and rhythm of implementation proposed by the LHE were revised before implementing it at the UR (DF080604, p. 6; HUS081305, p. 4, CDL072803, p. 10). Additionally, the LHE was framed by different members of the academic staff at the UR as “an imposition, an imposition initially from the WB and then, from the government” (IM081304, p. 8). Accordingly, the policies were seen as being imposed in a trickle down fashion, going from the top, to academic units and departments (IM081304, p.8; HUS081305, p.5). This generated discussions and questions in every stage of the process (IM081304, p.8).

According to professors and university bureaucrats, there were discussions at many levels at the UR in order to select and prioritize the policies coming from the LHE, that there was confusion and lack of clarity about the actual origin of specific policy decisions themselves, e.g., incentives for faculty, financing of research projects, etc. Both professors and academic staff described a saturated climate of policy implementation (IM081304, p.9; DF080604, p.7; HUS081305, p.10) as a result of the top-down approach followed in the reform process. The climate of confusion and saturation appeared more complex when related to resource distribution to support the implementation of reform policies (IM081304, p.9).

Another aspect in which the UR determined the pace and rhythm of the reform was related to the reform of plan of studies. This was just enunciated in the LHE, but it was at each university that the features and targets of this were decided. Several members of the academic staff coincide in describing that the reform of the plans of studies developed at each university at their own pace. Rose, at the UR illustrated that each university

SRL: decided as one of its political lines, to work in its plans of studies, and the reform of them. It was a process that started at the top of the university but trickled down to each department. At the UR there was a commission for the reform of the plan of studies with participation from each department and school. This commission decided which the lines to follow for the curricular reform were. (SRL122303, p.11).

At the UIW, it was after the LHE was passed and its regulations were known to be implemented that the university started in a rather inorganic fashion, quality evaluation activities. ASyotros depicted a rather slower pace of implementation of the regulations from the LHE, and the manners in which this university specified the LHE's requirements related to quality improvement:

ASyotros: After 1995, the law was passed which established that the universities needed to comply with the external quality evaluation. This university started at that time to develop some dispersed activities of internal quality evaluation, mostly focused on academic issues, related also to the type of faculty profile, in terms of gathering some

data related to professors' background and credentials...From 2000, institutionally, there was a decision of starting to systematized the much disarticulated procedures of internal quality evaluation. I was asked by the provost at the university to first, gather all the information from the Ministry available about internal evaluation. We prepared new guidelines for the internal evaluation that had nothing to do with the initial guidelines we had from the LHE. (ASyotros080204, p. 4).

At the UIW, academic staff referred to a political decision being taken at the hierarchical top at the university to specify the general dispositions from the LHE (ASyotros, p. 5; CMyotros; AQ072704). The university authorities provided the "general guidelines" about how to organize the process but "without discussions around the pre-conceptions for the quality evaluation itself" (ASyotros, p. 5). Nevertheless, they also recognized that the notion of developing specific regulations for the evaluation and accreditation of studies in Architecture and the development of standards for the external evaluation procedures came from the Ministry of Education.

Members of academic staff at the UIW differentiated the style and goals of the policies proposed by the LHE related to quality evaluation, from the ones designed at the UIW. CMyotros characterized the policies from the LHE as having a "punishing character", "installing evaluation for the sake of evaluating", and "as an institutional duty" (CMyotros, p. 5). The academic staff described the policies aiming to enhance quality at the university as "slower" and "of a more confusing nature" (NP, p. 7), "procedural and still progressing", and as "agreement and participation of faculty" (CMyotros, p.5).

4.4.5 Quality improvement and role of academics

The implementation of the quality improvement was initially trialed at the institution. According to academic staff, this quality improvement process was intertwined with a culture of evaluation

of faculty and ultimately of students (p.4: CL). Academic staff describes the effects of quality evaluation at the institutional level as “living in a culture of evaluation” (CLO072804, p.4).

This notion of constant quality evaluation at the university level, according to academic staff at the UR, emanated from both the Ministry of Education and the university:

CL: The constant evaluation and quality evaluation are demands that fall on faculty. These demands come from the Ministry of Education and they also come from the university. Today, the university needs faculty who is able to produce knowledge, does research, and transfer this knowledge to her/his students, and to society (CLO072804, p.5).

From the academic staff’s standpoint, one issue limitation within the pursuing of quality at the institutional level has been the lack of professors’ credentials. This fueled at different schools the request to professors to obtain graduate or post-graduate degrees. This happened according to Mabel, in a directionless fashion (DL072404, p.11). The demand in some schools framed by few academic staff members as of “brutal pressure” (DL072404, p.11).

Academic staff at the UR described the “formation of human resources” as a process interlocked with quality improvement (CLO072804, pp. 2-3). The demand of research productivity from faculty appeared as an important goal related to quality improvement and subordinated to it in the so-called “achievement of excellence” (IM092204, p.14). Faculty described it as an unquestionable movement to show faculty research productivity (BCA072704; BF080304; TS080404; GL080604; MLM081104; MLM080504; NDR081904; CMG071003, pp. 6-7, p.14). Nevertheless, from the faculty’s standpoint, the requirement of faculty research productivity was additionally subordinated to other policy decisions. For 68% of faculty interviewed at the UR, highlighted that paradoxically the “push for institutional quality improvement has been an opportunity to study more, work on the reform of plan of studies, and improve the quality of what we offer” (DF080604, p.8). The declared interest of professors on

quality improvement was the trigger to redefine a new professional role (DF080604, p.8; CMG071003, p. 12; GL080604, p. 5).

The pursuit of quality at the UR appeared as a heterogeneous goal at the university, depending not only on resource availability but internal dynamics at the schools. The problem of funding was seen as emblematic for faculty, who sees it as a contradiction (MLM081104, p.18; BCA072704, p. 8). Some schools, such as the school of Architecture, the school of Engineering, the School of Humanities and Sciences, appeared to focus strongly on the quality demand. According to 78% of professors working at these schools, faculty with graduate degrees were more concerned with the process of quality improvement, which generated tensions with other faculty (DL072404, p.9; TS080404; MLM081104; NDR081904). Additionally, there were paradoxical dynamics within the institution itself in the pursuit of quality. Three of the academic staff interviewed for this study stressed a dual contradiction at the university: first, the university following major policy lines extracted from the reform movement opened a large number of both graduate and undergraduate programs without situating the quality of the offer as a primordial goal. Second, the university has situated as a vital component of its policies and practices the pursuing and maintenance of quality.

In the case of the UIW, the issue of faculty research productivity was framed by academic staff and faculty as specifically subordinated to LHE requirements more than to be aligned to a quality improvement movement at the institution (CMyotros, p. 7). The way in which academic staff at the UIW organized it, was pre-determined by the LHE and as a way that faculty has to participate in quality improvement. Academic staff depicted that professors have shown “continuous work and interest in self-evaluation and in the reform of the plan of studies” (ASyotros, pp. 7-8, & CMyotros).

Academic staff described the quality improvement goals at the UIW translated into three components: program planning and program evaluation (PN, p.12), increasing demands on professors' work (PN, p.12; GN, p. 8), and demands on professors' professional development (AQ072704, p. 6). The combination and timing of these components, fueled in the beginning a climate of uncertainty and confusion among faculty, which was described by a member of the academic staff as a "climate of collective hysteria" (PN, p.12).

In contrast, professors at the UIW perceived the institutional pursuit of quality improvement as a clear institutional goal, with strong differences per school and reaching their schools with uneven impact. Nevertheless, as their colleagues at the UR, they perceived that the pursuit of quality at the institutional level has impacted unevenly their work or aspects of their work. 67% of the faculty interviewed from the UIW, when referring to the process of quality evaluation framed it while allowing faculty participation in a limited fashion. Paula portrayed it as a "practice that allowed for some degree of faculty participation" (MCS081004, p. 5). Professors at the UIW characterized the faculty participation mostly at the stage of the internal quality evaluation, responding to the call and leadership from the academic staff (MCS081004; BF080304; MAM081204). At the same time, they eloquently stated as faculty working at the UIW of being committed and participants in the institutional goal of quality pursuing.

Academic staff at the UIW corroborated the ample participation of faculty in the quality evaluation process. They describe the internal evaluation development as the main avenue for professors' participation (ASyotros; CMyotros; AQ072704), and as a process that involved "rigor", because of its pace, goals, and procedures (GP, p.12; NP, 0704). However, academic staff also elucidated the process as a combination of different micro-processes which entailed different degrees of participation from faculty within each school. In contrast with the manner in

which faculty portrayed this endeavor, academic staff explains that faculty showed strong interest in internal evaluation, and reform of plan of studies. Academic staff stresses the commitment of faculty to this institutional endeavor, which manifested in a different way in the descriptions volunteered by professors.

Faculty role in institutional quality manifested as limited to their participation when lead and organized by academic staff. There were specific areas where faculty participation was displayed, under the umbrella of institutional quality programming. Those areas were: the reform of plans of studies, and the fulfillment of institutional excellence through the performing of the internal quality evaluation. These two aspects translated specifically in more requirements of credential improvement to faculty, and research productivity from faculty.

4.4.6 Academic staff and the professoriate

In the process of transfer of the higher education reform policies into their implementation at the universities, the framing and mediation of the policies themselves were captured by members of the academic staff. The process of meaning construction is not only embedded in social contexts and interactions (Weick, 1995, p. 38) but also in power-driven dynamics where certain meanings (expressed and sustained by certain actors at the institutional context) are reinforced, strengthened, and superseded by others.

Academic staff became the main agents that produce the synthesis of meaning of the policies, as well as the focus of them in terms of selecting priorities and a pace for their implementation (Weick, pp. 12-13). But the ways in which academic staff mediated and interpreted the broader policies for their implementation at the institutional level, were also exchanged, negotiated, and even resisted by other institutional actors, which work and endeavors

were affected by the implementation itself, namely, the professoriate. The dynamics of reform policy implementation at the universities under scrutiny, allowed multiple processes of institutional structuration and re-structuration which developed through the implementation process (Weick, p. 36) and engulfed their actors: academic staff and the professoriate.

The relationships, and meaning mediations, and exchanges between academic staff and faculty at each university around and through the policy implementation shed light on the multifaceted aspects of policy implementation and the complexities of meanings constructed (Weick, p. 38). In the process of sense-making, the issue of power driven meaning construction (Weick, p. 38) could also be traced through the interactions between faculty and staff

At the UR professors highlighted their rather subordinated role and channeled participation not only in the implementation of the reform policies, but also in the actual meanings constructed from them. These dynamics run true for professors with different seniority, and appointments. Nevertheless, intertwined with this role, there were issues of power within the institution and its actors that were embedded in the ways in which the policies were enacted.

Cate a professor working at the UR for 10 years, described the relationships between faculty and staff in the context of the policy implementation, as supported in a

BC: [...] hierarchical relationship, us [faculty] being their clientele...because of the history of the reform movement and our role in it, because of the history of the departments, and because of the dispersion and lack of ties between faculty and academic staff. This has definitely impacted the tone of the discussions of the policies themselves... (BCA03, pp. 1-2).

This description of the type of relationship between faculty and staff appeared reiterated by faculty from different schools, with different degrees of tensional ties or conflict between faculty and staff (BCA072704; BF080304; TS080404; GL080604; MLM081104; MLM080504; NDR081904; CMG071003). Other faculty highlighted that the problems arising from the

implementation of the policies fueled pre-existing conflicts in each department and schools in terms of appointments, or distribution of resources for research.

In contrast, academic staff at the UR while acknowledging the conflict around the process of policy implementation, explained that there were institutional needs that supported policy implementation as it unfolded, as well as the selection of areas of policy priority for their implementation. For instance, academic staff stresses that it was academic staff who decided “which are the areas with actual possibilities to develop research, and therefore, where the financial efforts of the university should be applied” (CLO072804, pp.2-3).

Additionally, other members of the academic staff described as a key topic in the implementation of the policies themselves the issue of “institutional control and institutional monitoring” (CLO072804, p.3) which appeared as a trend through different schools and programs at the university. Klaus describes and justifies this logic as it follows:

CL: In the transformation of the UR there were things that relate to the issue of authority within the university...But I honestly think that there are issues that have to do mostly with the regulations and the law...of course there are regulations at the university and outside the universities that constrain our actions...But there are also hierarchies and authorities that play a role in how the reform policies were implemented at the university, and at each school. However, I have to say that in our school, we really formed working groups. That is my personal way of working... (CLO072804, p. 3).

Other members of the academic staff framed the process of policy implementation as the result of a group’s project lead by the authorities at the university. They justified with a combination of historical factors, and the participation of different actors at the institution:

NLV122303: The top management at the university, and the faculty formed working groups that provided advice for the implementation of the policies. Different staff and faculty at the university lived with distinctive intensity the stages of this process. The demanding rhythm of the reform movement, the new demands, requires the action of people who are the most capable to face these situations. In some cases, this has to do with the professional credentials and seniority and experience people have in their work. Most importantly, we noticed that there has been a progressive transition to this situation (NLV122303, p. 4).

Paradoxically, another academic staff member characterized the implementation process as a course of action in which: “no one can complain that it wasn’t a participatory endeavor, because a participatory management approach was followed” (LI122203, p.13).

For faculty at different departments and schools, the area of the policies that ignited the most intense conflicts between faculty and staff was the issue of reform of plan of studies. The conflict developed in terms of the reduction of the length of courses (namely “cuatrimestralizacion” in Spanish), and in relationship with the urgency and pace of the implementation of the policies themselves. One faculty gives an eloquent description of the conflictive nature of the exchanges between faculty and staff:

CMG: now looking back, what I see as the main problems in the implementation...Well, it was within the school, and most specifically within the department...I think the strongest issue was the reform of the length of the courses [from one year to one semester]. Each and every one of us defended their object of study, and our appointments and positions...We were concerned about losing our jobs by the reduction of the teaching load...It was connected with the concern of showing through teaching that we were working. In general, there was concern in this sense, in the percentage of research and teaching to warranty our job (CMG071003, pp.4-5).

Additionally, the issue of suffering pressures from the academic staff to the implementation of specific policies, such as the ones on the reform of plan of studies and the reduction of the length of the courses, is illustrated in the following:

CMG: The academic secretary from the school came to our meetings, he pressured and pressured and ordered us...He came to visit our meetings and expressed that the change in the plans had to be done or had to be done...I don’t clearly remember the legal context for this, but what I remember was the very clear pressure. The dean of the school came to our meetings and I remember that he brought examples on the reform of plan of studies that the Universidad de Rosario was conducting...The pressure is what I remember the most...The guidelines were not so much on what to agree upon but on doing it...I also remember that a month before of the academic year, the academic secretary called us and told us that we needed to offer that year, the courses in the new length (CMG071003, p. 5).

At another school, GL describes the dynamics of the reform of the plans of studies as:

GL: it was happening in a context of pressure...I remember my colleagues with full time appointments here at this school, feeling the urgency to have this reform done and have it ready soon. Those were the guidelines we received at the many meetings we had...We had the meetings in the evenings and on Saturdays... (GL080604, p. 8).

Paradoxically, one member of the academic describes the tensional nature of the relationship between academic staff and faculty with an incident at one school:

DL: the pressures at each school were so different...In some cases there had been already cultures among faculty of doing research and publishing, etc. But in some other cases...the pressure of combining the reform policies with the new demands of publishing and research was brutal. I know a case...I know this case very closely, in which the professor got crazy, because she couldn't take the pressure... Really crazy. She has a leave of absence.... (DLS082304, p.10).

In addition, several faculty elucidated the overall policy implementation at the UR as a course of action in which “issues of salary and influence were intertwined with the decision-making at the university” (DF080604, p.9). The political and rather controversial character of the relationship between faculty and staff within the process of policy reform was stressed by 88% of the faculty interviewed. One faculty described this as “the problems of different political lines that operate at the same time within the university” (DF080604, p.9). In addition, the pace and urgency of the reform triggered the establishment of agreements between actors to ensure the lack of resistance to specific policies (IMD072804, p.12).

In a rather different manner, at the UIW, the academic staff, developed and proposed a different fashion of implementation. They organized and lead the implementation of specific policies among the professoriate, but after an initial period, they “step out” from working with faculty and let faculty develop their meetings and pace of work. Nevertheless, at the UIW, the pace of implementation was influenced by the need to comply with processes of quality evaluation and accreditation (CMyotros; ASyotros; AQ072704.). The dynamics of implementation was also decided and somewhat structured by the top hierarchy at the university

(CMyotros, p. 7) and the academic staff claimed to have structured the process in a “non-interventionist fashion” (CMyotros, p. 17; ASyotros, p. 16). However, academic staff described their role as related to the reform of the plan of studies as “of constant evaluation and re-evaluation” (CMyotros, p. 17).

The participation of faculty in the implementation of policies at the UIW had different profiles as compared to the ways in which that happened at the UR. Both members of academic staff and faculty describe that professors adopted a less resisting role in the overall implementation of the policies, in particular, in the reform of plan of studies. A member of the academic staff explained:

CM: We were surprised when in the first meetings we had with the entire faculty...professors were not accustomed to intervene in the decision-making at the university...Up to the point that they would raise their hands to participate in the discussion. The practice of dialogue, debate, and reflection was not an installed practice among faculty. Neither this practice was common in the decisions around educational policies taken at the school level...So, as academic staff, we had to give life to the issues, and organize groups of faculty to work in different areas of policy (CMyotros, p.7).

This was described by several faculty from the UIW, in the notions of “we were invited to participate in the decisions, and for some of us was a new experience” (MCS081004, p. 9), and in the idea that “faculty were resistant to provide their opinions and ideas. It took several meetings to get us to even talk about the fears about the reform of the plans of study...and about the whole issue of quality evaluation” (BF080304, p. 4).

Between members of academic staff and faculty at the UIW the methodology used to support the implementation of the reform policies was of “first guiding faculty and making them participate, and then, let them work by themselves” (ASyotros, p.8). Another interesting aspect of the ways in which academic staff at the UIW framed the policy implementation was the idea that “faculty was invited” and “with their participation we [academic staff] tried to construct

common meanings referring first to quality evaluation and accreditation and shared notions about other policies to support a successful implementation” (CMyotros, p.9).

4.5 IMPACT OF MACRO AND MICRO POLICY DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

4.5.1 Description of the professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals

The literature on the academic profession in Argentina is scarce. There have been few research studies published in the last 10 years on both the generalities of the profession in Argentina (Marquis, 2003), as well as specific dynamics in the overall functioning of the profession, using the lenses of networks and power in access to research and knowledge production (Saguier, 2004).

Thus, in an analysis of the multiple policy levels that affect and impact the academic profession at two Argentinean universities, it is pivotal to present a portrayal of the main features of Argentinean faculty, and the several features affecting professoriate’s work in the context of the implementation of the reform policies at these two settings.

For politicians who participated in the design and debates on the LHE, the academic profession in Argentina had “an overwhelming low professionalism” which appeared as the reason for the lack of “development of research production” (AS073004, p.1). Additionally, politicians described the academic profession as composed by diverse “oligarchies, some of them with international relationships. When the government of Menem proposed the reform policies, they based their proposals in alliance with these groups” (AS073004, p. 1).

A shared depiction of the academic profession among politicians, academic staff, and faculty interviewed was the idea that “the academic profession has internal divisions...It’s divided in groups but they are subordinated to the logic of the hard sciences” (HS081304, p. 2). In addition, all politicians described the political intention of the government with the LHE to unify and reformulate the academic profession mirroring the logic of the hard sciences, and following models from other countries (AS073004, pp. 1-2; HS081304, p. 2). In addition, all politicians agreed that the academic profession in Argentina lacked unity, and it was “decimated and disaggregated in individualistic internationality” (DLS082304, p. 2). Academic staff at both universities described the academic profession as “having strong heterogeneity” (CM080604, p. 8; DLS082304, pp. 14-16). The heterogeneity of the profession circulated through the boundaries of the disciplines, types of appointments, and level of credentials and graduate degrees (DLS082304, pp. 13-14).

It was apparent, that the point of departure for the policy proposals about the academic profession was that politicians’ evaluation of the academic profession was that their quality was low.

In an overview, academic staff at the UR depicted the academic profession as handling “three basic duties, which are the same ones that the university has: teaching, research, and service (by extension and transference)” (CLO072804, p. 10). Academic staff at the UR described that the most crucial problem for the academic profession was the “low salary, which is the most important issue” (CLO070103, p. 8). This situation coupled with another recent phenomena affecting the academic profession, a “strong degree of mobility” (CLO070103, p. 9). This phenomena which was described as typical among younger faculty, operated as “an obstacle

for knowledge production, by impacting the creation and development of new research projects constantly at the university” (CLO070103, pp. 9-10).

Professors at the UR described tensions within the profession, e.g., the system of entry exams (in Spanish: “concursos”); professionalization without unionization; and the problem of a majority of part-time positions as the shared working conditions of faculty. The scarce literature on the realities of academic professionals in Argentina identifies the same features (Marquis, pp.52-53, & pp. 57-59). Faculty found that the reduced number of full time positions among faculty “impacts not only faculty political representation, but also the policies that the university displays towards faculty” (BCA072704, p. 4).

Another aspect highlighted by academics from both the UR and the UIW was the problem of political representation. Professors from both the UR and the UIW did not consider that the unions collectively represented the profession. Additionally, when probed about representation, professors agreed on their preference of another collegiate representation instead of unionization. Meanwhile, academic staff at the UR described faculty’s political representation as their representation in the governance structure of the university and not in faculty unions. Carolyn eloquently portrayed this notion in the expression: “we want professionalization but no unionization” (BCA072704, p. 15).

67% of faculty described that the profession was undergoing a period of transition, in the context of the implementation of the reform policies. This so-called transition was described as a complex scenario by faculty because of the “growing demands of professional development, and faculty evaluation” (BF080304, p. 5). In addition, faculty described that they face more “bureaucratic duties, that ultimately affect faculty work, because of more demands of

paperwork” (DF080604, p. 13). The foremost feature of this transition was depicted as the “movement for the professor as researcher” (in Spanish: “la movida del professor investigador”).

Another aspect of their profession that faculty highlighted was the obstacles in the possibilities of knowledge production and the actual publishing of their work (BF080304, p. 6). Additionally, the majority of faculty had part-time positions, situations that impacted the possibilities of knowledge production and research that when possible “are conducted with a lot of effort on part of faculty” (CMG071003, p. 11).

In spite of the several challenges faculty face in Argentina, all professors interviewed agreed upon the enjoyment of autonomy as professionals. This is signaled by professors from both the UR and the UIW, as the landmark that not only allows them to teach but also as an essential component at the core of their profession. This notion appeared connected with tensions, e.g. while faculty recognized that they had autonomy in their classes, in transferring from their research to their teaching, and in what they did research on, they also questioned the “challenges to our autonomy when conducting the reform of plans of studies” (CMG071003, p. 8). This notion of rather restricted autonomy was described as “being like a factory worker, because you are still dependant...As an academic professional, you don’t have autonomy to negotiate your own salary, nor your professional development” (CMG071003, p. 12).

Professors at the UIW found the issue of their autonomy less questioned by the university context and the policy implementation at this institution. One professor mentioned that she “enjoys a strong level of autonomy because I teach what I want, and have the freedom to pursue any research I want to. Without that, I wouldn’t be teaching at this university” (MAM081204, p. 15). Faculty at the UIW found as a paramount feature of the profession, the generalized situation of part-time faculty. One professor described it as “professor-taxi” (MCS081004, p. 19) which

impacted both the possibility of knowledge production and their commitment to service at the institution.

4.5.2 Professional Status

The literature on academic professionalism has stressed how the most recent wave of higher education reform policies affected the professional status of academics worldwide. Jayaram (2003) depicts this situation as “the decline of the Guru” alluding to a previous stage of a more respected social status of the professoriate worldwide. Additionally, other authors such as Margolis (2004) have depicted the decline of the social situation of the professoriate worldwide as “the withering of the professoriate”. Margolis describes this decline as deeply linked to the social respect of the role of the professoriate. Altbach stressed the relationship of this decline with global, national, and institutional factors that affect the role of the professoriate (Altbach, 2003). For the specific case of Argentina, Marquis (2003) describes the “poor recognition” of faculty work by society and by their own institutions (p. 52).

The LHE (1995) established for the first time in the history of Argentinean higher education the specific roles and duties of the professoriate. Additionally, the implementation of the policies at the institutional level has affected in specific ways the perception of the status of academics in this context.

Politicians, who participated in the design of the higher education reform policies, described the impact of the reform movement on individual professional status. One politician defined the policies as having little effect on the formation of new academic groups dedicated to research. Byron portrayed this as related to the policies of salary incentives, “which in the long run constituted very individualistic appeals which are rooted in the notion of with your own

individual effort, you can succeed” (AS073004, p.1). In addition, all politicians framed the effect of these types of policies as a “failure”.

Another politician defined that one of the contradictions of the Argentinean academic profession and the effects of the LHE on it, was the ratification of the system of entry exams (In Spanish: “concursos”). Martha depicts this as the tensions generated for academics because “the ethos of the academic community is to avoid social control” (DLS082404, p. 13).

Academic staff at the UR situated specific policies and their implementation as influencing faculty’s professional status. Kent explained that “the reform of plan of studies generated an internal review about some aspects of the professional status of faculty” (CDL072803, p. 6). Academic staff at the UR stressed the connection between the lack of a better professional status as a result of the salary reality. Additionally, academic staff from the UR described the issue of faculty status as complex. One member of the academic staff (Kent) portrayed a compelling situation related to faculty’s professional status in the context of the reform movement:

One of the perversities of the system is in the incentives that faculty receives for research. This is not part of the salary structure. So, there is an implicit perversity in it. This situation does not actually improve faculty status. The issue of status is difficult to define. The status of the academic profession has to do with knowledge production. Faculty produce more knowledge but the knowledge they produce doesn’t have any quality. Professors do it to receive the incentives, but their socio-economic status does not actually improve as a result of this (CDL072803, p.7).

Academic staff at the UR also defined the issue of faculty evaluation as related to the status of academics. Members of academic staff at the UR explained that faculty entry exams were in fact a “pre-requisite of a better professional status” (CLO72804, p. 8). Academic staff at the UR also stressed another crucial factor influencing the status of academics, which was the type of position held by faculty either that was full time or part time.

All members of academic staff at the UR found the relatively low salary faculty received compared with the salary levels of other professional groups and how it affected their status. Thus, Vincent depicted as: “academics will have a better social recognition if the salaries were better” (IM081304, p. 16).

For professors, the actual effect of the policies on their professional status was problematic and controversial. Professors at the UR manifested more troublesome notions related to their professional status as a result of the new policies, and new demands to their work. In contrast, professors working at the UIW framed the issue in a less dramatic fashion.

All professors from the UR related the issue of status to the lack of a collegiate organization that could represent them as a whole, as academics. The tensions were connected to the role of unions which were described as “collectively representing us [faculty] as a group” (BAC072704, p. 1). Accordingly, professors find in a collegiate representation, a better way to obtain status recognition. Additionally, all professors interviewed found a relationship between the lack of a “better status” with the absence of salary increases to support faculty research work and even knowledge production. Carolyn portrayed the issue as paradoxical because “the institution recognized our status if you present papers or publish. There is professional recognition inside the university. But, there wasn’t a good salary that accompany it” (BAC072704, p. 2). Jocelyn depicted the same situation as “there will be more recognition of our status if the salaries were better” (ILSSP070103, p. 16). Additionally, professors found issues in what they call, the “projection of their recognition to other spaces” (BAC072704, p.2), and being an obstacle for “the construction of a professional community” (ILSSP070103, p. 17). This portrayal, illustrates a rather low social status attained by academic professionals in the broader social context.

It was intriguing the generational distinction established by senior faculty or faculty between five to ten years of seniority in relationship of younger professor's status. This runs true for faculty working at different schools and different fields of studies. In an overview, senior faculty found that the recognition of status was "better for the younger generations" (DF080604, p. 2). Senior faculty explained that the "better" status achieved by younger faculty, related to their better credentials, and more extended graduate degrees.

Faculty working at the UR described an effect of the policy implementation on faculty status as the "shift in favor of professor-researcher which came with the LHE and its implementation" (CMG071003, p.10). Along this lines, the demands for more research created "new ways of managing the profession, which ultimately, would improve the status of those who do research and obtain new credentials" (DF080604, p. 12). Additionally, 53% of faculty at the UR described that the same demands of research or degrees triggered "status differentiation within the academic profession" (DF080604, p. 13).

Additionally, another problem found by faculty both from the UR and the UIW, were the distinction of different status positioning of faculty who also had liberal professions (e.g., lawyers, doctors, architects, and engineers) working as faculty at the university, and faculty who were educators, e.g., mathematicians, historians, Language, or biologists. The distinction within the profession was highlighted as a so-called "existential conflict" within the academic profession. Faculty related a "better" status as academics, for faculty who was also a member of liberal professions. Additionally, 53% of faculty across disciplines and schools defined themselves as their status "being determined by their work teaching at the university" (BF080304, p. 3).

At the UIW, professors described their status as defined by their work when “it is publicly recognized as an intellectual production when your books and chapters are published” (QF080304, p. 4). The theme of the relationship knowledge production and status was typically addressed by faculty across schools and knowledge fields. Additionally, professors at the UIW related their professional autonomy to their status as academics.

In addition, manifesting similarities in the ways in which their colleagues at the UR described the lack of relationship between professional status and unionization.

4.5.3 Role/ Roles of the professoriate

Van Patten has described the professoriate’s roles as a bundle of contradictions (Van Patten, 2000, p. 19). The literature that describes the professoriate from a global standpoint finds that the main features of the professoriate are teaching and doing research (Altbach, 2003), as well as their commitment “towards their discipline and their institutions” (Boyer, Altbach, Whitelaw, 1994, p.11). However, in the context of reform movements, the traditional roles of the professors are challenged and questioned (Currie, 2004). The linkages of professor’s role at universities with issues of state control of academic labor which are described in context of reform implementation are highlighted in different themes manifested by the data in this section. In this case study, the roles of the professoriate although proposed by the LHE (1995) were framed and proposed within institutional contexts of policy implementation. Overall, faculty roles are proposed and framed by both the policy documents and by academic staff. This situation illustrates the description of faculty as the component of the so-called “managed professionals”.

The diverse themes excerpted from the literature and manifested in the data are related to roles of the professoriate in the reform movement, in the higher education system, in quality improvement, and in schools and universities.

Roles of the professoriate in the reform movement

The LHE (1995) described the duties and roles of the professoriate in one of its chapters. According to Mollis (2001), the description presented by the LHE (1995) was specific and rather operational in defining faculty's duties and obligations. There was however a degree of generality in the LHE's description of faculty roles that allowed academic staff and professors at both universities to frame and re-frame the roles of the professoriate within the reform movement while describing the connection of these roles to the university (CDL072803).

According to 50% of professors from the UR, the main role of faculty in the context of the reform movement is "to produce knowledge and transfer it" to students (BFL083004, p.1). This is a role typically highlighted by the literature on academic professionalism from a global standpoint (Altbach, 2003). Frank, another professor at the UR, described a change in the role of faculty in the context of the implementation of the reform policies. Frank explained that the implementation of those policies was a catalyst of new avenues for faculty, because it was "a reason to study more" (DF080604, p. 3). Other faculty, see their role in the reform movement as the support for the pursuit of quality at each institution (DF080604; GL080604; MLM080504). All faculty at the UIW saw their role within the reform movement as agents of knowledge production which will ultimately improve quality (GPNP0708, p. 5),

Four members of the academic staff at the UR defined the role of faculty within the reform movement, as "being the critical mass within the university by contributing and helping the state and universities in their functions" (CLO072804, p.1). Two members of the academic

staff at the UR described that a small number of faculty, manifested resistance to their roles. This staff member framed it as faculty “resisting change and resisting their changing role within the reform movement” (IM081304, p. 5).

In rather contrast, for academic staff at the UIW, faculty was a crucial participant in catalyzing the actual reform at the university. CM explained that “when faculty is aware of their competencies and knowledge, they can independently work to support the overall transformation in which we are embarked” (CMyotros080204, p. 3). Maxine and Benerice described that when professors are able to self-develop the competencies they have, they can support students’ self development.

Roles in the higher education system

According to the LHE, and other policy documents, the overall role of faculty in the higher education system was framed in very general and not specific fashions. This perception is different from the literature (Mollis, 2001) that finds the LHE as very “specific regarding the role of faculty” (Mollis, 2001).

There are recurrent themes that appear in interviews to politicians related to the role of faculty in the higher education system. They link the role of faculty in the systems with an increment on the levels of professionalization of the professoriate. One politician explained that there has been an increase of professionalization in the “[...] areas that we could define as academic capitalism, such as distance education, transfer, and contracts. More things that overall increase the salary of faculty without being included in the salary” (AS070304, p.1). In addition, this increment of professionalization coupled with other roles, such as the individual knowledge production because, “it is clear that people started to move to produce more” (AS070304, p. 1). Another politician illustrated this point as the “need for faculty to get involved in knowledge

production, in teaching, and in obtaining graduate degrees” (HS082004, p. 8). This theme is shared by other politicians interviewed as well as by 80% of academic staff at both the UR and UIW.

Academic staff at the UR defined the scope of the role of academic in rather broad and almost grandiose fashion. 3 members of academic staff at the UR explained that professors have a “social role” which entailed both a position of “social contention”, and a position of “social prestige” for working at the university (CLO072804, p. 3; ASF070304, MI081204). Another member of the academic staff described the social function of faculty as challenged by other demands on faculty such as, “accreditation, publication, and other work demands that are so strong on faculty that they can’t fulfill their social role” (CDL072803, p.4).

Additionally, academic staff at the UR include within the role of faculty, governance roles (CLO072804, p. 3). This role of faculty in governance was highlighted by academic staff as the “total integration of the professoriate to the life of the university” (CDL072803, pp. 3-4). This appeared as another shared topic among academic staff at the UR. Another theme related to governance and the social role of faculty is the notion of faculty as “the critical mass” or “critical thinking backbone” of the university (CDL072803, p.4).

A subordinate topic among academic staff from the UR was the notion that faculty “should obtain grants and give service to third parties to have some money fueled into the university” (IM081304, p.9).

At both the UR and the UIW, academic staff describe that faculty has a strong heterogeneity which impacts their teaching and research roles.

Professors at both the UR and the UIW portrayed their roles as components of the so-called academic career (BCA071004, BF080304, TS080404, DF080604, MCS08100).

Accordingly, the academic career includes both teaching and research activities.20 professors depicted their teaching role as “important being at the public or private university” (BCA071004, p.2). Furthermore, the teaching role was framed as “being a professional teacher, doing both research and knowledge production...just doing research is making me a professional teacher, looking to expand the bibliography, etc” (BCA071004, p.2). This issue of knowledge production is framed as related to transfer to students through teaching (GLO080604)

While professors describe their role at the university as vital, 70% of them highlighted a basic contradiction, which is its lack of full autonomy. Kelly eloquently portrayed it: “we have roles at the university, but we don’t have autonomy. We can’t negotiate our own salary. So, we can’t feel like academic professionals” (CMG071003, p.5).

40% of faculty interviewed at both the UR and the UIW see their participation in quality improvement at the university as a component of their work.

Finally, professors situate their role in the higher education system in a broader community. Eunice depicts it as follows:

As a researcher, you belong to a university...But in fact, you also belong to academia in the country, and you have to provide service in this regard. For instance, you have to participate as evaluators with programs from other universities, etc (TS080404, p. 9).

Roles in Quality Improvement

Gordon et al. (2004) in their research on analysis of discourses of academic professionalism in times of reform, explain that those discourses are aligned closely with “discourses of excellence, quality, and productivity circulating in broader society within institutions of higher education” (p. 52).

In an overview, academic staff from both universities framed the pursuit of quality as a cornerstone of the implementation of higher education policies. They also situate the role of faculty in this context in a two-fold way: faculty should contribute to quality improvement, and faculty's duty is to be involved because of the institutional efforts to obtaining funds to support faculty improvement. Klaus portrayed this as follows:

The university obtained funds to support educational quality improvement, applying to the funds for quality improvement from the IMF. Professors need to get involved in those endeavors. For example, we have funding to support faculty pursuing their masters' or PhDs. So, it will greatly benefit faculty if they get involved (CLO72804, p. 1).

It is intriguing how academic staff at the university highlights linkages between the role of faculty and the increased accountability of faculty work. 54% of academic staff finds that faculty involvement with distance education "puts the issue of quality and faculty work as more exposed to be evaluated" (CLO72804, p. 2).

Additionally, academic staff describes faculty's knowledge production and faculty research as a component of the overall quality improvement at the institution. This is framed as such by 67% of academic staff as part of the demands which appear in the policy documents as well as in other requirements from the Ministry of Education. Faculty's credentials and graduate degrees are framed as vital information within the quality evaluation of the institution. Kent portrays the deep relationship between faculty credentials and quality at the university:

Professors need to show their credentials and background because we are continuously involved in the accreditation of plans of studies and quality evaluation. Professors need to fulfill formal and bureaucratic demands. There are a lot of demands on professors. There are even more demands when they are applying to research funds. Their research grants impact the quality of the university in general (CDL072803, p. 3).

Accordingly, all members of academic staff at the UR highlighted that professors need to have "certain pre-requisites to be working at the university" (ASF070304, p. 3). Lilly described that "at this time and age professors need to obtain graduate degrees in order to contribute to the

quality improvement at the university” (LI122203, p. 7). These faculty conditions are framed as related to the formation of human resources at the UR. Claus depicted the relationship:

The university [UR] prepares human resources in research which is very important, and the university is extremely conscious of this. There is a generational change coming up (CLO072804, p. 3).

Vincent, who is a member of the academic staff at the School of Engineering, considered that the quality evaluation conducted at the UR was an instrument for the institution to realize with data which was the real state of quality and the status quo in relationship with professors’ situations (IM081304, p. 6).

At the UIW, academic staff saw professors as active agents in the quality improvement implementation processes conducted at the university. Maxine describes faculty’s role as crucial but subordinated to the leadership from academic staff. She explains that

We believe that professors need to be actively involved in the process of quality evaluation. We organized them and lead the process for them...Our idea is to start backing up at a certain point. We want faculty to continue with the practice of evaluation as a constant practice (CMyotros, p. 4).

Academic staff at the UIW showed similarities with academic staff at the UR, depicting professors’ role as an important support of quality improvement efforts. Eunice portrays this role in a twofold fashion: “professors need to put into practice self-evaluation, because its part of being faculty”, and “faculty has to actively participate and work for quality improvement. They need to be committed to quality...” (AS080604, p. 4). Additionally, academic staff at the UIW revisited the intense work that faculty had conducted in support of institutional initiatives to improve quality: “the strength and effort displayed by faculty has been incredible. Faculty have worked intensively even without getting paid” (AS080604, pp. 4-5).

In rather similar fashion as their peers from the UR, academic staff at the UIW highlighted linkages between quality improvement and professors role in teaching and research.

Betty described that “the mission of the university is to teach and do research. Professors need to be involved with this so quality will be improved” (AQ072804, p. 5). Other members of the academic staff at the UIW explained that one way to improve quality at the institution is when “professors-researchers transfer research to their work with students” (CM080604, p.5).

At the UIW two members of the academic staff, portrayed the demand of quality on professors, as well as the requirement of graduate studies as “strenuous” on professors’ lives and work (GPNP0704, p. 5). They also portrayed these demands as external or foreign to professors’ work.

It is intriguing that professors at both the UR and the UIW, scarcely referred to this topic. When professors were cued on this particular issue, they considered it as a topic which was somewhat distant to their specific roles or actual work at the universities. They acknowledged the importance of their evaluation, commented on the demands or requirements of improvement to their credentials, but did not highlight a specific role on their part in the quality improvement and implementation processes.

Roles of professors in schools and universities

This notion of the roles of faculty at universities appears as a landmark in the literature on academic professionalism from different theoretical standpoints (Altbach, 2003; Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994; Margolis, 2004; Gordon et al., 2006). Accordingly, there are certain aspects of faculty work that are highlighted in the literature, such as commitment to teaching, research, and service. Additionally, the LHE (1995) has also stressed the teaching, research, and social service of faculty as professors’ duties.

Academic staff at both the UR and the UIW described the main roles of the professoriate as “teaching, research, and transfer of knowledge especially to society” (CL070103, p.2).

Academic staff established a relationship with this role of social transfer of knowledge production as a “duty for each and every faculty, because they have to conduct research, small or little, as well as teaching” (CL070103, p.2). This duty was framed within the opportunities for research that faculty receive. Kent explained that “we give opportunities to young faculty to pursue this double role: research and transfer” (CDL072803, p.2). Additionally, academic staff at the UR highlighted the social contention role that faculty has working at the university, because “families send their kids to the university which is still an institution with social prestige” (CL070103, p. 2).

Academic staff from the UR and the UIW characterized the role of faculty at the universities where they work as “belonging to the university” (CL070103, p. 3; CM080604), and being committed by one institution which entailed duties and obligations from professors. Therefore, faculty’s roles at the university are defined by not only the LHE or other policy documents, but also from institutional needs. Vincent explained that “at the university, we deeply need that professors produce knowledge, conduct research, and transfer their knowledge through teaching students, and to society” (IM081304, pp.3-4). Additionally, Vincent explained that the combination of “functions of teaching, and research follows the model of the American universities” (IM081304, p. 8). Other members of the academic staff at the UR also described that this role of “being specialist in their knowledge and pedagogically prepared”, should allow faculty’s role and work at the university to be projected socially (LI122303, p. 8).

In addition, academic staff at the UR identified faculty participation at the university government as part of their role. Claus described this as a “double representation faculty have, both with the union, and institutionally” (CLo72804, p. 3).

At the UIW, academic staff conferred a more active role to faculty. Maxine explained that “professors should participate by themselves, and produce by themselves the reform of plan of studies” (CM080604, p.6). Overall, academic staff at the UIW highlighted faculty commitment and efforts in their participation at different endeavors of the university, including, the reform of plans of studies.

Professors at both universities, found that one of the landmarks of their role was teaching. Carol defined teaching as “the most important role wherever we teach, either in the public or the private university” (BCA072704, p.1). Nevertheless, according to teachers’ degree of research and knowledge production, faculty also finds the transfer of knowledge from research, as a crucial component of their university role. Candace described that “the main role for me as an academic is for me to transfer my knowledge production through teaching to the students” (BC072704, p.1).

Professors described some tensions in the conditions of their role at the universities, e.g. “a dependant relationships with the university, because we can’t negotiate anything” (CMG071003, p. 5). This dependency was also contradicted by professors’ recognition of faculty’s autonomy and determination of their work in their classes (DF080604, p. 6).

In contrast with the positive views from academic staff at the UR about faculty research and knowledge production roles, 88% of faculty at this university described their research role as rather “imposed and forced, because it was determined by outsiders” (MLM080504, p.9).

Faculty at the UIW highlighted the importance of research and knowledge transfer to teaching (MAM081204, p. 2). Additionally, they portrayed their involvement in research and knowledge production as a somewhat individual responsibility because “when you work at the university, even if you have also a liberal profession, this is what you do. It is frustrating that not

everyone does research and transfer to students...” (MCS08100, p. 5). The ways in which faculty from the UIW described their role, manifested a linkage with the stage of policy implementation in which this university is involved, as well as the less committed and actual number of faculty involved in research projects.

4.5.4 Professional Autonomy

Professional autonomy is a significant issue within the different perspectives on the academic profession. It relates to issues of control and determinacy of faculty work. Academics are described as suffering the “separation between planning and execution” (Braverman, 1974, p. 15) in their work but still maintaining certain degree of control and determinacy over curriculum.

Professional autonomy entails certain critical components for the work of academic professionals, such as, curriculum determinacy, control and determinacy of faculty workload, relationship between faculty and university management, issues of faculty evaluation, and political participation of faculty.

Curriculum

The LHE proposed the need of reform of plans of studies as a way to upgrade teaching and learning. At both the UR, and the UIW, processes of reform of plans of studies had been or were conducted.

At the UR, there was an institutional project of reform of all plans of studies enlightened by the dispositions of a university policy document entitled the “Millennium Program” (1999). This program established the basic requirements for the reform of plans of studies as well as the main proposal of reducing the length of courses from two semesters to one. This process was defined as “cuatrimestralization”.

Academic staff at the UR described the reform of plan of studies as a “slow process as any process conducted at the university. But because we have democracy at the university, there were discussions and debates around the reform of plans of studies” (CLO072804, p.11). Academic staff described the process of reform of the plans as based on the “respect of academic freedom” (CLO072804, p.11). Additionally, members of academic staff illustrated it as a process “organized in an original and collective ways, so everyone can participate” (LI122203, p. 23).

Professors at the UR found the aforementioned process as exemplary of the changes introduced to support the reform movement. The change in the plans of studies was described by several faculty as “understood in different ways by different faculty. Several professors simply reduced the contents in their curriculum. But to me, this process entailed epistemological and theoretical changes in what I have to teach” (BCA072704, p. 1). In the case of schools such as the School of Law and the School of Architecture, the reform of plans of studies entailed not only a reduction of the length of the courses but the identification of non-mandatory courses which were previously mandatory.

At different schools at the UR, the reform of plans of studies was organized and lead by the authorities of each department. In all the cases, faculty interviewed described the process as “plagued by discussions and arguments because some faculty believed the courses they teach were the most important courses” (PB080504, p. 4). Additionally, professors described this process as “suffering the reform of the plans of studies” (BAC072704, p. 6). In the majority of cases, academics expressed “strong resistance to the plan” (GLM072704, p. 12) while undergoing long and strenuous departmental meetings. Professors resistance to the new plans were rooted in concerns about students’ capacity to self-direct their work, epistemological notions, and actual concerns about the scope of knowledge being taught (MLM081104;

BCA072704; NDR081704; DRS081204; ILS070103). In addition, faculty perceived that the decision of the reform of the plan of studies “came from top-down. We had the feeling that all the decisions were already taken and they were pre-determined” (ILS070103, p. 22). Another problem of reforming the plan of studies was found in the implementation of distance courses for undergraduate programs. Professors’ concerns were also framed as realizing they were teaching “the minimum contents in each course” (BCA072704, p.5). Professors found that the reform of the plans of studies was also problematic in relationship with the introduction of new forms of students’ evaluation (MLM081104; BAC072704; NDR081904). In spite of the discussions and resistance to the reform of plans of studies, the institution fully implemented it by 2002. These data is intriguing in the ways in which professors, in spite of the resistance to the decision and procedures that sustained the reform of plan of studies, they rescued their autonomy and pedagogical reasons to not to support this reform.

Faculty at the UR manifested that the guidelines, tone, and overseeing of the reform of the plan of studies was in the hands of the academic secretariat at each school. The curricular change was closely monitored and scrutinized by academic staff at the university. This created a climate of tension and discussions between faculty and academic staff who was described as “pushing the reform of the plan of studies” and imposing the notion of “the reform of plans of studies has to happen or has to happen” (CMG071003, p. 9). Additionally, academic staff framed the reform of the plan of studies as a demand coming from the LHE. Kelly described the dynamics of the process:

The reduction of the length of the courses was seen as something we had to do because the LHE demanded it. There was a strong and spread resistance to this change. A lot of resistance...And then, everyone wanted to defend their space, and nobody cared if the cuatrimestralization was good or bad for the students or even for us, faculty (CMG071003, p. 12).

The structure of reform of the plans of studies as well as the resulting plan generated distinctive feelings among faculty. 67% of faculty from the UR described feelings of frustration and failure in how the reform of the plan was developed and the actual outcomes of it. One faculty depicted it as “it hurts me to see how this plan works. I feel as faculty as a failure” (BF083004, p. 9).

Additionally, at certain schools in the UR, there were external evaluators who were called by the academic staff to contribute and assess the reform of the plans of studies. This situation also triggered resistance from faculty at each school.

Faculty at the UR also found connections between the process of quality evaluation and accreditation, and “the contents selected to be part of the plan of studies” (GLO080604, p. 18).

At the UIW, the reform of the plan of studies was structured in a different fashion. Academic staff led the process of reform of the plans, but then allowed faculty to “self determine the reform of the plans” (CM080604, p. 16). Faculty working at the UIW although highlighting the leadership and guidance from academic staff in the reform of plans of studies also acknowledge a high level of “freedom and autonomy in the process of reform” (MCS081004, p. 8).

Control and Determinacy of Workload

The literature on academic professionalism tackles the issue of determinacy and control of workload in a broad and general fashion, as the result of the dynamics of faculty as “managed professionals” (Currie, 2004; Ginsburg, 1998; Roadhes and Slaughter, 1998; Smyth, 1995). Additionally, the actual research studies that deal with this issue are limited. Nevertheless, in this context, it is important to stress that control and determinacy of the conditions of their work (and salary) is the quintessential component of being a professional.

The LHE in the chapter in which it describes the duties and role of the professoriate in Argentinean universities, does not refer specifically to this issue. But, in ulterior policy documents at each institution, such as, the Millennium Program, and in the actual process of implementation of policies, there were intriguing phenomena related to this aspect of professional autonomy.

At the UR, professors found control exerted over their work within the process of reform of the plans of studies (aforementioned). While professors perceived that the change in the plans of studies was in contrast with epistemological and theoretical reasons, they also perceive it as contrasting with their ways of “doing their work” (BCA072704, p. 2). When the plan was finally implemented, professors perceived it as imposed, because of it crystallized “theoretical and epistemological fragmentation” (BAC072704, p. 2).

A critical issue in the reform of plan of studies was the introduction of distance courses. Faculty resisted this decision, but distance teaching was imposed.

In addition, faculty perceived that the process of re-categorization (or upgrade of their appointments and positions) was forced with a very demanding and bureaucratic rhythm. One faculty highlighted a basic contradiction in this context which is to “get an upgrade of your job category while still perceiving the same salary” (BCA072704, p.3).

In the context of reform of plans of studies, the Millennium Program also proposed the need for faculty to achieve graduate degrees. Professors perceive this as “a need to do a professional conversion” (BMC082204, p. 4).

In this environment of change and policy reform implementation, professors perceive the changes as part of the so-called “academic career”. Faculty framed the so-called academic career as another requirement to change certain aspects of their work. Faculty described the

contradictions of the so-called academic career as an “imposed game” that “will be better with higher salaries” (BCA071004, p. 5).

Professors described their autonomy in determining how and what to teach but in a context where the plan of studies was reformed following institutional guidelines. Faculty however, shared the description of their teaching as fully controlled by them (BCA071004; MLM081104; NDR081704; DRS081204; ILS070103).

Both at the UR and the UIW, faculty involved in research described also that they conduct their research in a climate of freedom and without impositions. Candace explained that she conducted her own research “without any impositions” (BF080304, p. 7). Nevertheless, professors also identified that “before the quality evaluation and the LHE, research transfer was very limited. Nowadays, we are pushed to do more of it” (BF080304, p. 8).

Faculty and academic staff recognized that the changed climate of quality evaluation and accreditation has brought faculty into a “vortex of demands and more demands and commitments” (CL072404, p. 9). This notion of growing bureaucratic demands appeared as “horrible and affecting professors’ schedules and time for work” (DF080604, p. 15).

At the UIW, both academic staff and faculty acknowledged that the implementation of higher education reform policies brought “new demands to the faculty. Professors started to express concerns and started to ask the origins of these demands” (GPNP0704, p. 20). Nevertheless, the demands appear less charged and less controversial as compared to the public university. The issue of more time put into the job, as well as in the pursuit of research appears as themes among faculty working at the UIW (MCS08100; MAM081204).

Relationship with University Management

The dynamics of separation between job execution and management, and the character of the academic profession as “managed professionals” put at the relationship between faculty and academic staff in stormy waters.

At the UR, tensions arose when academic staff proposed, led, and imposed the process of reform of plans of studies. Faculty complained with different degrees of virulence about the tensional relationship with academic staff. Faculty described their relationship with academic staff as filled with “fights” and “discussions” (NDR081904, p.1). The most critical period of the relationship between faculty and academic staff was during the process of reform of plans of studies.

Faculty described the co-existence of different “logics related to how to do faculty work” (BF080304, p. 2). Academic staff is portrayed as representing a logic in which things have to happen, such as the reform of plans of studies in a serendipitous fashion, while faculty manifested a slower and more “planned timing” of the work in which they are involved (ILSSP070103, p. 5).

Faculty Assessment and Evaluation

At the public university, faculty is subjected to a system of entry exam (“concurso”) and to periodical assessments in order to upgrade their appointments or acquire better positioning because of their research work. Professors at the UR did not complain about the dynamics of being evaluated. Nevertheless, they expressed concerns about the periodic dynamics of it (every seven years, even as a fulltime faculty) as well as the bureaucratic demands that it entailed. Professors needed to show evidence of presentations, research, publications, etc in order to yearly upgrade or maintain their type of assignments. This dynamics create a climate of anxiety among faculty.

Professors at the UR perceived an increased number of demands and requirements when the Millennium program and the reform of the plans of studies were implemented, due to the new profiles for faculty work proposed. Kelly framed this process as a component of the shift or movement of “professor-researcher” (CMG071003, p. 3). This shift in faculty roles triggered new job requirements for professors.

At the UIW, faculty assessment and evaluation was scarcely referred to and described as problematic. Faculty access to the UIW happened without an entry exam and a system of categorization of faculty positions was still underdeveloped.

Political Participation

The majority of faculty working at the UR described the role of faculty unions as somewhat limited and as rather static. Several faculty illustrated the current role of the unions as “simply mediators, because in this context, the unions can’t question or fight” (BAC072704, p. 1). The faculty union was portrayed as “passive” (MLM081104, p. 6) and without a clear “plan of struggle” (ILSSP070103, p. 8). Additionally, faculty described union’s participation as “small and limited” (ILS072104, p.5). Several faculty stressed the lack of intervention of the union in any claim during the implementation of the reform of plans of studies. Nonetheless, faculty recognized the role of the union in the defense of public education which appeared as one of its foremost political banners (CMG071003, p. 4).

Academic staff at the UR described faculty’s political participation as having representation in the governance structure of the university (CL072804, p. 5).

In contrast, faculty at the UIW did not belong nor had any faculty union.

4.5.5 Work of academic professionals

As it was aforementioned, the work of the professoriate is mostly defined by teaching and research. Professors described that in the context of the reform of plans of studies, working with students “became more demanding and strenuous” (NDR081904, p. 1). In the same context, faculty was bombarded by meetings and gatherings in order to revise specific policies being implemented at the institutional level as well as to participate in the change of plans of studies.

A recent phenomena was the introduction of distance education at the UR. Faculty expressed contradictory feelings towards this format. In an overview, professors described it as “more time consuming” and “more stressful” than the traditional teaching (ILSSP070103, p. 4).

4.5.6 Concursos

The data analyzed related to professors’ views over the system of entry exam was not significant and scarce. Professors’ views on concursos were intertwined with other notions related to their work, the academic career, etc. Thus, this theme appeared illustrated within aforementioned themes.

4.6 RESEARCH QUESTION #1: MACRO-LEVEL: GLOBAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES

1. How are the goals of the State in the design of the Law on Higher Education of 1995 perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators/academic staff) in the higher education reform movement in Argentina?

How does each group characterize the nature of the reform movement?

What are the similarities and differences between groups?

Politicians, academic staff and the professoriate explained that the goal of the Argentinean state in the design of the LHE were multifaceted and intertwined policy objectives from other areas. According to different actors interviewed, the LHE represented paradoxical goals and it was embedded in broader socio-political projects, e.g. the reform of the state and the insertion with the knowledge society. The state goals expressed in the LHE did change in their meanings in time, according to different actors interviewed. A shared notion about the goals of the state and the higher education reform movement was the notion of higher education as an sector which reform would add prestige to state-driven reform processes.

Academic staff and policy makers define the goals of the policies broadly, and stressing its contradictory features. They frame the LHE as specifically focused on issues such as quality improvement, restrictive autonomy, decentralization, governance structural change at the universities, and expansion of participation of different university actors as key goals of the reform. As a “behind the scenes” goal of the reform movement, 80% of academic staff and 88% of the politicians, identify the goals of translating the premises from the World Bank or the IMF as another crucial component of the reform policies. This notion of the LHE as a catalyst and even a translator of the WB or the IMF’s philosophy are also identified as an operation in

different stages. To complete this concept, policy makers and academic staff identify “before and after moments” of policy focus, which are intertwined with both the more active or less active transfer of ideas from the WB and the IMF into the policies themselves, or the slight change in the governments’ priorities in higher education. These stages or moments of changing policy focuses manifest as related to the availability of resources (loans) to support the reform movement, as well as internal and external conditions favorable to the Argentinean state.

Additionally, politicians and in a lesser fashion, academic staff at the universities, describe the LHE and the policies towards higher education in Argentina as instruments for the government to enhance its presence, and as a government’s tool for its success in a strategic sector of public policy. Paradoxically, politicians, academic staff, and professors explain that the LHE represented the retrenchment of the state from both social and educational arenas.

The reform movement was charged with a highly political content. The political nature of the reform policies are crystallized in the description provided by one professor from the UR who explained:

DF: The problem with the LHE is an example of the problems generated when political dynamics supersede academic issues. Thus, academic dynamics get modified and affected by political agreements...Unfortunately; the academic goals of the higher education reform in Argentina were modified by that” (DF, p. 8).

Another prominent finding from the analysis is the paradoxical nature of the goals and achievement of the reform movement as described by academic staff and politicians. The theme about the tensions between the attempt of decentralization and centralization of control is an example of the paradoxes within this reform movement. This tension expresses in the problem of extension of accountability and control from the national government while supporting or maintaining university autonomy. The tensions are fueled by the distribution of resources from the government to the universities, combined with the regulation of academic activities, and the

monitoring of its development and quality by a very centralizing structure (CONEAU) constitute an illustration of the paradoxical goals of the higher education reform movement. Tensions are also exacerbated by the combination of higher education policies that allowed the growth of private universities and even public universities while additionally refining and enhancing the mechanisms of quality control and accreditation.

In an overview, professors' descriptions of the goals of the LHE do not differ from the description of members of academic staff at each university. It is captivating the fact that professors at the UIW did not seem to identify clearly the goals of the state through the LHE and the reform movement itself. In general, professors perceive the policies strongly focused on control and monitoring of the professoriate, in conjunction with the theme of endangering of institutional autonomy. The dynamics of "controlled" autonomy is framed as filtering into the institutions, and their internal processes. In an overview, they connect the effect on the work of professors (decision-making, curriculum reform, research demands) as goals of the reform movement itself. In addition, few faculty stated that the LHE represented the transfer of models of higher education from other countries.

Another shared theme within academic staff at both universities is the issue of challenge or endangering of institutional autonomy, which appears as paramount within this process. In addition, this state's goal of a controlled autonomy represents a historical shift in the role of the state towards the higher education system in Argentina.

There are shared themes in the ways in which each policy actor perceived the goals of the reform movement: notions like the relationship of the WB and the reform, the notion of endangered institutional autonomy of universities, and the identification of exogenous pressures on the reform policy imperatives themselves. It is also a striking finding that 100% of the

academic staff at the public university and its professors highlighted the existence of the connection between the process of state reform (1990's) operating at the national government, and the higher education reform movement. Both professors and academic staff at the public universities, with different degrees of deepness in their analysis, portray the higher education reform policies as "strategic" for the government reform as a whole.

It is also intriguing how contradictory the nature of the reform itself is described by members of the professoriate. There are three major themes that arise from the ways in which academic professionals frame the reform: as an inevitable process, from which "there was no way out", and therefore, of an obscure and conspiracy nature; as an inevitable process from which there are possibilities of accommodation and benefits being extracted from; and as a needed process to enhance change and improvement at the university and its quality. These notions are coupled with ideas such as "the reform was like a storm, which came with all its changes".

Overall, academic staff although describing the demanding nature of the reform policies in terms of "so much is asked to universities", they also perceive it as a process that paradoxically, allowed universities, either to improve their knowledge of themselves, and better manage their business, or as a possibility of taking upon the seeds of change open by the reform, embarking in a process of quality improvement. Few members of the academic staff at both the UR and UIW perceive the reform policies as filled with some degree of "perversity" in the dynamics they generate at the institutional level. The LHE itself is the result of resistance and debate from different actors within the system itself (HS as academic staff).

4.7 RESEARCH QUESTION #2: MICRO-LEVEL OF INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

2. How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff) characterize academic professionalism:

What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?

What are the similarities and differences among groups?

The major issues of academic professionalism identified by different policies actors are diverse. These issues relate both to the dynamics of policy design and to the implementation and actual challenges affecting the profession worldwide, with specific matters rooted in the history and status of the academic profession in Argentina.

Among the main topic of academic professionalism is the tension between teaching and research as the defining aspect of academics in Argentina. This tension appears fueled by the actual lack of salaries that could support faculty research, as well as the absence of institutional structures to support more the production of knowledge.

According to politicians and academic staff, the professoriate manifests a dearth of quality in knowledge production; faculty still has “low academic professionalism”, and the professoriate present a high level of heterogeneity in terms of abilities and capacities. These aspects are framed by academic staff, as obstacles and problems that impact negatively the work and roles of academics. And while the internal diversity of the academic profession in Argentina is prototypical of the academic profession globally, the lack of “points of cohesion” obliterates the possibility of collective organization and representation of their concerns, demands, and needs. Professors see themselves in a process of transition towards firmer lands of academic professionalism. They see their academic professionalism “under construction”, but firmly

moving towards it. They are also critically aware of the obstacles for the achievement of deeper professionalism, as well as the efforts entailed to be fully defined as academic professionals. In general, faculty across schools, seniority, and disciplines, perceive this professionalization process as an auspicious opportunity for personal improvement. Paradoxically, faculty stresses that this improvement entail effort and sometimes, lack of stronger financial support. Faculty also express concerns on the notion of the academic career which manifests determined by the institution or the new policies, instead by professors themselves.

Academic staff and politicians in a lesser degree, find that the academic profession in Argentina has a threefold duty: teaching, conducting research, and providing social service. While academics generally identify teaching as the core of their profession, the ones who are deeply involved in research define teaching as the avenue to transfer to students the knowledge they produce and question. A small percentage of faculty define as a duty their involvement in research and knowledge production. Meanwhile, the notion of a “social role” of the academic profession is less intense in either faculty form the UR or the professors at the UIW.

While academic staff finds the issue of faculty mobility and the differences between younger and senior faculty as highly problematic for the support of an institutional research agenda, professors frame this issue as a source of differentiation of opportunities and possibilities within the profession. There are growing tensions between junior and senior faculty, which are rooted in issues of access to graduate degrees earlier in academic life, flexibility of adaptation, and actual number of research opportunities and funding available for junior faculty.

Another crucial topic in academic professionalism is the wide spread use of part-time positions. This runs true at both universities and it is the source of problems for institutional development, faculty productivity, and connection to the institution. Academic staff frames this

as a problem for faculty social roles and service to the institution, and as an obstacle for research and knowledge production. Among faculty, this issue relates to actual job stability, and salary.

The issue of faculty political representation is another topic brought by academics at both the UR and the UIW. Professors question the unions as the collegiate structure that could defend and represent them. Professors from the UR find the lack of a collegiate organization to regulate their salaries, defend their rights, and determine certain aspects of their work as a problem in the current structure of their job. It is intriguing that the majority of faculty does not perceive professors' unions as either representing their interests, or defending their rights. Faculty unions are described by faculty as not working hand in hand with the progressive professionalization of the profession.

For academic staff, the issue of faculty representation is restricted to professors' participation in the governance structure of the university. The roles of faculty unions are described by faculty as rather complementary of faculty participation in university governance.

There are specific aspects of higher education reform policy that are considered critical by faculty, such as, the shift towards the professor-researcher, the growing demands of professional development, and faculty evaluation. Faculty perceive them as rather forced and imposed. In contrast, both politicians and academic staff see these demands as the foreground of a deeper and broader professionalization of faculty.

The issue of professional autonomy which is a landmark feature of academic professionalism in the literature deserves a more extensive consideration. All faculty differentiate two facets of autonomy in their work: full autonomy in what they teach, how they teach, and in the research they conduct; and the more "channeled" autonomy as faculty in the context of the university, and within endeavors such as the reform of plans of studies. Professors differentiate

clearly these two facets of their professional autonomy, without finding that they ultimately lack autonomy or decision-making regarding their work. Nevertheless, there is an incipient perception of the issue of autonomy as a problematic area of their “being professionals”. Faculty working at the UR described inconsistencies in the notion of professional autonomy because of the reduced capacity in setting up “the rules of the game”, e.g. the academic career, requirements of graduate degrees, etc. They perceive a contrast in the movement towards professionalization, and their limited influence on the conditions for its development. Furthermore, faculty at depict themselves as dependant upon others in the determination of certain aspects of their work and about the salaries they perceive.

In contrast, academic staff and politicians widely perceive that faculty as academic professionals have full autonomy in all the aspects involving the exercise of their profession.

Another fundamental feature of the profession is social status. This has become an area of contention for faculty. Faculty perceived contradictions and tensions related to the status of academics in society and within academics themselves. Faculty signals the differences between academics that also belong to so-called liberal professions, and academics that do not have liberal professional degrees. Academic staff in a lesser fashion describe the same differences that academics identify. Faculty and academic staff weight differently academic status in society. For faculty it entails not only the social acknowledgement of their role in knowledge production or at the university, but also a degree of salary perception that it is absent in the current situation. Meanwhile, academic staff portrays the issue of academic status in a rather grandiose fashion: faculty have a higher social commitment and impact because they work at the university. Few academic staff from the universities relates the salary structure to the problem of professional

status of academics. Politicians frame the issue of status as related to issues of social control of the exercise of the profession.

Professors perceive themselves as being part of a broad collective entity which transcends borders and institutions, which is academia. Academic staff stress the linkages of faculty to specific institutions and define the scope of the profession in a rather restrictive manner.

4.8 RESEARCH QUESTION #3: THE IMPACT OF MACRO AND MICRO POLICY DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

3.How-if at all- do the stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?

As the previous section demonstrated, stakeholders' perceptions on academic professionalism are complex, punctual, and focused on specific features or traits of academic professionals. The most relevant perception that has impacted the implementation of the policies is the notion of poor professional quality. Thus, the views on academic professionalism are combined with the ways in which different stakeholders "make sense" of the reform policies set up a multifaceted pattern for policy implementation at each university. The ways in which policies are implemented are foregrounded by the fragmented notions of academic professionalism that different stakeholders have, and they project these fragmented views would translate into policies. Additionally, the academic staff's perception of academic professionals is framed subordinated to notions of quality evaluation and institutions.

Academic staff prioritizes however a particular notion related to academic professionals, which is professional development as professionalism, which is also used by academic staff as an

instrument of monitoring and control of academic workers while paradoxically, offering professional improvement. In this sense, academic staff projects to the notions of professionalism the so-called “double edged sword” ideology of professionalism.

In the context of this reform movement in Argentina, notions about academic professionalism manifest and couple with other reform policies, e.g., quality improvement, institutional autonomy, and representation in governance structure of the university. The ideas on academic professionalism manifest subordinated to these notions, and coupled with them. The coupling dynamics of the perceptions/ notions of academic professionalism with other ideas about the reform policies themselves intensify a paradoxical nature of the process of implementation of the reform policies, expressing tensional aspects and misalignments with the “text” of the reform policies themselves.

Thus, the concepts on academic professionalism, relate to the ways in which policies are implemented, because they are coupled and combined with other policy notions. Therefore, the institutional stress on quality improvement, reform of plan of studies, and institutional autonomy, among others, is prioritized and somehow monopolizes the discourse of implementation at both institutions fueling tensions and misalignments with the policies themselves.

An eloquent illustration of these dynamics is the intense emphasis on quality evaluation and quality enhancement at the university. There is a strong linkage in the ways in which the goal of quality improvement is portrayed as a major policy goal, as it is perceived by policy makers, academic staff, and professors, and the vision of professor’s professional development, and professional improvement as a component or requirement to the achievement of that. In addition, at both universities, academic staff and professors perceive these processes as

interlocked and displayed in a series of steps or phases systematized in different fashion for different stakeholders.

The ways in which policy priorities for each institution are set up and determined have a paradoxical relationship with the manners in which academics are perceived. Thus, policy priorities at the university level tapped into specific aspects of academics as professionals but in a fragmented and not necessarily related fashion.

The views on academic professionals appear as problematic and puzzling for certain aspects of policy implementation. For instance, there is recognition of the need to improve representation of professors and other stamens in the governance of the university, but this aspect is seen by academic staff not as a priority or a necessity, neither as a crucial component of the life and work of academic professionals.

Another aspect that has triggered contested implementation strategies has been the issue of the reform of plan of studies, as a first aspect, and of curriculum as a secondary component of it. In an intertwined fashion, the reform of curriculum was pushed forward as a core condition for a full implementation of the policies, while professors questioned, accommodated, or resisted this. Nevertheless, the policies, and the views on the professoriate recognize profess' autonomy as a vital component of their autonomy. Nevertheless, in a paradoxical fashion, when it was "time to" apply the curriculum reform policies, academics had a narrow margin of decision-making on the pace and breath of this aspect of implementation.

From the analysis of the data and the use of theoretical concepts it should be stated that there is a weak relationship between the ways in which reform policies are implemented with the perceptions on different stakeholders notions on academic professionalism. As it was aforementioned, this relationship is fragmented, partial, and circulates paradoxical terrains. Both

ideas feedback each other, and generate new interpretations of both as different stakeholders implement them. Additionally, both institutions present striking similarities, while maintaining and supported original features mostly based on their institutional *raison d'être* than anything else.

The relationships between perceptions of academic professionals and ways in which reform policies are implemented have their backbone in the perceptions of the priorities, goals, and pace of the reform itself. This element deeply foregrounds the implementation process.

The ways in which the policies are implemented have a strong relation with the sense-making process that different stakeholders construct of the policies themselves in exchanges and interactions with other institutional actors.

manifested broader social policies from the state. State had an ultimate monitoring role of higher education. This translated into threats to autonomy of universities and tighter control of them. Autonomy was defined as restricted and fueled by tensions. The main problem of autonomy was related to resource allocation and management.

Policy dissemination and communication (LHE and other policies) marked by a top-down approach.

LHE was used to impose models from other countries.

Pressures of accountability from the state.

LHE and other policies generated “perversity” within the system.

Lack of institutional structures to support changes proposed by the LHE. The pace of implementation was external to the institutions.

The LHE represented a point of inflection of the policies towards the system, in particular because of their specification of the policies towards academic professionalism. The main emphasis should be in quality improvement.

The clashes between LHE’s goals and institutional policy goals created a climate of “institutional squizofrenia”

Demands of academic professionalism: fictional and exogenous to faculty and universities.

Specification of national policies triggered policies created within each university.

The demands on faculty work were expressed in the Millennium program.

Professors noted the influence of neoliberal ideas and international organizations.

The LHE and other policies represented accountability pressures and expressed the notion of a “ghost state”.

LHE and other policies translated into increased bureaucratic demands which in turns impacted faculty work. According to faculty, the policy priorities were related to quality evaluation and improvement.

Reform of plans of studies as areas of tensions and misalignments.

creation of new universities.

Different degrees of government control towards private and public universities. Academic staff at the UIW found as goal of policies, the increasing demands of control and quality evaluation.

Thus, private and public universities are perceived as yielding different degrees and levels of autonomy.

At the UR, the LHE was seen as a catalyst of internal quality assessment at the university.

There was a need to specify the general higher education policy framework proposed by the LHE.

At the UR, this was used as an instrument to collect data about the university.

Academic staff provided a synthesis of the policy messages and translated institutionally, the policy priorities.

Influence of globalization and examples from reform movement operating in other countries.

Top-down dynamics of policy design and implementation impacted mostly faculty work.

Economic incentives do not favor the development of academic professionalism.

Faculty identified two levels of policy: the national and the institutional.

Pace of reform implementation, which affected

faculty’s work, was different at each institution. At the public university, the implementation was urgent,

	<p>Policies towards academic professionalism: contradictory. The notion of academic career was imposed to faculty. Specific guidelines towards academics, coming directly from the university, e.g., reform of plans of studies.</p>	<p>while at the private university, it was proposed in a slower fashion. Quality evaluation and improvement was conceived differently at the two universities.</p>
<p>Research Question #2: How does each group (politicians, professors, and university administrators-academic staff characterize academic professionalism?:</p>	<p>Similarities</p>	<p>Differences</p>
<p>a. What major issues in academic professionalism are identified?</p>	<p>Politicians found the policies towards the professoriate: contradictory. The main problem was that faculty lacked professionalism (“overwhelming low professionalism”). Additionally, the academic profession has internal divisions and it is highly heterogeneous. In spite of the monetary incentives, there has been no improvement of academic professionalism. There is a need to increment the level of professionalization among faculty.</p>	<p>The LHE has had little effect on professors’ professional status.</p>
<p>b. What are the similarities and differences among groups?</p>	<p>Academic staff saw the need to make explicit the policies towards academic professionalism features in the policy documents proposed to specify the broader national policies. Academic staff guided faculty participation. The reform of plan of studies was monitored by academic staff. Pursuing quality at the institutional level was limited by the lack of faculty’s credentials and professional background. Paradoxically, quality evaluation was seen as an enhancer of faculty’s professional status. Academic staff saw demands on faculty’s research productivity as coming from the LHE and the institutional decisions to support it, as a way to align the institution to these demands. Academic profession has internal divisions. Main problem of academic professionals: low salaries,</p>	<p>At the UR, the policies towards the professoriate enhanced faculty’s participation in pre-determined areas (“channeled participation”). At both universities academic staff led and monitor faculty participation. However, at the private university, after an initial period of close monitoring, faculty could deliberate around issues of implementation by themselves. At the UIW, the top university hierarchy was the final decision-maker. At the UR, one major institutional policy goal was to provide faculty of professional development opportunities. At the public university, faculty improvement was framed as “formation of human resources”, while increasing the demand of faculty productivity. Professional duties of academics: teaching,</p>

non tenure track positions, and strong degree of mobility.

Faculty felt that there was a saturated climate of policy implementation, because of the policies specifically targeting academics.

Climate of quality evaluation created tensions for faculty work and increasing demands.

Main areas of professional tensions: system of entry exams, professionalization without unionization, and preeminence of part-time positions (“taxi-professor”).

Profession is undergoing a transitional period: “movement for the professor as researcher”.

Faculty enjoys professional autonomy. This notion of autonomy also yields internal and external tensions.

Professional status relates to salary increases. Socially, there is recognized low social status.

Status recognition was “better” in the case of junior faculty.

Main roles of faculty: produce knowledge and teach.

Teaching is the landmark of faculty work.

Faculty at both universities saw a linkage between quality improvement and professors’ roles in teaching and research.

research, and service.

The role of faculty is to produce knowledge and contribute to the quality improvement. At the UIW, faculty is seen as a crucial participant in the implementation of change at the university level. Knowledge transfer is vital for the professoriate.

Demands of quality improvement were framed as “brutal” and excessive by professors. At the same time, this demands provided opportunities to “study more”.

Faculty from the private university saw professoriate’s participation in the quality improvement process as limited.

Professional duties of the professoriate:

Lack of political participation in governance structures.

At the UIW, professors’ autonomy is characterized as stronger than at the UR. The main problem of autonomy at the UR was the process of reform of plans of studies. At the UIW, the reform of plans of studies was less controlled and faculty was given more capacity for decision-making.

Issue of the so-called academic career was a problem of professional autonomy because it was imposed.

Effect of policies on professional status was controversial at the UR. At the UIW, the outcomes of reform policies on professional status were less dramatic.

Lack of collective representation: a problem for faculty at the UR.

<p>Research Question #3: How-if at all-do the stakeholders' perception about academic professionalism relate to the ways in which the reform policies are implemented?</p>	<p>Similarities</p>	<p>Differences</p>
	<p>Complex perceptions of stakeholders about academic professionalism. These perceptions had punctual and target specific features or traits of academic professionals. Shared fragmented notions of academic professionalism. Academic staff framed professional development as professionalism, and therefore it is used as an instrument of control and monitoring of faculty work. Notions of academic professionalism coupled with quality improvement, and institutional autonomy.</p>	<p>Need to improve faculty's participation in university governance. Intense emphasis on quality improvement as a way to enhance academic professionalism. Faculty participation in governance not a priority.</p>
	<p>The perceptions of policy priorities impact in a subordinate fashion the role of faculty.</p>	

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In the previous chapter, data were systematized and analyzed using the analytic structure emergent from the three-fold theoretical framework (macro-level, institutional level, and the issues affecting the professoriate). The data analysis illuminated the research questions that guided this study, focusing on the goals of the Argentinean state in the design of the Law on Higher Education of 1995 as perceived by different actors (politicians, professors, and university administrators/academic staff); each group's characterization of the nature of the reform movement (similarities and differences); and finally, if stakeholders' perceptions about academic professionalism related to the ways in which the reform policies were implemented. A matrix systematizing the findings was composed to synthesize the results of the analysis.

This final chapter begins with a brief review of the case study, and its main issues. General reflections are presented on its main purpose, which is the analysis of the tensions and impacts initiated by the Argentinean higher education reform policies of 1995 (and subsequent policies) on the ways in which professors and academic staff perceive the role of the professoriate at two Argentinean universities. Additionally, this section offers a concise summary of the main findings, connected with the overarching conclusions of the study.

To conclude, the chapter under the guidance of the focused synthesis method expounds policy recommendations (targeting the macro and micro policy dimensions) and implications for further research.

5.1 REVIEW AND REFLECTIONS ON THE CASE STUDY

The analysis of the policy phenomena regarding how higher education reform policies in Argentina have affected two universities, particularly with regard to the professoriate, has highlighted several trends and issues which are endemic and at the core of educational policy in the country. These issues have been constructed through the analysis in chapter 4, and they could be synthesized as follows:

The policy stemming from the reform movement fueled tensions. These tensions were transferred to different phases within the policy structure, particularly design and implementation phases. There are perspectives of policy analysis that stress the notion of the complexity of educational reform. In this case it is instrumental to analyze higher educational policies in Argentina with the combination of a rational approach and institutional approaches. This combination of approaches can shed light and give voice to the tensions, and the specific institutional dynamics that have differentiated public and private institutions.

As the literature suggests (Mollis, 1995; Marginson & Mollis, 2001) the policies were not created in a vacuum and emerged in a politically charged environment. In addition, they were determined by the state reform process, and the economic and social transformations originating from it. The complexity of the policy phenomena in Latin America (as Torres & Schugurensky, 2002, and Schugurensky, 2003, suggested) represents the strong determination of the role of the state and its weight in educational policy. Educational policies are framed as strategic in the context of public policies and the state has a strong influence over them for each of the stakeholders of the system and policy actors involved. Furthermore, while the literature stresses the importance of the role of the state in higher education policy formation (Schugurensky, 2003; Torres, and Shugurensky, 1998), it diminishes how much the government approach to public

policies also influences the ways in which policies are being implemented at the institutional level through the mediation of different stakeholders of the system. Meanwhile, the work by Marginson and Mollis (2001) stresses the importance of considering subaltern actors in the power dynamics of higher education.

Policies and policy messages travel through institutions, broaden their meanings, and somewhat lose their original intentions. The goals from their inceptions are constructed and reconstructed by institutional actors. There is a conflictive linkage between the moment of policy-making and policy implementation within higher education reform. In the case under analysis, university autonomy and budgetary issues have affected the pace and phasing of this policy implementation. This could have been resolved by general agreement between universities and the government, which has been accomplished loosely in the last decade. This dynamic has ignited policy messages of contradictory ideas and gave room to paradoxical interpretations which have generated differences and conflict between institutions and the government, and among institutions themselves.

Another source of tensions and misalignments between policy design and implementation has been the strong impact and the privileged place in which the policies of quality evaluation and quality assurance have been analyzed at both at macro and micro levels. The positioning of these policies as the cornerstone of the reform movement has been the catalyst for exacerbated relationships, between the state and its monitoring organisms, between the state and the universities, and inside the universities themselves. The situation has been aggravated by a climate of “trickling down” pressures: government on the institutions, institutions on their academic staff, and academic staff on the professoriate which operated according to the quality evaluation demands and concerns. Thus, this aspect of the reform policies became so crucial in

each institution that it subordinated other policies with enormous potential for change. As a result of this, academic staff and the professoriate frame policies referring to quality as essential in each institution. Accordingly, they conceived and understood their institutional environments as highly monitored and controlled.

The case study allowed for an in depth analysis of the tensions, misalignments, negotiations, and struggles, around the reform policies and within them, the ideas of academic professionalism. The notion that the LHE was more than its words, and that it entailed a constellation of preconceptions, was manifested in individual notions from different policy actors regarding what the LHE meant, and which were its goals. Thus, it is in this context that the need to rely upon organizational theory approaches (Weick, 1995) could shed light on how the knowledge and meanings of policies are constructed at the institutional level. The processes through which higher education policies are formulated, and implemented, are marked by the ways in which different actors make sense of what is needed to be changed and what's needed to be done.

Research on Argentinean higher education, has historically focused on issues of university autonomy (Mollis, 2001; Fernandez Lamarra, 2003), or on the relationship between the Argentinean state and the universities (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002, p. 429; Torres & Puiggros, 1995; Schugurensky, 2003; Chiroleau et al., 2001; Fernandez Lamarra, 2003). Research on policies affecting the professoriate in Argentina have broadly targeted problems shared with the academic profession globally, such as salary, appointments, or most recently, the existence of academic oligarchies with practices of clientelism on the knowledge production (Saguier, 2004). This study, while revisiting previous research, proposes the construction of a

case from a policy research standpoint. This view integrates previous proposals from the literature and focuses on specific institutional cases.

Another challenging situation has been the issue of institutional autonomy, widely studied by Mollis (2001). Different policy actors framed and considered institutional autonomy as contradictory and paradoxical. Overall, the tensions between the declaration of institutional autonomy by the LHE and then, the creation –at the same time- of mechanisms of monitor and control of the institutions, propelled an environment of conflicting dynamics and translated into paradoxical phenomena. In this context, the paradoxes translated into the struggle within each institution to preserve as much as possible their autonomy, while displaying inside mechanisms of control of the autonomy of their actors, namely the professors.

Similarities and Differences

Similarities and differences among stakeholders' responses to the reform policies, expressed by the data, illuminated the main issues that supported this case study, and communicated the major tensions and misalignments previously considered.

Institutional actors from both the University of the River and the University of the Incarnate World showed striking similarities in the ways in which they frame the goals of the state, academic professionalism, and its impact on policy implementation. These similarities were consistent across groups of actors (academic staff and faculty) and institutions.

In terms of the goals of the state as propeller for the higher education reform movement, the participants manifested similarities in the following aspects:

- All actors interviewed defined the political goal of the Argentinean state in the higher education reform movement as intertwined with other policy objectives, e.g., adding

prestige to reform of the state. Paradoxically, for all actors, the LHE represented the retrenchment of the state from social and educational arenas.

- The goals of the reform policies manifested contradictory features related to issues of quality improvement, autonomy, decentralization, institutional governance changes. Nevertheless, institutional autonomy was framed as endangered within the higher education reform policies, and was one of their major goals.
- Among politicians and academic staff at the two universities, the reform policies translated higher education premises from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund into the reform of the Argentinean system.

Differences were expressed in the following:

- Academic staff perceived the issue of institutional autonomy as paramount within the reform policies.
- Professors across the two institutions saw the reform policies focused on control and monitoring of the professoriate
- Only professors identified the reform policies as an inevitable process; as a process-nevertheless- that could allow accommodations; and as a needed change to support quality improvement through the higher education system.
- Academic staff at the two universities framed the policies as intending a close control of the universities, while paradoxically, allowing them to improve their management, and achieve detailed control of their internal resources.

Linked to the major issues of academic professionalism within the reform policies, different actors manifest similarities and differences in the as it follows:

Similarities:

- The policies fueled tensions between teaching and research; in a structure of endemic salary support and lack of institutional infrastructure to support knowledge production.
- Professional autonomy appeared as landmark in the conception of academic professionalism.
- Political participation of faculty in governance was a crucial aspect of academic professionalism.
- The social status of the professoriate was an intertwined component of academic professionalism.

Differences:

- Academic staff and politicians expressed striking similarities in the view of the professoriate as “low” in terms of academic professionalism, and with heterogeneous capacities and abilities.
- Professors saw the policies as the platform for the transition to a more defined and improved academic professionalism.
- While academic staff and politicians saw the academic professional’s duties in teaching, research, and social services; professors defined their most important duty as teaching, followed by research.
- Academic staff perceived the mobility of faculty as an obstacle for institutional improvement.
- Professors did not perceive unions as supporting faculty professionalization.
- Faculty recognized the policy shifts towards the professor-researcher, demands of professional development, and faculty evaluation, as imposed and forced.

- Faculty framed their autonomy as paradoxically restricted and enhanced by the implementation of the reform policies. Nonetheless, professors saw themselves as lacking influence in determining the aims and pace of the reform implementation. Meanwhile, academic staff while considering faculty autonomy as a core component of the profession, they also understood that policies were implemented ensuring full autonomy of the professoriate in their work.
- Professors recognized their social status as contradictory and limited in relation to other professions and their salaries. Nevertheless, academic staff described professors' social status as defined by their social commitment because of their work at the university.

The impact of macro, and micro policy levels on academic professionals at the institutional level expressed differences and similarities among groups:

Similarities:

- Stakeholders' perceptions on academic professionalism were complex, punctual and focused on specific traits of academic professionalism. Thus, they translated into policy implementation at the institutional level in a fragmented fashion.
- The views on academic professionalism appeared combined with the ways in which different stakeholders "made sense" of the reform policies.

Differences:

- Academic staff's fragmented notions on professionalism transmuted into defining professional development as professionalism; and as instrument to monitor and control academics in their work.

- Academic staff at the universities designed policy implementation of the policies affecting the professoriate as coupled with other reform policies, e.g., quality improvement, institutional autonomy, and institutional governance changes.
- Academic staff described as important but not vital, the participation of faculty in institutional governance.

Accordingly, there was a weak relationship between the ways in which reform policies were implemented with the perceptions of different stakeholders on academic professionalism.

5.2 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The use of the complementary methodology of focused synthesis (Majchrzak, 1985) allows the identification and formulation of critical recommendations of next stages for higher education reform policies.

These policy recommendations are rooted not only in the analysis that preceded this chapter, but also in the request and need that the policy process presented in the context of the analysis itself.

- While data was collected and analyzed and while current information was still emerging, the terrain of higher education policies manifested diverse degrees of conflict and paradox. The continuous arising of political conflict around the policies, between the central government and the higher education institutions, the tensions between academic staff and professors, operate as obstacles for attainment of –in fact- what was proposed in the written policies, more specifically, in the LHE (1995). For a successful attainment of the goals of the reform policies, there is a need to channel and reduce the high levels of political contestation of the policies. The high voltage of the politically charged environment appears to be discouraging improvement.
- The top-down approach followed by the policy design and implementation process has silenced crucial voices at the institutional level. Members of academic staff and the professoriate perceive certain policies as external and “foreign” to their institutions and their roles, because these actors had not participated in the decision-making process at the macro-level. The situation gets intensified at the institutional level, where professors

perceive the policies coming directly from the LHE, with limited mediation from the academic staff.

- In this context, professors perceive the policies affecting their work and demands determined solely in their pace and implementation by the academic staff at each university. Meanwhile professors have little participation in the implementation policies that clearly target faculty work but are the ones with the primordial knowledge of the lights and shadows of their work itself. These dynamics of policy implementation have created not only tensions in each institution, but also a clear breach between academic staff and the professoriate. Although there are shared policy interpretations, these two actors appear showing different goals and aims even in the context of the institutional policies.
- Professors do not feel these policies as their own and do feel subjected to a rhythm of implementation that has not contemplated their own needs and demands. Thus, there is a need to create institutional spaces for the exchange, encounter, and even debate of the institutional policy priorities. Additionally, institutional actors need to perceive themselves as informed and therefore, as participants in the process of change. The current set up obliterates for practical reasons, professors' agency in the process.
- It is essential to revisit the regulatory laws and written policies on certain aspects of the reform itself. This time, the process should be informative from the collection of data and opinions to different policy actors situated at the "bottom" of the system. New mechanisms of circulation of these ideas so that policy makers could be informed at the time of policy design are created.

- Universities have to build internal mechanisms of representation for each of their actors, so they could both participate and have their voices heard in the process of policy design and implementation. The creation of a council that could participate in policy formation with knowledgeable representatives, who could inform the professoriate and the academic staff at each institution, would be perceived as highly validated within the institutions.
- Systemic mechanisms, through which policies circulate at both the macro and micro levels of the policies, need to be established. The identification of the current informal avenues through which policies circulate and get mediated could become a crucial supporter of the design and implementation of higher education reform policies and would demystify and prevent endangering of institutional autonomy or the fear of its endangering.
- Another aspect that has appeared to fuel tensions and misalignments has been the positioning of quality improvement as the foremost policy priority at both the macro and micro level of policy implementation. The policies on quality improvement have been enforced within the reform process at each institution. There is a strategic need to equilibrate institutional policy decisions not to focus only on this aspect of reform but also not to support financially these initiatives. If these policies are to be supported and strengthened for budgetary and actual political requirements, different actors are to be called to voice their perceptions and views on quality itself.
- One of the most complex issues that arise from the previous analysis has been the dichotomy between the ways in which academic staff and professor perceive the main traits of the academic profession. The views from academic staff manifested as

fragmented and foregrounded in disaggregated views on the professoriate and their role in higher education. Thus, it would be crucial for professors to actively participate to confer academic staff some “voice” in identifying policy priorities and procedures to sustain change at the institutional level.

- It is a well explored fact that the professoriate at different institutions from a global standpoint has limited roles in higher education reform policy implementation. In this particular case, the highly top-down character of both the policy design and implementation alienates the professoriate and exacerbates the lack of agency on the implementation process. Thus, professors manifest resist specific aspects of the policies being implemented. This could be overcome by generating mechanisms and spaces for inquiry and participation of the professoriate.
- Another critical aspect of policy implementation has been the determination of ways in which the professoriate would achieve professional development. Professors need to have more determinacy in the areas, offers, and actual pace of the professional development opportunities. In this way, professors will perceive ownership of their professional development and become agents of their own professional improvement, while exercising autonomy as professionals.
- Additionally, the process of reform of plan of studies needs to be revisited at both institutions, as well as in a macro-level approach. The example of how the process of reform of plan of studies was conducted at the two institutions could inform of the limitations of a highly determined process from a top-down approach. This in particular, is framed by the professoriate as the foremost aspect of their autonomy, because it is an aspect that the implementation process at the institutional level situated as urgent and

framed as required by the quality improvement and evaluation. This triggered professors' resistance, because they perceive one of the core components of their professionalism under attack. In future processes, the reform of plan of studies has to become less political, and less over determined by its linkages with the improvement of quality at the institutional level.

- Policies towards the professoriate ought to ensure an actual salary improvement and an increment of fulltime positions at each institution. The lack of these conditions is identified as an obstacle for successful reform intentions and improvement of faculty productivity.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There has been a great deal of research on Argentinean higher education which puts focus on the analysis of issues of institutional autonomy in the context of higher education reform (Mollis, 2001; Marginson & Mollis, 2003; Fernandez Lamarra, 2003).

Additionally, there have been studies on institutional differentiation (Garcia de Fanelli) or on the role of the state in higher education (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002, p. 429; Torres & Puiggros, 1995; Schugurensky, 2003; Chiroleau et al., 2001). Studies on the situation of Argentinean higher education have also shown a dearth of analysis of policy implementation beyond the case of the Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA). Furthermore, analysis on the actual situation or the effect of the policies on the professoriate, have been descriptive and have used anecdotal sources of information (Marquis, 2003).

This study intends to contribute in a manifold fashion to the analysis of Argentinean higher education policies. This research contributes to link the study of Argentinean policies with global ones, to reveal the connections between macro-policies with micro-policies by using the lens of sense-making in organizations (Weick, 1995), and the studies on the academic profession in times of reform movements (Altbach, 2003). The dearth of policy case studies that integrate these different levels of policy calls for research on specific cases that could add new perspectives, expand the concepts and theoretical instruments for policy analysis, and broaden their issues and boundaries in light of empirical findings. This work intends to contribute to the literature by drawing upon a convergence of perspectives and by analyzing empirical data to illustrate and illuminate the scope, limitations, and applicability of theoretical constructs related to policy analyses.

The use of the lens of sense-making in organizations appears as a fruitful instrument in the exploration of the ways in which reform policies transit from their design and implementation at different institutions. This construct also allows for the exploration of an active role of policy actors at the institutional level and how their interpretations and framings of the policies influence how the policies are implemented at the institutional level. The use of sense-making approaches for analysis of policy implementation could also be used for analysis that focuses on bridging or connecting both macro and micro levels in policy analysis. Further research based on the lenses of sense-making to weave the linkages and connections between these two levels and their actors would illuminate other issues of higher education policy reform in Argentina and in other national cases.

The complexity of the policy phenomenon at both the state level and the institutional level, as well as the role of specific actors supporting, framing, and promoting the policies

themselves, requires for a broader and deeper analysis the use of other theoretical and complementary models. Following the steps of sense-making approaches, this would be enhanced by a study of the role of networks and educational policy, communities of practice, analysis of transfer mechanisms, comparison between policy diffusion and implementation. This study while focusing on the ways in which policies were framed and the tensions and misalignments between policy design and implementation did not targeted the role of specific actors within the system who played a rather vital role in the policy design and implementation.

The studies on the influence of actors networks in academic power and policies is reduced to one study by Saguier (2004). This case study will contribute to the line of analysis inaugurated by Saguier. Additionally, this case shows intriguing findings on the role of policy actors and their networks on policy formation and policy transfer.

Using the same theoretical frameworks the case of policy analysis and implementation would be enriched by expanding the collection of data to more universities in Argentina and would enhance the analysis of the case and would propose other tensions in the implementation of this case.

Another study focusing specifically on how the changes introduced in the work of faculty entail identity changes for the professoriate will be another enriching study derived from the current one.

Additionally, knowledge on policy implementation in Argentina will be broadening with a specific study on the ways in which academic staff at the universities mediate and interpret policies from the state. The need to study this group as a significant policy actor will enrich the study of the complex phenomena of higher education in Argentina.

The comparison between the two institutions implementing the policies was not the main purpose of this research. Nevertheless, a comparative analysis of the ways in which public and a private universities in Argentina designed and implementing broader policies will introduce new questions and research issues to the study of higher education in Argentina.

Finally, a comparison between higher education reform policies affecting the professoriate at different national environments would strengthen the knowledge of higher education reform policies affecting faculty from a global standpoint.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCCOLS

The first of the appendices is composed by the interview protocols for the interviews with politicians, academic staff, and professors.

I. Interview Protocol for Professors at the University

1. About the LHE and its implementation:
 - a. What were the goals/ objectives of the Law of Higher education in the reform of higher education?
 - b. What were the main features of the implementation of the higher education reform policies?
 - c. How were the policies implemented at your school? Probes: when were the policies implemented?; How was the implementation paced?; which were the changes first noted in terms of curriculum requirements?, etc.
2. a. How have these features modified the activities and endeavors at your school, the program of studies where you work at, and the university as a whole?

b. Considering your appointment [position] at the school, could you characterize which transformations you witnessed in this institution in the last 5 years?

c. Which were the changes implemented to the functions of the institution that modified or maintained the role of the institution at both the regional and national levels?

3. How-if at all- the changes implemented at your school have affected your role and functions in it, in your relationships with your colleagues, etc. Probes: have you experienced changes in the type of appointment you have?; do you have to co-teach with other colleague/ colleagues?; etc.

4. About how the changes at the university in the last 5 years have affected the role of the professors:

a. How have these transformations at the university been intertwined with the process of accreditation and evaluation? How if at all have they affected your role and other professor's roles? (Probes: Amount of time for research activities?, teaching load; teaching load in relation with research activities?; curriculum: re-design?; professor's evaluations; salary changes?; general program of studies in your school?, etc).

b. How would you describe your role within the process of implementation of the reform policies? Have you-if at all- participated in any way in the structure, organization, or pacing of the implementation of the reform policies? [Probes: Academic staff involved and relationship with faculty?; Did you participate as a member of the consulting staff that collaborated with the academic staff?].

5. About academic professionalism:

a. How could you define the features and roles of academic professionals in the Argentinean higher education system? (Probes: System of entry exams?; Autonomy and

decision-making in terms of work and curriculum design? Political participation as a related to working at the university?; etc)

b. What are your perceptions about this role? Has it been maintained, modified, and transformed, within the implementation of the reform policies? [Probes: status, both social, and within the institution? In relation with academic staff and decision making?]

c. How would you characterize your work as an academic professional in terms of research, teaching, etc? [Probes: relationship between teaching and learning? Teaching and research?; core activities of the work?]

c. (Examples and illustrations for 5.b.).

6. Professional background:

a. Seniority as a professor

b. Type of courses that you teach

c. Type of appointment

d. Do you have any other type of appointment (program coordinator, etc) in your department/ school?

II. Interview Protocol for Academic Staff at the University

1. About the LHE and its implementation:
 - a. What were the goals/ objectives of Law of Higher education in the reform of higher education?
 - b. Which were the main features of the implementation of the higher education reform policies?
 - c. How have these features modified the activities and endeavors at your school, program of studies where you work at, and the university as a whole?
2. Considering your appointment [position] at the school, could you characterize which transformations you witnessed operating in this institution in the last 5 years?
3. How-if at all- the changes implemented at your school [SCHOOL OF....] have affected your role and functions in it, in your relationships with the professors working with you, etc
4. About the transformations at the university in the last 5 years and how have they affected the role of professors,
 - a. How have these transformations at the university been intertwined with the process of accreditation and evaluation? How if at all have they affected your role and other administrators' roles?
 - b. How would you describe your role within the process of implementation of the reform policies? Have you-if at all- participated in any way in the structure, organization, pacing of the implementation of the reform policies?
5. Academic professionalism:

- a. How could you define the features and roles of academic professionals?
(probes: autonomy and decision-making, curriculum design, political participation, etc)
 - b. What are your perceptions about this role? Has it been maintained, modified, and changed, within the implementation of the reform policies?
 - c. (Examples and illustrations for 5. b.).
- 6. Background in the position:
 - a. Seniority as academic staff

III. Interview protocols for Politicians

1. When the LHE was passed in 1995, it redefined the conditions and type of relationships between the state and the higher education system. In this context of implementation, it would be important to explore the different steps through which it was sanctioned:
 - a. What were the political conditions that influenced the design and passing of the LHE?
 - b. What were the goals of the LHE in the context of implementation of the reform policies?
 - c. What were the policies towards the higher education system used to support the design of the higher education reform?
 - d. How did the process of implementation start based on the passing of the LHE?
 - e. What were the features and roles of the state in relationship with the reform policies implemented in higher education?
2. About academic professionalism:
 - a. Regarding issues of academic professionalism, what are –if at all- the changes that the design and implementation, that the LHE introduced, created for the work and lives of professors?
 - b. What do you think is the role academic professionals should play in both the implementation of the reform policies and in the higher education institutions where they work?
3. [In case of politicians who participated in the Congressional Commission of Education: Which was your role in it?]

APPENDIX B

CODE BOOK

The code book used for data analysis using N6 is presented. The code book experienced iterative revisions.

Code Book

Base Codes/INTERVIEWS

1. Policy-makers/ politicians

2. University of the River:
 - a. Academic staff
 - b. Junior Faculty
 - c. Faculty between
 - d. Senior faculty

3. University of the Incarnate Word:
 - a. Academic staff

- b. Junior Faculty
- c. Faculty between
- d. Senior faculty

4. Type of position for academic staff and professors:

- a. Full time
- b. Part-time

5. Miscellaneous:

Background; OFF THE RECORD comments which could shed light on some aspects of the case.

ANALYTIC/INTERVIEWS

***On going and iterative process

1. MACRO-LEVEL: Global and National policies

1. a. Context pressures: [RQ1]

.Global trends in education reform policies, and global “norms” or demands. Illustrations of: “...because of globalization and the influence of privatization in higher education”; global demands: “modernization” of socio-economic under the influence of globalization; retrenchment of the national/ central state in higher education in terms of funding.

.International loans and pressures (and importance) of WB’s demands.

.Global demands: Priority of R&D (research and development) and hard science and research.

.Accountability movement in higher education and quality control (TQM) as a global trend.

.Global trends affecting higher education, such us:

Privatization: when it is described in a very general fashion, including demands to the professoriate and more

Introduction of use fees (when applicable)

Reduction of institutional autonomy

Quality assurance and quality evaluation

[FOR REFERENCE: Some aspects appear in the World Bank’s “Perils and Promise” report]

EMERGENT THEME: World Bank and IMF’s influences; international loans when they are described and presented as: “this reform is the result of the WB’s influence”. [Include when faculty refer to this aspect with awareness of it as an influential variable].

b. Role of the state in higher education: [RQ1]

.GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS: Different roles of the state: “total” intervention, systems with institutional autonomy, importance of funding.

. In Argentina: previous history of state’s involvement and “commitment” to supporting the higher education system.

.“Public Policies” towards Higher Education (when framed as “public policies”).

."Contradictions" in the role of the state towards higher education: financial involvement with preservation of autonomy (similar to Western European experience/ Welfare state). (Or, as opposed to...)

.Current situation and previous situation in the 1990's: Government in favor of privatization of higher education and "control" of specific aspects of institutional autonomy (financial accountability, quality control with CONEAU), reduction of funding and "investment" in higher education. Quality improvement(general descriptions).

.Incentives (general descriptions when related to the reform policies).

.EMERGENT THEME: Role of the LHE as catalyst of previous notions, and of state's Educational role towards the sector.

c. State/ University relations: [RQ1].

Framing of the reform policies, as coming from the state, in relationship with the universities through the LHE. State/university relations, in terms of room for:

university autonomy;

ideological control in curriculum or "what to teach";

academic freedom;

Control of the university by the state, e.g., budget.

Imposition of curriculum reform or other general policies contained in the LHE.

Reasons why government proposed and supported certain HED policies.

d. Autonomy: [RQ1]

.University autonomy in the case of Argentina: in terms of university governance, but funding of university has been secured (but it does not operate in a permanent fashion in this way, variations).

.Relationship between institutional autonomy and professional policies.

.University Autonomy versus state's control.

.University ability to determine certain aspects of policy implementation: general descriptions.

e. Goals of the reform movement globally: [RQ1].

AS EXPRESSED BY THE LHE AND OTHER WRITTEN POLICIES:

.Accountability pressures, financial reduction of state's investment in social policy areas, influence of international organization for the development of education (loans, plans, and programs).

.Strengthening of state's financial, organizational control, on education or other social areas.

. Intensification of state's control

.Efficiency in higher education administration as part of national systems (investments, administrative organization, etc).

f. Argentinean state's goals:

.Efficiency in public investment investment and in the administration of universities.

. Quality evaluation policies. CONEAU's control: oversees of quality assurance and accountability at the institutional level.

.Ministry of Education's guidelines, and control of universities (as compared to previous policies towards higher education).

.Education as an area included in the so-called reform of the state (as an area like social programs, etc).

.Reduction of state's involvement.

."Supervised" or "controlled" autonomy. Autonomy with boundaries: examples of how public universities had

EMERGENT THEMES: Policy incentives, and budget policies. Specific quality evaluation policies at both universities.

g. Tensions/ misalignments between design and implementation:

Basically, what the LHE proposed and what actually happened

.Goals of the higher education reform: generic and more related to "what the state/government wanted", the "state's plans expressed in the LHE": from early 1990's and afterwards.

.Tensions at a double level: state (& government)-institutional; and institution-professors.

.Differences between state's goals and institutional goals. No clarity in the pace and path of the policy implementation process from the state, or institutional decision-making and having power. Therefore, universities "set up" or "develop" specific plans, schedules, and implementation's schemas.

.Different ways, and means to achieve goals: as they appear in the LHE, and as they happened at the institutional level.

.General policy priorities not specified. Institutions chose the pace, priorities, and policies to focus on and “set”...

EMERGENT THEME: Resistance from universities (first period of implementation) as described by staff and politicians.

h. General policies towards the professoriate

The profession has “a role” in improvement of general educational quality of the system. In other words, professors need to get “professionalized” or obtain graduate degrees (general descriptions/ references).

.The so-called: “academic career” requirements by the law and other regulations.

.New requirements: professionals need to get a Ph.Ds or graduate studies. “Forced” professionalization of academe (Ginsburg’s notions from articles, 1996 & 1998).

.Differentiation of academic profession as a result/consequences of policies, and political participation

.Professionals: rights and duties in the university

.Professional autonomy: reform and alignment of plans of studies

.EMERGENT THEMES:

Evaluation and accreditation related to “categorizacion” (categorization) of careers and professors.

Professional “model” as understood from the LHE.

Role of professors’ unions

Issue of entry exams, or “concursos” when described as a general policy (in the LHE or other written policies).

i. Quality evaluation and improvement: WHEN REFERRED TO DESCRIPTIONS OF STATE’S ACTIONS & THEIR IMPACT AT THE UNIVERSITIES

.CONEAU’s actions and regulatory procedures (general)

.Quality evaluation at each university (internal evaluation) when aligned to national policies.

.Program accreditation: requirements.

.Accountability: when institutions are being accountable to the state.

.Institutional evaluations

EMERGENT THEME: “Categorizations” of professors (assignments of professor’s assignments or position-titles), & quality improvement.

j. Other state’s policies towards the higher education sector

Separation of different types of institutions

EMERGENT THEME: Miscellaneous (role of specific state/ government bureaucrats, which are identified as key actors in relationship with the LHE), demographic information from interviewees.

Included in Goals of the State’s code.

k. Emergent Node (Conceptual):

Miscellaneous on reform and academic professionalism, general description on reform that might summarize interviewees’ perception. Grand descriptions of the “spirit” of the higher education reform.

2. MICRO-LEVEL: INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

a. Specification of national broader policies

. Due to the manner in which the reform policies were designed and implemented (timing, schedule, pacing, priorities, targets, etc), universities had to somewhat “specify” and “focus” the broad, unspecified, nonspecific, general policies from the LHE.

Note: The LHE has the character of a so-called “general act”. Universities came up with policies or frameworks for actions, such as, the “millennium program”, programs per school at the UIW, for evaluation purposes. Exercise of university autonomy specifically, and creating regulations post-LHE.

.Millennium program (as an institutional policy); school’s documents and institutional regulations at the private university

EMERGENT THEME: History of the university in relationship with national policies and ways of “dealing” with messages from higher education policies.

b. Participation and policy-making (implementation) processes at the institutional level:

[Answer to the following questions or issues, like]:

.Who participated in the designing of the policies: academic staff, program coordinators, members of academic secretariat, etc?

.Who were the governmental and institutional actors who intervened?

.How and with which phases the institutional policies were developed and implemented?

.How do different actors describe the process? OR As the processes are described by different actors: academic staff and professors

.When professors were asked and deliberated around the policies in the process. When professors and academic staff discussed policies.

c. Goals of policy initiatives (at the university level)

[What actors say about the following and/or answers to the following questions or issues]:

. How do the institutional policies frame/ stipulate and conceptualize the goals of designing and implementing reform policies at the institutional level? E.g.: “at the university, we decided to do this first, then this later”. [as the UIW did with program evaluation].

.”Cuatrimestralizacion” as reform of plan of studies, and its purposes.

.How do different actors (academic staff and professors) see the goals and purposes of policy design and implementation at the institutional level? (both general and specific), as comparing/ complementing the LHE

.Institutions: aims, goals, and intentions sought by specific policies .

.Administrative re-structuring of school departments.

d. Comparison between state policies and institutional policies

State policies	Universities
Broad	Specified
General	Targeting precise issues
Generic	Focused
Generalities about curriculum reform	Specific pace and type of curriculum/ plan of studies' change

e. Quality improvement and role of academics at the university level: WHEN INTERVIEWS ARE FROM STAFF AND POLITICIANS AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL; and WHEN PROFESSORS MARGINALLY REFER TO THIS ISSUE.

(Role of academics in connection with quality improvement)

.Quality will be improved if academics enhance their credentials, knowledge background, research productivity, instructional capacity and teaching

.Academics: subordinate role in designing and implementing quality evaluation; “subjects” of the evaluation themselves.

EMERGENT THEME:

“Categorization” of professors (including the procedures, the processes, and the demands) at the university level.

What professors need to do to “improve” educational services at the institutions.

f. Academic staff and the professoriate: In general, interactions, discussions, and exchanges between staff and professors about issues of implementation/ reform/ etc

.Academics/ professors: “suffer” the reform, lack of capacity to “set the rules” or “determining priorities”; “subjects” and “agents” of the reform itself, “investing” their work in the reform of the plan of studies; reduced control of conditions and focus of the reform policies; “targeted” participation.

. “URGENCY” of the reform when academic staff designed the policies.

.Academic staff: “supervision” or “foreseeing” of the reform implementation process; they design and “set” the pace and the steps of the reform implementation; organization of the reform implementation process; bureaucratic control; oversees the reform process; give rationale and “ideology” that explains and support of the reform.

.”Incentivos”’: as they are administered by academic staff and within the institution.

3. IMPACT OF MACRO/MICRO LEVEL POLICY DIMENSIONS ON THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

a. Description of professoriate in Argentina as academic professionals:

.General socio-economic status

.Academic freedom

.Types of appointment

.What does being an academic in Argentina entail?

.System of entry-exams to the profession: CONCURSOS when described in a general fashion by professors

.Academic job and demands, e.g., research productivity and teaching load

.Issues and problems related to autonomy (general overview)

.Work at the university: job and demands

.Professionals (from so-called liberal professions): similarities and differences with academics

b. Professional Status

.Before the reform movement and reform policies (in the long term perspective, from the dictatorship and when coming back to democracy, until de early 1990s): what does it mean to be a professor at the university and how other social groups perceive academics from the university, “prestige and privilege” in relation to others (Notion of status: Weberian “flavor”).

.Outcomes of reform policies on professional status (of academics): prestige and social respect from other groups, what it means to be an academic, while and after the reform is implemented.

. “Dedicacion exclusive”: when academic staff and professors talk.

c. Impact of the LHE/ reform movement on the role/ roles of the professoriate:

1. In the reform movement (in general):

Professors’ participation in discussions, decision-making process, demonstrations, public display and statements regarding higher education reform policies, etc.

2. In the higher education system:

“Research productivity”, “knowledge production”, “efficiency” of academic’s work, their “value” and importance in higher education. [It could also be described as: the importance of research and research production, service to third parties, publishing, etc].

3. Role in schools and university:

Positioning in relationship of decision-making processes; hierarchical position among themselves, and in relationship with academic staff at the university; control of resources, distribution of resources.

4. Roles in quality improvement:

Were they asked/ consulted? Did they participate in internal evaluation of quality at the university? Type and level of participation in the internal and external evaluation.

Ways in which professor’s work was affected by the reform policies; or by the implementation of reform policies.

d. Professional Autonomy:

At the landmark that has defined the conditions of professionalism.

Autonomy through its diverse features:

1. Curriculum:

Who determines what and how to teach?

Who determines curriculum?

What makes decisions about curriculum?

Adherence to guidelines (general) from the Ministry of education

Final curriculum designing decisions.

2. Control and Determinacy of workload:

Determinacy and control of rationality between determination/ indeterminacy of the ratio

Who and how the hours of work and workload are determined?

How the quantity and time of work, workload, and research are established?

3. Relationship with university management:

Discussions, forums of exchange, hierarchical structure, communications, “delegation”
on specific professionals

4. Faculty assessment/ evaluation:

.Decision-making around faculty assessment: Who, when, how it is conducted?

.Relationship with academic staff around faculty assessment.

Role of peers (other academics)

System of entry exams (concursos)

Relationships with quality evaluation

5. Political participation: from one perspective this represents the landmark aspect of the
profession that determines the condition of professionalism

Participation in unions

What is entailed by academics political participation? Examples: participation in the demonstrations, and strikes organized by union. Etc.

6. Professional improvement: post-graduate, graduate studies. The reasons and justifications professors provide when they explain why they do seek for them.

e. Work of academic professionals: appointments/ salary; academic career; teaching load and research (relationship). Publications, conference attendance, research production, etc.

f. CONCURSOS: System of entry exam.

.Specific features.

.Goals (as described by different participants)

.Outcomes on the actual work and professors' appointments

.How professors position themselves in relationship with "concursos"

. Role of exams in quality improvement.

Second paragraph.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, E., Gordon, S., Iverson, S. (2006). Re/thinking practices of Power: The discursive framing of Leadership in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30 (1), 41-68.
- Altbach, P. (1977). Comparative perspectives on the academic profession. Altbach, P. (Ed.). *Comparative perspectives on the academic profession*. New York: Praeger.
- Altbach, P. (1997). The Academic Profession: the Professorate in Crisis. In Altbach, P., Finkelstein, M. (Eds.), *The academic profession: the professorate in crisis*. New York: Garland Publishers.
- Altbach, P. (Ed.) (2003). *The decline of the guru. The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Anderson, J. (1979). *Public policy making*. United States: Praeger.
- Apple, M. (1989). Critical introduction: Ideology and the state in educational policy. In Dale, R. (Ed.), *The State and education policy* (pp. 1-20). Toronto: OISE Press.
- Argentina.(nd) Bill from the commission of Education, Budget, and Economy at the chamber of representatives and Dictum from the majority
- Argentina. (1995). Congress Debates-Law on Higher Education.
- Arnove, R.; Altbach, P.; Kelly, G. (1992) (Eds.). *Emergent issues in education: Comparative perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Aronowitz, S. (1997) Academic unionism and the future of Higher Education. Nelson, C (Ed.), *Will teach for food. Academic labor in crisis* (pp. 181-214). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Askling, B. (2001). Higher Education and Academic Staff in a Period of Policy and system change. *Higher Education*. 41, 157-181.
- Astiz, M.F., Wiseman, A., and Baker, D (2002). Slouching towards decentralization: Consequences of globalization for curricular control in national education systems. *Comparative Education Review*, 46, (1), 116-124.

- Avellaneda's Law (1885). Available: www.puan480.org. Retrieved: 03/25/2004.
- Balán, J. (1998). Higher education policies in Argentina in the 1990's: Regulation, coordination, and autonomy. In Balán, J. Kent, R., and Navarro, J.C., *Higher Education Reform in Latin America* (pp. 1-43). Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Latin American Program.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered. Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.
- Boyer, E., Altbach, P., Whitelaw, M.J. (Eds.). (1994). *The academic profession. An international perspective*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capital. The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. London: Monthly Review Press.
- Brunner, J. et al. (2005). *Guiar el mercado. Informe sobre la educacion superior en Chile*. Viña del Mar (Chile): Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez.
- Carnoy, M. (1995). Structural adjustment and the changing face of education. *International Labor Review*, 134 (6), 36-42.
- Chen, X. (2003). The Academic Profession in China. In Altbach, P. (Ed). *The decline of the guru. The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries* (pp. 107-166). New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Chiroleau, A; Iazzetta, O; Voras, C; Díaz, C. La política Argentina de los 90: Los alcances del concepto de autonomía. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 9 (22). Retrieved: May 8, 2004, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n22.html>.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, B. (1987). *The academic life. Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Connel, R. (1995). Transformative labor: Theorizing the politics' of teachers' work. In Ginsburg, M. (Ed) (1995). *The politics of educators work and lives* (pp. 91-114). USA: Garland Publishing.
- Coraggio, J.L., and Vispo, A. (2001). *Contribución al estudio del sistema universitario Argentino*. Buenos Aires: Mino y Davila.
- Currie, J. (1998). Globalization as an analytical concept and local policy responses. In Currie, J. & Newson, J. *Universities and globalization. Critical perspectives* (pp.15-20). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Currie, J. (2004). The Neoliberal Paradigm and Higher Education: A critique. In Odin, J., and Manicas, P. (Eds), *Globalization and higher education* (pp.42-62). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The state and education policy*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Denzin, N; & Lincoln, I. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fernández Lamarra, N. (2003) La educación superior Argentina en debate. Situación, problemas y perspectivas [The debate on Argentinean Higher Education. Its situation, problems, and prospects]. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.
- García de Fanelli, AM. (2001). Reformas en la educación superior en la Argentina: Entre el mercado, la regulación estatal y la lógica de las instituciones. In: Serna, R. (Ed.). *Experiencias de reforma en la educación superior en América Latina: Los años noventas*. México: Plaza y Valdez.
- Ginsburg, M, & Spatig, L. (1988). On producing a competency-based teacher education program. In Ginsburg, M. (Ed.), *Contradictions in teacher education and society: A critical analysis* (pp. 59-97). New York: The Falmer Press.
- Ginsburg, M., Meyenn, R., Kanna, I., Miller, H. & Spatig, L. (1988). El concepto de profesionalismo en el profesorado: comparacion de contexto entre Inglaterra y Estados Unidos. *Revista de Educacion*, 285, 5-31.
- Ginsburg, M., Wallace, G, & Miller, H. (1988). Teachers, economy, and the state: an English example. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4 (4), 317-337.
- Ginsburg, M., Kamat, S., Raghgu, R., & Weaver, J. (1992). Educators/politics. *Comparative Education Review*, 36 (4), 417-445.
- Ginsburg, M. (1996). Professionalism or politics as a model for educators' work and lives. *Educational Research Journal*, 11 (2), 133-146.
- Gottlieb, E.; Keith, B. (1997). The Academic Research-Teaching Nexus in Eight Advanced Industrialized Countries. *Higher Education*, 34 (397-420).
- Haag, S. & Smith, M. L. (2002). The possibility of reform: Micropolitics in higher education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10 (21). Retrieved: December 3, 2003 from: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n21.html>.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Harney, S. & Moten, F. (1998). Doing academic work. In Martin, R. (Ed.). *Chalk lines. The politics of work at the managed university* (pp. 154-180). Durham: Duke University.

- Hostaker, R. (2000). Policy change and the academic profession. In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., & Henkel, M (Eds.), *Reforming higher education. A comparative study* (pp. 131-158). Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hutcheson, P. (2000). A professional professoriate. Unionization, bureaucratization, and the AAUP. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Jayaram, N. (2003). The fall of the Guru: The Decline of the Academic Profession in India. In Altbach, P. (Ed). *The decline of the guru. The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries* (pp. 199-230). New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Johnson, ;and Christensen,. (2004). Educational research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches.
- King, Roger (2003). Globalization and the university. In King, Bjarmason, Edwards, Gibbons, Ryan (Eds.) *The university in the global age*. Basingtoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- King, Roger (2003). Globalization and the university. In King, Bjarmason, Edwards, Gibbons, Ryan (Eds.) *The university in the global age*. Basingtoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Kogan, M. & Marton, S. (2000). The State and Higher Education. In Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., Henkel, M (Eds). *Reforming Higher Education. A comparative study* (pp. 89-108). Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Larson, M. (1980). Proletarianization of educated labor. *Theory and society*, 9(1), 131-135.
- Lee, M. (2003). The academic profession in Malaysia and Singapore: Between bureaucratic and corporate cultures. *The decline of the guru. The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries* (pp. 135-166). New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Levy, D. (2006). Market university? In *Comparative Education Review*, 50 (1), 113-124.
- LHE (Law on Higher Education) (1995). MCyE. [Retrieved: April 2003].
- Lieberman, M. (1956). *Education as a profession*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lincoln, Y. (1991). Advancing a Critical Agenda. In Tierney, W. (Ed.). *Culture and ideology in higher education. Advancing a critical agenda* (pp. 17-32). New York: Praeger.
- Majchrzak, A. (1984). *Methods for policy research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Marginson, S., and Mollis, M. (2001). The door opens and the tiger leaps. Theories and reflexivities of comparative education for a global Millennium. *Comparative Education Review*, 45, 4, 581-615.
- Margolis, M. (2004). The withering of the professoriate: corporate universities and the Internet. In Odin, J., and Manicas, P. (Eds), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 24-41). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.

- Marquis, C. (2003). Universities and professors in Argentina: Changes and challenges. In: Altbach, P. (Ed.). *The decline of the guru. The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries*. New York: Palgrave.
- MCyE, Argentina (1995). Law on Higher Education.
- Miles, M.; Huberman, M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis : A sourcebook of new methods* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Mollis, M. (1998). The paradox of the autonomy of Argentinean universities: From liberalism to regulation. In: Kempner, K., Mollis, M., and Tierney, W. (Eds.). *Comparative Education. ASHE Reader Series*, (pp. 244-254). MA: Simon and Shuster.
- Mollis, M. (2001). *La Universidad Argentina en tránsito. Ensayo para jóvenes y no tan jóvenes*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
- Mollis, M. and Marginson, S. (2002). The assessment of universities in Argentina and Australia: between autonomy and heteronomy. In *Higher Education*, 43, 311-330.
- Mollis, M. (2003). Un breve diagnostico de las universidades Argentinas: Identidades alteradas. In Mollis, M. (Ed.), *Las universidades en America Latina: Reformadas o alteradas? La cosmética del poder financiero* (pp. 203-212). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
- Morrow, R., & Torres, C. A. (1995). *Social Theory and Education. A Critique of Theories of Social and Cultural Reproduction*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Neave, G. & van Vught, F. (Eds.). (1991). *Prometheus bound: the changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe*. London: Pergamon.
- Nelson, C. (Ed.). (1997). *Will teach for Food*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Nixon, J. (2001). 'Not without dust and heat': the moral bases of the 'New' academic professionalism. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 49 (2),173-186.
- Nixon, J, Marks, A., Rowland, S., Walker, M. (2001). Towards a new academic professionalism: A manifesto of hope. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22 (2), 227-244.
- Offe, C. (1984). *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Keane, J. (Ed). London: Hutchinson.
- Oszlack, O. (1985). *La Formacion del Estado Argentino*. Buenos Aires: Editorial de Belgrano.
- Patton, (1980).
- Roadhes, G. & Slaughter, S. (1991). The public interest and professional labor: Research universities. In Tierney, W. (Ed.), *Culture and ideology in higher education. Advancing a critical agenda* (pp. 187-211). New York: Praeger.

- Roadhes, G., & Slaughter (1998). Academic capitalism, managed professionals, and supply-side higher education. In: *Chalk lines. The politics of work at the managed university* (pp. 33-68). Durham: Duke University.
- Robertson, S, Bonal, X., and Dale, R.(2002). (in press) Gats and the education service industry: The politics of scale and global re-territorialization.
- Saguier, E. (2004). Prebendarismo y Faccionalismo en la institucionalizacion del conocimiento: El caso de la investigacion y la docencia Argentinas (1989-2003). *Archivos Analiticos de Politicas Educativas*. 12, (6). 1-82. Retrieved: March 2005, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n6>.
- Schugurensky, D. (2003). Higher education restructuring in the era of globalization. Toward a heteronomous model? In Arnove, R. and Torres, CA. (Eds.), *Comparative education. The dialectic of the global and the local* (pp. 292-313). USA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Seoane, V. (1999). Tiramonti, G., Suasnaber, C., and Seoane, V. (Eds.) *Políticas de Modernización Universitaria y Cambio Institucional* (pp. 67-91). La Plata: Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación. Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Slaughter, S. (1988). National higher education policies in a global economy. In Currie, J. and Newson, J. (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 45-70). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Smyth, J. (1998). In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., Hopkins, D. (Eds), *International handbook of educational change* (pp.1242-1256). Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The Art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stromquist, N. & Monkman, K. (2000). Defining globalization and assessing its implications in knowledge and education. In Stromquist, N. & Monkman, K. *Globalization and education: integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 3-25). New York: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Suasnábar, C. (2002). Resistencia, cambio y adaptacion en las universidades Argentinas: Problemas conceptuales y tendencias emergentes en el gobierno y la gestion academica. *Fundamentos en Humanidades*. Universidad Nacional de San Luis. (1-2), 35-56.
- Tabb, W. (2001). State power in the world economy: From national Keynesianism to Neoliberalism. In Tabb, W. (Ed.). *The amoral elephant: Globalization and the struggle for social justice in the twenty-first century* (pp. 51-78). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Taylor, S, Ritzvi, F., Lindgard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and the policies of change*. New York: Routledge.

- Tierney, W. (1991). Ideology and identity in post-secondary institutions. In Tierney, W.(Ed.). *Culture and ideology in higher education. Advancing a critical agenda* (pp. 35-57). New York: Praeger.
- Tiramonti, G., Suasnábar, D., & Seoane, V. (1999). *Políticas de modernización universitaria y cambio institucional*. La Plata: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Torres, CA., & Puiggros, A. (1995). The state and public education in Latin America. *Comparative Education Review*. (39, 1). (pp. 1-27).
- Torres, C.A. (1998). The capitalist state and public policy formation: Framework for a political sociology of educational policy making. In: Kempner, K., Mollis, M., & Tierney, W. (Eds.). *Comparative Education. ASHE Reader Series* (pp. 351-367). MA: Simon and Shuster.
- Torres, A., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in a comparative perspective. In: *Higher Education*, 429-455.
- Tyler, L. and Mollis, M. (1997). Higher Education in Latin America. In: *Contemporary Higher Education*, 6. New York: Garland.
- Universidad Nacional del Litoral (1999-2006). Programa Milenium (Millennium Program). Santa Fe, Argentina
- Van Patten, J. (2000). *Higher education culture. Case Studies for a new century*. New York: University Press of America.
- Wagner, P. (2004). Higher education in an era of globalization: What is at stake? In Odin, J. and Manicas, P. (Eds.), *Globalization and Higher Education* (pp. 7-23). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: California.
- Weidman, J. and Regsurengiin, B. (2002). Higher Education and the State in Mongolia: Dilemmas of Democratic Transition. (Chapter 7). In Chapman, R. and Austin, A. Higher Education in the Developing World. Changing Contexts and Institutional Responses (pp. 129-148). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Williamson, J. (1988). *The Progress of Policy Reform in Latin America. Policy Analysis*.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research. Design and methods*. Thousands Oaks: Sage publications.