ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue IX, September 2025

Towards Understanding University Governance: Answers from Literature

Dr. Vedant V. Pandya

Professor, Department of Business Administration, M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.1409000082

Abstract: This literature review examines the evolution, key milestones, foundational contributions, predominant models, measurement approaches, determinants, interdisciplinary intersections, and global variations in university governance. Drawing on scholarship from Europe, North America, Asia, and the Global South, this paper traces how governance emerged as a distinct research domain in higher education, identifies seminal works and contributors, compares governance frameworks across contexts, and highlights measurement tools and data-analysis techniques. It also explores recent trends, mediating and moderating variables, implications for policy and practice, and persistent research gaps. The review concludes with recommendations for future inquiry, emphasizing under-researched regions and longitudinal mixed-methods studies.

Keywords: University governance, higher education policy, governance models, comparative analysis, measurement tools, antecedents, interdisciplinary, research gaps

I. Introduction

University governance has become a critical locus of scholarly inquiry as higher education institutions respond to pressures for accountability, autonomy, and strategic management. The research domain encompasses the structures, processes, and actors that shape decision-making, resource allocation, and strategic direction in universities. This paper presents a comprehensive literature review of university governance, addressing its origins, key reference points, significant contributions and contributors, prevailing models, measurement approaches, antecedents, interdisciplinary linkages, recent trends, implications, mediating and moderating factors, and knowledge gaps. A global comparative lens highlights international variations in governance design and practice. The review draws exclusively on peer-reviewed sources.

Origin and Evolution of University Governance

University governance has its roots in medieval guild traditions, where scholars collectively regulated academic standards and curricula. Clark's (1983) cross-national historical analysis shows that early universities in Europe were primarily self-governing collegial communities. Neave & van Vught (1991) noted that the formal study of governance as a distinct research domain emerged in the late 20th century, influenced by organizational theory and public administration scholarship. The massification of higher education after World War II triggered interest in state-university relations, as governments sought efficient ways to steward expanding systems (Marginson & Considine, 2000). Also, what catalised governance research, as observed by De Boer, Enders, & Schimank (2007) were New Public Management (NPM) reforms in the 1980s and 1990s, which emphasized market-based instruments, performance indicators, and managerial accountability. Kezar & Eckel (2004) have noted that scholars began to conceptualize governance not simply as hierarchical control but as a complex interplay of actors, rules, and cultural norms.

Major Milestones

Several initiatives and publications have served as milestones in the development of university governance research. OECD's 2003 report "Governance in Higher Education," which introduced comparative governance indicators and typologies for autonomy and accountability (OECD, 2003). European University Association's autonomy scorecards (2008), which benchmarked institutional, academic, financial, and staffing autonomy across member countries (European University Association, 2008). World Bank's "Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities" (Salmi, 2009), which framed governance reforms as central to achieving global excellence. Salmi's typology of governance reforms, distinguishing steward, manager, and leader roles in university executive boards (Salmi, 2009). Aghion et al.'s (2010) empirical study linking governance structures to research productivity and innovation in Europe and the United States. These reference points shifted governance from descriptive accounts to analytical frameworks that inform policy and comparative research.

Significant Contributions and Key Contributors

Early foundational contributions include Clark's (1983) conceptualization of the "triangle of coordination," which balances state steering, market mechanisms, and academic oligarchy. Neave and van Vught's (1991) comparative analysis across Europe, North America, and Australia illuminated the shifting balance between state control and institutional autonomy.

Kezar and Eckel's (2004) synthesis reviewed governance challenges—such as stakeholder diversity and resource constraints—and proposed an agenda for future scholarship focusing on inclusivity and shared governance. Shattock's (2006; 2012) work on governance capacity emphasized the role of governing boards in strategic decision-making and accountability. Deem's (2001) critique of academic capitalism highlighted the tensions between managerial imperatives and scholarly values.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue IX, September 2025

Key contributors whose work shaped the field include Burton R. Clark, Guy Neave and Frans A. van Vught, Adrianna Kezer, Michael Shattock. Burton R. Clark pioneered collegialism and coordination in cross-national perspective (Clark, 1983). Guy Neave and Frans A. van Vught studied state-university relationships under NPM (Neave & van Vught, 1991). Adrianna Kezar and Peter Eckel contributed in the area of governance challenges and future research agendas (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Michael Shattock studied board governance and institutional capacity (Shattock, 2006; 2012). Patrick Blessinger and colleagues studied governance in emerging economies and the Global South (Blessinger & Anchan, 2017).

Models of University Governance

Governance models reflect varying emphases on collegiality, managerialism, and market mechanisms. The principal models are (i) Collegial Model Emphasizes shared decision-making, academic senates, and faculty primacy. Characteristic of traditional European and Commonwealth systems (Clark, 1983), (ii) Managerial Model Stresses professional management, performance contracts, and executive leadership. Observed in Anglo-American and Australasian contexts (Deem, 2001), (iii) Corporate Model Adopts private-sector governance practices, including boards with external members, risk management, and strategic planning (Bleiklie, 1998), (iv) Hybrid Model Integrates collegial and managerial features, with dual governance structures to balance academic and administrative input (Gornitzka & Maassen, 2000) and (v) Network Model Envisions governance as a multistakeholder network including government agencies, industry partners, and international bodies (Brunner, 2009).

Table 1. Comparison of Governance Models

Model	**Decision Authority**	**Key Actors**	**Principal Features**
Collegial	Faculty/ dominant senate	Professors, deans	Academic freedom, consensus-based committees
Managerial	Executive leadership	Vice-chancellors, managers	Performance metrics, accountability contracts
Corporate	Governing board majority	External experts, trustees	Strategic oversight, risk management, planning
Hybrid	Dual (academic + admin)	Senate + board	Balancing collegial input with managerial goals
Network	Distributed across stakeholders	Government, Industry, NGOs	Collaboration, stakeholder consultations

As per Table 1 above, Higher education institutions employ a range of governance models, each defined by who holds ultimate decision-making power, which actors drive the process, and the core practices that guide institutional life. These archetypes span from faculty-led structures grounded in academic deliberation to broad networks of external stakeholders collaborating on strategic goals.

In the collegial model, decision authority rests squarely with a faculty-dominated senate. Professors and deans convene in committee settings to deliberate proposals, relying on consensus to uphold academic freedom. Shared governance ensures that teaching, research, and curriculum choices reflect the collective expertise of the academic community.

Under the managerial model, executive leadership—typically vice-chancellors and senior administrators—steers the institution. Decisions are driven by performance metrics and key performance indicators, with accountability contracts linking individual and unit objectives to measurable outcomes. This approach emphasizes efficiency, targets, and systematic evaluation.

The corporate model vests authority in the governing board majority, often comprised of external experts and trustees. Board members provide strategic oversight, set long-term plans, and institute formal risk-management frameworks. Institutions adopting this model focus on sustainability, resource optimization, and alignment with broader economic and regulatory environments.

A hybrid model blends academic and administrative decision channels, with both the senate and governing board sharing authority. This dual structure seeks to balance faculty input on scholastic matters with managerial emphasis on operational goals. By integrating collegial debate with executive priorities, hybrid governance aims for both innovation and accountability.

In the network model, governance is distributed across a wide spectrum of stakeholders, including government bodies, industry partners, and nongovernmental organizations. Policymaking unfolds through collaborative consultations, tapping diverse perspectives and resources. This model fosters external partnerships, enabling institutions to respond nimbly to societal needs and emerging opportunities.

Measurement of University Governance

One of the frequently used measurement criteria is Dimensions of Governance**.** Scholars converge on several core governance dimensions. These include (i) Institutional Autonomy (academic, organizational, financial) (Shattock, 2012), (ii) Accountability

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue IX, September 2025

(internal mechanisms vs. external oversight) (OECD, 2003), (iii) Transparency (access to decision records, stakeholder communication) (Barblan & Karran, 2013), (iv) Stakeholder Participation (faculty, students, alumni involvement) (Kezar & Eckel, 2004) and (v) Strategic Capacity (long-term planning, innovation orientation) (Bleiklie, 1998).

Another area of focus while measuring the University Governance is the Research Tools used for Measurement. Researchers use a mix of quantitative and qualitative instruments. Survey instruments (Likert-scale questionnaires), such as the OECD Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) survey (OECD, 2003). Autonomy scorecards, assessing legal frameworks and de jure vs. de facto autonomy (European University Association, 2008). Case-study protocols involving document analysis and interviews (Shattock, 2012). Governance indices, such as the World Bank's SABER-Higher Education framework (World Bank, 2012).

Data Analysis Techniques align with tool types. They include Descriptive and inferential statistics (means, regressions) for survey data (Salmi, 2009), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to test relationships among dimensions (Aghion et al., 2010), Thematic coding for qualitative interviews (Kezar & Eckel, 2004) and Social network analysis to map stakeholder interactions (Brunner, 2009).

Antecedents and Determinants of Governance

Antecedents shape why and how governance reforms occur. Scholars have identified several antecedents. Some of them include National Policy Context, Historical Traditions, Institutional Mission and Funding Mechanisms. Reforms in New Zealand and the UK were driven by neoliberal agendas (De Boer et al., 2007). Collegial governance persists in Germany and Scandinavia due to entrenched academic self-regulation (Bleiklie, 1998). Research-intensive universities adopt corporate models to compete globally (Aghion et al., 2010). Performance-based funding systems incentivize managerial reforms (Salmi, 2009).

Scholars have identified evidences that the factors that influence governance effectiveness include Leadership Style, External Pressures and Internal Culture. Transformational leaders foster participatory governance, whereas transactional leaders emphasize compliance (Meek, Goedegebuure, Santiago, & Carvalho, 2010). Accreditation agencies, rankings, and stakeholders drive accountability measures (Hazelkorn, 2015). Collegial cultures resist top-down managerial controls (Shattock, 2012).

Interdisciplinary Relationships

Existing body of knowledge on University Governance indicate that University governance research clearly intersects with multiple disciplines including Public Administration, Organizational Behaviour, Economics, Political Science and Law. Public Administration examines regulatory frameworks and accountability mechanisms (OECD, 2003). Organizational Behavior explores leadership, culture, and change management in institutions (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Economics analyses resource allocation, marketization, and efficiency (Salmi, 2009). Political Science investigates the state's role and policy networks (Neave & van Vught, 1991). Law studies legal autonomy and statutory provisions for universities (Barblan & Karran, 2013). These interdisciplinary lenses enhance our understanding of governance complexity and inform more holistic reform strategies.

Recent Trends in University Governance

Recent scholarship highlights several emerging themes. Digital Governance uses adoption of big-data analytics and dashboards for strategic decision-making (Hazelkorn, 2015). Stakeholder Inclusion considers greater engagement of students, industry, and community representatives in governing bodies (Aghion et al., 2010). Sustainability Governance integration of environmental and social responsibility in strategic plans (Blessinger & Anchan, 2017). Crisis Resilience focuses on governance agility in response to COVID-19, including rapid policy adaptation and virtual board meetings (Meek et al., 2020). Due to Global Ranking Impact, universities adjust governance to improve ranking metrics, influencing academic policies and resource priorities (Hazelkorn, 2015).

Implications of University Governance

Design and practice of Effective governance have profound impact. Institutional Performance is an outcome of clear governance that correlates with research productivity and teaching quality (Aghion et al., 2010). Academic Freedom argues that a Balanced autonomy safeguards scholarly inquiry and innovation (Barblan & Karran, 2013). Equity and Access have significant impact as governance policies influence student diversity and inclusion initiatives (Blessinger & Anchan, 2017). Societal Engagement get influenced as strategic governance aligns university missions with community needs (Meek et al., 2010).

Mediating and Moderating Variables

Governance effects are shaped by Leadership Style (transformational vs. transactional) as a moderator between governance structure and institutional outcomes (Meek et al., 2010). Institutional Culture mediating the relationship between autonomy and innovation (Shattock, 2012). External Pressures (rankings, accreditation) moderating governance reform adoption (Hazelkorn, 2015). Understanding these variables is essential for tailoring governance reforms to institutional contexts.

Knowledge and Research Gaps

Despite extensive scholarship, gaps remain in the body of knowledge. One of them is the area of Longitudinal Studies. Few studies track governance reforms over multiple decades. Blessinger & Anchan (2017) have identified Global South Perspectives as one of the major Gap areas. Under-researched governance models in Africa, Latin America, and South Asia. Inadequate use of Mixed-

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue IX, September 2025

Methods Designs has led to the need for integrated quantitative-qualitative approaches to capture governance complexity. Absence of Standardized Metrics have led to the lack of universally accepted instruments to compare governance across diverse contexts. Future research should prioritize these areas to enrich theoretical frameworks and inform policy.

International Comparisons of Governance Models

United States Model is characterised by Strong boards of trustees, emphasis on institutional autonomy, and performance contracts with state authorities characterize U.S. governance (Shattock, 2012). In the United States, universities enjoy a high degree of autonomy. Governing boards focus primarily on strategic oversight—setting long-term vision, approving budgets, and appointing top leadership—while faculty retain a moderate influence through senates and committees. Regulatory accountability is enforced via state-level performance contracts that tie public funding to metrics like graduation rates and research output.

United Kingdom focuses on Managerialism and audit cultures prevail, with vice-chancellors wielding significant executive power under regulatory oversight (Deem, 2001). British institutions operate under moderate autonomy, with governing bodies exercising strong executive control over financial and operational decisions. Faculty influence remains limited, largely confined to advisory roles on curriculum committees, as the body of decision-making authority shifts toward administrative leadership. Oversight is maintained by external quality assurance agencies that conduct periodic reviews of teaching standards and institutional governance. Germany uses Federal structure grants universities considerable legal autonomy, with academic senates retaining primary decision-making authority (Bleiklie, 1998). German universities combine high autonomy with a more consultative board structure. Boards serve in an advisory capacity, guiding strategy and safeguarding financial health, but they defer heavily to faculty senates on academic matters. Faculty wield strong institutional influence, participating in decision-making across departments and faculties. Nationwide coherence is ensured by a framework of federal and state laws that define university rights, funding formulas, and performance expectations. India adopts Regulatory bodies like the University Grants Commission define governance norms, with incremental shifts toward autonomy in National Institutional Ranking Framework reforms (Ministry of Education, 2010). In India, autonomy ranges from low to moderate depending on institutional type and ownership. Governing boards often hold nominal power, with day-to-day decisions driven by university administrators and government appointees. Faculty influence varies widely—public institutions may empower professors through statutory councils, while private colleges restrict academic input. Regulatory oversight is administered by the University Grants Commission and a web of professional councils, each prescribing standards for curriculum, staffing, and infrastructure. Nordic Countries use Participatory governance features strong faculty representation, centralized funding, and high public trust in universities (Meek et al., 2010). Nordic universities combine high autonomy with deeply collaborative governance. Boards include faculty representatives alongside external members, enabling joint stewardship of finances, strategy, and academic direction. Faculty influence is consistently high, with scholars actively shaping policies on research priorities and educational innovation. Oversight comes from national funding agencies that link block grants to performance indicators yet respect institutional discretion in resource allocation.

Across global higher education systems, institutions exhibit distinct combinations of autonomy, board engagement, faculty participation, and regulatory oversight that reflect their national contexts and priorities.

Table 2. Governance Characteristics by Region

Region	Autonomy Level	Board Role	Faculty Influence	Regulatory Oversight
USA	High	Strategic oversight	Moderate	State-level performance contracts
UK	Moderate	Executive control	Limited	Quality assurance agencies
Germany	High	Advisory	Strong	Federal and state laws
India	Low to Moderate	Nominal	Variable	UGC and professional councils
Nordics	High	Collaborative	High	National funding agencies

Data Analysis Techniques in Governance Research

Governance Research uses several common analytical techniques. They include (i) Descriptive Statistics and Regression Analysis Employed to examine relationships among autonomy, funding, and performance indicators (Salmi, 2009), (ii) Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Used to test complex models linking governance dimensions, leadership style, and outcomes (Aghion et al., 2010), (iii) Qualitative Thematic Analysis Applied to interview transcripts and policy documents to identify governance narratives (Kezar & Eckel, 2004), (iv) Social Network Analysis Maps stakeholder relationships within governance structures (Brunner, 2009) and (v) Mixed-Methods Triangulation Integrates quantitative and qualitative data to provide comprehensive insights (Shattock, 2012).

II. Conclusion

The field of university governance has evolved from historical collegial traditions to complex models combining academic self-regulation, managerial professionalism, and market mechanisms. Seminal contributions have established analytical frameworks that guide comparative research and policy debates. Measurement tools and data-analysis techniques have diversified, yet

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue IX, September 2025

standardized metrics and Global South perspectives remain under-developed. Future research should pursue longitudinal mixed-methods studies, develop universal governance indicators, and examine governance in emerging higher education systems. Effective governance is integral to institutional performance, academic freedom, equity, and societal engagement, making this domain a vital area for continued scholarly and policy attention.

References

1. Aghion, P., Dewatripont, M., Hoxby, C., Mas-Colell, A., & Sapir, A. (2010). The governance and performance of universities: Evidence from Europe and the US. Economic Policy, 25(61), 7–59.
2. Barblan, A., & Karran, T. (2013). The governance of academic freedom: National contexts, university structures. Higher Education Policy, 26(2), 165–187.
3. Bleiklie, I. (1998). Rationalization and organizational reform in higher education. Higher Education, 36(3), 239–265.
4. Blessinger, P., & Anchan, J. (Eds.). (2017). Humanitarian education and learning: The pedagogy and practice of learning for emergencies, health, and well-being. Emerald Publishing.
5. Brunner, J. J. (2009). Governance and the university. In P. Altbach, L. Reisberg, & L. Rumbley (Eds.), Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution (pp. 309–332). UNESCO.
6. Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. University of California Press.
7. De Boer, H., Enders, J., & Schimank, U. (2007). On the way towards new public management? The governance of university systems in England, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany. In U. Teichler & W. K. Becker (Eds.), Higher Education and the Welfare State (pp. 155–171). Springer.
8. Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the tail wagging the dog? Public Administration, 79(2), 259–278.
9. European University Association. (2008). Universities' autonomy in Europe II: The scorecard. European University Association.
10. Gornitzka, Å., & Maassen, P. (2000). National policies and institutional strategies in European universities. In P. Maassen (Ed.), University Dynamics and European Integration (pp. 13–32). Springer.
11. Hazelkorn, E. (2015). Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence. Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. The Journal of Higher Education, 75(4), 371–399.
13. Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia. Cambridge University Press.
14. Meek, L. V., Goedegebuure, L., Santiago, P., & Carvalho, T. (2010). The changing dynamics of higher education in high achieving systems. OECD Publishing.
15. Ministry of Education [India]. (2010). Report of the Committee for Evolution of the New Education Policy. Government of India.
16. Neave, G., & van Vught, F. A. (1991). Government and higher education relationships across three continents: The winds of change. Pergamon Press.
17. OECD. (2003). Governance in higher education. OECD Publishing.
18. Salmi, J. (2009). The challenge of establishing world-class universities. World Bank Publications.
19. Shattock, M. (2006). Managing good governance in higher education. Open University Press.
20. Shattock, M. (2012). Handbook of governance and policy in higher education. Routledge.
21. World Bank. (2012). SABER-Higher Education: Systems Approach for Better Education Results. World Bank.